THE POWER OF LANGUAGE IN EFL CLASSROOM

N.W.A.S. Dianithi [1], P.K. Nititiasih[2], I.N.A.J. Putra[3]

[123]English Language Education Post Graduate Program, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha
e-mail: anggi.septya@undiksha.ac.id, kertinitiasih@undiksha.ac.id, in_adijayaputra@undiksha.ac.id

This research was aimed at investigating powerful utterances and bases power used by the teachers in the classroom interaction. This research is a descriptive qualitative research. The data were collected through observation to English Teachers of Senior High School. There were four English Teachers of Senior High School teaching in six different classes and different grades. The collected data were analyzed by using two theories: the theory of speech act proposed by Searle (1979), and the theory of power proposed by French and Raven (1968). The result of the study showed that in the classroom, interrogative directive speech as the most frequently utterances produced by the teachers were very powerful to make the students actively participated in the classroom interaction. However, expert power as the power base that mostly occurred in the interaction made the students dependent on the teachers' existence to learn. Legitimate power and informational power that less occurred were the power needed to be used in the classroom to build the students internal motivation and independence. Implication?

Keywords: Communication; Interaction Power; Language; Speech Act

1. INTRODUCTION

Students engagement is a crucial aspect in the learning process (Sesmiyanti, 2016). According to Dharmayana (2012), students' engagement and commitment toward school activities of the students could improve the students' academic achievement or even their success in their future life. Otherwise, what happened recently in senior high school is the teachers found difficulties to get the students engaged in teaching and learning process, as what happened in SMA N 1 Amlapura, a public school in Karangasem.

Nowadays, teachers only teach in the classrooms, while in another hand, they have to give the students feedback, such as motivation during teaching and learning activities, in order to improve the students' ability (Sesmiyanti, 2016). As teaching defined as instruction, a set of events, outside the learners that are designed to support internal process of learning (Sequeira, 2017), so teachers and their role are often considered as the most important aspect of the educational process. However, learning related to the students and what they learn are more important consideration (Sequeira, 2017). Learning is a relatively permanent change behavior which occurs at the end of experience (Akdemir, 2016). It means teaching is a set of instruction given by the teacher to the learners in order to make the process of learning run successfully.

There are many models used by teachers in teaching, depending on the context. Otherwise, not only from the model used by the teachers in teaching which is able to succeed the learning process, it also strongly depends on how the teachers' communication with the students. Communication is the way to exchange ideas, attitudes, emotion, or information which happens between speaker and a listener, both oral and written (Swandewi, 2016).

Language which is defined as a system of arbitrary symbols is used for human in communication (Aidinlou & Amineh, 2016). Mc.Croskey & Richmond (1983) stated that communication is the central to teaching process Mc. Croskey & Richmond 1983. Thus, the

success in running teaching and learning process in the classroom also depends on the language used by the teachers (Basra & Thoyyibah, 2017). It means that communication is the key that determines whether or not the knowledge is successfully transferred in teaching and learning process. Mc. Croskey & Richmond (1983) added that the process of communication occurred in the classroom shows the difference between knowing and teaching. In other words, teaching means to transfer what knowledge to others through communication, meanwhile knowing does not need to transfer the knowledge itself.

In the process of transferring the knowledge, power appears. Power and communication are closely related (Mc.Croskey & Richmond 1983). If there is no communication in the classroom then the teacher is powerless. The power will exist if it is used for all intense and purpose. That is why the use of power requires communication.

Through the communication the teachers transferred their knowledge to the students according their own way to make the students enjoy the learning process. Power exists in communication (Mc.Croskey & Richmond 1983). Power defined as the ability to influence opinions, values and behaviors of others (Vlčková,Mareš & Ježek, 2015 Directive speech act occurs from the interaction in the classroom and it has power to shape students' character based on principle religious, tolerance, discipline, hard work, creativity, curiosity, motivation, approval, friendly, peaceful service, being educated, community aware and responsibility (Duhita, 2018). In relation with the teaching and learning process, power of the teacher is an important thing to control the process. The primary task of teaching is to gain and maintain the cooperation of students (Doyle & Carter, 1984).

Power seems to be an important element of any discourse, and language is entwined in social power of different power (Andinlou & Amineh, 2016). This means that language indexes power, expresses power, and challage power (Wodak & maryer, 2015). French and Raven (1959) expressed social power highlight "the resources one person has availeble so that he or she can influence another person to do what that person would not have done otherwise.

Power refers to the ability of teachers to affect in some way the students' well-being beyond the students' own control (Hurt, et all, 1978). Teacher power is convinced as an individual's potential to have an effect on other person's or group of person behavior yet power cannot be taken as an attribute of teachers rather power is a property of the social relations (Anagaw & Mossu, 2019). In this regard, power is defined as the teachers' ability to influence students to do something they would not have done had they not been influenced (Karney et al., 1984). Teacher power is important component of instructional communication. Teachers' power in its own is also vital and can be considered as foundation upon which to professionalize teaching (Maxcy, 1991). Hence, the educational paradigm emphasized the articulation of power in the classroom (Jackman, 2014).

French and Raven (1986) proposed influential typology of social power as a relational phenomenon distinguishes coercive power (the threat of administering punishing consequences or removal of rewarding ones), reward power (the use of positive consequences or removal of negative ones), legitimate, referent power (which is based on good relationships and identification with those power), and expert power (related to perceptions of one's knowledge and ability in a given area) bases of teacher power.

All in all, it can be assumed that the most important thing to increase the quality of outcome in education is the teachers' communication. Even though the model, method and teaching material used is the best one that is all useless if the teacher cannot make good communication in the teaching and learning process.

Studies have confirmed that teachers' use of power strongly influences teacher - student relationships, students' motivation to learn, and learning outcomes (Anagaw & Mossu, 2019). Raywid (1995) cited that teachers' power is extremely impressive with regard to create and control the social environment of the classroom.

In another hand, Vlčková et al (2015) confirmed that there are some studies found that the qualified teachers master their teaching subject, but they do not know how to establish power relationship in the classroom that make them become harsh and rude, finally the students felt uncomfortable to learn. Therefore, it is important to place the right way to establish power relationship in the classroom. In accordance with Anagaw and Mossu (2019) there are some cases showing that knowledgeable and hardworking teachers who entered classroom well prepared were still failed to deliver their lesson effectively because of ineffective use of communication skill to engage, inform, or related with the students. Moreover, the teachers do not see themselves powerful in some ways (Maftoon & Shakouri, 2012).

Even though there were so many researches that teacher power can maintain the teachers – students' relationship, there were not the research that had concerned in how the bases power of the teachers work from the utterances produced by the teachers.

In order to investigate whether the phenomena that teachers' power can maintain their relationship to the students in order to make the students actively engaged in the learning process also occur, as well as to examine how the teachers communicate and implemented their power through the utterances produced in teaching and learning process, it is the importance of conducting the study.

Based on preliminary observation made in this Senior High School, SMA N 1 Amlapura, it was found that the teachers dominated the learning process. Meanwhile, to make the students as the center of teaching and learning process become the recent issues in education (Jackman, 2014). The teacher seemed work really hard to get the students academically engaged in teaching and learning process. It was clearly seen that the students repeatedly gave the students instructions to get the students engaged. Instruction is the way teacher to have students done something, and the other expressions used by the teacher to give them motivation or feedback. The instruction will be effective if it is powerful. As stated by Sulistiyowati (2016), the most interaction used in the classroom is instruction in which teachers usually innate the interaction by giving instructions. Therefore, giving instructions become a crucial issue in teaching and learning because once teachers fail in giving instruction, then the whole learning process is a waste of time.

The instructions given by the teachers are important to make the learning process effective. How the instructions given by the teachers work? Whether or not those instructions show the power owned by the teacher? Hence, it is important and timely to study teachers' power use during their instructional communication emphasizing how teacher power based associated with classroom interaction. Thus, this study intends to identify the major power bases of teachers, determine the classroom interaction patterns and uncover how teacher power base associated with the classroom interaction. Specifically, the purpose of this study are: (i) To investigate the powerful language expression used by the teacher to give instructions in the classroom interaction, (ii) To reveal the bases power of teacher presented linguistically that frequently appears with the instruction during the interaction in the classroom, (iii) To investigate how the teachers' utterances and power work on the students in the classroom interaction.

This research is concerned on power of language used by the teacher in motivating, giving feedback and giving instruction in English Language Teaching. It is focused on investigating which language expressions were powerful to get students actively involved in the classroom as well as to motivate them to be good students. Besides it is also aiming at investigating the reasons why the teachers' certain language expressions to be used in the classroom related to the power teachers wanted to show and to know the students' perception related to the expression used by the teachers.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Cohen, Manion, and Morison (2000) state, the research design is governed by the notion of fitness for purpose. The purposes of the research determine the methodology and design of the research. This research is concerned on power of language used by the teacher in motivating, giving feedback and giving instruction in English Language Teaching. It is focused on investigating which language expression powerful to get students actively involved in the classroom as well as motivate them to be good students. Besides it is also aiming at investigating the reasons why the teachers' certain language expressions to be used in the classroom related to the power teachers wanted to show and to know the students' perception related to the expression used by the teachers. Considering the purposes of the research and the nature of problem, this follows a descriptive research design with qualitative data. It is descriptive because the objectives of this study are observing and finding the information as many as possible of the phenomena and intended to describe those phenomena. It is considered as kind of qualitative method as it was conducted by collecting and analyzing data, and drawing representative conclusion.

In this method, the data used is purposive sampling in which only English Teachers in SMA N 1 Amlapura chosen by the researcher as sample. Then, the data obtained explored by description. The design of this study is followed qualitative research in which the data gained by made observation in effective teaching and learning process happened in SMA N 1 Amlapura in all grade. Further, the utterances produced by the teachers were identified based on speech act theory by Searle (1979) and then, the power dimension was analyzed. In analyzing the data, the researcher used her noted gathered in the observer personal notes, the data were in the forms of transcript of the conversation in the use of the teacher and students in classroom. The conversation consisted of 461 utterances. After the conversation transcript had been collected, the data processing procedure was carried out. Each utterance was identified base on Searle's theory (1979) that classified the utterances into five basic categories of action i.e. assertive, directive, commissive, expressive and declarative. After all of the utterances produced are classified, it was analyzed whether or not each utterance produced contain the six bases of power proposed by French and Raven (1968).

The subjects of this study were the English teachers of SMA N 1 Amlapura, presented in the Table 1.

Table 1. The Subject of the Study

No	Coding	Sex	Teaching Experience	Education	Class
1	Teacher R	Female	Experienced (10 years)	Master Degree	X IPS 1, X IPS 2
2	Teacher A	Female	Very Experienced (>15 years)	Master Degree	XI IPS 1, XI IPS 2
3	Teacher S	Female	Very Experienced (>15 years)	Bachelor Degree	XII Bahasa
4	Teacher W	Female	Less Experienced (8 years)	Bachelor Degree	X Bahasa

There are four English Teachers in SMA N 1 Amlapura that teach in all grades. All of them are women and married. Each teacher was encoded by Teacher R, Teacher A, Teacher S and Teacher W. They have various experiences in teaching English and come from different level of education. Teacher R and Teacher A had passed their Master Degree. Meanwhile, Teacher S and Teacher W were only in Bachelor Degree. Looking from teaching experiences, Teacher A and Teacher S was categorized as very experienced teacher which has experience in teaching for 15 years more. Teacher R was categorized as experienced teacher that has 10 years teaching experiences. Meanwhile, Teacher W has teaching experience for 8 years which was categorized by less experienced teacher. The object of the study is the language used, in this case the utterances produced by the teacher in interaction of teaching and learning process related to motivate the students, give feedback and give instruction, when they were teaching in the class X IPS 1, X IPS 2, XI IPS 1, XI IPS 2 and XII Bahasa and X Bahasa in academic year 2019/2020.

In this study, the researcher became the main instrument of the research. Besides, several instruments were used to collect the data namely, observation sheet, video recorder, and questionnaire. In this recent study, there were some steps of data collection, I.e.:

1. Observation and Documentation
   Observation and Documentation were conducted at the same time, started from 27 November 2019 - 03 December 2019. The researcher was taking the video record and picture while making observation in the classroom.
   First observation was made in the class X IPS 1 in which it was social class grade ten with 32 students in the classroom. The teacher who taught in X IPS 1 was encoded as 'Teacher R'. In the following day the observation was conducted in the class X IPS 2 with 30 numbers of students and the teacher teaching in this class was the same as the teacher in the class X IPS 1. In the next day, the observation was made in the class XI IPS 2 and XI IPS 1, these are social class grade eleven which each consists of 30 students, and the teacher teaching was encoded as 'Teacher A'. The observation was continued to the language class grade eleven on the next day, which is called as class XII Bahasa, that consist of 29 students and the teacher teaching was encodes as 'Teacher S'. The last observation was made in the tenth grade of language class called class X Bahasa with 25 students as participant, and the teacher that was teaching was encodes as 'Teacher W'. The observation was conducted in a week and it was stopped because the utterances produced were almost the same, which means the data tended to be redundant of the data that had been collecting before.

2. Writing the Transcription of Video
   After the data obtained, the researcher made the transcript of video conversation which were taken in the classroom. The video consisted of 461 utterances from the 12th meeting.

3. Sorting the Data according to Research Questions
   After the transcript was made, the data in transcription were sorted based on the research questions and classified as the data from teachers and data from students.

4. Coding the Data
   The sorted data were differentiated by codes. It helped the researchers to analyze the data.
   In analyzing the data, the researcher used inductive reasoning data analysis by interpreting the collected data based on expert's theory. In this research besides making observation the data were also obtained by recording the situation the classroom so the data which might be missed in the direct observation could be recalled in the video record. Next the data were analyzed using Searle and French and Raven Theory. The result of analysis was compared to the result of study from the other researchers which field was the same as this research.
   The data were in the forms of transcript of the conversation in the use of the teacher and students in classroom. After the conversation transcript had been collected, the data processing procedure was carried out. Each utterance was identified base on Searle's theory (1979) that classified the utterances into five basic categories of action i.e. assertive,

directive, commissive, expressive and declarative. To classify the data, the researcher was also helped by the experts. After all of the utterances produced were classified, it was analyzed whether or not each utterance produced contains the six bases of power proposed by French and Raven (1968).

3. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

a. The utterances produced by the teachers and the power occurred in the classroom interaction.

The observation was made in all grades which consist of six classes. It was revealed that the teachers tended to use pedagogical approach which means the teacher is the center of learning. Mostly, the topics being discussed during the observation were presented by the teachers. Meanwhile the students would actively get involved when they were given tasks or questions by the teachers. There were four different English teachers teaching in each class. Each teacher has her own way to communicate to the students. Otherwise, they had similarity in producing utterances and used their power. To cope with the situation in the classroom in which the students were passively engaged in the learning process causing the teacher became the center of learning. The teachers produced directive utterances more frequent over assertive, commissive, and declarative utterances. Directive utterances were used by the teachers to control activities conducted in the teaching and learning process. Since the students were very passive, the students tried to make them engaged by giving instructions through the directive utterances. Even though teachers also produced the other utterances in the classroom interaction directive utterances were the dominant utterances produced.

The directive utterances which were produced by the teachers to make the students engaged in teaching and learning process are presented on this following data.

| Teacher R | : | (Writing on the board) Okay. To remind you bout simple past tense, I want you to read your PR, about simple past tense. To make sentences about simple past tense. *Sekarang coba tukar sama temannya yang di belakang.*{Now, change your worksheet to your friends behind} Okay I need you to make three sentences using past form. *Jadi*, it's okay if you make short sentences. *Jadi, nggak apa-apa kalau ketiga kalimatnya pendek asal dalam bentuk* past tense. {So, it is okay that all sentences are short sentences as long as they are simple past tense sentences} Be with me please! Okay, let's check your sentences. At first, I want Purnawan. *Siapa yang merikasa punynya Pur?* {Who is cheking Purnawan's} |
| Student | : | (Rising hand) I went on vacation in the shop. I heart motorcycle in the village. |

(Data 1)

Data 1 showed directive utterances produced by the teachers. The teachers explicitly expect the students to do something in the first sentence uttered by the teacher, "*I want you to read your PR"*, which means t the teacher asked the students to read their homework. The next sentence produced by the teacher is "*I need you to make three sentences using past form"*, showing that the teacher was asking the students to make three sentences. Also, the other utterances such as "*Sekarang coba tukar sama temannya yang di belakang - Now change your worksheet with your friends behind!", Be with me please!* and *Let's check your sentences* which showed the teacher was asking the students to do some activities. All of the utterances

produced by Teacher R in Data 1 were her commands to the students. According to Searle's Theory, commands belong to directive utterances. In this occasion commands given by the teacher to direct them involved in the teaching and learning process.

Different from teachers R, teacher A has different way to motivate the students to learn at home. She tended to use interrogative utterances in order to give the students some home assignments. It pictured in conversation between teacher and students in data 2 as follows:

Teacher A   : *Boleh dikasi tugas nggak di rumah?* (Smile) {May I give you assignment?}

Students   : *Boleh, Nggak boleh ?* {Yes please, NO}

Teacher A   : *Boleh dikasi tugas nggak di rumah? Kan hari jumat libur?*
          {Is it okay if I give you homework? Aren't you free on Friday?}

Students   : *Boleh* {Yes please}

(Data 2)

In this conversation the teachers managed to give some assignments to do at home. Despite of directly told the students to do the assignments at home the teacher asked the students permission first by saying "*Boleh dikasi tugas nggak di rumah? Kan hari jumat libur?*". The teacher asked the questions first showing that she insisted the students. Finally, the students agree to make the assignments. What was said by the teachers was like a command for the students to make assignments at home. Thus, it could be concluded that the teacher produced directive utterances. However, the teacher preferred to say it interrogative way.

The example of directive utterances in data 1 and data 2 were functioned to give instruction to the students. Even though the utterances were different i.e. affirmative utterances in data 1 and interrogative utterances in data 2, they had the same purpose, to give instruction to the students.

In addition, during observation of teaching and learning process teachers also produced directive utterances to give feedback toward students' response such as answering questions thrown by teachers and asking some questions to the teachers. The directive utterances produced by the teachers in giving feedback are pictured in the following examples.

Student   :   I went to school on holiday. I follow PKKP for PKS trainee. I feel
                      nice and happy.
Teacher R :   *Ada yang salah?* {Is there anything wrong?} I followed PKKP activities?
Student   :   I do discipline trainee. I feel nice.
Teacher R :   I feel nice. *Yang mana yang salah?* {Which one is incorrect?}
Student   :   I feel nice.

(Data 3)

The conversation in data 3 above showed how the teacher gave feedback to an answer from student. The teachers directly ask the other students to judge whether the answer correct or incorrect. This kind of feedback could make the students think again about the answer. Otherwise, it could also make the student that answer the question feel ashamed when he found that his answer still incorrect. It also could demotivate the students to get involved in teaching and learning process. The way teacher R giving feedback was different from what did by teacher A, pictured in this following conversation.

Teacher A   : Yes. After rain, there is beautiful rainbow. One more opinion, sekarang!

Student	: (Raising hand). After raining, we get wet.
Teacher A	: After raining, we get wet. So, what about rainbow? There is rainbow on the picture.
Student	: (Smile)

(Data 4)

What was shown in data 4 is the teacher A was giving direct feedback to the student that tried to give her opinion about a picture on the text that was being discussed. In this section the students were given picture and asked to make sentences of cause and effect related to the picture. The miss perception happened when the students make the sentence *"After raining, we get wet."* Unlike what was done by Teacher A that directly asked the other students to judge whether the sentence correct or incorrect, teacher A tried to ask question to the students to analyze again the picture and her sentence. At the end the students realized that she had made mistake and felt motivated to try again. In this case the teacher gave the students more chance to think and analyze the topic.

The both conversation (data 3) and (data 4) presented the teachers produced directive utterances in giving feedback to the students. However, there were differences of the way Teacher R and Teacher A communicate with the students. Teacher A tended to use interrogative utterances even though she had the same purpose to ask the students to analyze the answer of a student in the classroom. Feedback given by Teacher R seemed more effective to motivate the students to be actively engaged in the learning process in such a way the student who made mistake was guided by the teacher. However, Teacher R seemed directly judge the students, made her students felt ashamed and demotivated to involve in the learning process.

Teacher S	: What is the goal, what is the ingredients and the steps? Yes! Who can answer number one, *ya siapa yang bisa jawab nomor satu? Angkat tangannya!* {Rise your hand!}Ya Sinta
Sinta	: (Answering)
Teacher S	: Can you read the question first?
Sinta	: What is the text about? About making Gudeg Jogja.
Teacher S	: How to make Gudeg Jogja. Number two? Desi!
Desi	: Answering
Teacher S	: Any other opinion? *Bagaimana jawabannya Desi?* {How was the answer Desi?} Is it right?
Students	: Yes.

(Data 5)

What is presented in data 5 was the activity of question and answer sections, the teacher gave the students more chances to analyze their own answered, which means the teacher did not directly gave their judgment whether the answer correct or incorrect. It made the trained the students critical thinking and made the students paid attention to one another. It was quite the same as what was done by Teacher A in data 5.

From the three examples of conversation on the data presented previously, it could be concluded that the teachers had their own way to give feedback to the students. Teacher R was more direct to the students in which when the students made mistakes the teacher directly judge the students by their own judgment. This way could easily make the students realize his mistake otherwise it could numb the critical thinking of the students as well as make them feeling uncomfortable because their effort to try was not appreciated by the teacher. Meanwhile, the way of teacher A and teacher S in giving feedback to the students seem more effective to build the students' critical thinking in which the students did not directly tell the students whether they were correct or not. The teachers tend to ask question to the students, so they could

analyze their answer once and at the end realize their own mistake. It could also build the students' confidence because they felt their effort was appreciated by the teachers and finally, they enjoyed engaging in the teaching process.

Analyzing the power from all directive utterances presented on the previous data, they were two types of teacher bases power occurred in the conversation, i.e. teacher legitimate power and teacher expert power. Teachers' legitimate power occurred in data 1 and 2. Data 1 and 2 showed the teachers were controlling the activities in the teaching and learning process. The students followed the instruction given by the teachers. In this case, the teachers had power to control the teaching and learning process because they had a label as teacher that had role to control the activities in the classroom

Meanwhile, in data 3, 4 and 5 expert power of teachers showed their expert power in the process of teaching and learning, besides their legitimate power. In those data the teachers controlled the activities in the learning process at once with giving feedback to the students' answer. In those situations, the teachers gave correction to the students' answer. It showed that teachers mastered the material discussed very well so they could direct the students to get correct answer. Expert powers were the most teachers' power occurred in teaching and learning process. Beside on the data presented above, it mostly occurred during the activities in which the teachers explained the lesson. Based on the observation made, the teaching and learning process were dominated by the teachers to explain the lesson, and then followed by question and answer activities.

Reward powers were almost never showed by the teachers. When the students did a great job and effort the teachers did not give much appreciation to the students' effort to be good. Otherwise the teachers likely more focused on students miss behavior. As an example, obtained from the observation, the teachers warned the students that did not pay attention to their explanation by reminding the consequences they would take. It showed the teachers' coercive power.

The percentage of utterances and the power of the teachers are presented in the Table 2.

Table 2. Utterances and Power of the Teacher

TEACHERS' UTTERANCES	ILLOCUTION							POWER			
	Ass	Direct	Com	Express	Declar	Info	Re	Coer	Leg	Exp	Ref
13	5	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	5	7	0
33	15	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	25	0
16	1	12	2	1	0	0	0	2	3	12	0
9	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	0
100	14	85	2	0	0	0	0	0	32	70	0
71	7	61	4	0	0	9	0	0	21	40	3
242	**47**	**190**	**8**	**1**	**0**	**11**	**0**	**2**	**75**	**160**	**3**
	19%	76%	3%	0%	0%	4%	0%	1%	30%	64%	1%

b. How the utterances and power worked on the students.

The four English teachers that have been observed had different style in communication with the students. Even though all of them had similarity that tended to produce directive utterances and frequently used the expert and legitimate power in teaching the students, the way they communicate gave different impact to the students. It could be seen from the perlocution of the utterances produced by the teachers as shown in table 3

Table 3. The utterances produced and the power used by the teacher to give feedback to the students'answer.

Teacher	Directive Illocution	Power	Perlocution
Teacher R	I am happy. *Betul apa salah? Kalau pakai* I am happy, *betul? Salah!*	Expert Power	The student was silent, could not respond and seemed confuse
Teacher A	After raining, we get wet. So, what about rainbow? There is rainbow on the picture.	Expert Power	The students took a look at the picture a, smiled and tried to revise her sentence
Teacher S	Mix? *Kalian aduk dulu baru dituangkan air?*	Expert Power	The students thought about their answer, smiled and said the correct answer
Teacher W	One hundred fifty thousand. *Setuju?* Do you agree?	Expert power	The other students said "no and *salah"*

they tried to

correct their

friend's answer.

Otherwise the

student who

gave answer

seemed shy

Data on the table showed how the teachers gave feedback after the students answered the questions thrown. All of the teachers showed the expert power in which the students could decide the correct and incorrect answer by the knowledge they had as well they produced directive utterances to respond the students answer. There are two different types of directive utterances produced by the teachers, they are affirmative and interrogative. The different type of utterances gave different impact to the students.

Teacher teaching in X IPS 1 and X IPS 2 encoded as Teacher R was so direct when speaking to the students. When the students made mistake, the teacher would directly blame and judge the students and the students would give correction to the mistake herself without giving any chance to the students to think about their mistake first. The way teacher communicate was good for the students because the students could recognize her mistake directly. Otherwise it made the students unmotivated to learn because the teacher would always tell them the correct answer directly. The students also felt shy when they made mistake because the teacher would directly blame and judge them, so when the teacher asked the students questions nobody wanted to try to answer and afraid to make mistake. It affected the students' participation in the teaching and learning process. The students would answer the questions or actively participated in the classroom when the teacher offer them reward like what was illustrated in the first day and second day observation.

Meanwhile, the teacher who teaches in XI IPS 1 and XI IPS 2 that encoded as Teacher A was more indirect than the Teacher R. Both of the teachers tended to produce directive utterances and showed their expert power. However, the way of Teacher A communicate to the students was different. She preferred to use interrogative utterances which function as directive. The students were involved more in teaching and learning process. The students also felt they were given part to make decisions in the process of learning, like how many tasks that could be given to them. So, in this case the decision was not only made by the teacher. It made the students more active to participate in the teaching and learning process. Moreover, when the students made mistakes the teacher let them to analyze it first by asking them some follow up questions which made the students felt more comfortable and confident to speak in the classroom.

In line with the Teacher A, Teacher S who taught in class XII Bahasa also has the same style as Teacher A. They tended to use interrogative utterances which were to get the students do something. It made the students' participation in the classroom more active. It was not only the teacher talking but the students also involved. The students enjoyed the teaching and learning process. Otherwise, when the students made mistake, the teacher did not give clear feedback, like observation made in the fourth day. The teacher did not directly judge the students whether they were right or wrong, the teacher tended to ask the students questions to analyze their mistake first, but in the end the teacher did not give any emphasis toward the students answer which confused the students sometimes.

In addition, Teacher W teaching in class X Bahasa respond the students answer by throwing back to the students to decide whether the answer correct or incorrect. It could build up the students' critical thinking and motivate them to answer every question correctly. However, it could also make the students feel unconfident to be blame by their classmates. Thus, the motivation from the teacher was highly needed. As the last teacher observed was the only teacher who gave the students some advice and motivation. In this case Teacher W was the teacher who showed her informational power at the most, even though she was also as the same as the previous teachers that tended to produce directive utterances and showed their expert power. The advice and motivational words conveyed by the teacher in the process of learning got positive response from the students. After they were motivated by the students, they were more serious to learn and enthusiast to practice and solve the task given by the teacher. In other words, the students' participation in the learning process increased.

Based on the observation made it was obtained that all of English teacher in SMA N 1 Amlapura mostly produced directive utterances when communicate in the process of learning and followed by assertive and commissive utterances. According to analysis of the data the percentage of directive utterances was 76%, assertive utterance was 19% and commissive was 3%.

Directive utterances produced by the teachers to give some instructions to the students during teaching and learning process. They are two types of directive utterances which are produced by the teachers during the process of learning, i.e. affirmative and interrogative. The existences of these directive utterances were recognized by questioning, requesting, commanding, inviting, prohibiting, motivating, suggesting and interrupting. In the process of learning, the teachers produced more directive utterances to get the students to do something which made them involved in the teaching and learning process. From the observation made, the teachers were dominant in talking in the classroom or it could be said that the students did not have initiation to talk in the class unless the teachers asked them some questions or asked them to do something. The interaction in the classroom was still depended on the teachers. The students tend to be passive and only responded the students' questions. Otherwise, the uses of directive utterances produced by the teacher were effective to make the students speak in the classroom. At least it was not only the teachers who speak and explain the lesson the classroom, by asking questions the teacher could make the students more active to participate in the classroom. This finding was in line with the result of the research conducted previously by Basra and Thoyibah in 2017 that aimed at investigating classroom speech acts performed by an English teacher in terms of speech acts classification determined by the theory of John R Searle (1999). It was found that directive utterances were dominating the utterances said by the English teacher when teaching in the EFL classroom. The reason of the teacher using directive utterances was to ask the students about something, and to command and request the students to do something. It could be concluded that the directive utterances can be functioned to give the students instruction. In accordance with study conducted by Sulistiyowati in 2016, the purpose of giving instructions is to enable the students to manage effective learning as well as generate the students' enthusiasm to participate in the teaching and learning process. In addition, the result of the study showed that the instruction given by the teachers had to be challenging to make the students more active to participate in the classroom and to build up their initiation. Moreover, giving the students chances to react to important issues critically without being dominated by the teachers could increase the students' activeness.

It means that to get the students actively participate in the process of learning, the teachers have to be able to give appropriate instructions. The use of directive utterances to instruct or ask the students can be effective if the directive utterances can challenge the students to think critically, and build up their initiation to participate. Connected to the present research, directive utterances were more powerful to challenge the students when it was presented in interrogative form rather than in affirmative way. It gave the students more chances to think about their mistakes and how to fix the mistakes without feeling ashamed since the students did not directly blame the students but guided them to find the correct one. Thus, it could build the students' confidence and initiation. It was more effective rather than the teacher dominated the students to respond certain issues affirmatively.

Besides, the data gained from the observation in this present research showed that 3% of utterances produced by the teachers were commissive utterances. These utterances used by the teacher to refuse the students answers. When the students answered the questions asked by the teachers incorrectly, the teacher directly refuse the answer and tell them her own answer directly without giving students more change to correct the answer. According to Sulistiyowati (2016), this kind of way could numb the students' critical thinking and unmotivated them to participate more in the process of learning. As what happened in the observation, when the students' answers were refused directly by the teacher, the related students felt ashamed and unmotivated to participate again when there were other questions given. They seemed afraid to make mistake. Responding the teachers' questions seemed to be a risky thing for the students. Thus, they preferred to be silent and did not think at all. That was why the students did not have critical thinking and felt unmotivated to engage in the classroom interaction.

Furthermore, 13% of assertive utterances obtained in this present study were produced by teachers when they were explaining the concept and theory related to the topic discussed. Assertive utterances were used to represent the world as the speaker believes it (Yule, 1996). When the teacher was explaining the theory of the topic discussed, they conveyed what they believe to the students. Based on the observation made, the teachers dominated in explaining the topic discussed. Too much explanation drove the students into boredom. However, the students became active in the learning process when the students were asked about something and to do something. It means that it would be more effective that the teachers were asked to find out the concept first themselves and at the end they discussed their opinion with the teacher. In conclusion, directive utterances were the most effective utterance to get the students actively involved and participated in the learning process.

Looking at the utterances produced, there were power of teacher laid in every utterance and moves made by the teachers. From the observation made in the six classes, it was obtained that Expert Power were dominant occurred in the teaching and learning process. Expert Power showed the teachers competences and knowledge in the specific area and most information taught in the classroom is presented from an expert power (Aidinlou & Amineh, 2016).

This power occurred frequently when the teachers explained the topic to the students, in which the teachers shared their idea to the students. In this point the teacher became the source of learning and when they share the ideas or concept the teachers tends to produce assertive utterances. Because of the activities in the process of teaching and learning were dominated by teachers' explanation, the teachers' power that mostly occurred was expert power. It was 64% of the other power occurred. Besides, this expert power also laid in the directive utterances which were mostly produced by the teachers, especially when the teachers responded and gave feedback to the students. The existence of this power was also strengthened by the teachers' activities in which the teachers asked questions to the students and the teachers answered the questions themselves. This power gave the students less chances to make interaction and respond to the issues discussed.

Another power that followed the expert power was legitimate power. The percentage of this power was 30% dominated the other powers. Legitimate power refers to the role of the teacher in the classroom specifically to how to control the classroom related to make certain demand and request (Aidinlou & Amineh, 2016). In this present study, the teacher used this power in controlling the process of teaching and learning by requesting the students to do something and making the rules that should be followed by the students in the classroom. In this case this power occurred together in directive utterances produced by the teachers. What was revealed in the research by the observation conducted, this power occurred frequently by the teachers because the students were very passive. So, the students need to be directed to activities which make them actively involved in the teaching and learning process. It made the teachers was still dominant in the interaction, because of the lack initiation of the students.

According to research conducted by Anagaw (2019) concerned on the investigation of teacher power bases in terms of classroom interaction, legitimate and expert power in which the

teacher was dominate on, were negatively associated with classroom interaction. These power bases could limit the students' interaction in the process of learning. It was suggested that the teachers had to find out the alternative power sources that can permit students interactions. It was in accordance with the condition obtained from the observation. Teacher expert power enabled the students in learning process because they easily find the source from their teachers. Otherwise, the students would only depend on the teachers to build up their knowledge. So, they did not have initiative to find out the other sources of learning. In other words, it could prevent the students to be independent. In contrast with what was propose by Anagaw (2019) that legitimate power was also limit the students' interaction. As what was found out in the present research that legitimate power helped the students to interact more with the teachers and classmates during teaching and learning process. If the teacher did not used their legitimate power there would be no activities in the classroom, since the students were very passive.

The other power bases occurred in this research was 4% informational power, 1% coercive power and 1% referent power. Informational power in this study occurred when the teachers gave the students advises and motivation as what was found in the last day observation. This informational power was effective to change the students' behavior by making the students understand what was the reason of they have to do something. According to Raven (2008) Informational power influences the cognitive change and acceptance behavior. It means that informational power was effective power that could make the students change behavior without burden the students, otherwise it could increase their motivation. In this research the coercive power occurred when there were no any students that respond the question thrown by the students. To overcome the situation the teacher used her coercive power to get the students involved by saying they would not be given score for their task if nobody answered the question. This way was work on the students to be actively engaged. However, it could change the students' motivation sometimes, in which the motivation of the students became to get good score rather than to understand the lesson. In accordance with the statement from Raven (2008), the informational power could build the students internal motivation. By this power, teacher could give the students understanding the importance of learning. So, this power should be used more in the classroom.

In this research was revealed that directive utterance in which the expert power and legitimate power lay on were most frequently produced by the teachers that were powerful to make students engaged, involved, and actively participated in the learning process. However, the existence of expert power that most frequent occurred during teaching and learning process which laid on assertive and directive utterances could limit the students to make interaction, especially when the utterances were produced affirmatively in which the teachers directly respond to certain issues that the students had to concern on. Meanwhile, the legitimate teacher power laid on the directive utterances were more powerful to make the students that were very passive to be actively participated. Thus, the use of directive utterances which consist of legitimate power were better to use to conduct activities that lead the students to the activities which make them can learn more independent and build their internal motivation. Besides, the teachers also could improve the use of informational power to get the students motivate in engaging in the classroom interaction.

The result of this study was had similarity with the other research related to how the expert power impacted the students' participation. It made the students really depended on the teachers and drove them to be passive. Otherwise, it was deferent in how the legitimate power affected the students that could guide them to actively engage. The used of each teacher bases power and the way of the teacher communicate could not fix in every situation. It really depended on the characteristics of the students. Thus, the teachers could use the utterances showing the power that appropriate with the students' characteristic.

Besides of the linguistics perspective showing teachers' power, there were others factor that also affected the effectiveness of teaching and learning process such as the educational background, teaching experiences of the teachers, gender, and marital status. In this present research the teachers were grouped in two three categories they were very experienced teacher (15

– 20 years teaching experience), experienced teacher (10 – 14 years teaching experience) and less experience teacher (5 – 9 years teaching experience).

Based on the observation found that the way Teacher A and Teacher S communicated to the students were effective to get the students engaged in teaching and learning process. They were very experienced teachers. They tend to use interrogative directive utterances to communicate with the students. It was successful build the students' critical thinking and motivation in learning. This finding was in accordance with the research conducted by Fernandes, Gracias, et al (2019) which obtained female teacher with more teaching experience were seen more capable of organizing their instruction clearly. Meanwhile, education level of female teachers had negative effect to their performance. Connected to this present research, it was found that Teacher S that had lower education level managed the classroom better than Teacher R which has higher education level. Otherwise, Teacher S has more experience in teaching and learning process.

Seeing from the teachers' marital status, all of them were married and it did not seem affect their performance. In line with the research conducted by Vijayalakshmi (2002), confirming that marital status did not have significant influence on the teacher effectiveness. Seeing from the gender, all of them were female, thus it could not be compared.

4. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The study concludes that, the teachers in the process of learning most frequently produceddirective utterances in the form of questions, requests, and commands. In giving instructions or some commands the teachers preferred to use interrogative utterances which were powerful and effective to get the students actively participated in the learning process.

In addition, the used of directive utterances especially the interrogative directive utterances acts could direct the students to be more active in the classroom in this case to think and analyze the concepts, stating their opinion and answers as well as involve in making decision in the classroom. However, when the teachers were very direct, it could make the students feel not interested and unmotivated to involve in learning process.

Teacher bases power also occurred in the utterances produced by the teachers. Expert power and legitimate power were the frequent power occurred during teaching and learning process. Since the students was very passive, the teachers need to be dominant to control the classroom to make the students actively participated in the process of learning which needed the teachers' legitimate power. Otherwise, the expert power occurred made the students only depend on the teachers' existence in learning process.

From the result of the study conducted, there are some suggestions as follows:
Suggestion for teachers:
- The result of this study suggested that directive utterances in the interrogative form were more effective to motivate the student to engaged in the classroom interactions
- This present study found that expert power that occurred made the students depend on the teachers as the only sources of learning otherwise informational power and reward power were found effective to build the students' internal motivation and independence in learning
- The use of directive utterance with legitimate power could be more powerful if the teacher could use it to lead the students into activity which makes them actively engaged in the classroom interactions.

Suggestion for the future Researchers

This research showed they were other factors which also affected the effectiveness of teacher besides the power seen linguistically. They were gender, educational background and teaching experience of the teachers. Otherwise, in this study the gender of the teachers was limited so it was necessary to enlarge the scope of the study.

REFERENCES

Aidinlou, N. A., & Amineh, R. J. (2016). Students' Perception of Teachers' Power in High School, Universtity, and English Language Institute. International Journal of Linguistics; Vol.6, No. 6, 76-86.

Akdemir, A. S. (2016). Learning and Teaching: Theories, Approach and Models. Elazig: Firat University.

Anagaw, M., & Mossu, Y. (2019). Teacher Power in EFL Classroom: Associations with Classroom Interaction. Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics; Vol.59, 6-17.

Arikunto. (2006). Metode Penelitian Kualitatif. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Ary, D. (2001). Introduction to Research in Education. USA: Wadsworth Group.

Austin, J. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. web.

Basra, S. M., & Thoyyibah, L. (2017). A Speech Act Analysis of Teacher Talk in an EFL Classroom. International Journal of Education,(10) 1, 73-78.

Baumgarten, S. (2009). Translating Hitler's "Mein Kompf": A Corpus - Aided Discourse Analytical Study. Searbrucken: VDM.

Budiasih, L. T., Andayani, & Rohmadi, M. (2016). Illocution on Speech Act of Foreign Students in Indonesian Learning. Parole: Journal of Linguistics and Education, 6(2), 41-48.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Marisson, K. (2000). Research Methods in Education. 5th Edition. London: Rotledge Falmer.

Dharmayana, I. W. (2012). Keterlibatan Siswa (Student Engagement) sebagai Mediator Kompetensi Emosi dan Prestasi Akademik. Jurnal Psikologi, 76-84.

Doyle, W., & Carter, K. (1984). Academic Tasks in Classsroom. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Duhita, A., & Zulaeha, I. (2018). The Politness Speech of Primary School Teacher in the Character Building of Learners. Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 7(2), 112-121.

Eggins, S. (1994). An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics. London: Printer Publisher Ltd.

Fin, A. (2012). Teacher use of procosial and antisocial power bases and students' percieved instructor understanding and missunderstanding in the college classroom. Communication Education, 61(1)1, 67-79.

French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). The Bases of Social Power In D. Cartwright (Ed.). Studies in Social Power, 150 - 167.

French, J., & Raven, B. (1968). Group Dynamics. Reasearch and Theory, chapter Bases of Social Power.

French, J., & Raven, B. (1986). French and Raven's Power Bases: A Focus for Educational Researchers and Practitioners. Sage Journal, (30)3, 256-265.

Goffman, E. (1959). The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York : Doubleday, Anchor.

Hancock, B., & Windridge, K. (2009). An Introduction of Qualitative Research. Brirmingham: University of Birmingham.

Handayani, T. K. (2016). Nilai-Nilai Karakter dalam Tindak Tutur Illocution dalam Buku WIR BESUCHEN EINE MOSCHEE. Litera Jurnal Penelitian Bahasa, Sastra dan Pengajarannya, XV(2), 36.

Harujanen, E. (2011). Students' Consent to a Teacher's Pedagogical Authority. Scandinavian Journal of Education Research, 55(4), 403-424.

Hickey, P. R. (2014). Speech Act Theory.

Hurt, H., Scott, M., & McCroskey, J. (1984). Communication in the classroom. Reading , MA: Addison - Wisely.

Jackman, W. M. (2014). Teacher - Student Discourses, Power Brokerage and Classroom Engagement. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science; Vol. 4, No 7(1), 154-159.

Karney, P., Plax, T., Richmon, V., & McCroskey, J. (1984). Power in the Classroom IV: Alternatives to Discipline . Communication Year Book, 8, 724-746.

Kimchi, J., Polivika, B., & Stevenson, J. (1991). Triangulation: Operational Definition . Nursing Research 40(6), 364-366.

Levin A. (2010) Power and Politics: Speech Acts and Freedom of Expression. In:The Cost of Free Speech. Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Martono, N. (2011). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif. Jakarta: PT. Raya Grafindo Persada.

Maxcy, S. J. (1991). Educational Leadership: a critical pragmatics perspective. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

McCroskey, J., & Richmond, V. (1983). Power in the classroom I: Teacher and students perceptions. Communication Education, 32, 175-184.

Nurhayati. (2010). Wacana Interaksi Kelas: Analisis Kritis Aspek dari Dimensi Sosial. Publikasi Ilmiah, 1-12.

Prasetyo, R. I., & Mulyani, M. (2018). Teacher's Directive Speech Acts in Teaching-Learning Interactions: Classroom Discourse Analysis. Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, 7(3), 213 - 221.

Quinn, P. (2006). Cooperative Learning and student Motivation. Education and Human Development Master's Theses.

Raven, B. (1992). A Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence: French and Raven Thirty Years Later. Journal of social Behavior and Personality, 7(2), 217-244.

Raven, B. H. (2008). The Bases of Power and the Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. Analysis of Social Issues and Public Policy, (8).1, 1-22.

Raven, B. H., Schwarzwald, J., & Koslowsky, M. (1998). Conceptualizing and Measuring a Power/Interactional Model of Interpersonal Influence. Journal of Applied Sosial Psychology,28, 307-332.

Raywid, M. (1995). The Subschools/Small SchoolsMovement - Taking Stocks.

Richmond, V. P., Davis, J., L.M, & Koontz, K. (1980). Percieved power as a mediator of management communication style and employee satisfaction: A preliminary investigation. Communication Quarterly, 28, 37-46.

Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts. London: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1976). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. Language in Society, 5(1), 1-23.

Searle, J. R. (1979). Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Act. Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1999). Mind, Language and Society: Philosophy in the Real World. Phoenix: Guernsey Press Co.

Seken, K. (2015). Introduction to Pragmatics: A Course Book for Beginner, Firstq///' Printing. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Sequeira, A. (2017). Introduction to Concept of Teaching and Learning.

Sesmiyanti. (2016). Student's Cognitive Engagement in Learning Process. Journal Polingua: Scientific Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Education, 48-50.

Suhirman, L. (2016). Speech Act in Psycholiguistics Class Setting in Postgraduate Program. IJOLTL, 1(1), 19-38.

Sulistyani. (2017). The Power of Directive Speech Acts in EFL Classroom Interaction. Conference on English Language Teaching (ICONELT 2017).

Sulistyowati, T. (2016). Teachers' Strategy in Maintaining Classroom Communication in Pre Service Class: A Functional Analysis. Presented: Language and Language Teaching Conference.

Swandewi, I., Ramendra, D., & Juniarta, P. A. (2016). An Analysis of Speech Acts Used by English Teacher in Classroom Teaching and Learning Process at SMA Negeri 2 Banjar.

Vlckova, K., Mares, J., & Jezek, S. (2015). Adaptation of Teacher Power Use Scale to Lower Secondary Students and Student Teachers. Pedagogicka orientace, 25 (6).

Vijayalakshmi, G. (2002). Factors Effecting Teacher Effectiveness. EduTracks 1(5), pp. 35-38.

Wodak, R., & Mayer, M. (2015). Methods of critical discourse studies. Baverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: OUP.

.