

AN ANALYSIS OF SPEECH ACTS PRODUCED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS AND STUDENTS TO FACILITATE TEACHING AND LEARNING AT SDN 10 PRINGGASELA EAST LOMBOK

MERDANA¹, SEKEN, K², ADI JAYA PUTRA, N³

Language Education Study Program, Postgraduate Program
Ganesha University of Education
Singaraja, Indonesia

e-mail: {merdana@pasca.undiksha.ac.id, ketut.seken@pasca.undiksha.ac.id,
nyoman.adijayaputra@pasca.undiksha.ac.id}

Abstract

This study was intended to describe, analyze, and explain types, functions, instructional functions of speech acts produced, and politeness strategies employed in the classroom. The subjects of the study were the teachers and the students. The data for this naturalistic qualitative study were collected through observation, interviews, and note taking that were then analyzed by following Miles and Huberman's (1994) interactive cyclical model. This study found that the teachers produced more utterances (72.59%) than students did (27.41%). The teachers mostly produced directives type of speech acts, while the students' speech acts were mostly assertives namely, responses to the teachers' directions. Furthermore, the teachers were found to use more direct directives than the indirect ones in the form of declarative, interrogative, and imperative. Those directives speech acts created in types of requestive, requirement, and advisory. The functions of the teachers' directives were question directives, bald imperatives, embedded imperatives, need statements, hint directives, and permission directives (Tripp, 1976). The instructional functions of the teachers' speech acts were of three modes, namely control, organization, and motivation modes (Johnson, 1997). The authority role of the teacher indicated the vertical status difference in the classroom. However, politeness linguistic devices also appeared as indication of the teacher's efforts to reduce the imposition effect of certain acts on the students.

Keywords: speech acts, teaching and learning, facilitate

INTRODUCTION

Learning is a process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. The interaction of the experience and environment takes a role in developing the content of learning and instruction.

Understanding language implies the understanding of pragmatics. Even the young children have to learn the pragmatics of language if they want to communicate effectively (Curtis and O'Hagan, 2005: 47-48). In addition, Wrench, et al. (2009) maintains that teaching is about establishing effective and affective communication relationships between teachers and students.

Teaching and learning in school can be done successfully through the appropriate use of language (Schleppegrell, 2004:19). The language plays an important role in the teaching and learning process. It means that starting school for children leads to confronting new ways of using and acquiring a certain language.

When teaching is designed to accomplish a particular goal of learning, it might be successful with the use of a certain language. The teaching is carried out by language that is known widely as classroom speech act (Curtis and O'Hagan, 2005: 48). Searle (1969) defined speech act as the basic unit of language,

the production of a token in the context of a speech act.

The classroom speech acts determine the quality of verbal interaction in the classroom. This provides important information for teachers, whereby they know the typical teaching behaviours they use extensively in communicating with the students. Wells (1985) acknowledges that language use is related to the context in which the interaction takes place. The children use more 'control speech' as a set of different directiveness, commitments and declaratives during pretend play, especially when children play with peers.

In spite of the importance of classroom speech acts as described above research on teachers and students' speech acts has not been done adequately. In fact research on classroom speech acts is quite rare. This research was conducted as an attempt to break up the scarcity. It was set up to examine the interpersonal discourse management in classroom interaction, namely, the use of speech acts and the way they are realized in classroom interaction.

Classroom speech act involves all verbal utterances used as a medium in classroom communication. Research on speech acts produced in the teaching and learning process in the classroom has been known as discourse studies or discourse analysis. This research is concerned with the relationship between language and the context in which it is used (McCarthy, 1991:5, Seken, 2004:61)

Cazden (in Hickman, 2000) identifies three general functions of language that make communication central in school, specifically in the classroom. That is through language, teacher transmits curriculum, controls the communication, and reflects personal identity.

The relationship of learning and language is the core of approaches to education. Toward the use of language in the classroom, the people act upon the meaning they construct. Johnson (1997: 274) asserts that interpersonal aspect of classroom discourse is related to three instructional functions: control, organization, and motivation. These three instructional functions of speech acts are

basic to teacher function in the classroom. The present research was meant to identify the teachers' speech acts for these instructional functions. The classroom speech acts, including the teachers' speech acts were described on the basis of Searle's speech act theory.

In relation to classroom speech acts, Searle (1969) maintains that directives is a speech act that is frequently used in a classroom interaction. The teachers use it to make the students do something. The types of speech act used are command, order, advice, request, warning, and so forth. Another theory of directives is proposed by Ervin Trip (1976), that also covers the functions of directives speech acts. The first is *need statement*. It is a declarative statement that is used to make the addressee (students) do whatever request of the speaker. The second is *bald imperative*. It occurs from a person who has higher status or superior to the addressee. That is, the addressee is a person who has lower status or subordinate status. The third is the speech act with polite directions, that is known as *embedded imperative*. This is indicated by an interrogative form and modals. The fourth is *permission directives* which occurs in an interrogative sentence. This is used by the children and subordinate people. The fifth is *question directives*. The primary moves that occur in classroom are question and answer moves. Question directives is treated as the tool of turn taking mechanism in the classroom run well. The question directives usually occurs in an interrogative structure form. The last of teacher's directives is *hint directives* that is formed in a declarative statement. This involves a meaning that is implied the statement used by the teacher. It can be said that the teacher implicitly makes a request, and so on.

According to Krish and Ervin Tripp (as cited in Tantra, 1992: 16) the primary function of directives is to guide behaviour and to get somebody to do something. In guiding and getting students to do something the teacher should consider the characteristics of the student, that relate to his/her age. As the students are still in

young ages, the emergence of using the polite strategies/utterances is really important. Politeness strategies are used to formulate messages to save the hearer's face when face-threatening acts are inevitable or desired. Brown and Levinson (1987) posit that positive and negative face threatening acts exist universally in human culture.

Considering the views described above, the present study focused on classroom interaction during the teaching and learning process at SDN 10 Pringgasela, East Lombok that includes investigation of: (1) types of the speech acts produced by the teachers and students, (2) functions of the speech acts produced by the teachers and students, (3) the instructional functions of directives speech acts produced by the teachers, and (4) politeness strategies used by the teachers and students.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research was designed as a qualitative research since the source of the data was the teaching and learning activity in naturalistic environment of the classroom. The data of this research were collected when the teaching and learning process was going on naturally (cf. Bogdan and Biklen, 2003: 3). As such, the study can be categorized as a classroom ethnography. The researcher observed the linguistic behaviours of teachers and students in a classroom context. This research analyzed the speech produced by teachers and students of SDN 10 Pringgasela. The subjects of this research were, therefore, the teachers and students of that school especially in second and third grade.

The data were largely collected through observation (in which recording and note taking were done) and interviews (Dell Hymes, 1974). The data were the sentences uttered by the teachers and students, field notes obtained through observation, and other written notes, and documents relate to the events within the scope of the research.

The data were analyzed using Miles and Huberman's (1994) interactive model of data analysis. That is, the data were

analyzed through three cyclical steps, namely, data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing/verification. Before selecting and reducing the utterances, the researcher, transcribed the utterances occurring in the conversation or interaction of the teachers and students in the classroom. Each of the selected utterances was entered into a profile in which all of its relevant characteristics are specified. The data were then classified and categorized based on specified characteristics. A synthesis was then made toward answering the research questions that yielded the findings of the research (cf. Seken, 2004).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this research, Searle's (1979) classification was used to describe the types of speech act produced in the classroom of SDN 10 Pringgasela. That is, the speech acts identified was classified into five categories, namely, assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.

In terms of frequency of occurrence, the type of speech act that occurred frequently in the classroom was assertives speech act (47.79%), that was followed by directives (44.11%), expressives (5.56%), and commissives (2.54%). Generally the teachers produced more utterances than students did. From the data, thus the teachers produced 1973 utterances (72.59%); the students produced 745 utterances (27.41%) within the time the observation was done.

The Type of the Teachers' and Students Speech Acts

The teachers in SDN 10 Pringgasela produced directives speech acts mostly. Searle (1969) asserts that the directives speech acts produce an effect through some actions that is done by the hearer. From the data collected, the teachers in SDN 10 Pringgasela created this type of speech acts as requestive (ask), requirement (command, order), and advisory (advice, suggest).

In advisory type the teachers used certain expressions that were intended to an advice (Searle, 1979). The expressions

used were *'dendek* (do not) and *(la) mun* (if). *Dendek* was employed as a negative imperative, that was used to advice the students not to do certain unexpected action. For instance, the teacher uttered *'Dendeq siq lek daya!* ('Don't answer for the north row students!). Furthermore, the expression of *(la) mun* (if) was used to advised the students in polite sense. This can be seen at a teacher's utterance *'Mun te gagah perhatiang pak guru ndih!* (Please, if you are a good boy, pay attention!')

The requestive type of the teachers' speech acts were used to ask the students about something that were constructed in question form. It applied *wh-question*, and also *yes-no question* types. On one hand, the teachers constructed the questions by applying the question words, namely, *'sai'* (who), *'apa'* (what), *'ngumbe'* (how), *kan'* (why), *'pira'* (how many), and *"mbe"* (which one). Those words put at the beginning or at the end of the questions. For example: *'Te kumbeq nasi' ono?'* (What to do with the rice?). On the other hand, the teachers employed the *Yes/No questions* type. In making this, the teachers chose modal auxiliaries and verb treated as auxiliary that were put at the beginning of utterance, Those are, namely, *"bau"* (can), *"mele"* (want), *"kanggo"* (may), *"tao"* (can), and *"iniq"* (can), and *'oah'* (already). For example: *Tao kamu miaq e conto ino?* (Can you make that example?)

The existence of question and advice in the teaching and learning develops the role of the teacher as initiator and sustainer of the interaction in the classroom (Brown, 2001). Appropriate questioning in an interactive classroom can fulfil several different functions. Searle (1969:22) asserts that directives is frequent speech acts in classroom interaction.

The one who produces the assertives speech acts is seen to commit the truth of the expressed proposition (Searle, 1979). From the finding, assertives appeared in reporting, suggesting, complaining, and stating. In reporting something, the teachers restated the students' responds/answers. Furthermore, in informing, the teachers

employed the *nasalized words* as one of the assertives. This expression change functioned as syntactic modification. For example, in utterance *'Ngeros, berarti ndek mele ndengerang bu guru ono'*. (If you talk too much, it means that you don't want to listen to me), the teacher nasalized the verb *'raos'* (speak) to be a noun *'ngeros'* (speak) that was functioned as information maker. Besides, the use of nasalized words the informative assertives employed certain markers, namely: *oah* (already), *laek* (formerly), *lekan* (since), and *"misal"* (for example) devices. For example in utterance: *'Oah sebut e'* (It has been mentioned).

In suggesting the students, the teachers used some expressions that contain a prospective meaning (future tense) such as the use of *'mun'* (if) clause, the use of *mudaq-mudaq* (easy), *sekurang-kurang* (at least), *kira-kira* (approximate), *agen* (so that), and the use of *'seke....., seke.....'* expression (in English it can be seen as the 'more and more' construction). Those were used by the teacher to suggest and motivate the students. Generally, those expressions covered the advisory meaning. The example from the data is *'Mudaq-mudaq ene, sik bau gitaq lek bale a. Ya, ciri-ciri kambing, ya'* (These are easy; you can learn the characteristics of the goat at home).

The other type of assertives is complaining (Searle, 1979). Complaining expressions were uttered in the high tone (especially at the end). Besides, the expressions of complain employed: *epe*, questioning tone, *banuk*, *lonto*, *kanso*, *laguk*, negative, *doang*, specifies, *padahal* and *kanyan*, but the teachers also employed certain Arabic word to complain. *'Astagirullohaladzim'* was used as call to express a sense of wonder mixed with sadness. In this case, the teachers complain on a certain attitude done by the students. The utterance found in the data is: *Ndek denger bu guru banu:k* (But you did not listen to me).

The other type of complaining was the use of *'kedok'* (deaf). In line with this, there were some other types shown in the data namely: *'susah'* and *'marak'*. For

example: '*Kan ne kedok!*' (Listen to me!). Furthermore, in stating certain information, the teachers used the affirmative or informative statements.

The type of expressives speech acts produced by the teachers were congratulating and threatening. In congratulating the students' attitudes, the teachers employed the expression '*bagus*'. The teachers agreed and felt satisfy on the students' answer (behaviour) appeared on using of '*bagus*', '*betul*' and '*hebat*'. As an example is '*Meong, betul*' (The cat. That is right). Toward threatening, the teachers applied '*awas*' device. This covered the advisory mode, entailed threatening term. This was used to warn the students. The other expressions were '*susah*', '*baeh silik*', and '*laun jaq*'. For example: '*Oahang baeh silik*' (Stop do that or I will give you a punishment).

Commissives speech acts are in term of offer and promise. Commissives speech acts commit the speaker himself/herself to do some future actions (Searle, 1979). Toward this, the teachers employed offering and promising utterances signalled by the existence of '*nengka*', '*kita akan*', the form of '*te + verb*', '*baeh*', and '*obaq te*'. For example: '*Obaq te benyanyi sekali juluk*' (Let's sing a song first)

Contrasted with the teachers' speech acts, the students also produced assertives in the highest frequency. Then, this followed by directives and commissives. None of the students' utterances are indicated as expressiveness and declarations. The high frequency of assertives figured the students, psychologically, as inferior to the teachers. This speech acts appeared in form of responses for the teacher's questions. For example: '*sepulu*' (It is ten). These finding showed that the students were responsive to the teacher's question and instruction. The absence of expressives and declarations speech acts had no influence on the students' responses. This phenomenon implied that the teachers successfully achieve their expectation by making the students respond verbally. Other implication was the understanding of teachers' instructions.

The Function of the Teachers' Speech Acts

Searle (1969:22) asserts that directives is frequent speech acts in classroom interaction that are used as a command, order, advice, request, warning, etc. The speaker states question to the hearer, demanding information from the hearer. Furthermore, Ervin Trip's concept (1976) on directives function was used. The types and functions of directives proposed are need statement, bald imperative, embedded imperative, permission directives, questions directives, and hint directives.

The structure of question directives was in interrogative mode. From the data, the highest frequency of directives speech acts was question directiveness. Mostly, the teacher controlled and managed the classroom by giving a series of questions. For example; '*Sik mbe ie pegawean sik perlu te gawek?*' (Which job is the important to do?). This indicated that the students were actively involved in the teaching and learning process, when teachers used question directives for asking certain information. This was commonly occurred in the class. Giving question was a good way to involve the students in the teaching and learning process in which two ways of interactions can be formed. However, the teacher was the one who mostly made question, while the students response in one word/syllable only.

Besides that, question directives also has other functions, namely; to check the students' knowledge about certain information, to check the students' understanding about certain information, and to ask the students' ability to do something. Meaning that a directives speech acts can have more than one function.

The other function of directives speech acts was *bald imperative*, that were formed in imperative mode. It was used by person who has higher status or superior to a person who has lower status. The following is the example of bald imperative, such as, '*Gaweq mangkun ene nengka!*' (Do it like this now!)

The teachers commanded the

students in a direct way, was considered to be impolite. From the data, the teachers used directives speech acts to command the students. This function was formed by bald imperative type. The structure has direct relationship with the function of the utterance. It makes the meaning of the message clear. Considering this reason, the teachers need to take control over their classes. However, this reason should not respect listeners.

Embedded imperative was indicated by interrogative form and the use of modals. Embedded imperatives were also mostly used. The use of '*ndih*' (yes), '*ya*' (yes) and formal language were some variants of this type. The following is the example of this function. '*Dua nomer, catet ie juluk, ndih?*' (Please, write it first!), '*Nanti latihan sendiri dulu ya?*' (For the next activity! Please, do the exercise first!).

The utterances were categorized into embedded imperative. It was considered to be indirect and more polite because the use of interrogative form and the existence of the '*ndih*' and '*ya*'. These promoted the utterances that are judged as the polite command.

Directives in this research also appeared in form of declarative statement. Need statement type was used in classroom transactional setting. The function was making the students do a request. The example is '*Sik kiri kanan, ibu guru minta diam!*' (The left and right side students, I want you keep silent!).

The structure of hint directives was formed in declarative that seem to be the same as need statement. However, the meaning of this type of directives differs from need statement. In hint directives the speaker makes the request implicitly. To illustrate this, the following example can be considered as the hint directives. '*Mbe taok bangku a, Hadi?*' (Where is your chair, Hadi?). This utterance entails a meaning that the teacher tried to command a student to move into his chair instead of saying an utterance that contains a meaning of '*move to your chair*' directly.

The form of permission directives was also in interrogative sentence. The permission directives and imperative was slightly were the same, but the difference

was the subject. From the utterance, '*Nengka dua pulu, te sedik ie?*' (now we omit 20) indicates that the teacher asked for permission to their students before omitting the number written on the board.

The Instructional Function of Teachers Speech Acts

The teacher is responsible for educating the students and has communicative privilege through expertise in the subject and teacher's responsibility for attaining the aims of given subject (Trosborg, 1994: 159). Furthermore, Trosborg states that the teacher has the privilege to regulate the interaction and to provide evaluative feedback. Therefore, the taking turn in the classroom was likely differ from those of free conversation outside the classroom. In the classroom interaction, the teacher typically asked a question to student, after having been nominated by the teacher the students provided an answer, and finally the teacher evaluated the student's answer.

The structure of classroom discourse was seen as the didactic purpose of educational discourse. In the classroom, much of the time was spent on the transfer of information from the teacher to the students. When asking a question, the teacher tended to have particular answer in mind.

Interpersonal aspect of classroom discourse (Johnson, 1997) is divided into three modes: control, organization, and motivation. Based on the data, there were three instructional functions of speech acts produced by the teachers and the students at SDN 10 Pringgasela, namely: control, organizational, and motivational/evaluative functions.

All instructional functions of speech acts were produced by the teachers. Toward this, the functions of speech acts were functioned as controlling and organizing the process of teaching and learning properly. Directives, assertives, and commissives speech acts produced by the teachers were functioned as control and organizational moves. On the other hand, assertives speech acts were functioned as control organizational and evaluative functions. The last speech acts

was expressives that was functioned as motivational function.

In relation to the instructional function, this research also examined the discourse moves in the classroom. The discourse moves performed during the teaching and learning were initiation moves (*I-moves*), that were done by the teachers, followed by responses moves (*R-moves*) that were done by students, and feedback moves (*F-moves*) executed by teachers.

To initiate means to make the first move, to lead, to begin, to introduce an idea or concept for the first time, to express one's own will. Meanwhile, to respond means to take action after initiation. The initiation was in the teachers' privilege. In fact that the students produced four *I-moves* only; the teachers dominated the initiation, however the students enjoyed being restricted to perform *R-moves* whereas initiating and evaluating moves were the teachers' privilege. The teachers asked questions, then nominated students answer the question, and evaluative feedback was from the teacher. The teacher gave feedback and evaluation to the students' response.

Politeness Strategies

Politeness strategies are used to formulate messages to save the hearer's face when face-threatening acts are inevitable or desired. Brown and Levinson (1987) states that positive and negative face threatening exist universally in human culture. Based on the data collected toward the speech acts produced by the teachers in SDN 10 Pringgasela, it was discovered that the utterances produced by the teacher were attempted not to impose the students face.

Regarding to Brown and Levinson's (1987) conception of 'negative face', the teachers treated into two main categories, such as: *appealing strategies* and *softening strategies* (cf. Seken, 2004).

From the data, the teachers attempted to decrease the imposition to the students by using some softener markers in their expressions, namely: *inges (gagah)*, *ndih*, *ya*, *ke*, *endah*, *juluk*,

coba, *te*, *kira-kira*, *perlu*, *seharusnya*, *(c)oba*, *ngeno*, and *mana-mana*.

These linguistics' devices applied by the teacher since the students are still in young age. As an approval device, *ndih* was applied as imposition act. The following utterance serves to illustrate this point. For example: *Dendek anakku ndih?* was uttered by the teacher brings a meaning of 'Please, do not (do that) my children!'

The *juluq* served as mitigating devices in which appeared to have semantic and syntactic impacts on the utterance of performing the requesting acts. For example in utterance: '*Peta maukan sik tene juluq!*' (Please, search for the result here first!). The occurrence of *juluq* made the act of requesting indirect. So, the students would feel save from losing of face.

In requesting certain thing, it was established that the teachers usually used the first plural pronoun '*te*' (we). This term occurred as inclusivizer marker. This was used to minimize the nuance of imposing the students by including the teacher himself in the action he/she wanted the students to perform. For example, *Te balik nengka!* (Please, we turn it over now!)

The next is the use of *tolong* (help), *inges* (beautiful), and *gagah* (handsome) as the cooperation seeker. This was used to mitigate impositive act. *Tolong* was used to advise of forcing someone on the orders, requests, suggestion and reminders. The use of *tolong* was weakening the forcing of someone to something. The teacher also attached his utterance by *inges* device. By using this, the teacher could soften the force of the imperative sense. In this, the teacher softened his imperative/ request to the students to pay attention to his explanation. The following examples can illustrate them, such as '*Tolong perhatikan, inges!*' (Please, pay attention!); '*Andang julu gagah!*' (Please, look at this (in front) my boys!)

The next devices used were '*mun*' (if), '*en*' (if), '*kanggo*' (can), and '*bu*' (can) were used as markers of imposition minimizer. The teacher cared on the students' negative face by reducing the

threat that was potentially imposed on the students. The occurrence of specific conditional lexical expression such as 'mun' or 'en' might be employed in different position in utterances. Here is the example, 'Mun ndek meq pedas, bareh bacaang dirik meq tini!' (If you didn't understand, next you may read it by yourself!)

The next linguistics' device used was 'kanggo' expression. This expression shows the teachers' intention to the face threatening of the students. The teacher used 'kanggo' (may) to minimize his imperative, and also together with 'ndih' as the tag-like in making the utterance be more polite. The utterance below can illustrate this, 'Batur a belajar, ndek kanggo tama ndih?' (Please, your friends is learning, don't come in).

The other politeness was downgrader conditionalizer. The conditionalizer is the conditionalizing element in the utterance, serves the function to show the act in such a way that its assertives force is much weakened (Seken, 2004). It serves to modify the act so that it lies between two possibilities, that is, between 'it may' and 'it may not' be the case with regard to the state of affairs being conveyed in the act in question.

Placing the students in the position to decide between two possibilities, the conditional suppressed the coercive power of the act concerned. To illustrate this, the following is the example: "Mana-mana te ngojek aneng!" [N-ojek] (We (may have a job) at least as ojek!). Reminding an act as much weaker as the conditionalizer, the teacher used the device of 'mana-mana' (at least). It poses a possibility that the students did not need to take the action as reminded unless in the case that he decided to do the other jobs.

The use of *ngeno* (as said) served to suspend the act to a degree that it becomes somehow uncertain. This device, refer to a suspender that was used to weaken the directives strength of the FTA whereby the teacher reduces its coercive force. The effect of this modification was, as intended by the teacher, that the students' face was to a certain measure rescued from being damaged by the act in

an advice. It appeared that the nuance of the utterance was not directly advice the students, but as a question. Consider the following example 'Ngeno, apa pegawean ngeno, adek ndak meq talon ate meq nggitak inaq amaq meq sik ato semeton meq sik mauk mbeli sepeda motor? (That is, whatever the job that can make us not irritate to father, mother or brother who are able buy motorcycle?)

The other device of politeness used by the teacher was 'coba' (try). Using this device, the teacher conveyed an advice by showing that his desire was cautious. This meant that the teacher was doubt to concerning what he/she wanted to the students to do or was not certain about the students' ability to do it. This can be considered in the following case; 'Coba tedok sik nine ndi::h? (Please, the girls keep silent!).

Furthermore, concerning the politeness produced by the students, the data showed that the students produced, in high frequency, declarative assertives. This function was employed by the students to respond the teacher's questions or instructions. The responses uttered by the students were in short answers (one or two words only). The following is the example of the taking turn in class.

- T : 'Dua puluh lima, te sediq lima belas sama dengan sepu::?'
What is twenty five omitted with fifteen?
Ss : 'Se:pu::luh'
(It is) ten.

In the dialogue, the students responded the teacher's question by saying what the teacher's want in short answer. To this, the students' politeness occurred in implicit. That is, no linguistics' marker/devices signaled the politeness strategies employed by the students. Analyzing the turn taking in the class, it was found that to convey speech acts the students employed the cooperative principles in conversation (Grice, 1975). Students should communicate in a rational and efficient manner. All of the students' utterances were the students' responses

to the teacher's questions. Cooperative principles that were found in the students' speech acts when the students' contribution was required by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in the class. The students directly answered the teachers' question as was shown in examples above. For *quantity maxim*, the students produced the responses as informative as required by the teachers. The students do not be either over-informative or under-informative in responding the teachers' questions. The students also tried to make contribution true, one for which the students have evidence (*quality maxim*). In addition, the students employed the *manner maxim* when their utterances were as clear as possible. That is, avoid ambiguity and obscurity. And the students also keep the *relation* with the teacher. The students produced the relevant responses for the exchange. That is, the teachers asked the students then should be answered as efficient as possible by the students. In short, it can be concluded that the students delivered the information only. The student has no intention to produce the responses either in compound or complex sentences.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the discussion above, the researcher comes to some conclusions and recommendations.

Conclusions

From the analysis of the teachers and students' speech acts produced during the teaching and learning process in second and third grade at SDN 10 Pringgasela, this research come to some conclusions as follow.

First, the teachers produced more utterances than students to explain certain thing to the students and asked the students to do or not to do something. It seems that the teachers used such utterances as directives function in which the teachers control and regulate the students (Halliday, 1976).

The local language (mother-tongue) was used more than the national language

(Indonesia) as the medium of instruction. In line with Romaine (2000:206) who asserts that children who do not come to school with kind and linguistic background supported in the schools are likely to experience conflict.

The frequency of teachers' speech acts implied that the degree of directness in conducting the teaching and learning was high. However, this was considered appropriately since the intention was to benefit the students. Authority role of teacher indicated the vertical status difference in the classroom. Students' choice of speech acts form indicate that the students aware of this status difference. This can be seen from the high percentage of assertives speech acts (97.32%), directives (1.34), commissives (0.67%), and declarations (0.67%). Meanwhile, the expressives did not find in the students' utterances. Directives are mostly used by the teachers other than the students. It is common if the teachers ask the students to do the orders. To ask the students to say a sentence, to answer the questions, and to follow the teachers' instruction are common orders from the teachers. The expectation of the teachers in using directives in the classroom is the students' compliance. The teachers tend to believe that the whole instructional process in the classroom with regards to direct and indirect speech act is to benefit the students.

The functions of the teachers' directives speech acts at SDN 10 Pringgasela are control, organizational and motivational or evaluative functions. These released in utterances to ask the students about certain information, to check the students' knowledge about certain information, to request the students to do certain action, to command students, to check the students understanding, about certain information, to focus the students' attention, to ask the students ability to do something, to warn the students, to suggest students in positive way, to ask permission, and to suggest the students in negative way. Meanwhile the directiveness of students have some functions such as ask about certain information, ask permission, to get

teachers' attention, to clarify certain information, to request the teacher to do something, and to command someone. Directives speech acts in the classroom were used to manage and control the students' behaviour during teaching learning process. Teachers' directives demand the students' compliance. The teachers' directives is also a good model for the students to learn pragmatics in the classroom. In asking certain information, the students are able to use directives in appropriate way.

The teachers' attitude toward the students is higher and he is in authority. In such classes, the teacher has right to ask the students questions or to give them instructions. In addition, as a vertical distance or vertical status difference between the teacher and students, the students are obliged to follow or to carry out what the teacher wants. For instance, in the interrogative/elicitation, it is noticed that whenever no appropriate answers by students, the same questions are repeated louder and in more emphasized ways. This shows that teachers anticipate students to comply in answering the questions. However, the use of improper name and politeness marker indicate that the teacher is trying to reduce the imposition effect of certain acts to the students. Teachers use some politeness markers' devices, namely:

- a. *Ndih* and *Ya* as the approval seeker.
- b. *Juluk* as the willingness seeker.
- c. *Te* as the inclusivizer marker.
- d. *Inges*, *tolong*, and *gagah* as the cooperation marker
- e. *En*, *mun*, and *kanggo* as supportive move in imposition minimize.
- f. *Mana-mana* as downgrader conditionalizer.
- g. *Ngeno* as downgrader suspender.
- h. *Coba* as downgrader tentativizer.

Therefore, considering our cultural value, teachers' speech acts can still be categorized as appropriate speech act.

Recommendations

It is advisable for the teachers to reduce the use of need statement and direct imperative that is not contain the polite marker. Some contributions from

this research in reducing the forcefulness of the imperative are the use of politeness marker "*ndih, ka, so, etc*", the use of modal "*kanggo, bau*", the use of proper name, and the use of inclusive pronoun. The teachers can use one of the above strategies to modify their sentence. It is useful to be applied in elementary or middle school especially for younger students.

Being clear in delivering a message is good for the students as the message can be recognized easily without an inference among the students. However, this leads to direct speech act without awareness of politeness. By using indirect form of speech act, the teacher is showing awareness and consideration to the students' value. However, the students have to make an inference about teachers' intention to gain a sense of what the teacher intended to make. Indirect speech act has its directives force when it is done in certain context. Therefore, it is suggested that the teachers should use indirect speech act in daily teaching as it will be a good model for the students in learning.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. 2003. *Qualitative Research in Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Needam, MA: Allyn and Bacon
- Cazden, C. B. 1988. Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning. In Hickman, S. 2000. *Social Significance of Pattern of Questioning in Classroom Discourse*. <http://cla.libart.calpoly.edu>. Retrived on October. 29 2012.
- Curtis, Audrey and Maureen O'Hagan, 2005. *Care and Education in Early Childhood: A Student's Guide to Theory and Practice*. New York. Routledge Falmer.
- Ervin-Tripp, S.M. 1976. A Coeficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales, *Journal of Educational and*

- Psychological Measurement*, 20 (1): pp: 37-46.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and R. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Hickman, S. 2000. *Social Significance of Pattern of Questioning in Classroom Discourse*.
<http://cla.libart.calpoly.edu>. Retrived on October. 29 2012.
- Hymes, D. 1974. *Foundation in Sociolinguistics: an Ethnographic Approach*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- McCarthy, Michael 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *An Expanded Sourcebook: Qualitative Data Analysis, second Edition*. London: Sage Publications.
- Nunan, David. 1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schleppegrell, Mary J. 2004. *The Language of Schooling: A Functional Linguistics*. New Jersey : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Searle, J.R., 1969. *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. 1979. *Expression and Meaning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Seken, I Ketut. 2004. Being Polite in Balinese: An Analysis of Balinese Adat Leaders' Spoken Discourse. A *Dissertation*. Malang: State University of Malang Graduate Program in English Language Education.
- Tantra, D.K. 1992. Children's Comprehension and Production of Directives at Ages Six, Seven, and Eight in Bali (Indonesia). A *Dissertation*. New York: State University.
- Wells, G. 1985. *Language Development in the Pre-School Years*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wrench, Jason S., Virginia Peck Richmond and Joan Gorham. 2009. *Communication, Affect, & Learning in the Classroom*. New York: Tapestry Press.