

Pragmatic Forces in The Speech Acts of EFL Speakers At *Kampung Inggris*, Indonesia

Muhamd Mukhroji¹, Joko Nurkamto², H.D. Edi Subroto³ & Sri Samiati Tarjana⁴

Abstract

This study examines the kinds of speech acts that are performed by EFL learners at *Kampung Inggris*, Kediri, Indonesia and the reasons behind them. The Speech Act Theory put forward by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) emphasizes locutionary acts, where five categories of speech acts (i.e. directive, expressive, declarative, assertive, and commissive) are the focus of investigation. This study selected 75 students and 12 teachers for its sample. Advanced-level proficiency students were observed in four settings: a classroom, a café, in the temple, and an English base camp. The results show how pragmatic forces manifest in directives (e.g. commands, requests, advice) at 35.3%, expressives (e.g. greetings, thanks, and congratulations) at 25.9%, declaratives (e.g. baptising someone, pronouncing someone guilty) at 13.9%, assertives (e.g. statements, explanations) at 12.9%, and commissives (e.g. promises, threats, and agreements) at 12%. The problems students experienced with speech acts concerned the modeling of speech acts, a lack of competence with performing various speech acts, poor strategies for selecting and using a certain speech act, and less exposure to, and awareness of, using pragmatic competence.

Keywords: *pragmatic force, speech act theory, Kampung Inggris, origin, Searle.*

Introduction

The notion of a speech act forms the central premise of this study. Austin's theory argues that all utterances, together with their meanings, perform specific actions through particular forces (Amakali, 2016). Levinson (1983) indicates that Austin's notion of *doing through words* is guided by three simultaneously performed acts: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. The meaning of a speech act is derived through a dynamic process that involves units, such as the form, context, and function of the utterance (Kaburise, 2004). The linguistic term that is used to refer to the intention or force of an utterance can vary, and example terms include *speech act*, *illocutionary act*, *dialogue act*, *discourse act*, and *speech function* (Schiffrin, 2005). This study investigates a pragmatic area concerning the use of speech acts by a particular group of speakers

¹Doctor candidate in Linguistics, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia; email: adjie_chadel@yahoo.com

²Prof. Dr. Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia; email: jokonurkamto@gmail.com

³Prof. Dr. Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia;

⁴Prof. Dr. Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia;

of English as a foreign language (EFL). One argument posits that speech acts involve manipulating the form, function, and context of a language.

Speech Act Theory (SAT) represents an utterance-analysis tool for establishing a connection between grammatical forms and language functions in specific contexts (Sotillo, 2017). Searle (1969, p. 7) states that “the theory of speech act starts with the assumption that the minimal unit of human communication is not a sentence or other expression but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving orders, describing, explaining, apologizing, thanking, congratulating.” This study, however, excludes politeness from its focus.

The objective of this study is to describe the pragmatic forces embedded in the illocutionary acts performed by students learning English as a foreign language (EFL) in Pare, Kediri, Indonesia. *Kampung Inggris* is located in Tulungrejo and Pelem Village, Pare, Kediri, Indonesia. It is a center for informal English teaching serving 180 institutions with around 300 students each. A total of 54,000 students come from Indonesia and various other countries, such as Malaysia, Thailand, Korea, Vietnam, Jordan, South Africa, Japan, and Iran. The term *Kampung Inggris* was first coined by Mr. Kalend, an inspired local man, in 1976 to label his English course, which has now been legally registered as *Kampung Inggris Kalend*.

Performatives are utterances that do not just say something—they actively change the reality they describe (Levinson, 1983). A performative is therefore essentially a sentence spoken to achieve something other than convey content that could be either true or false (Nuccetelli & Seay, 2008). In this study, SAT is used to analyze the corpus resulting from analysing the conversations between learners in four distinctive contexts: a classroom, a café, an English camp, and in the temple.

Based on the study of Sotillo (2017), this research applies SAT in the context of conversational analysis. SAT attempts to explain how speakers apply language in order to achieve their goals or actions and how the recipients of a message infer the speaker’s intended meaning (Sotillo, 2017). SAT also allows researchers to explain the intended meaning of a discourse by identifying and coding it as illocutionary acts, whereas conversation analysis focuses on the co-construction and negotiation of meaning during direct interactions or recorded conversations (Sotillo, 2017).

Research into SAT (e.g. Sotillo, 2017; Schrifflin, 2005; Kaburise, 2004) suggests that SAT analysis is based on the premise that utterances are performed for specific functions, and a certain structural arrangement of constituents needs to be articulated. There is also agreement that pragmatics represents a system of rules that defines the relationship between meaning and context, and this occurs when matching functions within a certain language choice in a specific context. A pragmatic investigation is therefore a combination of a syntactic/semantic examination and the study of meaning in relation to speech situations, so pragmatic analysis deals with the meaning of an utterance rather than the meaning of a sentence (Kaburise, 2004).

Sotillo (2017) outlines in his study that in SAT, functional units of communication have locutionary or propositional meaning (i.e. the literal meaning of what is said), illocutionary meaning (i.e., the intended meaning of what is said), and a perlocutionary force (i.e., the effect of what is said on the message's recipient).

In analyzing an utterance, Austin (1962, 1976) introduces three constituent elements, namely the locutionary act (the act of speaking something), the illocutionary act (the act in speaking something), and the perlocutionary act (the act performed by speaking something). Speech act analysis mainly deals with the latter two acts. An illocutionary act represents an utterance with an illocutionary force, such as asserting, arguing, advising, or promising something. A perlocutionary act, meanwhile, should be limited "to the intentional production of effects on (or in) the hearer. Our reason is that only reference to intended effects is necessary to explain the overall rationale of a given speech act" (Bach & Harnish, 1979, p. 17).

Brown (2000, p. 223) indicates that "illocutionary competence consists of the ability to manipulate the functions of the language." Thus, the functions of linguistic forms should be taught in an EFL language classroom, so learners can both understand and produce functional language that will be effective for communication. According to Brown (2000, p. 223), "Second language learners need to understand the purpose of communication, developing an awareness of what the purpose of a communication act is and how to achieve that purpose through linguistic form."

The types of illocutionary acts employed vary according to the speaker's perspective, thus emphasizing the most common and comprehensive principles of Searle's (1979) speech act taxonomy. Some previous studies are reviewed here to consider their findings. Ali, Kristina and Sumarlam (2017) conducted research on assertive speech acts in relation to politeness principles.

They identified assertive speech acts as including admitting, assuring, informing, reporting, arguing, and affirming. Azhari, Priono and Nuriadi (2018), meanwhile, investigated the *Speech Acts of Classroom Interaction*. Their results indicate four types of speech acts: directives (imperative), assertives, expressions, and commissives, with imperatives being the most frequently performed, indicating a lack of pragmatic competence among students.

Searle (1985) indicates that expressive speech acts can be divided into apologizing, thanking, condoling, congratulating, complaining, lamenting, protesting, deploring, boasting, complimenting, greeting, and welcoming. Tauchid and Rukmini (2016) investigated the expressive acts appearing on Wayne Rooney's Facebook page. They revealed that expressive speech acts appear in terms of congratulating, complimenting, thanking, and boasting. Most utterances were dominated by expressive speech acts of boasting. Saddhono and Fatma (2016), meanwhile, examined the use of local language in social interactions in South Sulawesi. Their results revealed that local language was used in imperative, interrogative, and declarative acts, with it serving prohibitive, suggestive, requestive, and permissive functions.

The current study is concerned with speech acts in the context of EFL, where pragmatism is pivotal to achieving discourses where speech acts act as inputs to language learning. Scholars, as summarized by Azhari, Priono and Nuriadi (2018) agree that in the context of EFL learning, studies into speech acts pay attention to the units and categories of speech acts (Searle, 1976), the ways of performing speech acts (Searle, 1965, 1975; Grice, 1975), the meaning, and the deep and surface structures related to analyzing performatives in a conversational context (Sadock, 1970).

This study takes an EFL context where an English-learning community is developed based on the basic principle that learning can take place in the most natural settings. This community involves around 54,000 students. It has established new, strong rules for English-language teaching in general, and it specifies pragmatic models that enhance and contribute to pragmatic practices and pragmatic teaching. Cultural interactions among the students—which come from not just the diverse regions of Indonesia but also from other countries, such as Vietnam, Malaysia, Cambodia, Jordan, and Africa—provide opportunities for improving our knowledge of pragmatic analysis. Speech acts that deliver directives, assertives, commissive, declaratives, and expressives, along with their intended functions, vary considerably in this community, providing new evidence to improve the body of literature for pragmatic competence.

By reviewing accounts of these speech acts and events, our analysis also focuses on the contribution of speech act theory to language acquisition, leading us to the belief that speech acts classification is a crucial aspect of learning a language and achieving communicative competence. With this background in mind, the following research questions guide this research:

- 1) What types of speech act are found in the interactions among the EFL community of *Kampung Inggris*?
- 2) What kinds of speech act manifest the most among the EFL community of *Kampung Inggris* and why?

Literature Review

Pragmatics

Pragmatics is defined as “the societally necessary and consciously interactive dimension of the study of language” (Mey, 1993, p. 315). Crystal (1997, p. 301), meanwhile, defines pragmatics as “the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication.” These definitions emphasize pragmatics as a “social interaction,” thus underscoring pragmatics not just as the action of communication (speaking, writing), because the action also has an effect on its recipients.

Pragmatics is the study of applying language within particular circumstances and communicative situations (Schiffrin, 2005; Sotillo, 2017). In pragmatics, speech acts are the underlying actions we perform when we speak to convey various purposes, such as informing, commanding, promising, refusing, and so on. These speech acts therefore tell us what a speaker intends us to do within the propositional content of what he or she says (Schiffrin, 2005). According to Sotillo (2017), understanding speech acts requires recognizing how messages vary, such as in the following aspects: what is being communicated or the particular speech act being enacted (Leech, 1983); the people taking part, as well as their intentions and knowledge of the world and what impact these have on their interactions; the context; any deductions made within that context; and what can be implied from what is said (Watson & Hill, 1993; Thomas, 1995).

Schiffrin (2005) argues that a speech act is identified by the production of an utterance that provides appropriate constraints for our responses. After each utterance, conversational expectations are implicitly or explicitly formed, thus serving as an understanding for a later conversation, producing a relevant and appropriate response, and giving an ability to identify if and when an interaction goes awry. Schiffrin (2005) indicates that a speech act can generally be inferred from three properties: (1) the *content* of the utterance, which is the proposition expressed by it; (2) the *force* or *mood* of the utterance expressed through *descriptive*, *prescriptive*, and *requestive* markers, which roughly correspond to the traditional *declarative*, *imperative* and *interrogative* mood types; and (3) the *position* of the utterance within a conversation.

Schiffrin (2005) further states that in a normal conversation, for a natural language utterance, it is not enough to know the grammatical category of all the words in the utterance, the conventional meaning associated with each word, and how such meanings combine to form an overall meaning. Furthermore, Schiffrin (2005) clarifies that before a specific meaning (i.e. the one intended by the speaker) is perceived, the listener must have a clear understanding of the context in which the utterance occurred, and this understanding relies upon “on our assumption that a reason is being expressed for an action performed in speaking” (Brown & Yule, 1983). Both the action and the reason for it are made known by the speakers through their location within a conventional structure of spoken interaction (Schiffrin, 2005). In addition, Hymes (1972) proposes a schema for what he calls speech events to break down the constituents of a context into units of analysis that he identifies as a *speaking grid*, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1.

The speaking grid of Dell Hymes (1972)

S	Setting, scene	The temporal and physical circumstances and the subjective definition of an occasion
P	Participants	The speaker, sender, addressor, hearer, receiver, audience, and/or addressee
E	Ends	The purposes, goals, or outcomes
A	Act sequence	The message form and content
K	Key	The tone or manner
I	Instrumentalities	The channel (e.g. verbal, non-verbal, physical forms of speech drawn from a community repertoire)
N	Norm of interpretation and the interpretation	Specific properties attached to speaking and interpretation norms within cultural belief systems
G	Genre	Textual categories

SAT

The creators of SAT, Austin (1962) and his student Searle (1969), indicate that a particular act takes place when utterances are made (Dylgjeri, 2017). Austin (1962) suggests speech acts as the theory of “*How to Do Things with Words.*” Austin (1962) further divides speech acts into three categories: (1) the locutionary act, which is the act of saying something (the act of producing an utterance); (2) the illocutionary act, which has an intended meaning; and (3) the perlocutionary act, which, unlike locutionary acts, influences the feelings, thoughts, or actions of the listener. For example, perlocutionary acts could be inspiring, comforting, persuading, promising, encouraging, and so on. They can affect the beliefs, attitudes, or behaviours of the addressee. Levinson (1981) describes a perlocutionary act as an utterance’s consequences, whether intended or unintended.

Prior to Austin’ (1962) and Searle’ (1969) works, a classification of speech functions was proposed by Malinowski (1923) for two broad areas (pragmatic and magical) that focus on religious activity in the language of a culture. In addition, Karl Buhler (1934) applied a concept from Plato in categorizing the functions of utterances into the expressive function (language oriented toward the self, the speaker); the conative function (language orientated toward the listener); and the representational function (language oriented toward anything other than the speaker and listener). In the era that followed, scholars such as Bach and Harnish (1969), Vendler (1972), and Allan (1986) proposed their own perspectives, as summarized in Table 2.

Table 2.

A comparison of the five classifications of illocutionary types

Austin (1962)	Searle (1969)	Vendler (1972)	Bach & Harnish (1969)	Allan (1986)
Expositives	Assertives	Expositives	Assertives	Statements
Commissives	Commissives	Commissives	Commissives	
Behabitives	Expressives	Behabitives	Acknowledgement	Expressives
Exercitives	Directives	Interrogatives	Directives	Invitationals
		Exercitives		Authoritatives
Verdictives	Declaratives	Verdictives	Verdictives	
		Operatives	Effective	

Although there are differences in the above classifications, they all seek ways of constructing a conceptual framework for language functions, much like what Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) engaged in when Austin wrote his book *How to Do Things with Words*. According to Austin (1962), utterances comprise the performative and constative, each performing a kind of

action, rather than merely stating something that could be true or false. Utterances containing verbs like *declare*, *promise*, *object*, *pronounce*, and *name* (among others) are **performatives**, while all “ordinary” declaratives that *describe*, *report*, or *state* can be assessed in terms of truth and falsity (e.g. “It is raining.”) and are therefore **constatives** (Schiffrin, 2005). Austin’s (1962) work on five classes of illocutionary acts (Schiffrin, 2005) was later improved by his student Searle (Sotillo, 2017), as set out in Table 3.

Table 3.

Summary of the speech acts models of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969)

No	Austin’s (1962) model fo speech acts	Searle’s (1969) revised model
1	Expositives make clear how one’s utterances fit into a general argument or discussion, such as “I assume,” as well as with verbs like postulate, state, deny, remark, inform, ask, testify, accept, correct, deduce, interpret, illustrate, and so on.	Assertives/representatives are statements to describe a state of affairs under the assumption that the utterance has a truthful proposition. The speaker tries to form words that match the world, as is seen in assertions, statements, claims, and suggestions.
2	Exercitives are “...an assertion of influence or exercising of power,” such as to order, warn, bequeath, advise, nominate, and so on.	Directives are statements to compel or encourage another person’s actions to comply with the propositional element, and they are intended to get the listener to carry out an action (e.g. command, request, invite, dare, or challenge). It aims to cause the listener to take a particular action, such as through a request, command, or a piece of advice.
3	Commissives promise or give an undertaking, so the speaker commits to performing a certain action. This includes declarations and intentions, such as to undertake, promise, sign a covenant or contract, swear, bet, or plan.	Commissives are statements th at commit the speaker to a certain future action. The speaker floats some particular future course of action, such as in the form of a promise, offer, threat, or vow.
4	Verdictives —such as the giving of verdicts, by a jury, referee, arbitrator, for example— may not be final, because they may be an estimate, reckoning, appraisal, clarification, or argument, for example. They are exercises of judgment, such as to acquit, convict, rule, estimate, value, calculate, or analyse.	Expressives are statements to express the sincerity of a speech act, such as through sympathy or excuses.
5	Behabitives is a miscellaneous group that relates to attitudes and social behaviours (e.g., apologies, thanks, sympathies, resentment, welcomes, blessings, and so on.)	Declaratives are statements that say something, such as pronouncing someone guilty or declaring a war.

Searle’s approach (1969) differs from that of Austin (1962) in that he was unhappy with the distinction Austin drew between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. He especially disliked, and indeed rejected altogether, the distinction between the first two. He saw locutionary acts as being constitutive of illocutionary acts, so he therefore advocated a rigorous and systematic investigation of the third type alone (Schiffrin, 2005).

Searle (1969) initially considered the opportunity for classifying speech acts according to their felicity conditions (i.e. the necessary conditions for the successful performance of a particular speech act). Such conditions include the **essential conditions** (the kind of illocutionary act that the utterance represents), the **propositional content conditions** (the kind of propositional content the speech act will have), the **preparatory conditions** (the contextual requirements, such as the speaker's or listener's ability or willingness to act), and the **sincerity conditions** (the speaker's psychological state being expressed in the speech act) (Schiffrin, 2005; Sotillo, 2017; Kaburise, 2004). According to Searle (1969), each speech act must meet four felicity conditions before it is a successful act, namely ASHT, where A=act; S=speaker; H=hearer; T=utterance (Kaburise, 2004).

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| (1) Propositional content: | A must be a future act of S. |
| (2) Preparatory conditions: | The promise must be something H wishes to be done, or at least would rather have done than not, where in a normal course of events, S would not perform the act. |
| (3) Sincerity condition: | S aims to do A. |
| (4) Essential condition: | S expects utterance (T) to oblige him to do A. |

This brief summary of speech acts illustrates how the “discovery” of speech acts has brought new insights into the use of natural language. It shows a deeper understanding of why language study should not just deal with linguistic form per se but also analyse how linguistic choice meets the demands of a specific context to realize effective communication (Kaburise, 2004). There are *functions* of language (e.g., ordering, requesting, and apologizing), and each function is characterized through a specific linguistic feature. Effective communication therefore means making an appropriate linguistic choice (Schiffrin, 2005; Sotillo, 2017; Kaburise, 2004).

Methods

Design and Setting

This study is qualitative in nature in that it uses a corpus of speech acts as its data. Located in Pare District, Kediri Regency, *Kampung Inggris* engages approximately 54,000 students from some 180 institutions, with these students coming from all over Indonesia as well as many other countries.

The settings for this study included classrooms, cafes in the surrounding campus, a temple as a learning setting, and an English camp. The main goal was to observe informal speaking activities, thus allowing learners to make errors, speak unacceptable utterances, and hit linguistic

and psychological barriers (Mukhroji, 2018). Activities in the camp started between 5:00-6:30 am and ended at 7:00-9:00 pm. All students were involved in the camp for speaking activities. Cafes were other settings for engaging in speaking practices, with ten cafes being available in the surrounding campus. The researcher conducted the research over a five-month period from June to October 2018.

Participants

The 237 participants for this study (as shown in Table 4) comprised 225 students and 12 teachers. Four institutions were selected as research subjects, thus representing the elementary, intermediate, and advanced levels. The 12 teachers taught the classes that the researcher observed in the research settings. Students' levels of achievement were distributed as follows: elementary (32.1%), intermediate (31.2%), and advanced (31.6%). The institutions, students, and teachers were selected based on purposive sampling techniques. They were available for the investigation as recommended by the course managers with the agreement of the classroom teachers and camp authority.

Table 4.
Subjects for the study

No	Course/Institution	LE	TM	DV	Teacher	Total
Pelem Site						
1	Basic English Course (BEC)	20	18	20	3	61
2	Mahesa Institute (MI)	18	20	18	3	59
	Subtotal	38	38	38	6	120
Tulungrejo Site						
3	Global English Course (GEC)	20	18	20	3	61
4	Oxford English Course (OEC)	18	18	17	3	56
	Subtotal	38	36	37	6	117
	Grand total	76	74	75	12	237
	Rate percentage	2.1	31.2	31.6	5.1	100

Of the 237 students, the 75 advanced-level students were involved more in this study. These advanced-level students engaged with questionnaires, observations, and interviews throughout the entire research process. These 75 students were considered appropriate for collecting data about speech acts, with them having adequate proficiency in English for their pragmatic competence to be considered sufficient when using speech acts. In the classroom observations, elementary and intermediate students were also observed to enrich the survey data. No records were taken in the classrooms other than field notes about speech act attainments and strategies for how the students accomplished pragmatic competence.

Data Collection Techniques

This study focused on illocutionary meaning and the functional orientation of the discourse (Sotillo, 2017). Searle's (1969, 1979) basic taxonomy of five types of illocutionary acts was used to identify, classify, code, and subsequently tag the speech acts. The discourse originated from the context of conversations when an illocutionary act is defined as a propositional unit. Linguistic elements such as greetings and taking leave; expressive, phatic, and conative interjections; and onomatopoeic speech act verbs (a subset of interjections) were also categorized as speech acts (Tsai & Huang, 2003). Greetings and farewells that comprised more than one word (e.g. "*Hi, how are you?*"), common acronyms, initialisms, and abbreviations were coded depending on the context of the exchange as being expressive, assertive, or some other category (Sotillo, 2017).

The data for this study were collected using four techniques: questionnaire, observation, interview, and documentation. The questionnaire was used to collect demographic data and survey general information. Other data obtained from the questionnaire included students and teachers stating which speech acts were easiest to perform, their problems in performing speech acts, and their strategies to develop speech acts. Observation was used to collect data from the verbal interactions taking place in the English camp, cafes, and FGD (Focus Group Discussion). A video camera was used in the observation process to record data. Observations took place three times for each class, and a semi-structured approach was used to guide an in-depth interview with teachers and students. Each interview was recorded by video camera and took about 15 minutes.

Data from video recordings were transcribed verbatim to identify speech acts in terms of sentences and conversation corpuses. Complimentary to the observations, field notes were prepared to aid the researcher in locating the focus of the study and highlighting identification points for pragmatic competence. Documents—including teaching materials and students' notes, work, and biodata—were collected to support the results. With this in mind, primary data for speech acts were identified from the corpus resulting from the video recording transcripts and field notes. In addition, the transcripts of interview data were used in triangulation, with the secondary data obtained from the documents being used as a complement.

Data Analysis Techniques

Qualitative content analysis was used to analyse the data. More specifically, the data were sorted using thematic analysis to form the domain and taxonomy (Spradley, 1985; Miles &

Huberman, 1994; Santosa, 2017) of the speech acts. Four steps of analysis were then applied, namely domain, taxonomy, thematic, and componential analysis (Spradley, 1985; Santosa, 2017). The process of analysis referred to Miles and Huberman's (1994) suggestion of data collection, data reduction, data display, and verification-conclusion drawing within a circular model. The analysis format adapted the approaches of Ngoc Minh Vu (2017), Bayat (2013), and Dylgjeri (2017). First, the performative acts were analysed to identify locutionary acts and their intended meanings. Second, five classifications of perlocutionary acts were defined and interpreted. To make sense of the descriptions, numerical features for the types of speech acts, the kinds of utterances, and the reasons behind a typical speech act were illustrated.

Findings

Kinds of Speech Acts

Frequency of occurrences

The first analysis results involved the kinds of speech acts identified from the contexts described in Table 5. The analysis revealed the proportion of speech acts in terms of the five taxonomies of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), namely directives, assertives, expressives, commissives, and declaratives.

Table 5.

Frequency of speech act tokens

No	Kind of speech act	Functions	Token	%
				N=108
1	Directives	7 subtypes: question, request, suggest, hope, instruct, invite, and order	38	35.3
2	Assertives	5 subtypes: Inform, conclude, assume, confirm, and accept	14	12.9
3	Expressives	3 subtypes: greet, thank, and compliment	28	25.9
4	Commissives	3 subtypes: promise, suggest, and agree	13	12.0
5	Declaratives	4 subtypes: thank, apologize, welcome, and congratulate	15	13.9
			108	100

Based on Table 5, the frequency of occurrences for speech acts are ranked as follows:

- Directives 35.3%

- Expressives 25.9%
- Declaratives 13.9%
- Assertives 12.9%
- Commissives 12%

Utterances in speech acts

Directives

Directives are used to give orders and lead the listener to take a particular action, such as by requesting, commanding, or advising. Some examples are given below:

- What is your reason for studying in Global English? (question)
- Next, I invite Mr. Adin to present his speech. (request)
- I think you can send me the information over WhatsApp. (suggestion)
- I hope we will meet again here next Friday. (hope)
- Okay guys, please raise your voices because we want to record them. (instruction)
- We have a meeting tomorrow, and I invite Mr. Aji to attend. (invitation)
- Please argue why speaking skills must precede other skills when studying English.
(order)

Assertiveness

Assertives are statements used to describe a state of affairs, and while ensuring the truthfulness of the propositional content, the speaker tries to make his or her words match reality. This is seen in assertions, statements, claims, and suggestions. Examples of this are given below:

- Our focus is to discuss whether grammar and vocabulary are important when studying English. (*inform*)
- According to me, if a student has a larger vocabulary, he can speak more in English, while grammar forms the rules to control how you speak English. (*conclude*)
- Some students listen to English sounds from recordings or from other people, while others read newspapers to enrich their vocabularies. (*assume*)
- Is it okay if I choose the topic based on my own interest? (*confirm*)
- You speak different English with my teachers, but now I understand why it is different.
(*accept*)

Expressives

Expressives are statements to express the sincerity of speech acts through notions like sympathy and excuses. Such expressions include greetings, thanks, and compliments.

- *Assalamu alaikum*. Hello everybody! (greeting)
- Ms. Nidya is very kind. Words cannot represent my grateful. (thank)
- Oh my God! That's such a surprise! (compliment)

Commissives

Commissives are statements that oblige a speaker to take a certain future action, such as through a promise, offer, threat, or vow. Three functions are given below:

- If you can come, I will give you an Oxford English Dictionary. (promise)
- You should not eat too much rice because you may end up suffering from diabetes. (suggest)
- I agree with Totok. His argument is perfect. (agree)

Declaratives

Declaratives are statements that say something, such as pronouncing someone's guilt or innocence or declaring a war. Example functions include:

- Mr. Ardin has helped us so much. I am grateful for his kindness. (thank)
- I think everybody makes mistakes. My apologies. (apologise)
- We have a new friend from Vietnam. She wants to learn English with us, so I say, "Welcome to *Kampung Inggris*." (welcome)
- Wonderful. I think Zulkifli has given a great speech. (congratulate)

Locutionary analysis

The following analysed propositions were taken from various settings to perform the locutionary analysis.

1. *Locution*: "Do you want to join the nine-month program? I think it is the best choice, so you can achieve a mastery in English."

Illocutionary act: Directive (offering and suggesting)

Perlocutionary act: Encouragement and hopefulness

2. *Locution*: “Please look at the examples. Three graduates passed from this program and now they have been studying in Australia. You have to work like these guys. Study how to achieve success.”

Illocutionary act: Directive (appeal)

Perlocutionary effect: Inspiration

3. *Locution*: “Everybody should meet a foreigner in Borobudur and talk to him in English for about 10 minutes.”

Illocutionary act: Assertive (report).

Expected Perlocutionary effect: Hopefulness.

4. *Locution*: “It is hard to do the IELTS test, but we must do our best.”

Illocutionary act: Assertive (state).

Perlocutionary effect: Confidence.

5. *Locution*: “I know that Mr. Kalend is the founder of Kampung Inggris, and in the digital era, we can do a better job to learn English.”

Illocutionary act: Assertive (state).

Perlocutionary act: Confidence and aspiration.

6. *Locution*: “Please remember academic English has a different style. We can learn from the models in the exercises.”

Illocutionary act: Commissive (promise).

Perlocutionary effect: Encouragement and hopefulness.

7. *Locution*: “We will start working hard together to prove to ourselves that we can pass the IELTS and study in a top Australian university.”

Illocutionary act: Commissive (promise).

Perlocutionary act: Happiness and hopefulness.

8. *Locution*: “I don’t believe it! So great. I just write my ideas following the example, and I correct the grammar by myself. I didn’t know that I received the highest score in the test.”

Illocutionary act: declarative (surprise)

Perlocutionary effect: inspiration and suggestion

9. *Locution*: “Thank you for giving me a second opportunity to comment. The presentation of Tomy was good, while the presentation of Wiwik was, well, not so bad. I appreciate that you worked very well.”

Illocutionary act: declarative (thank and criticize)

Perlocutionary effect: motivation

Reasons for Selecting Speech Acts

The reasons for employing various kinds of speech acts were explored through interviews. Learners said that each speech act involves a certain degree of difficulty, and they tend to prefer the easiest option. As we can see from Table 6, the order of difficulty for a performing speech act mirrors its frequency of occurrence.

Table 6.

Levels of difficulty for speech acts

No	Speech act	Functions	Advanced Level N=75		Teacher N=12	
			F	%	F	%
1	Directives	question, request, suggest, hope, instruct, invite, and order	18	24	4	33.3
2	Expressives	greet, thank, and compliment	16	21.3	3	25
3	Declaratives	thank, apologize, welcome, and congratulate	15	20	2	16.7
4	Assertives	Inform, conclude, assume, confirm, and accept	14	18.7	2	16.7
5	Commissives	promise, suggest, and agree	12	16	1	8.3
			75	100	12	100

As Table 6 suggests, directive speech acts comprise general acts that are common in communication practices. Various communication manifests through directive acts, so it is reasonable for this study’s English speakers to reflect this. In addition, the functions of this act can be replicated in other speech acts. For example, this study identifies a “suggestion” appearing in both directive and declarative acts. The level of difficulty in performing a certain speech act is associated with informal exposures and patterns that the teacher exemplifies throughout the teaching process. A model is then adopted based on the teacher’s performance, and this exposure encourages students to apply speech acts in various circumstances.

The evidence for all types of implemented speech indicates that the learners are aware of applying pragmatic competence when communicating with others. The interview results also indicate that there are five conditions where learners cite barriers to performing well in communication, namely:

- Models for speech acts;

- Lack of competence in performing various speech acts;
- Strategies for selecting and performing certain speech acts;
- Less exposure to classroom and social interactions; and
- Awareness of using pragmatic competence.

Models for speech acts are patterns that teachers exemplify in the classroom or during communication. Such models are initially adopted by students and then modified to result in an adapted performance. Edi testified, “However, models are not enough. We need competency to perform. If our vocabulary or knowledge of grammar are not matched, we are difficult to perform.”

According to Ms. Nidya, a teacher of global English, a lack of competence in performing speech acts occurs in various interactions in the classroom and within social settings. Gradually, this lack of competence is overcome as students encounter new experiences during their study.

Mr. Muhtar, a teacher specialized in IELTS and TOEFL preparation, asserts, “Lack of competence indicates proficiency of English the students acquire. The impact is somewhat the entire teachers should pay attention. Students are failed to perform academic success.”

Evidently, this study indicates that the five handicaps to performing a speech act complement each other. A student needs a model, but he or she performs speech acts inadequately because he or she lacks competence and finds it difficult to select strategies. Students’ exposures are limited, so it is hard for them to imitate ideas when expressing speech acts. In addition, an awareness of applying pragmatic competence in communication does not emerge. “We are not aware of teaching the pragmatic competence. We do not know this exactly,” commented Ms. Nidya. When teaching in the classroom, “our focus is how to encourage students to speak. When writing, how to make them write. We don’t know what materials are taught in what is called as pragmatic competence,” explained Mr. Ardin, another teacher.

“Exposures are present. We create forums for various expressions, such as speech, lectures, debates, interviews, and discussion. We provide exposures for many different topics and purposes. However, we have a non-standardized academic English if compared to the university English”, claimed Mr. Zali.

There is an insufficient awareness of using pragmatic competence, and this affects the performance of speech acts according to most teachers, who agree that they do not teach pragmatic competence, nor do they provide models or exemplars for pragmatic acts.

Discussion, Conclusion, and Implications

This study seeks to identify the kinds of speech acts that manifest in communication among the learners striving to achieve English competency at *Kampung Inggris*, Kediri, Indonesia, as well as learn which speech acts are most frequently applied. The reasons for why such speech acts are typically demonstrated will be discussed in this section. Three types of speech acts from Austin (1962)—namely locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary—were analysed under the notion that all utterances with their meanings perform actions through certain forces. The speech acts discussed in this study, however, follow Searle's (1969) speech act classifications: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declaratives.

Our findings revealed a tendency among the EFL learners at *Kampung Inggris* to use directive speech acts to verbally express their opinions. We discovered that learners demonstrated directive acts most frequently, accounting for 35.3% of the total 108 tokens. Directive acts take place through a question, request, suggestion, hope, instruction, invitation, or order. Regardless of the directive act, the learners were also capable of using a variety of speech acts, although the functions were limited.

The learners also performed expressive speech acts 25.9% of the time, with greeting, thanking, and complimenting being typical of these expressive acts. Next came declarative acts at 13.9% through thanking, apologizing, welcoming, and congratulating. In addition, assertives were encountered at 12.9% in terms of informing, concluding, assuming, confirming, and accepting. Finally, commissive acts were least prevalent at 12%, and they expressed promise, suggestion, and agreement.

Our findings evidently contribute to theories for pragmatics and speech acts in two areas. First, speech acts indicate a practice of language that is not focused merely on grammatical form but rather deals with interaction units, namely locution. Second, for a learner, performing a speech act is a language-proficiency matter that needs pragmatic competence. In addition, the way that speech acts are performed confirms Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) theories about general proficiency with speech acts.

Kaburise (2004) admits that language competence is not just about mastering the forms of a language but also its communicative functions, such as to apologize, greet, disagree, accuse, warn, and so on. A mastery of the structural regularities of a language remains a very passive asset if speakers do not exploit it for the purpose of exchanging thoughts, ideas, and feelings between speaker and hearer, writer and reader. While forms are expressions of language, functions are their fruition. In addition, Brown (1987) elucidates how communication can be thought of as an arrangement of “acts” with an underlying purpose and intent. It is therefore not just something that occurs: It is functional with a purpose, and it was designed to effect some kind of change in the environment, however subtle or unobservable it may be.

According to Langton (1993), the ability to perform various speech acts can be a sign of language mastery. Langton (1993) further states that such powerful people can do and say more than others can and therefore be more dominant in their speech. In language learning, speech acts indicate the pragmatic competence that a learner is mastering. Students who perform various speech acts are indicating their attainment of language proficiency, and they attain greater mastery in using them.

Ebadi and Seidi (2015) indicate that proficiency level is apparent in learners’ strategies for using speech acts. High-proficiency learners adopt indirect strategies in their production, indicating that linguistic development is effective in selecting strategies. House and Kasper (1987), meanwhile, revealed that learners used many more direct-request acts than native English speakers, who mostly used indirect forms. A study by Bardovi, Harlig and Harford (1991) revealed, however, that the grammatical ability or general language proficiency assured by standardized tests like TOEFL does not necessarily guarantee learners’ pragmatic ability, although proficiency clearly does influence pragmatic competence. More exposure to the target language can help learners achieve pragmatic competence. For example, exposing EFL learners to authentic target language materials in the classroom and social contexts helps them to become acquainted with the sociocultural differences that exist between languages (Ebadi & Seigi, 2015).

In addition, Searle (1969, p. 7) indicates that “the theory of speech act starts with the assumption that the minimal unit of human communication is not a sentence or other expression, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving orders, describing, explaining, apologizing, thanking, congratulating, etc.” This implies that the acquisition of one type of speech act will guide a learner in becoming more skilled with other speech acts.

What learners therefore need are models, exposure, and an awareness of performing contextual speech acts.

This research has provided evidence for the types of speech act that students perform and the reasons for why they develop such patterns. In short, this study reveals all five kinds of speech act that were defined by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). In general, directive speech acts are performed most frequently, because many sorts of directive acts are common in interactions. In order of occurrence, the speech acts and their categories, as observed in this study, were as follows: directives (question, request, suggest, hope, instruct, invite, and order), expressive (greet, thank, and compliment), declarative (thank, apologize, welcome, and congratulate), assertive (inform, conclude, assume, confirm, and accept), and commissive (promise, suggest, and agree). Further evidence shows that speech act performance is affected by five conditions: the model for speech acts, the degree of competence with various speech acts, the strategy used to select and use certain speech acts, the degree of exposure in the classroom and social interactions, and the level of awareness of using pragmatic competence. All of these determine the confidence of students and their performance strategies, which in turn reflect on their pragmatic competence and language proficiency.

This study is limited in terms of the restricted classroom observation, especially since the complementary data and students' on-the-ground activities in using English could benefit from more depth and breadth. This implies that future research should combine observations from the classroom with those from social settings, while more in-depth interviews could help uncover greater insights for each type of speech act. In addition, this study reveals strong evidence for a variety of pragmatic practices, so an exploration of the pragmatic competence of EFL students in original contexts and their use of the rich variations of pragmatic functions could provide strong evidence to add to pragmatic-based theories.

References

- Ali, S. Kristina, D. & Sumarlam. (2017). The Politeness of Assertive Speech Acts: Synergizing the Linguistic Politeness Devices in Conflict Resolution Communication. *Lingua Didaktika*, 110(1), 22–35.
- Amakali, L. M. J. (2016). Persuasive speech acts in the Namibian National Assembly. *Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, 7(2), 1205–1219.
- Arif, Z. A. & Mugableh, I. A. (2013). Speech Acts of Promising among Jordanians. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(13), 248–264.
- Azhari, A., Priono & Nuriadi. (2018). Speech Acts of Classroom Interaction. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, 4(2), 24–45.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Austin, J. L. (1971). *Performative-constative*. in Searle, J. R. (ed.).
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words: The William James lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Urmson, J. O. & Sbisa, M. (Eds.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bach, K. & Harnish, R. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Bayat, N. (2012). A study on the use of speech acts. *Procedia-social and behavioral sciences*, 70(2013), 213–221.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, D. (1987). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Dylgjeri, A. (2017). Analysis of Speech Acts in Political Speeches. *European Journal of Social Sciences Studies*. 2(2), 18–26.
- Ebadi, S. & Seidi, N. (2015). Iranian EFL Learners Request Strategies Preferences Across Proficiency Levels and Gender. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(4), 65–73.
- Grice, H. P. (1957). Meaning. *The philosophical review*, 66(3), 377–388.
- House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. *Perspectives on language in performance*, 2, 1250–1288.

- Hymes, D. (1972). *Models of the interaction of language and social life* in Gumperz, J. and Hymes, D. (Eds.), 35-71.
- Juhi, K. (2016). Development of pragmatic awareness of nonnative Korean speakers. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(3), 1-20.
- Kaburise, Koryoo Phyllis. (2004). *Speech Acts Theory and Communication: An Uneven Study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Pretoria: Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2001). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Langton, R. (1993). Speech acts and unspeakable acts. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 22(4), 293-330.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malinowski, B. (1923). The problem of meaning. In: Halliday, M. (Ed.). *Language context, and text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective* (3–5). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mey, J.L. (1993). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mukhroji, M., Nurkamto, J., Subroto, E. & Tarjana, S. Sri. (2018). *Speech Acts in Social Interactions Among EFL Learners Community in Kampung Inggris Kediri*. International Proceeding, December 2018, Conaplin, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia. Bandung.
- Nuccetelli, S. & Seay, G. (2008). *Philosophy of language: The central topics*. United Kingdom: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Ngoc Minh Vu. (2017). *Teaching pragmatic in English as a Foreign Language at a Vietnamese university: Teachers' perceptions, curricular content, and classroom practices*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Sydney: Faculty of Educational and Social Work, University of Sydney.
- Rinnert, C., & Kobayashi, H. (1999). Requestive hints in Japanese and English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31, 1173-1201.
- Saddhono, Kundaru & Fatma. (2016). The Form and Function of Local Language in Directive Speech Act at A University in Central Sulawesi. *Lingua Cultura*, 10(1), 37-42.
- Sadock, J. M. (1974). *Toward a linguistic theory of speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.

- Santosa, Riyadi. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Kebahasaan*. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (Ed.) (1971). *The philosophy of language*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts in Cole, P. & Morgan, J. L. (Eds.).
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1983). *Intentionality: an essay in the philosophy of mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1985). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sotillo M., S. (2017). *Illocutionary acts and functional orientations of SMS texting in SMS social networks*. Montclair State University. Accessed on November 14, 2018.
- Schiffirin, A. (2005). *Modelling Speech Acts in Conversational Discourse*. (Doctoral Dissertation). The University of Leeds School of Computing, Leeds.
- Tauchid, A. & Rukmini, D.. (2016). The Performance of Expressive Speech Acts as Found on Wayne Rooney's Facebook. *English Education Journal*, 6(1), 1–10.
- Tsai, I-Ni & Huang, Chu Ren. (2003). The semantics of onomatopoeic speech act verbs. Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica. *Language, Information and Computation: Proceedings of the 17th Pacific Asia Conference*, 1–3 October, 2003, Sentosa, Singapore: COLIPS Publications.
- Thomas, J. (1995) *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Vendler, Z. (1967). *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.