Speech Acts in Social Interactions among EFL Learners Community in Kampung Inggris Kediri

Muhamad Mukhroji, Joko Nurkamto*, H. D. Edi Subroto, Sri Samiati Tarjana
Linguistics
Sebelas Maret University
Surakarta, Indonesia
*jokonurkamto@gmail.com

Abstract—**This study is based upon Binglish (bahasa Indonesia-English) interaction setting and the speech act analysis used by EFL learners in Kampung Inggris Kediri, Indonesia whose aims are to see how leaners use kinds of speech acts, strategies to use speech acts, and reasons to select the speech acts. A pragmatic analysis implementing qualitative approach was used as the research design. This study involved 150 students, and 6 English teachers as participants in three settings English base camp, cafes, and Focus Group Discussion. Data were collected using questionnaire to achieve demographic background, observations, interview and document analysis. Results show that five kinds of speech acts, i.e. directive, declarative, commissive, expressive, assertive appear depending on students' level of competence. Strategies of speech acts appear to define: apologizing, thanking, clarifying, refusing, complaining and informing. The fluency of speech acts is affected by the pragmatic competence and level of competences. It implies that teachers should design pragmatic competence to teach students and encourage students in variety of setting to maximize their awareness on pragmatic uses.**

Keywords—Binglish; speech acts; speech act strategies; pragmatic competence

I. INTRODUCTION

This study is a part of doctoral dissertation on pragmatic submitted for the doctoral program at Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta Indonesia, investigating speech acts developed by learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Kampung Inggris, Pare, Kediri Indonesia where 180 informal English courses are available and more than 40,000 learners reside to study in the kampong. This study focuses on how performative acts denoted into perlocutionary acts that are framed into five categories, directive, declarative, commissive, expressive, assertive and as suggested by Austin [1,2] and Searle [3] appear in the communication among learners in informal contents outside the classrooms. In addition, strategies to select performance on speech acts to determine the choice are described to identify reasons why the utterances are used [4-7].

Studies in speech acts [4,8,9] have summarized that the core analysis on speech acts have been focused on three concerns on how statements are made into locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts [2,10]. Locutionary is the statement made by the speaker to say information of being true or false. Illocutionary specifies what is inferred in the statement the speaker expect and what intended meaning the hearer will understand. Perlocutionary indicate what actions the hearer will do after perlocution has been inferred [8,9].

Analysis on the locutionary speech act in this study is focused on the performative speech act or perlocutionary seeing how speakers in the kampong Inggris whose level of knowledge is categorized as interlanguage learners. The perlocutionary acts are framed in adherence to Austin [2] and Searle [3] provisions on speech acts. Austin [2] divides the performatives into five classes and Searle [3] improves this classification and makes some changes inserting literal and non-literal directive acts [8]. The modified classifications include, directives making the hearer to do something, e.g. order a request, forbid; declarations to create a change, e.g. resigning, appointing; commissive to show the speaker wants to something by expressing an intention, e.g. promising; expressive to express the state of mind with regard to a situation, e.g. apologizing, celebrating; and assertive e.g. claiming, swearing, to state the accuracy of what is said [4].

This study refers to the conditions of English in the environment of Indonesian EFL learners indexed as the interlanguage level. Typical English would be the main features to describe, referring to Binglish (English using Bahasa Indonesia style, Binglish) [11]. Drawing the background in mind, this study is guided by the following two research questions:

- What speech acts are used by the EFL learners in English communication among the community in Kampung Inggris Kediri?

- What strategies are used to perform an utterance reflecting a speech at the EFL learners employ to communicate among the community?

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. Speech Acts

Speech Acts are recently coming into a considerable revolution in the developments of pragmatics as a discipline [9]. As pragmatics is seen as the study of language use in particular communicative contexts or situations of necessity [4,6,7], then the coverage of speech acts follows adhering the

principles of pragmatic analysis. Scholars have indicated the dimension of language outside the contexts to see the message being communicated including speech acts to be performed, the participants involved, their intention knowledge of the world and the impact on their interactions, the context [12], the deduction of the context and what is implied by what is said or unsaid [13,14].

Bayat asserts speech acts take part outside the language dimension of communication [4]. To communicate successfully, people are required both to acquire the language and to have the knowledge to use the language they acquired in order to communicate. According to Reite, while using the language people do not produce only an isolated series of sentences, but also perform an action. People do something through or make others do something, as seen in the events of "Thanking, requesting, promising". The Speech Act usually dealt with in foreign language teaching research, reflecting usage problems faced by people of different cultures [4]. The pragmatic dimension is associated with producing and understanding speech acts, and the acts in communication cases are associated with the functional dimensions of language [15]. Searle [3] emphasizes that speech act is presented in real language use situations, so the basically the speech act theory focus on the smallest unit of implementation of certain types of acts [4,15,16].

Austin [1,2] outlines two distinctive speech acts, constative and performatives. Constatives describe an incident or a situation in the form of statements; it denotes to be true or false values. Constative performs a task and cannot be characterized as true or false. Austin [2] and Searle [3] further define as the performatives [4].

According to Austin a performance of a statement infers simultaneously three acts: locutionary act to describe an action of what is the statement; illocutionary act to make someone else understand that the speaker intends to do something; and perlocutionary acts, to show the effect of what us said; the hearer does an act [2]. To describe the performance, Austin [2] and his follower Searle [3] classify performative acts into five classes: directives (order, request, forbid), declarative (appoint, resign), commissive (promise), expressive (apologize, celebrate, congratulate), and assertive (claim) [4].

An illustration cited from Bayat below clarifies the topic. "When a performative expression is carried out, the speaker does something simultaneously [4]. For example, when saying It is cold here, the speaker states he/she feels cold, or he/she may request someone to close the window or to turn on the heater. Additionally, the speaker may perform an illocutionary act by using a locutionary act. Speaker actually makes a request" [4,17].

B. *Pragmalinguistic and Sociopragmatic*

Leech divides pragmatics into pragma linguistics and sociolinguistics components [13]. Pragmatic competence, therefore, consists of pragma linguistic competence and sociodramas competence [18]. Pragma linguistics refers to the resources for conveying communicative acts and relational or interpersonal meanings [19]. Pragma linguistics competence is based on grammatical competence and deals with the rules of language usage. It includes the competence of correctly using the grammar rules to make sentences, and the competence of appropriately employing the language form in a specific context in achieving the communicative goal [18]. Such resources include pragmatic strategies like directness and indirectness, routines, and a large range of linguistic forms which can intensify or soften communicative acts [19]. Kasper exemplifies versions of apology below [19].

'I'm sorry' or 'I'm absolutely devastated.

Can you possibly forgive me?'

According to Kasper in both versions above, the speaker apologizes, but the speaker indexes a very different attitude and social relationship in each of the apologies [19]. In addition, sociopragmatics is the social perceptions underlying participants' interpretation and performance of communicative action [19]. Sociopragmatic competence refers to the patterns of appropriately understanding and using utterances in interpersonal communication, such as the Cooperative Principles and the degree of appropriateness in a verbal exchange [18]. Sociopragmatic is represented in the speech communities. The speech communities indicate social distance, social power, rights and obligations, and the degree of imposition involved in particular communicative act. The values of context factors are negotiable; they can change through the dynamics of conversational interaction [19].

Pragmatic competence indicates the use a language using correct form and functions appropriately in a variety of appropriate contexts. Ngoc Minh Vu asserts using language appropriately does not mean mere correct phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics, but involves pragmatic knowledge, or specifically, cultural knowledge to avoid misunderstandings or communication breakdowns. According to Ngoc Minh Vu complexity of using a language involves to carry message appropriately, using the right language at the right time, involving some cultural knowledge mostly at the right contexts. Therefore, teaching English should also involve the teaching of the culture [20].

Misunderstanding caused by grammatical mistakes, are more tolerated [21], however, misunderstanding on the use of appropriate contexts may endanger the communication. Thomas defines the mistakes in pragmatic use as "pragmatic failure" [22]. This issue raises at the language pedagogy level and teaching pragmatic, that is teaching students how to use language appropriately is of obvious [20]. According to Ngoc Minh Vu in teaching pragmatic, classroom instruction obviously requires the teaching and learning of pragmatics whereby knowledge and skills, and the process how pragmatic knowledge is being taught to the EFL learners are developed [20].

Pragmatic ability in EFL is part of a nonnative speaker's communicative competence and therefore has to be located in a model of communicative ability [19,23]. Kasper defines in Bachman's model, 'language competence' consists of 'organizational competence' and 'pragmatic competence' [15]. Organizational competence comprises knowledge of linguistic units and the rules of joining them together at the levels of sentence ('grammatical competence') and discourse ('textual

competence'). Pragmatic competence subdivides into 'illocutionary competence' and 'sociolinguistic competence'. 'Illocutionary competence' can be glossed as 'knowledge of communicative action and how to carry it out'. 'Sociolinguistic competence' comprises the ability to use language appropriately according to context. It includes the ability to select communicative acts and appropriate strategies.

Kasper postulates that pragmatic competence cannot be taught [19]. Competence, linguistic or pragmatic, is not teachable. Competence is a type of knowledge that learners possess, develop, acquire, use or lose. The challenge for foreign or second language teaching is whether we can arrange learning opportunities in such a way that they benefit the development of pragmatic competence in L2. As the study of Bayat speech acts in the pragmatics indicate how learners perform their choice of speech acts and strategies they employ. Therefore, strategies beyond the performance in the speech acts are important to investigate [4].

III. METHODS

A. Design and Setting

This study used qualitative approach, analyzing the corpus of speech acts into narrative features [20,24]. This study took place in Tulungrejo and Pelem, villages in Pare District, Kediri Regency. The villages have been popularized as Kamung Inggris Kalend where 180 informal English course institutions are served and more than 40,000 students from all over Indonesia stay to learn English and some of foreign country students, such as Malaysia, Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Jordan, South Africa involve in the learning process. Kalend is the charismatic Kyai local man who firstly originated the English learning model by 1976s and his name has been established in the Foundation of Kampung Inggris Kalend as the chairman. The use of Kalend philosophically indicates that as recently Kampung Inggris in other cities appear adapting the Kampung Inggris from Pare, Kampung Inggris Kalend is patented as the origin owing and holding the copy right patent.

The learning environment as the informal situation implies is of three main conditions: regular classroom, basecamp (homes served as a dormitory of students by the owners of institutions, and cafes served by the community in these villages. Learning programs and activities have been designed in these three settings to make learners enjoy in the informal activities. The main goal is to provide exposures in speaking activities that are far from formal situation, thus lowering learners' handicaps to make errors and unacceptable utterances and linguistics as well as psychological barriers. Each camp is controlled one to three lecturers supervising students' activities and coordinating the English camp activities. Regular schedule in each camp is 05.00-06.30 am after subuh praying and 07.00-09.00 in the evening times. All apply from Monday to Friday. All levels of students are involved in the camp.

Cafes are other settings the learning activities are also regularly set up. When topics for actual practices that needs more improvisations are required, cafes are mostly used as the learning setting in agreement between teacher and students. The owners of the course or individual teachers have made the coordination with the cafes so that it is easy to book. Tens cafes are available surrounding the sites and choice of menu and learning facilities are available. In addition, the regular classes are available in more informal set up for sitting down on the floor with tables in front of each student. Whiteboard and LCD are available for learning media. The institutions to be observed included: Basic English Course (BEC), Global English Course (GEC), and Oxford English Course (OEC). The researcher conducted the research for 5 months starting from June to October 2018.

B. Participants

Participants of this study comprised 150 students learning in three levels of competence: the beginner 50, intermediate 50, and advanced 50, as well as six teachers each of which was responsible for one level were selected as the participants. In all, the 156 participants were selected using purposive sampling techniques. Purposive sampling was used for two reasons: students and teachers were assigned to represent how pragmatic competence was developed; and, management has indicated welcome cooperation to conduct a research in the institutions and perceived as the development programs.

In general, the students came from various cities all over Indonesia and have the demographic features as follows. The elementary students, 85% aged between 19 to 25 years old, and 15% aged 26 to 35 years of old passed from undergraduate degree. Some of the intermediate levels were university lecturers aging 40 to 55 years old, undergraduates diploma aged between 27 to 30 years of age, and SMA graduates, pre-university, freshmen and senior university students preparing their leaving exam at a university. In the advanced level, 70% were seeking jobs and 30% were junior and senior students in a university. They spent their time to join in the course in the break-sessions in their universities. Surprisingly, there were 6 students each came from Malaysia, Jordan, Iran, Vietnam, Cambodia and Africa learning in the advanced level. Students whose residences were apart from Kediri, stayed in the dormitory served by the institutions or in the community surrounding the courses. As the policy of the course institution, each level was run for three months and students from other cities normally took the program for 6 or 9 months. At about 40% in each level and each institution students spent 12 to 16 months to study academic English such as academic writing, TOEFL and IELTS preparing for their studies overseas or apprenticeship for managing their own similar courses at their hometowns.

C. Data Collection Techniques

Data of this study were collected using four techniques: questionnaire, observation, interview and documents. The questionnaire was used to see demographic data, such as individual background, education, strategies to perform an utterance. Observation was used to collect data from the verbal interactions elicited in the English camp, cafes, and FGD (Focus Group Discussion). A video-camera was used in the observation process in each level. Observation took place four times in each level, providing 12 records. Interview was conducted in terms of semi-structured interview to search an in-depth interview with teachers and students. The interview

was recorded through the video-camera to identify the verbatim utterances containing pragmatic competence. Each interviewee was interviewed fully in English ranging in 15 minutes. Data obtained from the video-camera were transcribed verbatim to pose the pragmatic evidences in terms of sentences and conversation corpuses. Complimentary to the observation, field notes were prepared to help the researcher locate the focus of the study and highlight points in the identification of pragmatic competence. Documents including syllabi, textbooks, and students' biodata were collected to support the results of the records.

With this in mind, primary data on pragmatic competence were identified from the corpus obtained from the video-camera transcripts and field notes. The pragmatic competence data were classified into kinds of pragmatic utterances as suggested by Austin and pragmatic strategies. In addition, transcripts of interview data were used for the method triangulation [2]. The secondary data obtained from documents were used to compliment.

D. Data Analysis Techniques

Qualitative content analysis was used to analyze the data. Specifically, the data were sorted using thematic analysis to make the domain and taxonomy [24-26] of the pragmatic competence. Four steps of analysis were conducted following the domain, taxonomy, thematic and componential analysis [24-25]. Process of analysis was done inherently as suggested by Miles and Huberman suggesting circular model including: data collection, data reduction, data display and verification-concluding drawing [26].

Formats of analysis adapted a study by Ngioc Minh Vue [20], Bayat [4] and Dylgjeri [9]. First of all, performative acts were analyzed to identify the locutionary acts and the intended meaning. Further, five classifications of perlocution at acts were defined and interpreted. To figure out the descriptions, numerical features regarding types of strategies used by speakers to perform their selected speech acts were illustrated.

IV. RESULTS

A. Kinds of Speech Acts

The first aim of analysis of this study is to identify perlocutionary acts in the utterances the learners perform. Performative acts used to deliver message from teachers to students are differentiated from students-teachers, and students-students. Table 1 suggest the findings.

TABLE I. PERFORMATIVE ACTS IN BY TEACHERS TO STUDENTS

No	Speech acts	Elementary N=50; token=37	Intermediate N=50; token=49	Advanced N=50; token-62
1	Directives/exercitives: order, warn, advice bequeath, nominate, forbid	26=70.3%	20=40.8%	18=29%
2	Declaratives/expositives: state, deny, remark, inform, ask, testify, accept, correct, deduce, interpret, illustrate	8=21.6%	12=24.5%	12=19.4
3	Commissive/ Verdictives: undertake, promise, covenant, contract, swear, bet, plan,	0	5=10.2%	6=9.7
4	Expressives/behavitives: apologise, thank, sympathise, resent, command, welcome, bless	3=8.1%	8=16.3%	16=25.8
5	Assertives: acquit, convict, rule, estimate, value, calculate, analyse	0	4=8.2%	10=16.1

As table 1 suggests, variety of speech acts selected is different from elementary, intermediate and advanced level indicating the higher the level is the more variations the learners perform. The data suggest that elementary level missed two kinds of speech acts, commissive and assertive. Intermediate and advanced level students use all five speech acts but different in the frequency showing the advanced level performed higher frequency in each type of speech act. It implies that teachers control more to the elementary level students and less for the intermediate and advanced levels.

Results of analysis on speech acts delivered by students-teachers and students-students indicate elementary level command limited knowledge of English as the start of performing oral English. Intermediate level shows higher than elementary and advanced level perform confidently. Table 2 draws variety of speech acts performed for students to teachers and students-students.

TABLE II. SPEECH ACTS BY STUDENTS TEACHER AND STUDENTS-STUDENTS

Speech acts function	EL	INT	ADV
Directives			
-Would you please give me more information?	-	V	
-What do you mean by ….	-		V
-I want you repeat the information…	-	V	V
-Do you want me to submit again?	-		V
Declaratives			
-I don't know what you talked to me	V	V	V
-I agree with the group A and refuse the opinion of …	-	V	V

Table 2. Cont.

Commissive			
-I will come on time tomorrow Sir.	V	V	V
-I will visit my father next week and will back here in one week	-	V	V
Expressive			
-I am sorry Sir, I am late	V	V	V
-Please forgive me for my inconvenient and wrong manners	-	V	V
-Thank you very much for your attention	V	V	V
Assertive			
-In my opinion, group A is wrong and group B is correct	V	V	V
-I don't agree with you because you are wrong	V	V	V
-If you want top be successful, believe in Allah and obey His rules	-	V	V

B. Strategies to Select Speech Acts

Second aim of analysis indicates kinds of strategies used by EFL learners to select the speech acts as suggested by Bayat [4]. The results show that there are six types of speech acts the learners in elementary, intermediate and advanced levels have performed implicitly and explicitly as displayed in table 3.

As table 3 suggests there are six kinds of speech acts are used as the strategies by EFL learners: apologizing, thanking, clarifying, refusing, complaining, and informing. Strategies in each speech act are as follows:

1) Apologizing: giving reason, expressing regret, stating of being wrong

2) Thanking: expressing direct thank you, expressing gratitude, showing positive gestures

3) Clarifying: showing different facts, telling the background

4) Refusing: giving reasons, refusing directly, offering other opinion

5) Complaining: complaining directly, showing the inaccuracy, warning

6) Informing: stating definition, showing examples

TABLE III.   SELECTED SPEECH ACTS USED BY EFL LEARNERS

Speech acts	Elementary Token=40	Intermediate Token=70	Advanced Token=102
Apologizing	12=30%	14=20%	20=19.6%
-giving reason	2=5%	4=5.7	6=5.9
-expressing regret	6=15%	8=11.4	10=9.8
-stating of being wrong	4=10%	2=2.8	4=3.9
Thanking	18=45%	20=28.6%	24=23.5
-expressing direct thank you	5=12.5	10=14.3	12=11.8
-expressing gratitude	8=20	6=8.6	8=7.8
-showing positive gestures	5=12.5	4=5.7	4=3.9
Clarifying	6=15%	10=14,3%	18=17,6%
-showing different facts	4=10	6=8.6	8=7.8
-telling the background	2=5	4=5.7	10=9.8
Refusing	4=10%	6=8.6%	12=11.8%
-giving reasons	2=5	2=2.8	4=3.9
-refusing directly	2=5	3=4.3	5=4.9
-offering other opinion	-	1=1.4	3=2.9
Complaining	0	8=11.4%	10=9.8%
-complaining directly		3=4.3	4=3.9
-showing the inaccuracy		4=5.7	4=3.9
-warning		1=1.4	2=1.9
Informing	3=7.5%	12=17.1%	18=17.6%
-stating definition	2=5	8=11.4	8=7.8
-showing examples	1=2,5	4=5.7	10=9.8

C. Results of Interview

Viewed from kinds of the results of interview reasons to select strategies to perform speech acts varies across the level of competence. Three factors affect the ability of expressing speech acts properly, they are: pragmatic competence, level of competency and formality of contexts.

Pragmatic competence that indicates awareness of using certain utterance at proper contexts are acquired from the classroom interactions and teachers' utterances during teaching. This provides models and notion of using natural English as the native speakers speak. Utterances below complaining teacher's utterances that are too difficult to understand by a leaner exemplify the context.

(1) Excuse me. I am complaining your utterances. I don't understand most of your utterances because your accents are different from my teachers'. Do you use American or British English?

The context of excerpt (1) above is a student in the classroom who used direct complaint after a new teacher gives an introduction on a topic. The topic is interesting and enjoys most of the students. However, a student felt difficult to comply as he suggests that the information is hard to understand, delivered in faster speed, and the pronunciation is different from what he usually hears from his regular classroom teacher. Towards the complaint, the new teacher replies as in (2) using indirect speech act.

(2) Thank you for your comment. I will illustrate a passage written by L.A. Hill in graded Reading. One day, a teacher of English having very good qualification in English is teaching a class. He speaks fluently and accurately using the standard English. Surprisingly, after the teacher ended his information, a student raised his hand and complained: "Sorry Sir. I think I don't understand what you said. Your English is strange. My teacher never speaks like this."

The message in excerpt (2) clarifies that the teacher used indirect speech act to respond student's complaint. He is aware that the student lacked of competency in English and he indirectly responds using illustration. The teacher continued:

(3) Standard English is similar to both American and UK. You can refer to dictionary to consult. Please try to speak using standard English and you will be sure you can easily understand whether it is American or queen English.

Further analysis evidently indicates that the main factor affecting the student's complaint is the pragmatic competence. As in the greetings, interrupting, and apologizing, students lack of awareness to practice. "Teachers do not pay much attention to teach pragmatic. Our main goal is to encourage students speak," said Nidya, the teacher at advanced level.

Other clarification given by Mr. Muhtar, the teacher of academic writing and IELTS in advanced class indicates how pragmatic competence is neglected. He testifies:

(4) "I think it is not necessary for me to teach pragmatic. Frankly speaking, I do not quite understand what pragmatic is and how to teach it. If pragmatic is associated with how to speak properly in context, it is enough in my opinion to give students just an example".

Other utterances indicating lack of pragmatic competence are indicated by the use of the following phrases in excerpt (5):

(5)

- Excuse me
- Are you OK so far?
- Are you with me guys?
- Thank you

- Does it make sense?

Excerpts (5a) to (5e) indicate phrases normally used in the interactions for the uses of interrupting, apologizing, remembering audiences, and thanking. When applying the phrases for interrupting, for instance, students do not use "excuse me" before they say their opinion, but they raised their hand. The phrase "Thank you" a normal response to say gratitude is also absent. Fortunately, the phrases of "are you with me", "does it make sense", "are you ok so far" are not quite familiar during the learning process, and when teachers encourage students to make sure if they understand what the teacher just explained, the students keep silent, indicating that their pragmatic competence is lacking.

Level of competency is indicated simply by the class level. Students in the elementary level perform less utterances as their level of competency in English is restricted. Students of intermediate level perform better than the elementary level does because intermediate students learn more rules and contexts in English speaking activities. The advanced level admittedly, perform successfully all speech act level indicating that they already receive enough knowledge and experiences to perform speech acts for various purposes. Shortages may appear because they are in the interlanguage level.

V. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

Our findings have proved that speech acts would have been performed better if the level of competences increases. Specifically, five categories of speech from Austin [2] and Searle [3] do occur in the community of EFL learners. In addition, strategies to implement the speech acts are dependent on the pragmatic competence and context of formality of an utterance.

The first concern of this study is the selection of speech act. As the finding suggests, students with low competence in English as indicated by the level of class do not use all variations of the speech acts. To communicate with teachers, they neglect to use directive, and assertive speech acts. The intermediate and advanced levels however, perform all five categories of the speech acts. This means that students with lower pragmatic competence will not perform proper speech acts.

This finding confirms the study by Bayat [4] stating that participants used different kinds of speech acts depending on their level of competence, i.e. elementary, intermediate, advanced. Elementary level performed four of the five speech acts (declarative, commissive, expressive, assertive), and intermediate and advanced level students performed all five speech acts for more variety of utterances (directive, declarative, commissive, expressive, assertive). The most probable reasons are students with lower pragmatic competence perform the less variety of speech acts.

The role of pragmatic competence has been defined by the study of Ngoc Minh Vu [20], describing that pragmatic competence is the main factor EFL learners will perform fluent pragmatic in variety of settings. Pragmatic competence affects awareness of how utterances are described properly in

context of topics, setting and goals. This study confirms that pragmatic competence the main indicators that students used speech acts dependent on their pragmatic competence. As pragmatic competence is not taught explicitly by the teachers in Kampung Inggris, students are not aware of using appropriate pragmatic competence and they apply pragmatic models as they perform when they speak using bahasa Indonesia.

The evidence shows that students used six strategies to develop speech acts when communicating, namely: apologizing, thanking, clarifying, refusing, complaining and informing. The evidence shows that more variations appear in the communication but restriction occurred as students are in the interlanguage level of competence. In the study by Bayat [4] participants used eight strategies to perform the speech acts. Participants in Bayat's [4] study develop more strategies because the participants are more mature in English and they used for more purposes in more contexts.

Bayat asserts that strategies students use to select the speech acts are depending on the type of performatives. The variety of the strategies used is associated with specific conditions of the communication and qualities of the parties involved in a communication [4]. In his study, Bayat did not encounter any consistent use in speech acts application of undergraduates [4]. The strategies determined regarding the speech act are similar to the data obtained from the study carried on Korean students learning English by Jung [27]. Expression of apology that Jung discovered for the act of apology and expression of regret, explanation and giving a reason, acknowledgment of responsibility and taking the responsibility, offer of repair, promise of non-recurrence and making a commitment in this study are the strategies that have the same functions [27].

The most frequently used strategy is reflecting results strategy, an implicit justification to eliminate the negativity emerged. It is an indirect expression. In the act of refusing, the most frequently used strategy among is giving a reason strategy. However, refusing directly can be considered as impolite strategies. The next speech act dealt with in this study is thanking that uses thanking directly as the most frequently strategy by using use an explicit expression of gratitude. Zarei determined thanking strategies into: thanking, appreciation, repayment, recognition of imposition, apology, positive feeling, each of which indicates the same functions as in this study [28].

In summary, this study has identified three conclusions: speech acts students select, strategies to determine the speech acts, and reasons why a typical speech act is used. In general, students use five kinds of speech acts, namely directive, declarative, commissive, expressive, and assertive, with an exception that elementary students do not use directive speech acts to interact with their teacher in the classroom as it is considered impolite by the leaners. Typically, students' performance in using strategies of speech acts apply six types, namely: apologizing, thanking, clarifying, refusing, complaining and informing. Strategies used and kind of speech acts selected by the leaners are associated with their

level of competence and how pragmatic competence is taught in the classroom.

Restriction happens in this study because number of different setting and more informal contexts is limited. Implications should be made that this study cannot describe the full speech act categories in rich settings. Future research is recommended to extend the setting and explore more variety of occurrences representing speech acts variations. In addition, pragmatic competence be taught purposively in English natural contexts by the teachers and students are exposed on more awareness of practicing pragmatic competences.

REFERENCES

[1] Austin, J.L. (Flew, A. Ed.) 'Other Minds', Logic and Language: Second Series. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953.

[2] Austin, J.L. How To Do Things With Words. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

[3] Searle, J.R. Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

[4] Bayat, N. "A study on the use of speech acts". Procedia-social and behavioral sciences, vol. 70, pp. 213-221, 2012.

[5] Anggororeni, P., Santosa, R., and Wiratni, T. "Analisis Terjemahan Makna Interpersonal dalam Dubbing Film Thomas and Friend: Blue Mountain Mistery". Lingua, vol. 15(1), pp. 7-18, 2018.

[6] Subroto, D.E. Semantik Leksikal I, Surakarta: UNS Press, 1989.

[7] Subroto, D.E. Semantik Leksikal II, Surakarta: UNS Press, 1994.

[8] Schiffrin, A. Modelling Speech Acts in Conversational Discourse. Ph.D's Dissertation. Leeds, UK: The University of Leeds. School of Computing, 2005.

[9] Dylgjeri, A. Analysis of Speech Acts in Political Speeches. European Journal of Social Sciences Studies. 2(2),18-26, 2017.

[10] Austin, J.L. How To Do Things With words: The Wiliam James lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

[11] Budiharso, T. "Pembelajaran Menulis Esai dalam Disertasi: Kajian Metakognitif". Cendekia, vol. 12(2), pp. 141-152, 2018.

[12] Thomas, J. Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics. London: Longman, 1995.

[13] Leech, G.N. Principles of Pragmatics. London: Longman, 1983.

[14] Watson, J.R., and Hill, A. A dictionary of communication and media studies. London: Edward Arnold, 1993.

[15] Bachman, L.F. Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

[16] Solikhah, I. "Insufficient Preparation of Teaching Reading: What Should Teachers Challenge?", IJOTL-TL, vol. 3(3), pp. 71-84, 2018.

[17] Asher, N. and Lascarides, A. "Intentions and information in discourse", Proceedings of the 29th Annual meeting of the Association of Computational Linguistics, 34-41, Las Cruces, USA, June 1994.

[18] Qian Y. An Investigation of the Non-English Majors' Pragmatic Competence. Journal of Language Teaching and Research. Vol. 6(6), pp. 1289-1296, 2015.

[19] Kasper G. Classroom research on interlanguage pragmatics. In K. R. Rose and G Kasper (Eds.). Pragmatics in language teaching (pp. 33-60). New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[20] Ngoc M.V. Teaching pragmatic in English as a Foreign Language at a Vietnamess university: Teachers' perceptions, curricular content, and classroom practices. Unpublished Ph.D' Dissertation. Sydney: Faculty of Educational and Social Work, Univetrsity of Sydney, 2017.

[21] Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., Hyde, A.A., and Varner, W. Best practice: New standards for teaching and learning in America's schools. Heinemann Educational Publishers, 1998.

[22] Thomas, J. "Cross-cultural pragmatic failure". Applied linguistics, vol. 4(2), pp. 91-112, 1983.

[23] Savignon, S.J. "Communicative language teaching: State of the art". TESOL quarterly, vol. 25(2), pp. 261-278, 1991.

[24] Santosa, R. Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Kebahasaan. Surakarta: UNS Press, 2017.

[25] Spradly, J.P. Participant Observations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

[26] Miles, M.B., and Huberman, A.M. Qualitative Data Analysis. Newbury Park: CA, Sage, 1994.

[27] Jung, E.H.S. Interlanguage pragmatics: Apology speech acts. In Carol Lyan Moder & Aida Martinovie_Zic. (Eds.), Discourse across language and culture. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2004.

[28] Zarei, S. Expressions of gratitude: A Case of EFL learners. Review of European Studies, vol. 3(2), pp. 140-149, 2011.