An Analysis of Language Comprehension Disorder of a Student with Asperger Disorder to Rogative Act at *Tiji Homeschooling* in Padang

Syukrawadi Z [1], Havid Ardi [2]

English Department
Faculty of Languages and Arts
Universitas Negeri Padang
email: **syukra_jan90@yahoo.co.id**

Abstract

This paper aims to (1) identify the types of questions, (2) the patterns of questions used by Tiji Homeschooling teachers for students with Asperger's. Then, (3) also identify the types of responses from students with Asperger's to the questions from these teachers. This paper takes 5 times recorded dialogues between children with Asperger's and teachers during the teaching and learning process as data, namely utterances that are included in the rogative. From the results of the study, it can be seen that there are 430 questions where the type of direct rogative with a total of 373 (86.7%) is the most widely used and the type of indirect rogative is 57 (13.3%). From the grouping of types of questions, 372 (86.5%) information-seeking questions were found, 47 (10.9%) information-checking questions, and 11 (2.6%) clarification questions, the teacher used a lot of information-seeking questions. Then, there were also 112 types of responses, namely absurd response (AR) 18 responses, odd response (OR) 62 responses, more relevant but not very polite (RnP) 6 responses, and marginal response (MR) 26 responses where odd most responses appear in response to teachers' questions. This data concludes that the priority odd response type appears in the responses by students, aged six years, with the Asperger's disorder which indicate having problems understanding questions (language comprehension disorder) from Tiji Homeschooling teachers.

Key words: speech act, rogatives, Asperger disorder, response, *Tiji Homeschooling*

A. INTRODUCTION

Naturally, a child has stages to acquire language. Caregivers and his environment help him to develop his language. Along his childhood, he starts pronouncing single words, combining two or more words, and making simple

---

[1] English ELLSP of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang graduated on March 2021

[2] Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang

sentences. He learns from what he listens from the caregivers and what he has seen from the environment although he often finds many mistakes in practicing them.

Although most children acquire language without problems, disorders in their language development commonly happen in childhood. Basically, some children have impairments in language process of the brain, generally called as language disorders. One of language disorders that some of the children often suffer from classified in receptive language disorder. For this case, children are difficult or confused to understand in comprehending the messages when they have conversation that is known as language comprehension disorder.

Mostly children with autism find difficulties in comprehending the messages verbally and non verbally. Autism itself is well known with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). Asperger Disorder is a rare kind of Autism Spectrum Disorder among the other disorders. As Barnhill (2001:46) states Asperger disorder is a developmental disability marked by impairments in social relationship and in verbal and non-verbal communication and restrictive repetitive patterns of behavior, interest and activities. As a result, children with autism find difficulties to make a friend.

In every communication, human communicates information in the form of thoughts, ideas, intentions, feelings, and emotions as well. Then, people will acquire information by asking question. In any communication process, it might be fullfilled in which is called a speech act. Austin (1962) introduced the macro classes into locutionary act, illocutionary act, and Perlocutionary act. Then, Searl (2005: 12) categorizes illocutionary act into five macro classes: Assertive or representative, directive, commisive, expressive, and declarative.

 Meanwhile, Leech in Peccei (1999: 63) proposed rogative act as an extra category, where speaker can request or ask information to the hearer. Rogative occurs when the speaker as asks or gives a question to the hearer during interaction speech event. Leech (1983: 205-207) classifies types of illocution act into *assertive*, *directive*, *commisive*, *expressive*, *declarative*, and *rogative*. Rogative act is one of speech acts that occurs when the speaker as asks or gives a question to the hearer in communication. Speech act of this paper is focused on rogative speech acts. This kind of speech act may include in the forms of questions that children with asperger will have difficulty to answer or as a language comprehension disorder to rogative.

The acts of questioning, asking and inquiring information are included into rogative speech acts. These types of Rogative differ from the other types of speech acts based on the directness, the first is called direct acts of rogatives, and the second one is called indirect speech acts of rogatives.

According to Parker (1999: 17-19) and Wijana (1996: 33), the direct form of rogatives or the acts of asking questions is interrogative. In other words, the speaker conducts the act of questioning in interrogative form, it means that he performs direct speech acts of rogatives. Besides, Justova (2006) states that direct question is formed in order that speaker can get specific answer.

There are three kinds of direct speech acts of rogative; the first one is in the form of canonical interrogatives or the wh-question, the second is in the form of yes/no question, and the last is in the form of embedded interrogatives. The other type of rogatives are any kinds of greetings that are also included in this classification; the direct speech acts of rogatives.

Besides, Indirect question shows that speaker needs to feel the answer from hearer. Fiengo (2007) says that indirect questions refer to things that are not thoughts, but are sense of some sorts. In indirect speech act, there are some patterns that show the characteristics of this type, the first one performs rogatives by putting it into a sub clause with a question word or with 'if' o 'whether'. (Eastwood, 2008: 19). Then, Eastwood (2008:19) explains one more type of indirect speech act; embedded interrogatives or 'sub-clause + question'. in addition, There is another form of indirect rogative act, in the structure of "Declarative + Ok/right?" or in the form of tag-question. Moreover, there is one more patterns that also has function for questioning; "statement or statement". Both of the statements can be in the forms of "Noun + Noun", "Adjective + Adjective", and so on. The speaker asks the information to the hearer, then the hearer considers the right answer from the list of answers.

Moreover, Schiffrin (1998) classifies the types of question into (1) information-seeking question, (2) information-checking question, and (3) clarification question. Information-seeking question is the type when speaker wants to seek information, either general or specific information. Information-checking question is the type of rogative sentences and tag questions. Then, Clarification question is the type when speaker needs to clarify the information that he gets.

In other hand, Schank (1977: 421) argues that there are rules for responses, though it is probably more accurate to say that they are governed rather than severally restrict one's response. He found that there are some types of response which involve absurd response (AR), Odd Response (OR), more relevant but not very polite (RnP), and marginal response (MR).

The focus of this paper is the questions of teachers to their student with asperger disorder at *Tiji Homeschooling* in Padang. Then, the dialogue between the teachers and student may show various types of question. The dialogue will be in teaching and learning process where the forms of rogative acts appear, direct rogative act and indirect rogative acts. Then, there will be response from aspergers to his teachers' rogative acts.

B. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research is categorized as descriptive quantitative research because this research has purpose to describe the language phenomena that occur in daily life; meanwhile, this research was describe the fact or situation that currently occurred. This research described the forms of rogative acts and types of the questions that were used by the teachers at *Tiji Home Schooling* in Padang. Then, the types of response of an asperger student will show the languang

comprehension skill he has of his teachers' rogative acts. This research described the data that were collected from the source. The data were the questions in the dialogues between teachers and an asperger disorder in order to know the types of responses and the form of rogative acts.

The data of this research were questions that were used by teachers while teaching and learning process was running with an asperger student. The source of the data was recordings started from 21 September 2014 to 25 September 2014. To get the data, the researcher took several steps as follow (1) Collect the data by recording the utterances from the teachers and asperger student during the class. (2) Transcribe the dialogue into alphabetic transcription or making a note of utterances. (3) Find out and classify the utterances which belonged to rogative speech acts by the teachers of *Tiji Homeschooling* and type of responses by asperger student.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The data of this research were taken from five records of dialogue in learning and teaching processs at Tiji Homeschooling. Dialogue one was taken on 21 September 2014, dialogue two was 22 September 2014, dialogue three was 23 September 2014, activity, dialogue four was 24 September 2014, dialogue five was 25 September 2014. From the data, it was found that there were 430 rogative speech acts, consisting of two categories for rogative acts and three types of questions and four types of responses.

Table 1.0 The Occurance of Categories of Rogative Speech Acts used by Ms. Suci and Ms. Dinis' Utterances

Categories of Rogative Speech Acts	Frequency	Percentage
A. Direct Rogative Speech Act	**373**	**86,7%**
Canonical Interrogatives (W-H Interrogatives)	317	73,7%
Auxilary + Interrogative (Yes-No Interrogatives)	52	12,1%
Greeting	4	0,9%
B. Indirect Rogative Speech Act	**57**	**13,3%**
Taq Question (statement + tag (negative))	18	4,2%
Declarative + or + Declarative (Statement + or + Statement)	16	3,7%

I want to know + question	9	2,1%
Declarative + right/ok (statement + tag)	14	3,3%
Total	430	100%

Table 2.0 The Total Number of The Types of Question of Ms. Suci and Ms. Dinis' Utterances

Types of Question	Frequency	Percentage
Information seeking question	372	86,5%
Information checking question	47	10,9%
Clarification question	11	2,6%
Total	430	100%

Table 3.0 The Total Number of Types of Responses of Jove's utterances

No.	Types of response	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Absurd Response (AR)	18	16,1%
2.	Odd Response (OR)	62	55,4%
3.	More Relevant but not Very Polite Response (RnP)	6	5,3%
4.	Marginal Response (MR)	26	23,2%
Total		112	100%

1. Rogative Speech Acts

1.1 Direct Rogative Speech Acts

1. Yes-No Question

   Datum 5

   Miss Suci: Jove suka ayam goreng?

     (Jove- like- fried- chicken?)

     (Do you like fried chicken?)

   Jove   : Suka

     (like)

     (I do)

   Analyis:

According to Datum (5), the utterance spoken by Ms. Suci was indicated as Yes-No Question because the utterance *"Jove suka ayam goreng?"* is started by an auxiliary *"Do"* followed by interrogative about whether Jove likes fried chicken. Then, it can be seen that Jove gives response by answering Yes-No from his teacher's direct rogative act.

Meanwhile, the structure of Jove's utterance is about miss subject (I). It would be changed into *"ya, saya suka"*. However, it could be understood that he liked fried chicken.

2. Canonical interrogative (W-H Question)

Datum 260
Ms. Dini : Jove cuci tangan pakai apa?
    (Jove- wash- hand- use- what?)

    (What do you use for washing hands?)

Jove   : Sabun

  (soap)

    (soap)

Analysis:

According to Datum (260), the utterance delivered by Ms. Dini was indicated as canonical interrogative (W-H Question) because the utterance *"Jove cuci tangan pakai apa?"* is started by a question word *"What"* followed by an auxiliary *"do"* followed by interrogative about. Then, it can be seen that Jove gives response appropriately by answering it with simple answer *"sabun"*.

The structure of Jove's utterance is about miss Subject (I) and verb (wash). He only uses a word as an answer for the direct rogative act. It would be changed become *"saya cuci tangan pakai sabun"*. However, his answer could be understood that he used single word as needed information.

1.2 Indirect Rogative Speech Acts

1. I want to know + question

Datum 119

Miss Suci: Oh, ya. Miss ingin tahu kemaren jove liburannya kemana?

        (oh,- yes.- Miss- want- to- know- yesterday- jove- vacation- where?)

  (oh, yes. I want to know where you had a vacation the day before?)

Jove   : Ke Basko

(to-Basko)

(to-Basko)

Analysis:

According to Datum (119), the utterance delivered by Ms. Suci was indicated as I want to know + question because the utterance *" Miss ingin tahu kemaren jove liburannya kemana?"* is started by *"I want to"* followed by interrogative about. Then, it can be seen that Jove gives response appropriately by answering it with simple answer *"to basko"*.

The structure of Jove's utterance is about miss Subject (I) and verb (had vacation), and preposition (in). He only uses a word as an answer for the indirect rogative act. It would be changd become *"saya berlibur di basko"*. However, it could be understood that he had vacation in Basko.

2. Statement + tag (negative)

Datum 54

Miss Suci: *Oh, Ove mau mewarnai, ya?*

(oh,- Ove- want- to- paint,- yes?)

(oh, you want to paint, don't you?)

Jove   : *Iya, gambar dinosaurus*

(yes,- picture- dinosaur)

(yes, dinosaur picture)

Analysis:

According to Datum (54), the utterance spoken by Ms. Suci was indicated as statement + tag (negative) because the utterance *" Oh, Ove mau mewarnai, ya?"* is started by a sentence and followed by tag (negative) as an interrogative to confirm for what she thought. Then, it ca be seen that jove responds by giving short answer with additional information to support it *"iya, gambar dinosaurus"*.

The structure of Jove's utterance is about miss Subject (I) and verb (want to paint). He uses a phrasal word as an answer for the indirect rogative act. It would be changd become *"saya ingin mewarnai gambar dinosaurus"*. However, it could be understood that he wants to paint dinosaur picture.

3. Statement + or + statement

Datum 29

Miss. Suci   : *Ini namanya kelas, Jove. Oh ya, Tadi, yang antar kesini, papi atau mami?*

        (this- name- class,- Jove. Oh- ya,- just,- take- here,- father- or- mother)

    (this is class, Jove. Anyway, just now, the person took you here, father or mother?)

Jove   : *Papi*

    (-father)

    (father)

Analysis:

According to Datum (29), the utterance spoken by Ms. Suci was indicated as statement + or + Statement because the utterance *yang antar kesini, papi atau mami?* is started by a sentence and followed by a question by providng choices to clarify or to make the answer clearer as an interrogative. Then, it can be seen that jove responds by giving short answer by considering right answer *"papi"*.

The structure of Jove's utterance is about miss verb (took), object (jove) and preposition (here). He uses a single word as an answer for the indirect rogative act. It would be changed become *"papi antar jove tadi kesini"*. However, it could be understood that his father took him to the school.

4.   Statement + tag

Datum 189

Ms. Dini : *Oh berarti Jove biasa jajan sandwich dan resoles, ya?*
    (Oh- means- Jove- usually- have- sandwich- and- salad,- right?)
    (Oh it means Jove usually have sandwich and Salad, right?)

Jove   : *Ya*
    (-Yes)
    (Yes)

Analysis:

According to Datum (189), the utterance spoken by Ms. Dini was indicated as statement + tag because the utterance *Oh berarti Jove biasa jajan sandwich dan resoles, ya?* is started by a sentence and followed by a question by providing right rather than tag at the end, to clarify jove's previous utterance. Otherwise, jove only gives short answer by saying *"ya"* which he should give complete answer to decribe his choice.

The structure of Jove's utterance is about miss Subject (I), Verb (have), object (sandwich/salad). He uses a single word as an answer for the indirect rogative act. It would be changed become *"I have sandwich and Salad"*. However, it could be understood that He had Sandwich and Salad.

2. Types of Questions
2.1 Information Seeking Question
Datum 130

> Miss. Suci: coba jove itung. miss ingin tahu ada berapa mobil jove tarok
> *(Try to count it, I would like to know how many cars you put)*
> Jove   : satu, dua, tiga, empat
> *(One, two, three, four)*

The question above was from Ms. Suci's utterance in which she asked information seeking question. she asked jove about how many cars he put while they were playing cars together. She asked question to gather the information that she needed. Then, her student could understand his teacher's utterance by counting the cars as needed to answer.

2.2 Information Checking Question
Datum 197

> Ms. Dini: *ngapain Jove jam 12 tu?*
> *(what did you do at 12 pm)*
> Jove   : tunggu mami
> *(wait for Mom)*
> Ms. Dini: *oh jadi jajannya jam 12, ya? Waktu tunggu mami, iya?*
> *(oh so you had snack at 12, right? The time you waited*
> *for mom, right?)*
> Jove   : pulang sekolah
> *(after school)*

Previously, she gave question about when jove had snack, but he could not understand her utterance appropriately. The first question, she asked jove about what he did at noon where it was classified in information seeking question. Then, the next question above was from Ms. Dini's utterance in which she asked information checking question. She tried to connect his utterance with the next question as information checking "*oh jadi jajannya jam 12, ya? Waktu tunggu mami, iya?*" (Oh so you had snack at 12, right? While waiting for your mom, right?). Then, it can be seen that he could understand his teacher's by saying "*pulang sekolah*" (after school).

2.3 Clarification Question
Datum 213

> Ms. Dini: pop ice. Ok, yang hitam. *Apa itu yang hitam, minumannya?*
> *(pop iced. Ok, the black one. What is the black one, the drink?*
> Jove   : teh sirsak
> *(soursop tea)*
> Ms. Dini: *loh kok teh sirsak?* Ko...
> *(why do you say soursop tea? It's Ko....)*
> Jove   : kopmil
> *(coffee mixed with milk)*

The conversation was talking about kinds of drink he knew by mentioning the characteristic of each. The first question above, she asked jove what kind of drink with black as its characteristic in which it was classified in information seeking question. Whereas, he did not respond approriately by saying *"teh sirsak"* (soursop tea).

After he said such that, the teacher asked clarification question to clarify what he said by saying *"Loh kok teh sirsak? Ko..."* (why do you say soursop tea). Then, the teacher gave clue to answer. He replied with answer which is closed with the right answer *"Kopmil"* (coffee mixed with milk).

3. Types of Responses
3.1 Absurd Response (AR)
Datum 47

Subject   : Jovenanto Sutjiadi

Context   : In the conversation, the teacher intended to know about her student's activities in his holiday, at Basko Hotel. The teacher asked him whether he accompanied his mother to go shopping or not. Nevertheless, the student said that something needed to be packed.

Miss Suci   : Tidak. Temanin mami belanja ?

Jove   : *Ini miss, nanti dia dibungkuskan (holding a book)*

In the conversation above, she asked about his activity whether he accompanied his mother to go shopping. Meanwhile, the student gave response which was not relevant at all. In this case, he said that a book had to be packed. It indicates that a kind of Absurd Response. The student could not understand with what the teacher's mean which had literal meaning. So, the student gave an irrelevant response to the teacher's utterance that shows his difficulty to respond with the real topic of the conversation.

3.2 Odd Response (OR)
Datum 48

Subject : Jovenanto Sutjiadi

Context: In the conversation, the teacher asked her student about her activities in the beach during holiday. Before she asked about activities in the beach, she asked him the person who accompanied him there.

Miss Dini   : Sama mami, sama siapa lagi ?

Jove   : Cece nya, buk sus nya juga.

Miss Dini   : Ngapain Jove di pantai ?

Jove   : Main pasir. *Di air, tepi-tepi*

In the conversation, it indicates that there is a kind of odd response. The student has difficulty to respond the teacher's utterance. He could give respond by giving new topic which is closely relevant with the topic. So, when his teacher asked him about what he did in the beach, He added a new topic in his utterance by saying *di air, tepi tepi* (in the water, near by the beach).

3.3 More Relevant but not very Polite Way (RnP)
Datum 1

Subject: Jovenanto Sutjiadi

Context: In this conversation, it happened before the student and teacher started a lesson. Then, the student had started to pray before his teacher asked him to do it.

Jove   : Berdoa. (without any commands)

Miss Suci : Siapa yang suruh berdoa?

Jove   : *Belum siap*.

In this conversation, it indicates that there is a more relevant but not very polite Way (Rnp). The student knew that the lesson would start, so that he started to raise his hands. Nevertheless, his teacher had not asked him to do it, he even cut his teacher's utterance before she finished asking. It shows that the behavior of the student shows lack of politeness with more relevant with the topic. The student did something impolite way so that it would make his teacher angry or disappointed. This happens because the student could not control his emotion. At that time, he was so spiritful to study, but he showed it in impolite way.

3.4 Marginal Relevant Response (MR)

Datum 36

Subject   : Jovenanto Sutjiadi

Context   : The conversation happened after the teacher had started the lesson. She asked her student about the activities he had done at his primary school. When she asked about what he had learned, it made him confused. The teacher accepted his question, but she still asked the same question in order that he could give the correct answer.

Miss Suci : Ada makannya, ada belajarnya. Belajar apa tadi kata miss ? Belajar huruf, belajar apa lagi ?

Jove   : *Mencuci*

Miss Suci : belajar mencuci (smile)? Belajar apa lagi ?

Then, the student gave a quite relevant response, he answered it with related topic. Meanwhile, he had misinterpreting that made his teacher misunderstanding about the lesson he had learned from his school as the topic. He gave an irrelevant answer that showed his misunderstanding with what the teacher's meaning. So that, it is classified in Marginal Response.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Teachers used rogative speech act based on theory of Leech (1983) to an asperger's disorder at Tiji Homeschooling. They are direct rogative act and indirect rogative act in which direct rogative act is mostly appeared in teachers' utterances 86,7%. The category of rogative speech acts is mostly used by the teachers is direct rogative act for canonical interrogative with total 317 or 73,7% among other kinds of direct rogative acts such as Yes-No interrogatives, and greeting. This kind of question is in order to get information by using what, which, who, where, why, and how.

Whereas, in indirect rogative acts, statement + tag (negative) takes most used by the teachers with total 18 or 4,2% among statement + or + Statement, I want to know + question, and statement + tag. For indirect rogative acts, the hearer needs to feel and see before he gives an answer.

There are three types of question appeared in teachers' utterances based on Schiffrin (1998). They are information seeking, information checking, and clarification question. Information seeking is frequently used in teachers utterances with total 86,5%, then information checking, and clarification question.

In Jove's responses, there are four categories of responses occured based on theory of schank (1977) which consist of absurd response (AR) (16,1%), odd response (OR) (55,4%), more relevant but not very polite response (RnP) (5,3%), and Marginal Response (MR) (23,2%) with total 112 responses. Odd response is the most appeared response to his teachers' rogative speech acts.

Language comprehension can be shown through how jove responses to his teachers' rogative acts. Jove has limitation in his brain to understand the teachers' so that there is not relevancy in his response and he can not answer the questions appropriately. Then, the factor of environment also influences his focus to respond his teachers'. Moreover, Jove has problem to understand facial expression, gesture, tone, and even with literal meaning from the rogative acts given to him.

This analysis used pragmatic approach. Analyzing the rogative speech acts, types of question produced by teachers, and types of responses to the teachers rogative act by an asperger student at *Tiji Homeschooling* School based on the This analysis used pragmatic approach. Analyzing the rogative speech acts produced by teachers at *Tiji Homeschooling* School based on the theory of rogative speech acts by Leech, meanwhile rogative speech acts can be analyzed not only from this theories but also from other theories, then the types of question by Schriffin is also interesting to be analyzed in conversational analysis.

Furthermore, there are several issues in asperger which can be analyzed besides types of responses to rogative acts by future researcher.

As suggestion, it is expected that the future researchers will be interested to analyze about rogative speech acts more deeply and continue this analysis with related topic. The writer appreciates it and hope to get valuable suggestion as well as advice from the reader in order to be more accurate and complete in future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Leech, G. 1983. *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group Limited.

Schank, Roger. C. 1977. *Rules and Topics in Conversation*. Cognitive Science, 1, 421-441.

Schiffrin. 1998. *Approach to Discourse*. Great Britain; TJ International Limited, Padstaw, Cornwall.

Searle, J. R. 2005. *Expression and Meaning; Studies in The Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siemund, Peter. 2001. *Interrogative constructions*. In: Haspelmath, Martin; König, Ekke-hard; Oesterreicher, Wulf & Raible, Wolfgang (eds.). *Language Typology and Lan-guage Universals*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.