SPEECH ACTS FOR SUPPORTING ENGLISH TEACHING AND LEARNING

Yelfiza
STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat

Abstract

This research studied about speech acts used by the English lecturers at STKIP, who taught at the fifth semester at 2012 academic year. The researcher wanted to answer the questions about kinds of speech acts used by the lecturers, and which speech acts that supported language teaching. The method of the research was ethnomethodology. Instruments of the research were video and notebook. The number of participants was six lecturers. Sampling techniques was purposive sampling and data were analyzed by descriptive analysis. Based on the data analysis, finding can be sated as follows. Speech acts used by the lecturers can be categorized into eight types. They are asserting, announcing, informing, questioning, commenting, clarifying, praising, and commanding. Kinds of speech acts were influenced by the lecturers' culture. The more interactive lecturers produced more speech acts. Otherwise, the less interactive lecturers produced less speech acts. Finally, speech acts are categorized based on its benefits to the teaching improvement. Some speech acts are judged not effective but some others were not effective

Key words: Speech acts, English, lecturers, teaching, learning

A. Introduction

Humans with their superiority can change from time to time, so that they can become the most perfect creature. One of their strengths is that they have ability with their language. It is true that language is just a symbol that the speaker uses to inform his/ her thought to the others. But if it is used in interaction, it is very powerful. It can make the listener do what the speaker wants. In addition, the language uttered can also make the listeners angry, pleased, proud, etc. The language has the power which is only possessed by human. It can work as the people can do.

The success or the failure which comes to people's lives may be because of their language. If they have capability to use language, either written or oral, they often gain what they want. By language, they can make friends, so that they can enjoy better lives. On the contrary, if their language is poor, they can not do anything with the language. Even though they are smart, they will not be considered in any positions in the society. Moreover, they may get trouble for being isolated from their society.

Sociolinguistics as the study of language in relation to the society is also concerned with this phenomenon. This study tries to see how language can work within one society, which is studied in term of speech act. Classroom, in this case is as a society that works with the language. The teacher and the students establish communication, so that the student can learn something there.

There were many researches studying speech acts, but most of them studied speech act in society outside the classroom. Few of them studied speech acts uttered by teacher and the students. In fact, studying this situation is much more important for the success of teaching, especially for teaching language.

Rymes (2008: 83) suggests that classroom context can be characterized with two dimensions. They are social and interactional dimensions. The "social dimension" comprises social demographics like class, gender, race, and speaker's characteristics. In contrast to the social dimension, interactional dimension comprises the interactional expectations for turn-taking, story telling, or problem solving through face to face classroom talk.

This study does not discuss the two dimensions, so it is only focused on the social dimension as one of sociolinguistic topics. Sociolinguistics studies language in its relation to social dimensions which may include class, gender, race, and speakers' characteristics. However, in this paper based research, the writer only studies the lecturers' characteristics which are related to kinds of speech acts they use in classroom activities. While their class, gender, and race are not studied, because the social class and race of the lecturers are homogeneous, so that they do not need to investigate. In addition, gender of the lecturers is not also studied, because of unavailable data may be found from them.

618

During the research, all men taught the subjects that may use limited speech acts, for example, pronunciation, speaking, and listening. Then, gender is excluded from the analysis.

Therefore, the writer studies speech acts used by English lectures at STKIP PGRI during the teaching process. Therefore, she wants to answer some questions as:

1. What speech acts do English lecturers at STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat use in English teaching and learning activities?
2. Which speech acts can support English teaching and learning at STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat?

This research is proposed to find out kinds of speech acts that the lecturers use in English teaching and learning activities. In addition, it is also to show the readers kinds of speech acts that may be advantageous for the support of English teaching, so that English teaching will be more effective.

B. Brief Review of related Theories
1. Nature of Speech Acts

The terms speech act was firstly popularized by Austin (1962), with his book titled "How to Do Things with Words". He focused his attention on perfomative sentences- the utterance of which normally counts as performing the action named by the verb. Such sentences are nonnegative, present tense, auxiliaries, sentences containing a performative verb, first person subject, second person direct or indirect object, and a clausal or infinitive verbal compliment. Other examples are:

   a.   I order you to turn out the lights
   b.   I promise to turn out the lights
   c.   I bet you five dollars that Bill will turn out the lights
   d.   I propose that we get someone to turn out the lights.

Austin argued that the above sentences do not have truth values, and therefore not subject to truth condition. However he noted that they go wrong (infelicitious). Chapman (2000:117-18) criticizes what was studied by Austin. He sums up that speech can be analyzed from the point of view not just of what information it communicates, but of what acts it performs. Austin only distinguished a particular type of speech acts based on what acts it can perform which was labeled performatives. Performative is clearly different from uses of language which are intended simply to convey information. He called uses of language constatives. Performatives can be appropriate or inappropriate, happy or unhappy which are sometimes known as felicitious, and the factors which are necessary to make them are known as felicity conditions. However constative is asking about right or wrong sentences.

Furthermore, Geis (2006:19) adds that promising and offering can be felicitiously done only in circumstances in which the person making the promise/offer believes that the person to whom the promise/offer being made has some need or desire which the promise/offer is intended to satisfy. He concludes that volunteering, making complaints, giving warning, making request, making promise or offer, and issuing invitation as being examples of illocutionary acts which must be seen as communicative actions. Therefore, this is not the nature of speech act which is discussed in this paper.

Different from what was described above, linguistic act with social dimension, as focused in this paper is proposed by Searle (Searle, 1996: 167-168), which is called literal acts. For example, one makes assertion through using declarative sentences, asks questions using interrogative sentences, and issues directives using imperative sentences. He states that every sentence in English and presumably of every other language has a performative main verb in its deep structure. It has the consequence that in the sense of "saying" you can only perform an illocutionary act by saying that you are performing it. Moreover, he explains that there are a speaker, a hearer, and a speech act being performed by the speaker. They share a mutual knowledge of facts and rules of performing the various kinds of speech acts. The facts and knowledge enable them account for certain syntactical forms without forcing them to assume that the facts themselves have some syntactical description or representation in the deep structure.

It is clear that the term speech acts proposed by Austin is different from what was proposed Searle. Austin' speech act is related to communicative factors. It says about "appropriate or inappropriate, or happy or unhappy", known as felicitious. In addition, he does not consider the truth condition. However, Searle tries to develop Austin's concept of speech act by adding some factors,

619

such as speaker, hearer, speech act being performed and the relationship among them. He relates the speech acts to social factors. Therefore, both performative and constative are considered in his analysis. Since this is a study of sociolingistics, the writer follows what is developed by Searle in her analysis.

In real practice, Austin's speech act rarely occurs when a speaker utters his or her words or sentence, so to find what word act from performative verb used by the lecturers in teaching and learning activities is quite difficult. Fortunately, Searle who has developed the theory of speech acts proposed by Austin is more realistic. That every language has deep performative act in its deep structure is more reasonable. When a speaker utters a question, he or she may not state the performative verb as "I ask you", but instead he directly can utter a question if he wants to ask one's name, for example, "What is your name?"

2. Theory of Speech Acts

Austin (1962) found that when a speaker says something, he or she actually has a certain sense or reference. He explains that when someone expresses an utterance, he actually does something instead of saying something and he performs the locutionary act of vocalizing a sentence with a certain sense and reference. In addition, he also performs an illocutionary act which is commonly called a speech act. He argues that saying something will have the effect on the listener's feeling, thought, or action, which is called perlocutionary act.

To make it clear, he provides an illustration as follows.

   a. Locution:
      He said to me, "You can't do that."
   b. Illocution:
      He protested against my doing it
   c. Perlocution:
      1). He pulled me up, checked me up
      2) He stopped me, he brought me to my senses
      3) He annoyed me.

The examples of perlocution show us that one illocution can be understood by listeners variously. Different listeners have different effect of such illocution. This situation may be caused by some factors, which among them is the character of the participant engaged in interaction.

Chapman (2000) reports that Austin saw the notion of illocutionary force as a general theory of meaning, which could explain the problem he has identified for the distinction between constative and performative. Both types of utterance are said to have illocutionary force.

Chapman (200: 121-22) reports that Searle has developed Austin's work by enumerating the different classes of speech acts, by elaborating the nature of felicity conditions for these classes, and by relating the account of speech act to wider issues in the philosophy of language. Furthermore, it was reported that it is impossible to define a single illocutionary act, even if we are aware of the speaker's intentions. To Searle, intention is the primary illocution which is derived from the secondary illocution. For example, the utterance "Can you pass the jam?" will be unlikely that the speaker really can not asses whether the hearer is able to pass the jam. The hearer's ability to pass the jam is one of the felicity conditions for making request. Searle describes the primary illocutionary force as conventional, which is not appropriate to describe that of request. It would be acceptable for hearer to respond to both primary and secondary illocutionary forces, by saying "yes" and "passing the jam". Responding to the secondary illocutionary force is also acceptable, for example "passing the jam" in silence. On the other hand, it would be inappropriate to respond to primary force, by saying "yes", but "not passing the jam."

Geis (2006:124-25) describes that there are three theories of indirect speech acts. The first one is called Gordon and Lakoff's theory employing conversation postulates. Second is Morgan's theory employing convention of use, and finally conversation analytic approach of Levinson. For example, the sentence "could you turn out the light?, "I'd like for you to turn out the lights", and Can you pass the salt?' are said to be indirect because they seem to be intended to perform an action other than that which is most immediately suggested by their literal meaning. When saying "Could you turn out the lights?', the speaker is requesting information about the ability of the addressee to perform an action, but in the sentence "I'd like for you to turn out the lights", the speaker is asserting a proposition predicating a desire of the speaker that the addressee perform some action, the speaker's intended
620

illocutionary point that she means to be requesting the addressee to turn out the lights must be inferred.

Moreover, he explains that one does not actually calculate their illocutionary forces, but instead 1) associate underlying linguistic representations (logical form) that directly account for the request forces (Sadock and Green), or 2) apply conversational postulates to his or her logical form from which the request forces are derived in one inferential step (Gordon and Lakoff), or 3) apply conventions of use that short circuit the implicature (Searle and Morgan). In relation to a theory of short circuiting, he asserts that it is predicated on the assumption that we have learned to associate certain utterance forms with first members of canonical four turn request sequences, to comprehend their forces immediately (Levinson).

Vanderveken (2001: 28) states that speech act theory contributes to the theory of linguistic universals in formulating the necessary and universal laws governing the successful performance and satisfaction of all kinds of illocutionary acts in language use and comprehension. He argues that the logical form of illocutionary acts imposes certain formal constraints on logical structure of a possible natural language as well as on the mind of competent speakers. Moreover, if linguistic competence is the ability to perform and understand illocutionary acts, then competent speaker and hearers must have certain mental states and abilities which are generally and traditionally related to the faculty of reason.

Furthermore, to be fully able to use and understand the language, speakers must be able to refer and predicate the difference between truth and falsehood, success and failure, satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Then, they make certain theoretical and practical valid inferences and coordinate their contribution to the discourse. Thus, there is an internal relationship between the basic function and deep structure of language. Furthermore, the natural language contains a vast vocabulary rich grammar to express forces, proposition, and illocutionary acts.

The theory of speech acts are much influenced by the philosophy of the linguists. Each theory has certainly weakness and strength depending on how people view it. The writer infers that Austin's speech act theory is too general because he states that every word does something, so he divided the acts into three categories, from the language itself (locutionary act) the speakers' intention (illocutionary act) and from the response of the listener (perlocutionary act). However, in his theory he did not describe much about locutionary and perlocutionary acts, and more examples he provided were those of illocutionary act as the above examples. In contrasted with Austin's speech act, Searle has more focused on a single aspect of speech act. He concerned much on the speaker's intention, which he calls illocutionary act. Even when speaker asks a question, he/she may not mean questioning. For example, in the question, "Can you pass the jam?" the speaker does not really want to assess his/her listener's ability, but he or she intends to request him/her to pass the jam. Therefore to Searle, the act of a language is not based on the language itself, but to what the speaker intend with language he utters. This theory is more concrete and contextual compared with Austin's theory described above.

Furthermore, the speech act theory is useful in formulating the rule governing the successful performance and satisfaction of all kinds of illocutionary acts in language use and comprehension. Since the speech act is concerned with the speaker's intention, it impacts successful performance and satisfaction in language use and comprehension; the speaker's intention can be seen from the language he performs, and the listener's satisfaction can be gained if the speaker's intention is quite the same as the listener's comprehension.

3. Kinds of Speech Acts

There are five general categories of speech acts proposed by Searle (1996: viii) which involve telling people how things are (assertive), trying to get them to do things (directive), committing to doing things (commissives), expressing feeling and attitude (expressive), and bringing about changes in the world through sentences (declaration). Furthermore, speech act can be direct or indirect speech acts. Direct speech act can be communicated directly by using explicit performative sentences. Thus, a declarative sentence in a direct way to make a literal act assertion (Bill Clinton is President) can be used. For example: turn out the light. On the other hand, speech acts are said to be indirect because they seem to be intended to perform an action other than that which is most immediately suggested by their literal meanings (for example, I request you to turn out the lights).

621

Vanderveken (2001:27-28) lists five illocutionary points to show the illocutionary logic. They are the assertive point which consists of representing how they are in the world, the commissive point which consists of committing the speaker to doing something, the directive point which consists of trying to get the hearer to doing something, the declaratory point which consists of doing something by way of representing oneself as doing it, and the expressive point which consists of expressing attitudes.

He divides illocutionary acts into different levels. The first level is called elementary illocutionary act which is expressed in natural languages by elementary sentences containing a marker (verb mood and sentential markers) and a clause expressing respectively a force and a propositional content in each possible context of use. For example, declarative sentences serve as to make assertions, imperative sentences are to give directives, and interrogative sentences are to ask questions. The second level is called complex first level illocutionary acts which are expressed by sentences containing illocutionary connectives such as "I do not accept your offer", "If you want, I promise to help you" and "The road is slippery, pay attention!" The last one is called collective higher order illocutionary act. They are performed jointly by several speakers and they last during an interval of time containing several successive moments of utterance. For example, speakers in conversation perform their individual illocutionary acts with collective intention of conducting joint intervention such as exchanging salutations, making a report, a consultation or a negotiation, or doing things by making common declarations. They describe things in the world (descriptive goal), deliberate on their mutual future actions (deliberative goal), transform the world by the way of declaration (declaratory goal), or express common attitudes (expressive goal).

Viewed from kinds of speech acts above, the writer supposes that kind of speech acts proposed by Vadertaken is more detailed. Firstly he categorizes the speech acts similar with what is identified by Searle. Then he studies more about kinds of speech act. Finally, he categorizes the speech act based on the level. They are elementary level, complex first level, and collective higher order level. The level here is not related to the difficulty, but to the situation and the elements of the utterance, the utterance itself, the speaker and the hearer. The first level contains verb mood and sentential marker, for example, imperative sentences are to give directives. The second level is more complex level which contains illocutionary connectives, as "If I want, I promise to help you". The last level is collective higher order. The speaker performs his/her individual illocutionary acts with collective intention of conducting joint intervention such as exchanging salutation. This level occurs in conversation in which joint intervention can occur. These three levels may occur in classroom activities, but because the focus in this study is only on the lecturers' speech act, the third level is excluded from the data.

4. Classroom Culture and their speech acts

Understanding the students' behavior is a must, especially by a teacher. When interacting with the students, she or he likely chooses the words that may give contribution to their teaching. As suggested by Coulmas (1994: 216) that the language can be a medium to link individual with society. The language use offers the largest range of features and the most easily adoptable ones for identification.

To understand the students' identity, the teacher needs to understand the students' culture, their habit, their learning styles, etc, so that she can suit the words she wants to use with the students' culture. This possibly makes the classroom activities enjoyable for the students.

This subtopic attempts to discuss the culture and the relationship with speech acts uttered by the lecturers. The culture is viewed from the lecturer's and the students' view points. To make it clear, the meaning of culture is expressed through some definitions. Lee (2006:21) proposes a set of assumption that condition why one acts as one does. Then, he states that culture is a sorthand for belief and action. It is useful to differentiate between belief systems and the actions that flow from those beliefs. He supports his explanation by the concept given by Tomlinson who underlies a key aspect of culture when explaining human beings. Human beings make sense of the world around them based upon a large set of invisible assumptions that structure their daily lives, so they act and speak in certain ways that are consistent with particular context.

There are some characteristics of culture described by Nunan and Choi (2010:2) summarized from different opinions. They include the system of shared idea, activities, and belief. In classroom

622

activities, those characteristics of culture can be reflected by the teacher and the students through the interaction. When they share their ideas, question, give comment, and show their opinion about one topic being discussed, their culture can be identified. Otherwise, their speech acts can be identified by observing the cultural context in which the utterances are delivered.

C. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The method of the research is ethnomethodology, where the researcher describes the data as they are. Ethnomethodology involves studying how people produce and share social order, and it is descriptive analysis, not interpretive. Moreover, ethnomethodology assumes that the meaningful patterned and orderly character of every day life is something that people must work constantly to achieve and that one must assume that they have some methods for doing so (Baker, Ellece, 2011: 43). The research subjects were the lecturers and the students who were engaged in classroom activities in odd semester, 2012 academic year. Because the data expected were English utterances, so the writer decided to observe only the fifth semester students, while those were in the seventh semester were doing teaching practice and did not learn in class anymore. The lower level students were considered not ready to produce the data that could give useful information to the researcher, so they were excluded. Initially there were 16 lecturers and their students had been observed.

But because participants were taken based on those who produced the utterances containing speech acts, so only six lecturers became the participants in this research. Since this is a qualitative research, data colleting was done repeatedly till the researcher did not find the variations by using video as an instrument. Most of the subjects the researcher observed used Indonesian in interaction, so the data were not analyzed. Otherwise, the language samples were selected based of the variation of the data. The researcher only selected one sample for a category. The researcher collected the data by observing the natural setting and recording the classroom events. Then, the data were analyzed to answer the questions above.

D. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Data are described as the following descriptions.

Speech acts used by the lecturers can be categorized in 8 types. They are asserting, questioning, giving comment, lecturing, praising, accusing, and commanding. The illustration of each type will be given through the following examples.

(a)   Asserting

It was found in the middle of teaching activities when the students tried to respond to the lecturer's question. Then she said, **"You are right.** The other kind of assertion was followed by the teacher's correction to the pronunciation. When one of the students pronounced language **/lanjuij/**, the lecturer corrected and asked the student to repeat **/laŋguij/.** This is a kind of direct correction when the lecturer is not patient with the student's error because the error is considered vital and can not be tolerated. In addition, this error is only made by the lecturers who are aware of linguistic system, but not by those who just concern with communicative factors.

The conclusion can be drawn that the selected utterance is influenced by the speaker's culture. The speaker who is extrovert will easily say what he or she actually thinks. She or he will not say something different from the real one. For example by saying you are right or you are poor. Positive assertion may be useful for every type of students. But negative assertion can be disadvantageous for some students. For example, they will feel shy and afraid of the lecturers and their friends. Thus, minimizing negative assertion will be helpful for the students in order to feel well in the classroom.

(b)   Announcing

This kind of speech act was found in initial and in final when the lecturer announced the students' homework. For example, the lecturer announced the students' task in the pre teaching activities. She said, **"You will discuss the material outside, then I will call you one by one, so, wait for me. You should come, no excuse."**

Announcement contains the information that the speaker wants the listener knows. The information is generally related to practical order or rules as the above example. It is delivered for individual or group need. However, the selection of sentences is also various. Idealism lecturers tend to stress their words as example above, so it impresses a kind of force. On the other

623

hand, the pragmatism lecturers tend to be relaxed so that, sometimes the students consider the announcement unimportant. As the effect, they do not concern with the message delivered.

(c) Informing

Techniques of informing were found as direct informing and indirect informing. Direct informing was delivered directly by the lecturer and was listened and sometimes responded through question by the students. For example, when the lecturer explained about three procedures of teaching,

lecturer: **Pre-teaching is…, whilst teaching is …, and post teaching is ….**
Student: Ms, example?

Such datum shows how a lecturer informs and how the students respond when it is not clear yet. Another kind of informing was indirect informing, as preceded by a question (not need to be answered by the student) because the lecturer answered it herself. For example, "**what is the different between adapting and adopting?** Then she directly answered the question by saying "**Adapting is…, but adopting is …OK?** The other example of such kind is that the lecturer said "**you know what is meant by independent clause? It is …. Right?**

From these two examples, the researcher could find that the lecturers actually wanted to inform the difference between two terms, but she used a questioning technique before the sentence. It was also found that the more humorous and interactive lecturers tended to utter the indirect informing. However the more serious and calm lecturers chose to utter the direct informing. Therefore the situation of the classroom is different if the teachers have different characters, which result in different speech acts.

(d) Questioning

Questioning can be categorized into three types based on the purposes. They are questioning about the content, that of opening assertion, and that of common interaction. Each of them will be described below.

Questioning about teaching content was used when the lecturer wanted to know the students' knowledge about the content being taught. In this case, the teacher waited for the answer, but let them answer classically. For example, **"what is the main idea? What is topic sentence?"** this question was commonly followed by a command**,** for example**, "write an example on board!"**

Questioning of opening assertion was used when the lecturer wanted to assert some information, but preceded by the question. The question did not need any answers at all, because the information was new for the students, so the lecturer did not wait for the answer from the students. The data can be seen below.

Lecturer: **OK, preteaching is one of the phases in teaching, isn't it? This activity includes brainstorming. What is brainstorming?** She directly answered it. **Brainstorming is …."**

The first type of questioning shows the culture of the participants. They were aware of the students' work and controlled their activities. Thus, the students participated much in the class. But the second questioning, eventhough it tried to engage the students to participate, it actually failed to stimulate the students' participation, for the answer was not from the students. It still shows egocentrisms of the participant.

The last kind of questioning was just for interaction, and very general, so the answer was not only one. For the example**, "Do you understand? Do you know it? You get the point? Do you have a question?**

The above questions are not directed to a clear topic, so the answer may be ambiguous. If the answer is "yes" what is meant by "yes" is not clear. On the other hand, if the answer is no. Does it mean that all materials are not clear? Therefore, whatever the students answer does not go to the point.

(e) Commenting

Comment was produced by the participants in the preteaching activities. They gave comment about the students' homework. An example of this kind is **"You did it, but you did not read it before. Read! Read and read it again!"**

It was also found that comment was given in the medial, when the lecturer explained the material, and gave an example which was opposite with the ideal one. In this case to compare the material with what had been commonly done by the students, for example, "**Most of your**

seniors just copied the idea from another thesis, then, said that the source was taken from the original expert. It means that you lied the readers".

The lecturer may give comment to the students' negative work by negative comment, on the other hand the positive work with positive comment. The effective comment can challenge the students to work harder and better, but does not make the students angry and shy. The examples above show that comment was given to challenge the students and reminded them not to cheat in doing their assignment.

(f)   Clarifying

This type of speech acts were mostly uttered at the end of teaching activities, for example, when the teacher wanted to clarify what had been discussed by the students The lecturer explained the topic which was considered not clear for the students. There seemed one way interaction, no response from the students. For example, in explanation about the method of teaching, the lecturer explains, **"Understanding the language means that you should learn language in every section, and …. "**

This speech act is very important in teaching, especially in the class where the students are asked to present the materials and discuss with their friends. It is aimed to revise the students' miscomprehension or misinterpretation. In addition, it functions as feedback for the students, so they know whether their comprehension is right or wrong through confirmation activity.

(g)   Praising

This kind of speech acts was very limitedly found. In addition it was slightly produced, not shown off. For example, when the students answer the question, the lecturer said, **"That's good"** As the result, it did not have much influence on the students' motivation. This possibly was done because the students were adult, so the lecturers considered the students did not need much praise as reinforcement. Their motivation must be more on intrinsic motivation than extrinsic motivation.

However, this idea is not really true, because everyone either young or adult needs a respect, for example, through praising. But, the techniques and the chosen words should be suitable with their level of thought. It is impossible to treat elementary students similar with college students.

(h)   Commanding

Commanding was found frequently used by the lecturers who engaged the students in classroom activities. For example, **"Come in front! Show it! Underline it!** The class in which the students presented material in discussion rarely found using such speech act, because most lecturers tended to be silent during discussion, especially if they were not ready, so they kept silent from the beginning to the end. The lecturers who clarified the materials at the end of the teaching never commanded the students to do something, because they focused on clarification (lecturing).

What ever the technique of teaching the lecturer applies, this kind of speech act can be used, because teaching must not be monotonous. For example, after the students present a topic and discuss with his or her friends in the class, the lecturer will explain it again to make the material clearer. Moreover, in this activity the students may command the students to write an example or tell their own opinion, or make conclusion.

E. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Speech acts used by the lecturers can be categorized in eight types. They are asserting, announcing, informing, questioning, giving comment, clarifying, praising, and commanding. Speech act (asserting, questioning, praising, commanding are frequently used by interactive or more talkative lecturers who tried to involve the students in interaction. However, the lecturers whose is usually formal tended to utter lecturing and giving comment. It was also found that some speech acts were produced in one meeting, for example, asserting together with questioning, questioning with commanding, lecturing and giving comment. Lecturers who are more talkative tend to use various speech acts, but those with formal ones produce limited kinds of speech acts.

Finally, speech acts are categorized based on its benefits to the teaching improvement. Some speech acts are judged not effective because they can not give contribution for the improvement of the students learning. Moreover, the speech acts can not motivate the students to learn English, but can make them lazy, angry, and hate the subjects. Therefore, they are not suggested to apply by the

lecturers. Fortunately, there are some speech acts that are beneficial for language teaching. They make the students feel motivated, curious, active, confident, etc. Thus, they must be continuously used by the lecturers. The other category is the speech acts that need correction. Naturally, they are good to utter, but the way the lecturers utter them is not helpful, so that the students cannot gain comprehensive information.

REFERENCE

Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Baker, Paul and Sibonile Ellece. 2011. *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis*. Chennei: Replika Press Pvt Ltd.

Chapman, Siobhan. 2000. *Philosophy for Linguist: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Coulmas, Florian. 1996. *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Geis, Michael L. 2006. *Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kasper, Gabriele and Makoto Omori. "Language and Culture". Nancy H. Hornberger and Sandra Lee Mckay (ed). Sociolinguistics and education. 2010. Totonto: Mutilingual Matters.

Nunan, David and Julie Choi. 2010. *Languaage and Culture: Reflective Narratives and the Emergence of Identity*. Oxford: Routledge.

Richard, Lee. 2006. *Globalization, language, and Culture*. New York: Chelsia House.

Rymes, Besty. 2008. *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Tool for Critical reflection*. Creskill NJ: Hampton Press.

Searle, John R. 1996. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vanderveken, Daniel. 2001. *Essays in Speech Act Theory*. Amsterdam.: University of Matsuyama.