# AN ANALYSIS OF ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS OF TEACHER-STUDENT INTERACTION IN AN ENGLISH CLASSROOM

Marini Ganthina Putri[*1], Suroto[2], Anit Pranita Devi[3]

*Universitas Sebelas April*[1,2,3]

E-mail: marini_fkip@unsap.ac.id

**Abstract**

This study aims to examine the illocutionary acts performed by the teacher in the English class at Bimbingan Belajar Lita (BBL) Sumedang. It seeks to identify and analyze the various types of illocutionary acts and which type has the greatest perlocutionary effect used by the teacher. To accomplish this, the study applies Austin's (1962) theory, which divides speech acts into three types: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary, as well as Searle's (1974) theory, which divides illocutionary acts into five categories: assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative. This study employs a descriptive qualitative method, analyzing data obtained by observations, documentation, recording, and its scripts. The findings reveal a total of 174 illocutionary acts. They are identified as four types of illocutionary acts produced by the English teacher at BBL Sumedang, which are directives, expressives, representatives, and commissives. The most dominant illocutionary acts produced by the teacher is directives with 87 utterances or 50%, while the commissives are the lowest with 8 utterances or 4.6%. Moreover, there are three types of illocutionary acts that contain perlocutionary effects used by the English teacher at BBL Sumedang, which are directives, representatives, and commissives. The commanding act is the most dominant type of illocutionary act that contains perlocutionary effect, but the questioning act has the greatest perlocutionary effect because asking lots of questions will make students active in the long term.

**Keywords:** *Illocutionary Act, Perlocutionary Effect, Pragmatics, Teaching and Learning Process*

## INTRODUCTION

In the teaching and learning process, the teacher must build good interactions with students so that the objectives of the learning process can be achieved. Wasi'ah (2016) states that the success of the English learning process in the classroom is determined from the interactions and utterances used by the teacher. Therefore, a teacher must choose the right utterance when they give instructions or comments to students in class so that the quality of interaction in the class becomes better, one of which is by using illocutionary acts.

According to Austin (1962:99), an illocutionary act is an utterance intended for someone to do something. In the classroom interaction, there will be utterances produced by both teacher and students. The resulting utterances can be in the form of statements, requests, questions, orders, thanks, apologies and so on. The teacher conveys the material and interacts with students using speech, so that students will understand what the teacher say and understand the material easily. Utterances produced by teacher and students in the teaching and learning process can have an illocutionary meaning. The utterances themselves also have different illocutionary types and functions. Searle (1976:10-13) determines illocutionary acts into five types of speech acts such as declaratives, representatives, expressives, directives, and commissives. In the teaching and learning process, the main function of illocutionary acts is to influence students to take actions based on the teacher's instructions. The teacher's utterance stimulates students to respond and determine activities so as to make the interaction in the classroom better.

However, at BBL (Bimbingan Belajar Lita) Sumedang, the interaction in the class did not run smoothly, especially in the English class. Based on the pre-survey that was conducted, 80% of the 20 students said that they had difficulty understanding English material because the teacher tended to provide more information and material without inviting students to interact. In addition, based on pre-interviews conducted with an English teacher there, he did not understand how important illocutionary acts are in the teaching and learning process. Whereas, illocutionary acts are very important in the learning process. Merdana, Seken, & Putra (2013) state that speech acts, especially illocutionary acts produced during the teaching and learning process will determine the quality of the teaching and learning process in the classroom. If the teacher has sufficient knowledge about illocutionary acts, the teaching and learning process will be effective. However, since the teacher in BBL Sumedang did not know the significance of illocutionary act, the effective teaching and learning process did not occur. As a result, the students become passive and difficult to master English.

Based on the problems above, this research is conducted to explore in more detail the illocutionary acts produced by an English teacher at BBL (Bimbingan Belajar Lita) during the teaching and learning process using illocutionary act theory by Searle (1976). Moreover, it has been discussed in the previous paragraph that illocutionary acts have an important role in the teaching and learning process. Therefore, teachers must have knowledge of illocutionary acts so that communication and interaction in the classroom become better and the teaching-learning process becomes more qualified.

Several studies on illocutionary acts have been carried out by several researchers. Herfina (2021) discusses about the types and the most dominant types of illocutionary acts on teaching process in classroom. Meanwhile, Sukinah & Efendi (2021) explore the types of illocutionary acts and representations of teacher's power strategy in online learning interactions. Moreover, Widya (2017) describes the types of speech acts performed by lecturers in learning process. Wicaksono (2018), on his study, focuses on the function of commissives illocutionary acts performed by English teacher, while Soraya (2019) focuses on finding the types of directives illocutionary acts performed by English teacher in learning process.

Based on the explanation above, previous studies mostly only searched for the types of illocutionary acts and the most dominant illocutionary types. Responding to this gap, this research takes data from the utterances produced by English teacher during the teaching and learning process and looks for the type of illocutionary act that has the greatest perlocutionary effect. This research focuses on the analysis of illocutionary acts produced by English teacher in the teaching and learning process at BBL (Bimbingan Belajar Lita).

**Speech Acts**

Speech act is used to describe the actions performed by a speaker through their utterances, not only about the words themselves but also the intention behind them and how the listener interprets them. Austin (1962:108) divided speech acts into three types, such as locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts.

**1. Locutionary Act**

This is the act of uttering words with a particular meaning and reference. It is essentially the act of saying something. For example, "I promise I will pay you back tomorrow."

**2. Illocutionary Act**

This is the act performed in saying something. It is the intention behind the utterance, such as making a promise, giving a command, or asking a question. Related to the example of the locutionary act above, which means the intention of the utterance is making a promise.

**3. Perlocutionary Act**

This is the act achieved by saying something. It is the effect or consequence of the utterance on the hearer or the world. Related to the example of the locutionary act above, the effect of consequence of the utterance is the hearer may feel reassured or relieved.

**Illocutionary Act**

Illocutionary act is commonly referred to as the center of speech act, and it is even referred as the speech act itself. Searle (1976:10-13) proposed another concept of illocutionary acts. He argues that there are five categories of illocutionary acts, as follows.

### 1. Representatives

Representative commits the speaker to truth of the expressed proposition, and carry a truth-value. It expresses what the speaker believes. Representative is also called as assertive. In performing representative, the speaker delivers what he or she believes, then makes the world fit on the world to belief. When the speaker said, "It is snowing out!" means the speaker was trying to get the hearer to believe that it was snowing out.

### 2. Directives

Directive embodies an effort on the part of the speaker to get the hearer to do something, to 'direct' the hearer toward a goal. It could be an advice, a command, an order, a question and a request. For example, "Stop talking!"

### 3. Commissives

This type of illocutionary act is almost the same as directives. Commissive is the type of speech acts that commit the speaker to some future action. It expresses the speaker's intention to do something. Commissive includes offers, pledges, refusals, and promises. In the commissive case, the world is adapted to the words via the speakers themselves. For example, "I promise I will be there in three hours."

### 4. Expressives

Expressive expresses an inner state of the speaker. This type of illocutionary act centers on what goes on in the mind of the speaker, such as joy, sorrow, likes, or dislikes. Expressive includes apologizing, blaming, congratulating, praising, and thanking. In performing this type of speech act, the speaker expresses what he or she feels. For example, "Thank you for your help."

### 5. Declarative

Declarative brings some alteration in the status or condition of the referred object by virtue of the fact that the declaration has been successfully performed, such as marrying, baptizing, or firing. For example, "I now pronounce you husband and wife."

### Perlocutionary Effect

Perlocutionary act, according to Wijayana (1996), is a form of speech act that rely on producing a specific effect, and this effect is produced by the hearer. This type of speech act is also referred to as the act of influencing someone. Perlocutionary acts have a lot of influence because the speakers try to persuade the listener to do what they want, or what is known as the perlocutionary effect. Laurence and Ward (2005) give an example that illustrates the perlocutionary effect in the utterance, "shoot him!" as follows.

When the speaker says, "shoot him!" he or she persuades the hearer to shoot him. This is different from a locutionary act. In a locutionary act, the hearer only hears the speaker's utterance without capturing the meaning contained in it. Meanwhile, in the illocutionary act, the hearer will capture the meaning contained in the utterance produced by the speaker. Therefore, illocutionary types and functions are very important. Moreover, the utterance "shoot him!" can have a perlocutionary effect when the hearer actually shoots someone as the speaker intended. Below is a brief explanation of the example.

*Locutionary act:*

The speaker said to the hearer, "Shoot him!" meaning by *shoot* "shoot" and referring by *him* to "him."

*Illocutionary act:*

The speaker urged the hearer to shoot him.

***Perlocutionary act:***
The speaker persuaded the hearer to shoot him.
***Perlocutionary effect:***
The hearer shoots him as the speaker intended.

## METHOD

This study belongs to descriptive qualitative method. Bogdan and Taylor (in Moleong, 2007:3) state that the data examined in the descriptive qualitative research are verbal or written. The object of this research is the utterances produced by the teacher during the English class at Bimbingan Belajar Lita (BBL) Sumedang. Two English classes were selected and an English teacher was involved as research participants. In this study, the data were collected through observation and documentation. Classroom observation was used to explore the interaction between teacher and student in the classroom during the teaching and learning process. Creswell (2013) states that observation is one of the keys to collect the data in qualitative research. Moreover, documentation was also used to collect the data. Creswell (2014) states that the researcher can record the activity to collect the data needed. Fraenkel et al (2012) state that audio recording is one of data collection techniques in qualitative research. The device used to record the interaction between the teacher and students in the classroom is a mobile phone.

This study uses the data analysis technique developed by Creswell and Creswell (2018). First, prepare and organize data for analysis which includes managing the results of recording existing data by making transcripts of the recording. Second, read all the data thoroughly and repeatedly to obtain utterances that contain illocutionary acts based on the theory of by Searle (1976). Third, generating a description and themes. In this step, the utterances will be numbered and categorized based on the type of illocutionary act, the function of the illocutionary act based on illocutionary act theory, and the perlocutionary effect. Then, representing the description and themes. In this final step, the number and percentage of types of illocutionary acts, illocutionary functions and perlocutionary effects will be calculated and presented.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
### Types of Illocutionary Acts and Illocutionary Functions

This study shows that there are 174 data containing illocutionary acts. The directives serve the dominant frequency of all five types of illocutionary acts. There are 87 data (50%) containing directives acts. The lowest-rank frequency of illocutionary acts are the commissives with only 8 data (4.6%). The declaratives were not found in this research. The following is a detailed discussion of each type of illocutionary speech act.

**Table 1. Types of Illocutionary Acts**

| Illocutionary Acts | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Directives | 87 | 50 |
| Representatives | 66 | 38 |
| Commissives | 8 | 4.6 |
| Expressives | 13 | 7.4 |
| Declaratives | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTAL** | 174 | 100% |

Additionally, there are 15 types of illocutionary functions employed by the English teacher in the teaching and learning process at BBL Sumedang. Commanding is the most frequent illocutionary function used by the English teacher of BBL Sumedang. There are 64 data (36.9%) containing commanding function. On the other hand, the disagreeing, congratulating, thanking, forbidding, suggesting, and refusing function has the fewest frequent function with only 1 datum each (0.5%). The results are presented in the following table.

**Table 2. Types of Illocutionary Functions**

| Illocutionary Functions | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Stating an opinion | 2 | 1.1 |
| Informing | 27 | 16 |
| Explaining | 27 | 16 |
| Questioning | 22 | 12.6 |
| Agreeing | 9 | 5.2 |
| Disagreeing | 1 | 0.5 |
| Greeting | 7 | 4 |
| Congratulating | 1 | 0.5 |
| Thanking | 1 | 0.5 |
| Complimenting | 2 | 1.1 |
| Leave-taking | 2 | 1.1 |
| Commanding | 64 | 36.9 |
| Forbidding | 1 | 0.5 |
| Promising | 7 | 4 |
| Refusing | 1 | 0.5 |
| **TOTAL** | 174 | 100% |

Here is the explanation of the tables above.

**1. Representatives**

Representatives are in the second rank of the illocutionary acts produced by the English teacher of BBL Sumedang. There are five types of representative functions found in the data. They are stating an opinion, informing, explaining, agreeing, and disagreeing.

**a. Stating an Opinion**

> (96)  T: Nah, di sini juga ada Dedek. **Mungkin dulu yang pernah les bareng sudah kenal, ya.**
> Ss: Iya.

The bold expressions in the data above represent the teacher's own opinion about other students, who may have already known a new student. The expression "*mungkin* (perhaps)" denotes the expression of an opinion.

**b. Informing**

> (7)  T: **Di pertemuan ini, kita akan mempelajari expressions of hoping and congratulating atau ungkapan harapan dan selamat.**

As presented in the bold expression in the data above, the teacher informed the students that they would study expressions of hope and congratulations. Those bold expressions are informing because they contain information related to future activities done by the students in the teaching-learning process.

**c. Explaining**

> (10)  T: **Hope adalah harapan atau doa yang kemungkinan besar terjadi di masa depan. Kalau congratulations adalah ungkapan selamat.**

The data above shows that the English teacher gave the explanation on definition of hope and congratulation. The purpose is to provide the students with more explanation of hope and congratulations, so the students would understand more on that topic. Therefore, the bold expressions above are classified as explaining.

**d.   Agreeing**

> (52)   T: Jawabannya wish, hope, urge, atau recommend?
> Ss: Wish
> T: **Benar**. Tapi, kenapa wish?
> S1: Karena gak bakal kejadian.

The data above presents that the teacher asked for students' answers about the first number of the exercises that had been given. The teacher replied "Benar", which is an expression that means "yes". From this, obviously, the teacher agreed with the students' answer, so the bold expressions above are categorized as agreeing.

**e.   Disagreeing**

> (65)   T: Okay, jawabannya yang mana?
> Ss: Wishing?
> T: **Kurang tepat, ya**. Jawabannya adalah hope. I hope your dreams come true. Hal ini dikarenakan kemungkinan terjadinya besar.

The bold expressions in the data above present the teacher asking for students' answers about the exercise that had been given. The teacher replied "Kurang tepat", which is an expression that means "no" or "wrong". Obviously, the teacher disagreed with the student's answer, so the bold expressions in the data above are classified as disagreeing.

**2.   Expressives**
Expressives are in the third rank of illocutionary act frequency found in the teaching and learning process at BBL Sumedang. There are five types of expressive functions found in the data. They are greeting, thanking, congratulating, complimenting, and leave-taking.

**a.   Greeting**

> (1)    T: **Hello, class.**
> Ss: Hi!

As shown by the bold expressions in the data above, the teacher used the expression "Hello, class" to greet the students in the classroom. The students responded the teacher with the expression "hi". Therefore, the data above is classified as greeting function.

**b.   Thanking**

> (86)   T: The time is over. **Thanks for joining my class**. See you next week.

In the data above, the teacher performed thanking function with expression "thanks". He thanked the students for their attendance in the lesson today.

**c.   Complimenting**

> (159)    T:  Hahaha, **good job**. Okay, sekarang kita langsung bahas soalnya ya.

In the data above, the teacher gave compliment to the students for finishing the exercise he gave. The expression "good job" is one of compliment expressions. Therefore, the bold expressions above are categorized as complimenting function.

**d.   Congratulating**

> (5)    T: **First of all, selamat untuk kalian yang sudah memasuki kelas 9**. Di kelas ini, kalian harus lebih fokus karena kalian akan menghadapi ujian akhir sekolah.

In the bold expressions in the data above, the teacher used the expression "selamat" to congratulate the students who have entered grade 9.

**e.   Leave-taking**

> (87)    T: The time is over. Thanks for joining my class. **See you next week.**

The expression "see you" is one of the common expressions of leave-taking.

**3.   Commissives**
Commissive acts are in the lowest rank of other illocutionary acts found in this study. From the data, there are only two types of commissive function performed by English teacher at BBL Sumedang. They are promising and refusing.

**a.   Promising**

> (46)    T: Sudah selesai? Ada yang susah?
> Ss: Belum selesai.
> T: **Okay, nanti kita bahas bareng-bareng.**

As presented in the data above, the teacher said that he and the students would discuss the exercise. The bold expressions contain the word "nanti" which indicates future meaning. Therefore, the data above is classified as promising.

**b.   Refusing**

> (82)    S1: A, main game dong.
> T: **Game apa, waktunya udah mau habis.** Minggu depan saja ya.

In the data above, the teacher rejected the request of the student to play a game because the time was almost over. Therefore, the bold expressions in the data above are categorized as refusing functions.

**4.   Directives**
Directives are the most dominant type of illocutionary acts found in this study. Three types of directive functions are found in this study, such as commanding, questioning, and forbidding.

**a.   Commanding**

> (12)    T: Berhubung modul terbarunya belum ada, **kalian tulis materi dan soal yang akan saya tulis di papan tulis ya.**

The data above is classified as commanding function because the teacher told the students to write the material and exercise, he wrote on the board.

**b.  Questioning**

| (42) | T: **Dapat dipahami?** |
| --- | --- |

The data above is classified as questioning because the teacher wanted to make sure that the material that the students understood the materials that had been taught through a question.

**c.  Forbidding**

| (137) | T: **Kita terlalu berisik, kedengaran ke kelas sebelah.** |
| --- | --- |

In the data above, the teacher said the students were being too noisy and disturbing other classes. The utterance is clearly a forbidding function because the teacher forbade the students to speak too loudly.

**Illocutionary Acts that Contain Perlocutionary Effects**

In this study, there are 78 illocutionary acts that contain perlocutionary effects used by the English teacher of BBL Sumedang. The directive is the most frequent illocutionary act that contains perlocutionary effect with 66 data (84.6%). On the other hand, the lowest-rank frequency of illocutionary acts that contain perlocutionary effect is the representative with only 5 data (6.4%). The expressive did not contain a perlocutionary effect, while the declarative was not found in this research. The results are presented in the following table.

**Table 3. Illocutionary Acts That Contain Perlocutionary Effect**

| Illocutionary Acts that Contain Perlocutionary Effect | Frequency | Percentage |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Directives | 87 | 58.8 |
| Representatives | 54 | 36.5 |
| Commissives | 7 | 4.7 |
| Expressives | 0 | 0 |
| Declaratives | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTAL** | 174 | 100% |

Based on the data above, the directive is the most dominant illocutionary act that contains a perlocutionary effect. Directive acts that contain perlocutionary effects consist of commanding, questioning, and forbidding. Commanding shows a high frequency of occurrence or 64 times. The teacher uses a lot of instructions for the students to do a particular thing, such as asking the students to do a task or to introduce themselves during the teaching and learning process. Here is the example.

| (92) | T: Today we have new friends in our class. **Please introduce yourself.** |
| --- | --- |
| (97) | T: **Dek, ayo perkenalkan diri dulu.** |

Based on the data above, the teacher wanted the new students to introduce themselves. If the teacher successfully performs this act, the students will introduce themselves according to the teacher's command.

The questioning act also holds a high frequency of occurrence in this study, which occurs 22 times. The teacher asked many questions to get a response, answer, or information from the students. By

performing this act, the teacher wanted to test students' understanding or to make sure students finished the exercise or not as shown in the example below.

> (45)  T: **Sudah selesai? Ada yang susah?**

The possible effect of performing this act is that the students may become faster in doing the exercise because they feel the pressure of the questions posed by the teacher.

Another directive act that contains perlocutionary effect is forbidding. This act only occurs 1 time. By performing this act, the teacher wanted the students not to do something.

> (137)  T: **Kita terlalu berisik, kedengaran ke kelas sebelah.**

In the example above, the teacher forbade the students to speak too loudly. If the teacher successfully performs this act, the students will lower their voices, or even stop speaking.

Another type of illocutionary act that contains perlocutionary effect is representatives. Representative acts that contain perlocutionary effects consist of informing and explaining. Informing occurs 27 times in this study.

> (16)  T: **Di sini ada beberapa expressions yang mungkin sering kita ungkapkan, dan ini masuk ke dalam expressions of hope. First, "hopefully".**

The purpose of the informing act is to get the listeners know. In the example above, the teacher wanted to let the students know about the material he explained. If the teacher successfully performs this act, the students will have a good understanding of the material that he presented. Therefore, it may bring many positive effects to the students.

Explaining act also occurs 27 times. Based on the research findings, the teacher explained many things such as the differences between hope and wish. Here is an example.

> (40)  T: **Kalau dalam bahasa Indonesia, hope dan wish ini memiliki makna yang sama, yaitu harapan. Bedanya, kalau hope itu kemungkinan besar akan terjadi di masa depan. Maka, tenses yang digunakan adalah present tense dan future tense. Sedangkan wish adalah harapan yang hanya tinggal harapan atau kemungkinan besar tidak akan terjadi di masa depan.**

The act of explaining also serves to inform the audience of facts. In this case, the teacher informs students about the differences in expectations and desires. By doing this, the teacher wants to give students a better understanding of the topic. A possible effect of performing this action is that students can use 'wish' and 'wish' correctly without being confused.

The last type of illocutionary act that contains a perlocutionary effect is commissives. Based on the research data, there are two different types of commissives namely promising and refusing. The act of promising is more dominant than refusing. Promising occurs 7 times while refusing occurs only 1 time. The dominant act of promising has a possible effect that the hearers may expect something from the teacher. Here is an example.

> (83)  S1: A, main game dong.
> T: Game apa, waktunya udah mau habis. **Minggu depan saja ya.**

In the example above, the teacher promises that he and the students will play a game next week. The expectation provided by the teacher may build optimism and the possibility of the students attending class next week.

Based on the explanation above, commanding holds the highest frequency of occurrence with 64 utterances. However, this is not in accordance with the purpose of this study because according to its function, commanding is used to make students obey the teacher's orders. If this happens, the class does become active in the short term but not in the long term because if students continue to be instructed, they will continue to wait for orders without taking the initiative first.

Therefore, the pattern of communication between teachers and students needs to be changed, especially the utterances produced by the teacher. The teacher may reduce the use of the commanding

act and increase the use of the questioning act. The questioning act has the greatest perlocutionary effect because by asking lots of questions, students will be provoked to respond, answer, and even ask questions. This can lead to the initiative in students so that there is an active class in the long term.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the findings and discussion above, it can be concluded that there are four types of illocutionary acts produced by the English teacher at Bimbingan Belajar Lita (BBL) Sumedang. They are directives, expressives, representatives, and commissives. The directives are the most dominant illocutionary acts with 87 utterances (50%), while the commissives are the lowest with 8 utterances or 4.6%. In addition, there are 15 types of illocutionary functions used by the English teacher in the teaching and learning process at BBL Sumedang. They are stating an opinion, informing, explaining, agreeing, disagreeing, greeting, thanking, complimenting, congratulating, commanding, forbidding, questioning, promising, refusing, and leave-taking. Commanding is the most frequent function with 64 utterances or 36.7%, while disagreeing, congratulating, thanking, forbidding, suggesting, and refusing are the fewest frequent functions with only 1 datum each (0.5%).

Moreover, there are three types of illocutionary acts that contain perlocutionary effects used by the English teacher at Bimbingan Belajar Lita (BBL) Sumedang. They are directives, representatives, and commissives. The directives are the most dominant illocutionary acts with 87 utterances (58.8%), while the commissives are the lowest with only 8 utterances (4.7%). The commanding act is the most dominant type of illocutionary act that contains a perlocutionary effect, while the questioning act has the greatest perlocutionary effect because asking lots of questions will make students active in the long term.

**REFERENCES**

Aitchison, J. (2003). *Teach Yourself: Linguistics.* London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do Things with Words.* London: Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design (3rd ed.).* USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse.* London: Routledge.

Griffiths, P. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics.* Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Holmes, J. (1992). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher Ltd.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, M. & Saldaña, J. (2014). Qualitative Data Analysis A Method Sourcebook. USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Mishra, R. D & Rasundram, J. (2017). *Triangulation an Essential Tool to Enhance the Validity of a Case Study. Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Study, 4*(31), 69-74.

Moleong, Lexy J. (2007). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif.* Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya Offset.

Richards, J. C. and Schmidt, R. (2003). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 3 rd Ed.*, London: Pearson Education Limited.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1976). *A Classification of Illocutionary Acts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (2nd Edition).* Oxford UK & Cambridge USA: Blackwell.

Wijayana, D. P. (1996). *Dasar-dasar Pragmatik.* Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.

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

Herfina, L. (2021). *Analysis of Illocutionary Acts on English Teachers' Teaching Process in Classroom at SMPN 01 Patamuan Padang Pariaman.* Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 539. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.210325.024

Soraya, Z. K. (2019). *An Analysis of Directive Illocutionary Acts Performed by the English Teacher in Teaching and Learning Process at the Eighth Grade of SMP Negeri 2 Jetis.* IAIN Ponorogo. Retrieved from http://etheses.iainponorogo.ac.id/7131/

Sukinah, S., & Effendi, A. (2021). Teacher's Illocutionary Acts in Online Learning Interactions. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, *54*(1), 28–37. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.23887/jpp.v54i1.33061

Tyas, G.A. (2020). *A study on interpersonal meaning negotiated teacher-students classroom interaction in Vocational High School* (Bachelor thesis, Universitas Negri Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia). Retrieved from http://lib.unnes.ac.id/id/eprint/42225

Wasi'ah, N. (2016). A study of teacher talk in classroom interaction at an Islamic Senior High School. *OKARA Journal of Languages and Literature*, *1*. Retrieved from http://tempojs2.iainmadura.ac.id/index.php/okara/article/download/809/701

Wicaksono, M. A. (2018). *The Use of Commissive Illocutionary Acts in English Teachers' Talk of the Eleventh Grade in SMAN 1 Tengaran in the Academic Years 2017/2018.* IAIN SALATIGA. Retrieved from http://e-repository.perpus.iainsalatiga.ac.id/4623/

Widya, S. O. (2017). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Speech Acts Used by English Lecturers in Languange Teaching at STKIP YDB Lubuk Alung.* Jurnal Arbitrer, 4(1). Retrieved from 10.25077/ar.4.1.10-16.2017