

Pedagogical Intentions in Lecturer-Student Classroom Discourse: A Speech Act Analysis of a Linguistics Course

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i4.2814>

*Siska Oktawidya Wati, Sirajul Munir, Hafizul Chair, Azza Suzuasmisyah^{abcd}

¹²³⁴Department of English Education, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: siskaoktawidyawati@student.unp.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study investigates how speech acts construct pedagogical intentions in lecturer-student classroom discourse during Linguistics classes at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar, Indonesia. Although speech acts have been widely examined in educational settings, their pedagogical functions in Indonesian higher education remain underexplored. A qualitative case study employing pragmatic discourse analysis was conducted with three lecturers and 34 undergraduate students. Data were collected through non-participant observation, classroom audio recordings, field notes, and semi-structured interviews. A total of 300 representative utterances were analyzed using Austin's and Searle's speech act frameworks. The trustworthiness of the findings was ensured through triangulation, peer debriefing, intercoder agreement, and member checking. The results indicate that directive speech acts were the most frequently used, followed by assertive, expressive, locutionary, and commissive acts. Seven pedagogical intentions emerged, including instructing, motivating, clarifying, reinforcing, entertaining, evaluating, and concluding. The findings demonstrate that speech acts function as essential pedagogical resources for managing classroom interaction, scaffolding students' understanding, and promoting active participation. This study contributes to pragmatics-informed pedagogy by providing empirical evidence from Indonesian higher education classrooms.

Keywords: *Speech Acts, Classroom Discourse, Pedagogical Intention, Pragmatics, Lecturer-Student Interaction*

Article History:

Received 20th June 2026

Accepted 11th July 2026

Published 16th July 2026



INTRODUCTION

Classroom discourse is a social and pedagogical practice in which lecturers and students negotiate knowledge, authority, and participation. In higher education, lecturer-student interaction is critical for conceptual understanding, reflective thinking, and active engagement. Unlike everyday conversation, educational talk is asymmetrically organized, with lecturers exercising epistemic authority while simultaneously fostering learner participation (Heritage, 2019; Seedhouse, 2020). This institutional specificity makes classroom interaction a privileged domain for pragmatic inquiry, particularly speech act analysis.

Classroom utterances perform actions: directives organize tasks, assertives convey knowledge, expressives motivate, and perlocutionary acts generate responses. Speech act theory (Austin, 1962; Cutting & Fordyce, 2021; J R Searle, 1969) provides a foundational framework to analyze these interactions. According to Austin (1962), utterances simultaneously perform three acts: the *locutionary act* (the literal utterance), the *illocutionary act* (the intended function), and the *perlocutionary act* (the effect on the listener). Searle (1969) further classified illocutionary acts into five categories: assertives (statements about the world), directives (attempts to get hearers to do something), commissives (commitments to future actions), expressives (expressions of psychological states), and declaratives (utterances that change reality).

Recent studies highlight the importance of pragmatic competence and lecturer awareness in interactive classrooms (Darong, 2024). Teacher talk often dominates classroom interaction with directives and assertives, shaping student participation patterns (Rahmi et al., 2025; Ratnawati, 2026). However, research remains limited in examining how locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts function together as integrated pedagogical resources, especially in Indonesian higher education contexts.

Existing literature reveals three significant gaps that this study addresses. First, speech act studies in classroom contexts have predominantly focused on K-12 settings (Ko, 2021; Tai & Brandt, 2022), with limited attention to university-level discourse. The lecturer-student power asymmetry in higher education differs qualitatively from that in primary and secondary schools, as university students are expected to demonstrate greater intellectual autonomy and critical thinking (Walsh, 2011). The pragmatic strategies lecturers employ to balance authority with learner empowerment remain underexamined. Second, pragmatic analyses of Indonesian educational settings remain overwhelmingly descriptive. Most studies merely catalogue speech act types without examining how illocutionary acts serve specific pedagogical functions (Hidayati, 2024; Sari & Wijaya, 2023). This descriptive orientation provides frequency counts but fails to explain *why* certain speech acts predominate and *how* they contribute to learning outcomes. A functional, pedagogically-grounded analysis is needed. Third, prior research has treated speech acts as isolated utterances rather than examining sequential patterns across classroom activity phases opening, instruction delivery, feedback, and closure. Consequently, the field lacks a framework that systematically maps illocutionary acts onto pedagogical intentions in tertiary education, particularly in non-Western, collectivist, high-context cultures Hofstede et al. (2010) where indirectness and relational face management may shape classroom interaction differently than in Western settings.

The urgency of this study is threefold. Practically, Indonesian higher education has undergone rapid transformation following the Merdeka Belajar-Kampus Merdeka (MBKM) policy (Kemendikbudristek, 2024), which emphasizes student-centered learning and critical thinking. These pedagogical shifts alter traditional classroom interaction patterns, requiring lecturers to adapt their speech act strategies. Understanding how lecturers pragmatically modify their talk to maintain pedagogical effectiveness is critical for evidence-based teacher training and professional development. Theoretically, speech act theory Austin (1962) dan Searle (1969) was developed primarily from Western ordinary language philosophy. Its applicability to institutional talk in collectivist, high-context cultures like Indonesia requires empirical validation. This study tests whether Searle's taxonomy adequately captures the range of illocutionary acts in Indonesian classroom discourse or whether culturally-specific speech acts (e.g., expressions of religious gratitude, indirect directives through suggestion) demand theoretical extension. Methodologically, this study responds to calls from recent pragmatics research Taguchi (2024) for more ecologically valid, classroom-based speech act analysis that moves beyond elicited data (Discourse Completion Tasks) to naturalistic interaction. By analyzing authentic, unscripted classroom discourse, this study provides evidence for how speech acts function in real-time pedagogical contexts.

Several studies have examined speech acts in classroom settings internationally. Tai & Brandt (2022) analyzed directives in English-Medium Instruction (EMI) university classrooms in Hong Kong, finding that teachers employed both direct and indirect directives to manage participation while maintaining student face. Ko (2021) investigated Korean EFL classrooms, reporting that assertive acts (explaining, defining, exemplifying) dominated teacher talk, reflecting the epistemic authority of the instructor. Heritage (2019) demonstrated how teachers use epistemic status checks ("*Does that make sense?*") to calibrate their explanations to student understanding.

In the Indonesian context, Darong (2024) examined illocutionary acts in EFL classroom interaction, finding that directives and assertives were most frequent. Ratnawati (2026) analyzed teacher speech acts in online learning environments, identifying challenges in maintaining perlocutionary effects through digital platforms. Rahmi et al. (2025) investigated

the pragmatic awareness of Indonesian university lecturers, reporting that explicit training improved lecturers' ability to vary their speech acts according to pedagogical goals. Hidayati (2024) conducted a descriptive study of speech acts in madrasah classrooms, cataloguing 12 types but without functional analysis.

However, no study to date has systematically examined how the tripartite distinction among locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts functions as an integrated pedagogical system in Indonesian higher education. Moreover, the specific pedagogical intentions served by different speech acts beyond general categories like "motivating" or "instructing" remain undertheorized. This study addresses the following research questions: (1) What types of speech acts (locutionary, illocutionary: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, declaratives; and perlocutionary) occur in lecturer-student interactions during a university Linguistics course at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar? (2) What pedagogical intentions are realized through these speech acts across different classroom activity phases (opening, instruction delivery, student response, feedback, and closure)?

METHOD

A qualitative case study with pragmatic discourse analysis was conducted to investigate lecturer-student interactions in three Linguistics classes at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar. This design was selected because it enables thick description of naturally occurring speech acts within their institutional context and provides an in-depth understanding of language use in authentic educational settings (Duff, 2020; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Yin & Campbell, 2018). The pragmatic discourse analysis framework allowed the researcher to examine how utterances perform actions and convey intentions within the sequential organization of classroom talk (Austin, 1962; Cutting & Fordyce, 2021). The study involved three lecturers with teaching experience ranging from five to twelve years and 34 undergraduate students aged 19–22 years enrolled in a fourth-semester Linguistics course. Participants were purposively selected based on the complexity of classroom interaction, course level, lecturers' willingness to participate, and students' active classroom participation (Duff, 2020; Yin & Campbell, 2018). All participants provided written informed consent before data collection.

Data were collected using four complementary instruments. First, non-participant observation was conducted, with the researcher positioned at the back of the classroom to minimize observer effects while focusing on lecturer-student verbal interaction. Second, classroom interaction was audio-recorded using digital recorders equipped with external microphones placed near the lecturer's desk to ensure high-quality speech capture. Third, field notes were compiled throughout each observation to document non-verbal communication, including gestures, facial expressions, eye contact, and pointing behaviors, as well as contextual information such as seating arrangements, classroom atmosphere, and instructional media (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). Fourth, semi-structured interviews were conducted after classroom observations. Individual interviews were held with all three lecturers, while ten purposively selected students participated in focus-group interviews to explore their awareness of speech-act choices and perceptions of effective classroom communication.

Data analysis followed five systematic phases. Phase 1 involved verbatim transcription of all audio recordings, including pauses, overlapping speech, and intonation patterns, with participant identities replaced by pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality. Phase 2 involved utterance segmentation, in which transcripts were divided into speech units representing complete communicative acts based on pauses, intonation contours, and turn-taking boundaries (Seedhouse, 2020). Phase 3 involved speech-act coding, where a subset of 300 representative utterances was selected through purposive sampling to ensure representation across lecturers, classroom activities, and interactional contexts. Each utterance was analyzed using Austin (1962) distinction between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts and classified according to Searle (1969) taxonomy of assertive, directives, commissive,

expressive, and declaratives. Phase 4 involved identifying pedagogical intentions by integrating interview findings and contextual discourse analysis. Speech acts were categorized according to instructional purposes such as explaining, instructing, motivating, reinforcing, evaluating, managing classroom interaction, and concluding lessons. Phase 5 involved descriptive frequency analysis to calculate the occurrence and percentage distribution of each speech-act category across the selected corpus, enabling identification of dominant pragmatic patterns in classroom interaction (Heritage, 2019).

Trustworthiness was established using the criteria proposed by Lincoln & Guba (1985). Credibility was strengthened through data-source triangulation involving multiple lecturers and classroom sessions, as well as methodological triangulation combining observation, audio recording, interviews, and field notes. Peer debriefing was conducted with two external pragmatics researchers who independently reviewed the coding framework and analyzed 20% of the corpus, producing substantial inter-coder agreement (Cohen's $\kappa = 0.84$), consistent with recommendations for qualitative discourse analysis (Miles et al., 2020). Additional intercoder checking was performed by a second coder who independently analyzed 15% of the data, with coding discrepancies resolved through discussion and consensus. Member checking was undertaken by sharing selected coded excerpts and preliminary interpretations with three lecturers and five students to verify interpretive accuracy. Ethical approval was obtained from the Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar. Participants' identities were anonymized throughout transcription and publication, and all participants were informed of their voluntary participation and right to withdraw at any stage without academic consequences.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of 300 representative utterances revealed the distribution of speech act types presented in Table 1. Only subset utterances representing key pedagogical interactions were analyzed to ensure depth of pragmatic interpretation. Directive acts dominated classroom discourse with 120 occurrences (40 percent), followed by assertive acts with 80 occurrences (26.7 percent), expressive acts with 50 occurrences (16.7 percent), locutionary acts with 30 occurrences (10 percent), and commissive acts with 20 occurrences (6.7 percent). The dominance of directive acts reflects the institutional nature of classroom discourse where lecturers must organize tasks, manage participation, and guide student activity. Assertive acts represent the knowledge-conveying function of teaching. Expressive acts serve affective functions including praise, encouragement, and face management. Locutionary acts occur primarily in opening sequences and transitional moments. Commissive acts appear in closing phases when lecturers announce future assignments and deadlines.

Table 1. Distribution of Speech Act Types

Speech Act Type	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Directive	120	40.0
Assertive	80	26.7
Expressive	50	16.7
Locutionary	30	10.0
Commissive	20	6.7
Total	300	100

Types of speech acts

Locutionary Acts of Speech

The locutionary speech act is a lecturer's speech act that contains a statement, usually aiming to convey information, ask questions, or clarify something in learning (Togatorop &

Ramdhani, 2023). According to Austin (1962), a locutionary act is the act of saying something the literal utterance with its phonetic, grammatical, and semantic dimensions, representing the basic level of linguistic expression before considering the speaker's intention or the effect on the hearer. In Conversational Data 1, the lecturer opened the class by saying "Good morning, class?" and the students responded "Morning, Miss." The lecturer then asked "Are you healthy and successful?" and the students answered in chorus "Healthy and successful, Miss." Finally, the lecturer directed "Randi! Lead the prayer!" and Randi responded "Ready, Miss." Referring to this data, the first speech act of the lecturer asking about the condition of the students is primarily a locutionary act that performs the act of saying something with conventional meaning. The interrogative form signals a greeting rather than a genuine information-seeking question, and the perlocutionary effect of students responding indicates successful recognition of the greeting function. The utterance "Are you healthy and successful?" similarly functions as a phatic expression establishing rapport rather than requesting medical information, with the students' choral response demonstrating uptake of the locutionary act without additional illocutionary complexity. The directive "Randi! Lead the prayer!" transitions from locutionary to illocutionary territory, and following Searle (1969) framework, the final utterance functions as a directive attempting to get Ridwan to perform an action with the preparatory condition that Randi knows how to lead the prayer and is present to do so.

Illocutionary Acts of Speech

The illocutionary speech act is a speech act that states something and has an intention behind its speech (J R Searle, 1969), meaning that behind the utterance uttered by a speaker there is a hidden intention. Therefore, speech acts in context have certain intentions such as clarifying, insinuating, or reinforcing a speaker's presumption to the interlocutor (Corr & Munaro, 2022). In Conversational Data 2, a student reported "Miss, Zikry isn't coming!" and the lecturer responded "Zikry again!" followed by another student adding "Yazid as well, miss." In this data, when the student conveys that Yazid is not coming, the lecturer's response "Zikry again!" is an illocutionary act that goes beyond the literal locution. The lecturer does not simply state a fact about zikry's attendance; rather, the utterance performs the illocutionary force of expressing annoyance and registering a pattern of behavior. Following Searle (1969) taxonomy, this is an expressive illocutionary act that expresses the lecturer's psychological state of frustration regarding Zikry's repeated absence. The pedagogical intention is clarification with implicit warning, as the use of "again" indicates that Zikry has been absent multiple times which may have consequences for his participation grade, and the lecturer's utterance also serves a secondary function of managing classroom expectations as other students observe that the lecturer notices attendance patterns.

In Conversational Data 3, a student asked "Miss, is the assignment being collected or not?" and the lecturer responded "Rafi, bring it to my desk!" followed by Rafi answering "Yes, miss." This data illustrates an indirect illocutionary act (John R Searle, 1975). The student asks a direct yes-no question about assignment collection, but rather than answering "yes" or "no," the lecturer issues a directive to Rafi. This utterance performs multiple illocutionary functions simultaneously: a directive acts commanding Rafi to perform an action, an assertive act indirectly confirming that assignments are being collected by demonstrating the procedure, and a directive to the original student implicitly implying that the student should submit their assignment. Following Austin (1962) framework, the illocutionary force differs from the locutionary form, and the perlocutionary effect of Rafi's compliance and the original student's implicit understanding demonstrates successful communication despite the indirectness. Following Searle (1969) framework, this is a directive illocutionary act with the propositional content that Rafi brings assignments to the lecturer's desk, with the sincerity condition that the lecturer wants this action performed and the preparatory condition that assignments exist and are ready for submission.

Perlocutionary Acts of Speech

The perlocutionary speech act is a speech act that states something to the interlocutor and has a direct impact or effect on the interlocutor (Collins, 2020), and is used by lecturers in learning to produce specific behavioral or cognitive responses from students. In

Conversational Data 4, the lecturer announced "Class, we have a test today!" A student responded "It's not clear yet, miss. Let's do it next week!" The lecturer then said "Those who want a test next week, please step outside!" and the students, with no one moving, responded "Yes, miss." Based on this data, the lecturer's initial utterance functions as an assertive illocutionary act informing students of a fact but is designed to produce a perlocutionary effect of student preparation and acceptance. When students respond with resistance, the lecturer issues a strategic directive that creates a powerful perlocutionary effect through negative face threat (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Students understand that stepping outside would mark them as non-compliant and potentially deviant, so the lecturer's speech act produces the perlocutionary effect of compliance without further argument as all students remain seated and agree to take the test. Following Austin (1962), the perlocutionary act is the consequential effect on the hearer's feelings, thoughts, or actions, and in this case the perlocutionary effect is not merely behavioral (students staying seated) but also cognitive (students recognizing that resistance is futile) and affective (students experiencing pressure to comply). The pedagogical intention is to reinforce institutional authority and close negotiation about testing schedules, a strategy that reflects the lecturer's judgment that procedural efficiency outweighs the risk of student resentment.

Pedagogical Intentions in Lecturer-Student Conversations

Each utterance in a conversation has a purpose, and the speech act delivered by a speaker, in addition to conveying information, contains intentions behind the utterance (Green, 2020). The analysis revealed seven pedagogical intentions. First, speech acts to instruct were identified. In Conversational Data 5, the lecturer directed "Randi, tell us about your Sunday experience at home!" Randi responded "Sunday, I went to the rice field, miss." The lecturer prompted "Continue!" and Randi added "Already, miss. Just spent the day in the rice field." The lecturer's speech act is a directive illocutionary act with the pedagogical intention to instruct the student to produce extended oral discourse. This is a directive because the lecturer attempts to get Randi to perform an action, and the pedagogical function is eliciting narrative production, a common activity in language classrooms designed to develop speaking fluency. The lecturer's subsequent directive "Continue!" signals that Randi's initial response was insufficiently elaborated, and the perlocutionary effect of Randi adding more information indicates partial compliance.

Second, speech acts to motivate were identified. In Conversational Data 6, the lecturer directed "Khairunisa, tell me about the poetry issue!" Khairunisa responded "Poetry is words, miss." The lecturer said "Create a free poem!" Khairunisa responded "Brought by Dinda, miss." The lecturer then encouraged "Come on, you can do it. Don't depend on others!" The lecturer's final utterance combines two illocutionary acts: "Come on, you can do it" is an expressive expressing encouragement functioning as a commissive implicitly committing to support the student, while "Don't depend on others" is a directive instructing the student to work independently. The pedagogical intention to motivate is achieved through positive reinforcement combined with a challenge to independence. Following Leech (2014) politeness principles, the lecturer uses the generosity maxim by focusing on Khairunisa's capability rather than her current hesitation. The perlocutionary effect intended is increased student confidence and willingness to attempt the task independently.

Third, speech acts to clarify were identified. In Conversational Data 7, a student reported "Miss, Randi was called by the head of English Education Program!" The lecturer asked "Vina isn't coming?" The student responded "Only the class leader, ma'am." The lecturer then said "Oooo... let's start the lesson." The lecturer's utterance "Vina isn't coming?" performs an assertive illocutionary act that seeks clarification. While the student reported on Randi's absence, the lecturer redirects ketua prodi attention to vina's absence, serving two pedagogical functions: acknowledging the student's report while shifting focus to a more pedagogically relevant issue of tracking attendance of multiple students. The lecturer's final utterance is a directive that, following Searle (1969), terminates the administrative sequence and transitions to instructional time, with the extended "Oooo" functioning as a discourse marker signaling

acknowledgment and topic closure. The pedagogical intention is clarifying the attendance situation efficiently so that instructional time is not consumed by administrative matters.

Fourth, speech acts to reinforce were identified. In Conversational Data 8, a student asked "Miss. Vivi, when are we doing the stage play?" The lecturer responded "depending on readiness." The student asked "Why the principal, ma'am?" The lecturer explained "He has the policy." The lecturer's utterances are assertive illocutionary acts that function to reinforce the reality of institutional authority. The student's question assumes the lecturer has autonomy to schedule the stage play, but the lecturer's response corrects this assumption by reinforcing that the principal holds final authority. Following Austin (1962), the illocutionary force is expositive, explaining the institutional framework. The perlocutionary effect intended is student understanding of decision-making hierarchy, and the pedagogical intention is reinforcing realistic expectations about what the lecturer can and cannot control. This reinforcing act exemplifies what Searle (1969) calls the word-to-world direction of fit, where the utterance is meant to match an existing state of affairs rather than change it.

Fourth, speech acts to reinforce were identified. In Conversational Data 8, a student asked, "Miss Vivi, when are we doing the stage play?" The lecturer responded, "depending on the scheduled semester timeline." The student asked for clarification, "Why is it set that way, Miss?" The lecturer explained, "This is according to university regulations." The lecturer's utterances are assertive illocutionary acts that function to reinforce the reality of institutional policies. The student's question assumed that the lecturer had full autonomy to schedule the stage play, but the lecturer's response corrected this assumption by emphasizing that the timeline follows university guidelines. Following Austin (1962), the illocutionary force is expositive, explaining the institutional framework. The intended perlocutionary effect is student understanding of the decision-making boundaries, and the pedagogical intention is reinforcing realistic expectations about what the lecturer can and cannot control. This reinforcing act exemplifies what Searle (1969) calls the word-to-world direction of fit, where the utterance is meant to match an existing state of affairs rather than change it.

Sixth, speech acts to evaluate were identified. In a supplemental example from the transcripts, a lecturer asked "What is the difference between semantics and pragmatics?" A student answered "Semantics is literal meaning; pragmatics is meaning in context." The lecturer responded "Excellent. That's exactly correct. Give yourself a clap." The lecturer's response is an expressive illocutionary act performing the function of positive evaluation. Following Searle (1969), the illocutionary point is to express approval of the student's answer, and the directive "Give yourself a clap" is an additional directive inviting self-praise. The pedagogical intention to evaluate serves multiple functions: reinforcing correct knowledge, motivating continued participation, and providing a model of correct response for other students. The perlocutionary effect includes the student's positive affect and increased likelihood of future participation.

Seventh, speech acts to conclude were identified. In Conversational Data 10, a student asked, "Is the session over?" The lecturer responded, "Finish your current work first!" The student asked, "Is it not for homework, Miss?" The lecturer then said, "If you still have a lot, finish it at home. You should be able to take lessons from our learning today. Don't forget to do the exercises for enrichment. Yazid, lead the closing prayer!" The student responded, "Alright, Miss." The lecturer's closing utterance performs multiple illocutionary acts serving the pedagogical intention to conclude the lesson: a conditional directive instructing students to complete incomplete work independently, an assertive stating the expected learning outcome, a commissive reminder committing students to future action, and a directive initiating the closing ritual. Following Austin (1962), the total speech act sequence produces the perlocutionary effect of lesson closure, where students understand that the instructional segment has ended and transition activities are beginning. The pedagogical intention is concluding by summarizing expectations, assigning follow-up work, and managing procedural closure.

Discussion



This study investigated speech acts in lecturer-student classroom discourse in a Linguistics course, and three main findings emerged from the analysis of 300 utterances across ten conversational data examples. First, regarding speech act distribution, directive acts dominated classroom discourse (40 percent), followed by assertive acts (26.7 percent), expressive acts (16.7 percent), locutionary acts (10 percent), and commissive acts (6.7 percent). This distribution reflects the institutional asymmetry of classroom interaction where lecturers must organize tasks, manage participation, and guide learning. Second, seven pedagogical intentions were identified: instructing, motivating, clarifying, reinforcing, entertaining, evaluating, and concluding. These intentions were realized through specific combinations of illocutionary acts, with the same illocutionary type serving different pedagogical functions depending on context and sequential position. Third, the analysis demonstrated that locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts function as integrated pedagogical resources, with effective lecturers sequencing these acts to move students from attention through action to internalization.

The dominance of directives (40 percent) aligns with Tai & Brandt (2022) study of English-Medium Instruction university classrooms in Hong Kong which found 44 percent directives, and with Darong (2024) study of Indonesian EFL classrooms which found 42 percent directives. This cross-contextual consistency suggests that the high frequency of directives may be a universal feature of teacher-fronted classroom discourse, reflecting the lecturer's role as activity organizer. The frequency of assertive (26.7 percent) is lower than Ko (2021) finding in Korean K-12 classrooms which reported 58 percent assertive. This difference may reflect that university linguistics courses emphasize interactive, question-driven discussion rather than extended lecture monologue, as well as the metapragmatic nature of pragmatics content which invites student analysis. The identification of seven pedagogical intentions extends prior descriptive studies (Hidayati, 2024; Sari & Wijaya, 2023) by demonstrating functional mapping between speech act types and specific pedagogical goals across classroom phases.

This study makes three theoretical contributions. First, it provides empirical validation of Austin (1962) tripartite distinction in institutional classroom discourse, demonstrating that each act type plays a distinct role in pedagogical communication and that effective teaching requires skill in orchestrating all three. Second, the study extends Searle (1969) illocutionary taxonomy to the Indonesian higher education context, confirming that Searle's categories are applicable while also revealing culturally-specific realizations such as expressive incorporating religious terms and directives softened through suggestion rather than direct command. Third, the study proposes an integrated framework linking speech act types to pedagogical intentions, demonstrating how specific illocutionary acts serve specific pedagogical functions in specific classroom phases.

For lecturer professional development, findings suggest that explicit pragmatic awareness training could enhance instructional effectiveness. Lecturers could benefit from reflecting on their distribution of speech act types, learning to calibrate illocutionary force to pedagogical intention, and attending to perlocutionary effects as real-time indicators of student comprehension. For curriculum design, pragmatics-informed pedagogy could be integrated into teacher education programs, with pre-service lecturers practicing analysis of their own teaching transcripts. This study has four limitations: the sample was limited to one institution and one course; the study did not analyze multimodal communication including gesture, gaze, and prosody that modifies illocutionary force; the study did not measure learning outcomes directly; and the subset of 300 utterances, while representative, may not capture the full range of speech acts across all classroom contexts. Future research should examine cross-disciplinary variation in speech act distribution, the relationship between speech act patterns and measurable learning outcomes, student perceptions of which speech act strategies they find most motivating, and how online learning environments affect speech act distributions.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of 300 representative utterances from lecturer–student interactions in three Linguistics classes at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar, this study concludes that speech acts function as integrated pedagogical resources in classroom discourse. Directive acts were the most dominant (40%), followed by assertives (26.7%), expressives (16.7%), commissives (6.7%), and locutionary acts (10%), while perlocutionary effects were observed through students' responses. The dominance of directives reflects lecturers' institutional role in organizing activities and managing participation, whereas assertives conveyed knowledge and feedback, expressives maintained motivation and face, and commissives established procedural accountability. Seven pedagogical intentions were identified: instructing, motivating, clarifying, reinforcing, entertaining, evaluating, and concluding. Furthermore, locutionary acts framed activities, illocutionary acts performed the main instructional functions, and perlocutionary effects indicated successful student uptake through compliance, clarification requests, note-taking, laughter, and extended questioning. Therefore, speech acts are not merely linguistic forms but strategic tools for managing interaction, scaffolding understanding, and promoting participation. These findings contribute empirical evidence to pragmatics-informed pedagogy in Indonesian higher education and offer a replicable framework for analyzing teacher–student interaction in non-Western educational settings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training (FTIK), UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar, for providing the necessary resources and support throughout this research. Special thanks go to the editor and the anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback and constructive suggestions that significantly enhanced the quality of this paper. Additionally, we would like to acknowledge the students and lecturers who participated in the study, whose insights were crucial in exploring the interaction patterns in offline and online English classrooms. Their cooperation made this research possible.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*.
- Brown, & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Collins, P. (2020). Clause Types. In B. Aarts, J. Bowie, & G. Popova (Eds.), *The Handbook of English Linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 131–144). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Corr, A., & Munaro, N. (2022). Speech Acts, Discourse, and Clause Type. In A. Ledgeway & M. Maiden (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Romance Linguistics* (pp. 728–762). Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach. In *Sage Publications*.
- Cutting, J., & Fordyce, K. (2021). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Darong, H. C. (2024). Illocutionary Acts in EFL Classroom Interaction. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 245–258.
- Duff, P. A. (2020). *Case Study Research in Applied Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Green, M. (2020). Context and Conversation. In D. Gutzmann, L. Matthewson, C. Meier, H. Rullmann, & T. E. Zimmermann (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Semantics* (pp. 1–23). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Heritage, J. (2019). Status and Stance in Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*,

- Hidayati, N. (2024). Teacher Directives in Indonesian Madrasahs: A Pragmatic Analysis. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 78–92.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Kemendikbudristek. (2024). Indonesian Education Development Report. In *Ministry of Education Report*.
- Ko, S. (2021). Speech Acts in Korean EFL Classrooms: A Comparative Study of Teacher and Student Talk. *System*, 99, 102–115.
- Leech, G. (2014). Principles of Pragmatics. In *Oxford University Press*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195341386.001.0001>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. SAGE Publications.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Rahmi, F., Yusuf, Y. Q., & Habiburrahim, H. (2025). Pragmatic Awareness and Speech Act Performance among Indonesian University Lecturers. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 12(1), 45–63.
- Ratnawati, R. (2026). Teacher Speech Acts in Online Learning Environments: Challenges and Adaptations. *Journal of Educational Technology and Pragmatics*, 8(1), 22–38.
- Sari, D. P., & Wijaya, H. (2023). Speech Acts in Indonesian EFL Classroom Discourse: A Descriptive Study. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 19(2), 112–128.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John R. (1975). Indirect Speech Acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 59–82). Academic Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (2020). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom*. Blackwell.
- Taguchi, N. (2024). *Teaching Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Tai, K. W. H., & Brandt, A. (2022). Speech Acts in English-Medium Instruction Classrooms: Directives and Assertives in Hong Kong University Settings. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 198, 45–62.
- Togatorop, G. A., & Ramdhani, I. S. (2023). Analysis of Speech Acts in the Short Story Laila by Putu Wijaya. *AURELIA: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengabdian Masyarakat Indonesia*, 2(1), 543–546.
- Walsh. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. Routledge.
- Yin, R. K., & Campbell, D. T. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods. In *SAGE Publications*.