



REASONS BEHIND STUDENTS' SILENCE TO TEACHER'S DIRECTIVE UTTERANCES: A CASE STUDY ON A LOWER SECONDARY SCHOOL IN YOGYAKARTA

Alfi Nur Azizah¹, Suparno², Slamet Supriyadi³

Universitas Sebelas Maret, Jl. Ir. Sutami 36, Kentingan, Surakarta, Indonesia^{1,2,3}

Article Info

Article History:
Received April 2022
Accepted July 2022
Published September 2022

Keywords:
classroom interaction,
directive utterances,
reasons, students'
responses

Abstract

Classroom interaction is identified to engage students in responding and interacting with teachers and other students. However, one problem that usually interferes with teacher-student interaction is unpredictable students' reactions in interpreting the teacher's utterances. The present research investigated several reasons for students' responses to teachers' directive utterances. To reach the objective, a case study was applied. Three eighth-grade students in a Yogyakarta lower secondary school were selected to participate in this study. The data were collected through observation and interviews. Meanwhile, the data analysis was based on Miles' interactive model. The results of this study show that internal and external variables affect the students' responses during English classes. A lack of vocabulary and needing extra time to guess are the internal variables to understanding the teacher's intention. Meanwhile, unfavorable classroom atmospheres resulting from noisy students, noisy next-door classes, and noisy vehicles outside are the external variables that disturb the students' attention and understanding of the teacher's directive utterances. The results of this research reveal significant implications for students' attitudes, as they rarely develop their interaction due to internal and external factors. Thus, the condition requires the teacher's role as an active language user.

INTRODUCTION

Classroom interaction should be considered to ensure the accomplishment of teaching and learning processes and goals. The use of language in classrooms relates to the student's learning process and development (Celce-Murcia, 2000). Noor et al. (2010) stated that how teachers and students communicate impacts the students' perceptions and engagement in class activities, especially in language production. Moreover, language production allows students to interact with a diverse range of people in various contexts (Hussein et al., 2019). Meanwhile, the success of classroom interaction involves the participation of both teachers and students. Thus, the teacher, as the primary component, is responsible for achieving this objective. Richmond et al. (2020) proposed that effective communication between teachers and students is a prerequisite for teachers' success and students' learning.

As Austin (1975) stated, speech acts are actions that occur when you say something, while speech function is defined as an action performed by stating something. Additionally, speech acts are activities carried out by utterances (Yule, 1996). Regarding the use of language for communication, the main focus is on speech acts. Speech acts are essential in society because when people interact with one another, they employ speech acts to communicate their meaning or intention to the listener. As a result, when people interact in a social environment, they will be obliged to perform speech acts. Moreover, speech acts are commonly used at school throughout the learning process because when a teacher teaches, he or she performs speech acts to inform, advise, and guide students.

An utterance consists of three connected behaviors (Yule, 1996). The first is the locutionary act which refers to producing a meaningful familiarity with the speaker's word expression under the focus of the utterance meaning. The second is the illocutionary act which is accomplished through conversation to make a description, a suggestion, clarification, or other communication purposes. The last type is the perlocutionary act, which produces an utterance to affect the listener. Regarding the illocutionary acts, Yule (1996) suggested five general functions.

Declarations concern how the speaker changes the world via words. They enable the speaker to have a special institutional role, for example:

Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife.
Referee: You're out!

Representatives concern how the speaker believes that something is the truth or not. They include factual statements, assertions, conclusions, and descriptions of the world as the speaker perceives it, for example:

“The sun rises at the east.”

“*Red* in Bahasa Indonesia is *Merah*.”

Expressives concern the speaker's emotions, such as statements of happiness, sadness, favors, hate, joy, or sorrow, for example:

“I'm really sorry to hear that.”

“Congratulations on your winning!”

Directives concern how the speaker gets somebody to do something through orders, commands, requests, and suggestions, for example:

“Gimme a cup of coffee. Make it black.”

“Could you lend me some money, please?”

Commissives concern about how the speaker employs promises, threats, refusals, and pledges to commit himself or herself to future decisions, for example:

“I'll check one by one.”

“We will discuss it next week.”

Teachers frequently instruct students to do something related to the teaching-learning process, as directives are ubiquitous speech acts in the learning environment (Searle, 1969). Some research showed that illocutionary acts facilitated students in making interaction with their teacher through utterances in the forms of instructions, complaints, reports, orders, advice, punishments, promises, congratulation, apologies, and praises (Bahing et al., 2018; Christianto, 2020; Suhirman, 2016; Tri Budiasih, 2018).

Students' responses need to be identified through three language patterns of directives used by the teachers: imperative, declarative, and interrogative. Knowing which pattern to use in giving directive speech acts in the form of instruction can be highly beneficial in getting expected responses from students (Holmes, 1983, as cited in Sudrajat & Sinta, 2016). Khan et al. (2017) pointed out that teachers' communication skills hold a significant influence on student's academic success and act to support classroom contextual intent within conversations between the teacher and the students.

A study on directive speech acts in a classroom by Basra & Thoyyibah (2017) revealed that teacher directives affected the improvement of students' productive skills through questions, requests, or commands following the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles. Meanwhile, another study related to communication problems by Heriansyah (2012) reported that students had various problems regarding their English speaking skills due to a lack of vocabulary and anxiety. Those problems hindered the students' communication in the classroom. Another research by Christianto (2020) explored the types and functions of

speech acts in EFL classrooms. According to the results, locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary speech acts played a significant role in the teaching and learning process because their proper use could enhance teacher-student interaction.

There seem to be limited studies concerning students' responses viewed on their reasons. There were other studies concerning students' responses have been done. First, Ambarwati's (2019) study focuses on the student's response to the teacher's talk in some ways, such as the teacher's feeling of acceptance, the teacher's praise or encouragement, the teacher's acceptance of the student's idea, and the teacher's question. However, the study did not explore deeply how the students responded because the teacher talked too much and less paying attention to the students. The second study by Santosa et al. (2021) discovered that EFL teachers' speech act classification and its' motive were chosen. Their study did not present how students respond to each teacher's speech acts. The last study was employed by Sari (2018), who investigated the teacher's directive speech acts such as asking, interrogating, inquiring, inviting, commanding, ordering, hoping, suggesting, prohibiting, advice, and others at kindergarten school. The study did not explain further how the students responded. Indeed, knowing the students' responses and their reasons is critical so that we can provide appropriate corrections or actions when such comments are received to improve the student's English skills, mainly through more active participation.

To fill the gap, the present study specifically discusses the students' reasons related to their responses to the teacher's directives. Therefore, the researchers try to investigate the students' reasons that influence their responses to the teacher's directive utterances in one of the lower secondary schools in Yogyakarta.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Directive Utterances

Some scholars proposed a similar concept of directives, but their viewpoints on directive verbs are quite distinct. Directives are commonly used to get the hearer to do something (Kreidler, 2013; Searle, 1981; Yule, 1996). As stated by Yule (1996), directives are verbal actions used by a speaker to convince someone to do something. They convey the speaker's desires through positive or negative orders, commands, requests, and suggestions. In other words, directive utterances are intended to affect the hearer's action. The speaker seeks to make the world fit the words (via the hearer). According to Kreidler (2013), directive utterances are those in which the speaker attempts to persuade the addressee to do something or refrain from

doing something by using commands, requests, and suggestions. Meanwhile, Searle (1981) defined directive speech actions as those aiming to influence the listener to take action by asking, ordering, commanding, requesting, advising, and recommending something. To sum up, those directive categorizations are presented below.

- Yule (1996) : commands, orders, requests, and suggestions
- Kreidler (2013) : commands, requests, and suggestions
- Searle (1981) : asking, ordering, commanding, requesting, advising, and recommending something

Students' Responses

Two significant components must be considered in interaction engagement: utterances and responses. Those components denote that a conversation starts with the speaker's utterances and ends with the listeners' responses. Bennett (1975) coined the term "stimulus, response, and meaning (SRM) theory" to describe the meanings of some utterances that their roles can explain as responses or stimuli. Furthermore, he claimed that utterances are seen not only as replies but also as stimuli. In other words, the speaker's utterances serve as both responses and stimuli.

To communicate effectively, both the speaker (teacher) and the listeners (students) must be aware of acceptable answers or expected responses based on the speaker's utterances. In communication, an effective response is defined as an interaction predicted to have an outcome or effect. According to the Cambridge Dictionary, a response is something stated or done as a reaction to something expressed or previously done; an answer or reaction. Bennett (1975) defined a response as "something spoken or done in answer; reply or reaction."

A stimulus results in a student's response can be expressed verbally or nonverbally. A stimulus from the teacher, both verbal and nonverbal, can elicit responses from the students. McDuffie (2013) argued that verbal communication is the use of spoken language to deliver an intended meaning to a listener. Hence, students' participation as a response in classroom interaction can be exhibited by students' displays of gaze, body posture, body language, motions, eye contact, physical distance, and some other non-verbal communication such as nodding, smiling, leaning forward, and having arms open with palms up (Bezemer, 2008; Bostrom, 1996; Brown, 2007; Pease & Pease, 2004).

To determine students' responses, a theory of response techniques is introduced by Moskowitz (1971). There are three response techniques used by students during teacher-student interaction: (1) verbal responses in specific and student-initiated ways, (2) silence, and

(3) nonverbal responses. First, students' specific responses refer to how the students respond to the teacher with particular and preset answers, such as a simple phrase and a brief answer. Meanwhile, student-initiated responses refer to the students' initiatives to reply to the teacher's utterances by presenting their thoughts, opinions, reactions, and feelings. Second, silence responses denote that there is no verbal interaction between the teacher and the students, especially when the teacher says something to get the students to do specific actions in which they remain silent. Lastly, nonverbal responses refer to the students communicating without using words or performing gestures or facial expressions such as laughing, smiling, nodding, or giggling.

METHOD

A case study approach was applied in this research. According to Ary et al. (2010), a case study is concerned with understanding social phenomena from a single unit or an individual to arrive at a detailed description and understanding of the case. For these considerations, a qualitative case study was employed since this research aimed to explore a phenomenon of human behavior in real life. The researchers were to explain and investigate several significant variables contributing to students' responses to teachers' utterances during English teaching and learning activities at one of Yogyakarta's Lower Secondary Schools. Three eighth-grade students were purposively chosen from three different cognitive levels (low, medium, high) from their English mark in seventh grade to provide specific information and answers for the current research topic. The students categorized as low level belong to the English mark of ≥ 75 -83, equal to C. In comparison, a medium level is attributed to students who get >84-92, equal to B. Then, a high level equals an A and refers to students who get >93-100 the English mark. Those classifications are based on the Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia regarding the Assessment Guide by Educators and Education Units Junior High School in 2017.

The data were collected through observation and interviews. Before taking the research, the researcher had done a preliminary study three times in the same school where the research was done. Those meetings with students (participants) several times can ensure that the researcher's presence should not affect their silence or shyness. During observation, the researchers became passive participants who did not participate in the classroom or intervene in the teaching-learning process. Moreover, the researchers observed what was occurring and used a video camera to capture the English class activities.

The interview was conducted to obtain extensive information that could not be achieved by observation. The students were asked about their opinions or interpretation regarding the meaning of the teacher's directive utterances and their reasons for responding to the teacher's utterances. Then, the collected data were analyzed by following Miles et al. (2014) analysis techniques: data collection, data condensation, data display, and drawing conclusion/verification.

After collecting the data, the researchers selected and eliminated irrelevant information drawn from note-taking observation and written form of interview transcripts classified and categorized based on Moskowitz (1971) theory of students' responses classifications. In drawing a conclusion, the researchers organized the data into word descriptions and tables to determine what variables contributed to the student's responses to the teacher's directive utterances.

Triangulation was used to ensure the credibility of the data. As stated by Guba (1981), triangulation is used to increase the credibility of research data by combining various data sources, investigators, related theories, and data collection methods focused on a particular phenomenon. This research applied triangulation methods where two methodologies (observation and interviews) were used to validate the results.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Through the observation and interview conducted in the classroom, this section presents information related to numerous variables that influence students' responses to the directive utterances of the teacher.

Based on the data acquired from the observation and interview, the students used three response techniques: verbal responses in specific and student-initiated ways, silence, and nonverbal responses. In some circumstances, notably, the students remained silent because there was no verbal communication between students and the teacher. Additionally, when the teacher gave some instructions, the students used those response techniques to participate in the classroom. The following are the students' responses in various classroom settings.

Setting 1:

The teacher introduced new material about present continuous tense and asked the class about an activity they were doing.

Teacher: "What are we doing now?" (006-TD1-A)

Students: "We are studying English now."

Setting 2:

The teacher asked the students to make a sentence about an event in progress.

Teacher: "Can you give another example?" (007-TD1-A)

Students: (*silent*)

Teacher: "Can you make a sentence?" (008-TD1-A)

S3: "I am sitting on the chair."

Setting 3:

The teacher ordered her students to read a sentence from the book aloud, but one of the words was mispronounced.

Teacher: "Follow me, please!" (038-TD1-A)

Students: "Yes, Ma'am."

Setting 4:

The teacher allowed the students to make a table, as she explained.

Teacher : "*Berdasarkan kalimat - kalimat itu* (based on those sentences), you can make a table." (059-TD1-A)

Students: "Yes, Ma'am."

Based on the four distinct situations above, the students used the same verbal responses. In setting 1, the students responded to the teacher's question by saying the activity they were doing at that moment. In contrast, setting 2 describes the students' response to the teacher's request. Here, the teacher's utterance was performed in sequence after her previous utterance. Unexpectedly, none of the students tried to fulfill the teacher's request. As a result, the teacher performed another request that stresses the word "make a sentence." Interestingly, one of the students replied to his teacher's utterance. As depicted in the data above, both setting 1 and 2 represent student-initiated responses in which the students responded to the teacher's questions based on the student's ideas.

Hence, in settings 3 and 4, the students expressed their reaction by saying a simple phrase and quick answer, "Yes, Ma'am," to the teacher's declarative and imperative commands. The students realized that the teacher's commands should be answered as soon as possible when they understood the teacher's intent. Those students' responses indicate that classroom interaction occurred. Classroom interaction happens when the teacher, as the center of the teaching-learning process, employs dialogue with the students in some ways, such as asking questions about the lesson and requesting and ordering something from the students. Allowing the students to question, argue, or accept the given statements provides them with learning opportunities.

Setting 5:

The teacher invited the students to answer a given assignment voluntarily.

Teacher : “*Silahkan sukarela yang nomer 2.*” (Anyone who wants to do number 2, please come forward) (067-TD1-A)

Students: (*silent*)

S1: (*silent*)

Setting 6:

The teacher reminded the students to ask her about the lesson.

Teacher: “If you have any questions, or you are doubtful about this, you can ask me.” (026-TD1-A)

Students: (*Some students nodded their heads.*)

Setting 7:

The school bell rang at the end of the English class.

Teacher: “Okay (*the bell is ringing*). I think it's enough because time is up.” (180-TD2-A)

Students: (*A few students were silent while others were happy and smiling.*)

Setting 5 presents the students' silence as a response. The silent response may be divided into two categories: lack of understanding and feelings of embarrassment or fear of making a mistake. The division is supported by S1's statement, “*Sebenarnya saya mau maju, tapi takut salah. Malu kalau nanti diejek teman lainnya. Jadi diem aja.*” (I basically wanted to come forward, but I feared my answer was wrong. It's embarrassing if others laughed at me. So, I preferred silence). Consequently, the teacher-student interaction was broken, and strong communication among them failed to be established.

On the other hand, the students showed nonverbal responses in setting 6 and 7 by making gestures or facial expressions such as smiling, nodding, or chuckling to communicate with the teacher. As noted in setting 6, the response happened while the teacher explained the present continuous tense. In the middle of the explanation, the teacher reminded the students to ask her if they had any questions regarding the lesson. As students exhibited, they responded nonverbally by nodding their heads to show agreement towards the teacher's utterances. Surprisingly, in setting 7, many students smiled and were delighted, while a few remained quiet. Based on the descriptions above, it is clear that the students interacted with the teacher through three response techniques: verbal, silence, and nonverbal responses. Those students' responses indicate ways to enhance classroom interaction.

The researchers revealed several variables influencing the students' unexpected responses in the English class. The students presented various opinions related to their reasons for

choosing specific responses. The data obtained through the interview were focused on how well the students could interpret the teacher's directive utterances. According to the data, the variables were divided into internal and external categories.

The internal variables accounted for some of the student's responses to the teacher's utterances, including 1) lack of vocabulary and 2) the need for extra time to guess the teacher's intentions. Meanwhile, the external variables affecting the students' responses involved the noisy classroom environments, such as the students' chit-chats, overcrowded sounds from the classrooms next door, and vehicles passing by in front of the school's streets.

Internal Factors of Students' Responses

Lack of Vocabulary

Lack of vocabulary became the students' barrier to understanding the teacher's utterances, particularly when the teacher asked questions, gave orders, requests, and prohibition. In the observation, the researchers noted that the students chose to remain silent when there were words they did not know. Based on the result of the interview with participant S1, his limited vocabulary became an obstacle to comprehending English utterances, specifically without any Indonesian translation by the teacher. Below is what participant S1 said in the interview process about the reasons for his responses.

"Biasanya ada kalo gurunya pake Bahasa Inggris terus pasti gak akan mudeng. Kalo ditambah pake Bahasa Indonesia jadi mudeng." (S1)

(The teacher usually uses full English, so it certainly won't be easy. If the teacher adds her instruction in Indonesian, it will be easy for me to understand.)
(S1)

Participants S2 and S3 stated that they found it difficult to understand the teacher's utterances because of unknown meanings.

"Kadang-kadang bisa kadang-kadang gak karena belum tau artinya." (S2 and S3)

(Sometimes, I understand the teacher's instruction, but sometimes I do not understand it because I do not know what it means.) (S2 and S3)

However, as indicated in this transcript, the students reported that they could understand the teacher's sentences when he or she gave an Indonesian translation. In this case, the students realized that knowing the meaning and clarity of the teacher's intention assisted them in figuring out what the teacher desired. From this point, the unfamiliarity of the uttered words is regarded as one of the students' reasons that affected their response. It is in line with Holmes (2013), who states that children responding to unfamiliar words contributed to misleading interpretations and were labeled linguistically deficient.

Communication between a teacher and students in a classroom involves several familiarities with the teacher's words and voices. According to Koch (2017), a teacher's voice with a different pitch, melody, and volume can influence students' feelings and emotions. In some situations, the students struggle to understand the teacher's utterances. When attempting to interpret the teacher's meanings, the students use their experiences, such as vocabulary knowledge and guessing.

The first issue the students faced in the observed classroom was a lack of vocabulary. After encountering unfamiliar words, the students realized that having a large number of vocabularies could assist them in figuring out what the teacher wanted. The students would understand English instructions even if the teacher did not provide an Indonesian translation. Their desire to remain silent resulted from their encounter with unknown words. Alqahtani (2015) underlined the importance of vocabulary learning as a crucial part of foreign language learning to facilitate comprehensive communication in EFL classrooms.

Consequently, limited vocabulary impedes effective communication, particularly for students to respond to the teacher's directive utterances. Furthermore, vocabulary knowledge is required in interactional circumstances, and students' vocabulary deficiency is the fundamental cause of their inability to speak English (Seffar, 2015). An earlier study by Sumilia et al. (2019) indicated that learners unable to interpret the teacher's unclear sentences, cannot comprehend grammatical structures, and have shy or fearful characteristics find it challenging to respond to the teacher's words quickly.

The challenges of learning English viewed from students' perspective are proven by Songbatumis (2017), who argues that students might lack vocabulary mastery, forcing them not to participate actively in class. Besides, Baihaqi et al. (2019) showed that students' vocabulary acquisition improves when the teacher uses visual aids and word lists to teach vocabulary.

On the other hand, a problematic directive in teacher's pedagogical interaction was found in Waring & Hruska's (2012) research. A young learner produced inappropriate responses because the learner could not interpret questions or follow the teacher's instructions when the teacher used ambiguous directive language. In other words, the student's responses were affected by the teacher's ambiguous utterance production and the student's limited vocabulary. Therefore, it is logical to say that lack of vocabulary is one of the students' reasons for employing certain response techniques to the teacher's utterances.

The Need for Extra Time to Guess the Teacher's Intentions

According to the observation data, the students got silent when the teacher used complete utterances in English. The students said they needed a pause or broke for a few minutes to understand the teacher's utterances.

"Pas guru pake Bahasa Inggris terus-terusan, jadi kejeda mikir dulu artinya apa. Dulu awal-awal ada kendala terutama saat pengucapannya, kurang jelas, karena gak tau cara ngucapinnya apa jadi kurang bisa memahami." (S3)
(While the teacher uses full English, I think I need more time to process the meaning. Previously, there were obstacles, especially when the teacher's pronunciation was not clear. Since I didn't know how to say it, I couldn't understand it.) (S3)

Similarly, this factor is regarded as the students' reason that influenced their use of responses.

"Kalo pake Bahasa Inggris susah, gak tau artinya. Kadang paham kadang gak paham terutama artinya karena bahasa Inggris kan bukan bahasa asli kita (Indonesia) jadi belajarnya harus pelan-pelan supaya bisa memahami." (S2)
(Using English is quite difficult; I don't know what it means. Sometimes I understand it, but sometimes I don't understand it, especially the meaning. Since English is not our mother tongue, we have to learn it slowly to be able to comprehend it well.) (S2)

Based on the transcript of the interview, the students agreed that English sentences could not be understood easily because it is a foreign language that is rarely used in daily activities, except in the English classroom. Therefore, they spent a few seconds of pause before responding to the teacher's utterances appropriately.

The second issue was that the students needed time or pause to comprehend the teacher's instructions. During observation, the students remained silent to show that they were taking time to think about the meaning of the teacher's utterances. The students claimed that English instructions are confusing since English pronunciation and spelling are different, and English is not the Indonesian students' first language. Therefore, the students had to learn at a slow pace. Remaining silent does not indicate that the students are not acquiring language, but they merely need time to comprehend and process what they hear and listen to, and they will respond when they feel ready (Sundari, 2017). It is hard to think and construct meaning if the teacher does not provide pauses for thinking time. Pauses are required for students to make communication opportunities. Extending the pause time between teachers' and students' turns has been shown to promote classroom learning and improve classroom communication (Ingram & Elliott, 2016). This issue parallels Bahing et al. (2018), stating that teacher-student interactions unexpectedly end and even stop working because the teachers do not give sufficient time for students to speak more about their contributions to the class, and the teachers

immediately cut off the times of conversations. It also proved Affandi (2016)'s research about providing wait time in which teacher gives interval time between teacher's question and student's response to encourage them in participating teacher students interaction thus it caused students' social control pattern to feel directed and respected as a part of the interaction.

External Factors of Students' Responses

Noisy Classroom Environment

An interactive conversation between teacher and students is supposed to run smoothly per the teacher's plan. However, the observed classroom interaction turned out of control because of the noisy students talking to their friends and ignoring the teacher, the noisy classrooms next door, and the noisy environment outside the school. Due to these conditions, the students could not grasp the teacher's intent, although the teacher gave instructions clearly and loudly.

"Kalo suara guru sudah keras sih, tapi tidak selalu jelas karena ada suara truk, mobil, motor." (S1)

(The teacher's voice is loud enough, but I cannot hear it when trucks, cars, or motorcycles pass by.) (S1)

"Iya, sebenarnya itu guru memberi instruksi dengan jelas tapi karena kebanyakan siswa cukup ramai jadi masih kurang kedengaran." (S2)

(Yes, actually the teacher gives clear instructions, but many students talk to each other, so I can't hear it.) (S2)

"Kadang jelas, kadang tidak jelas. Paham ketika Bu guru memberi instruksi yang jelas kok. Tapi instruksi guru gak jelas karena kelas lain suka rame." (S3)

(Sometimes it's clear, but sometimes it's not clear. When the instructions are clear, I understand what the teacher means. But sometimes it's not clear because the classroom next-door is noisy.) (S3)

Related to the interview transcript above, the students admitted that their teacher instructed them clearly and loudly. However, the utterances were distracted by other sounds from inside and outside the class. As a result, the noisy classroom environment prevented the students from listening to and understanding the teacher's instructions well.

The last issue that the students encountered was the classroom environment. A classroom environment in which the teacher has little control opens the possibility of influencing the pupils' responses. A pleasant classroom environment promotes teaching and learning activities. A conducive learning environment encourages students to focus their thoughts and attention on what is being studied and allows teachers to deliver lessons smoothly. Hannah (2013) stated that a classroom's physical and non-physical environment substantially influences students' learning success. The physical environment contains the layout of students' desks and the corner room.

In contrast, the non-physical one includes sound, temperature, and seating arrangements based on the categorization of the students. Teachers must be aware of the auditory aspect of the classroom: noisy corridor or a student tapping their pencil on the desk, which may contribute significantly to students' attention and achievement. Concerning this issue, Singh (2014) asserted that having a stable classroom environment through good classroom management leads to successful learning for learners by generating a friendly atmosphere in which they feel appreciated, loved, and cared for better learning.

CONCLUSION

Concerning the objective of this study, it can be concluded that in the English teaching and learning process, students' responses to teachers' utterances are determined by internal and external variables. Those variables are anticipated to impact students' learning outcomes, specifically communicative competence. Related to the case, this research explored some reasons for students' responses in an English classroom. Some reasons contributing to the student's responses to the teacher's directive utterances are 1) lack of vocabulary, 2) extra time to guess the teacher's intentions, and 3) noisy classroom environment. Based on the results of this study, the three reasons mentioned become dominant factors in the students' reactions or responses to the teacher's utterances. This study implies that teachers' directives in EFL classrooms affect students' attitudes and interactions. In addition, teachers are the students' role models of active English speakers who encourage teacher-student conversations. This study has some limitations. First, the small number of participants because the researchers anticipated that large recruitment might not meet the goals. Second is the time limit of taking students' interviews that can be done during break time and after school. It was chosen to avoid students' focus while taking English classes. Finally, the researchers could not control for every possible factor, such as students' healthy and mood. Future studies are expected to dig deeper into teachers' problem-solving strategies in each cause of students' responses in English classrooms following the issue of this research. Thus, the teachers can pay attention to the student's attention, motivation and participation by involving them in communicative classroom activities for English practice, such as role plays or pair work interviews with minor obstacles.

REFERENCES

- Affandi, Y. (2016). Teacher's display and referential questions. *NOBEL: Journal of Literature and Language Teaching*, 7(1), 65–77. <https://doi.org/10.15642/NOBEL.2016.7.1.65-77>
- Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, III(3), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002>
- Ambarwati, M. D. (2019). Students' responses towards teacher talk. *RETAIN*, 7(3), 93–100. <https://jurnalmahasiswa.unesa.ac.id/index.php/43/article/view/30477>
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Razavieh, A., & Sorensen, C. K. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do thing with words* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Bahing, Emzir, & Rafli, Z. (2018). English speech acts of illocutionary force in class interaction. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(3), 113–120. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.9n.3p.113>
- Baihaqi, A., Wilian, S., & Nuriadi, N. (2019). The influence of classroom learning environment toward students' vocabulary acquisition: A study on second semester junior high school students. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 6(2), 710–719. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v6i2.762>
- Basra, S. M., & Thoyyibah, L. (2017). A speech act analysis of teacher talk in an EFL classroom. *International Journal of Education*, 10(1), 73–81. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v10i1.6848>
- Bennett, J. (1975). Stimulus, response, meaning. In N. Rescher (Ed.), *American Philosophical Quarterly Monograph Series 9* (pp. 55–88). Blackwell Publishing Ltd. <https://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/jfb/srm.pdf>
- Bezemer, J. (2008). Displaying orientation in the classroom: Students' multimodal responses to teacher instructions. *Linguistics and Education*, 19(2), 166–178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2008.05.005>
- Bostrom, R. N. (1996). Memory, cognitive processing, and the process of “listening”: A reply to Thomas and Levine. *Human Communication Research*, 23(2), 298–305. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1996.tb00396.x>
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Christianto, D. (2020). Speech acts in EFL classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 2(1), 68–79. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v2i1.68-79>
- Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *ECTJ*, 29(2), 75–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02766777>
- Hannah, R. (2013). *The effect of classroom environment on student learning* [Western Michigan University]. https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/honors_theses/2375/
- Heriansyah, H. (2012). Speaking problems faced by the English department students of Syiah Kuala University. *Lingua Didaktika*, 6(1), 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v6i1.7398>

- Holmes, J. (2013). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.2307/329116>
- Hussein, N. O., Albakri, I. S. M. A., & Seng, G. H. (2019). Pragmatic competence and activity-based language teaching: Importance of teaching communicative functions in Iraq EFL context. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 4(6), 1655–1660. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.46.5>
- Ingram, J., & Elliott, V. (2016). A critical analysis of the role of wait time in classroom interactions and the effects on student and teacher interactional behaviours. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(1), 37–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2015.1009365>
- Khan, A., Khan, S., Zia-Ul-Islam, S., & Khan, M. (2017). Communication skills of a teacher and its role in the development of the students' academic success. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(1), 18–21. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1131770.pdf>
- Koch, A. B. (2017). Sounds of education: Teacher role and use of voice in interactions with young children. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 49(1), 57–72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13158-017-0184-6>
- Kreidler, C. (2013). *Introducing English semantics* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315886428>
- McDuffie, A. (2013). Verbal communication. In F. R. Volkmar (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Autism Spectrum Disorders* (p. 3240). Springer New York. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1698-3>
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Moskowitz, G. (1971). Interaction analysis-A new modern language for supervisors. *Foreign Language Annals*, 5(2), 211–221. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1971.tb00682.x>
- Noor, N. M., Aman, I., Mustaffa, R., & Seong, T. K. (2010). Teacher's verbal feedback on students' response: A Malaysian ESL classroom discourse analysis. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 7(2010), 398–405. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.10.054>
- Pease, A., & Pease, B. (2004). *The definitive book of body language*. Pease International.
- Richmond, V. P., Wrench, J. S., & Gorham, J. (2020). *Communication, affect & learning in the classroom* (4th ed.). Creative Commons A-NC-SA License.
- Santosa, A. W., Fauziati, E., & Supriyadi, S. (2021). Speech act analysis of teacher talk in EFL classroom. *Proceedings International Conference on Education of Suryakencana (Iconnects) 2021*, 230–237. <https://doi.org/10.35194/cp.v0i0.1343>
- Sari, K. P. (2018). Teacher's directive speech acts at kindergarten school. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 7(1), 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.21580/vjv7i12735>
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173438>
- Searle, J. R. (1981). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Pres.
- Seffar, S. (2015). The effect of vocabulary knowledge on EFL oral competence. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 5(6), 8–13. <https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-05610813>
- Singh, A. (2014). Conducive classroom environment in schools. *International Journal of*

- Science and Research*, 3(1), 387–392.
https://www.ijsr.net/get_abstract.php?paper_id=02013831
- Songbatumis, A. M. (2017). Challenges in teaching English faced by English teachers at MTsN Taliwang, Indonesia. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Learning*, 2(2), 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.18196/ftl.2223>
- Sudrajat, B. A. N., & Sinta, R. (2016). The Pattern of Teacher Instruction and Function of Student Responses in EFL Classroom. *Creativity and Innovation Language Materials Development and Language Teaching Methodology in Asia and Beyond The 63rd TEFLIN International Conference*, 274–284.
- Suhirman, L. (2016). Speech acts in psycholinguistics class setting in postgraduate program. *IJOLTL: Indonesian Journal of Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 1(1), 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.30957/ijoltl.v1i1.2>
- Sumilia, E., Puspita, H., & Elfrida, E. (2019). Students' responses toward Teachers' questions in senior high school 8 Bengkulu. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literacy*, 3(2), 108–121. <https://doi.org/10.25157/JALL.V3I2.2538>
- Sundari, H. (2017). Classroom interaction in teaching English as foreign language at lower secondary schools in Indonesia. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 147–154. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.s.v.8n.6p.147>
- Tri Budiasih, L. (2018). Illocution on speech acts of foreign students in Indonesian learning. *PAROLE: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 6(2), 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.14710/parole.v6i2.41-48>
- Waring, H. Z., & Hruska, B. L. (2012). Problematic directives in pedagogical interaction. *Linguistics and Education*, 23(3), 289–300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LINGED.2012.06.002>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.