SPEECH ACT ANALYSIS OF TEACHER SPEECH IN THE CLASSROOM

Ma'rufxonov Maqsudxon Umidilloxon o'gli

Student of Andijan State Institute

of Foreign Languages(Uzbekistan)

maqsudbekmarufxonov@gmail.com

Supervisor: **Egamberdiyeva Iroda**, *Teacher of Andijan State Institute of*

Foreign Languages (Uzbekistan)

Abstract: *This article examines the pragmatic functions of speech acts in teacher discourse within classroom settings. Through systematic analysis of authentic classroom interactions, we investigate how teachers employ different speech act categories—directives, expressives, representatives, commissives, and declarations—to facilitate learning, manage classroom behavior, and develop rapport with students. Our findings reveal that teachers predominantly utilize directive and representative speech acts, with significant variations across educational levels, subject matters, and pedagogical approaches. The research demonstrates that conscious attention to speech act deployment can enhance teaching effectiveness, student engagement, and classroom dynamics. Implications for teacher education programs and professional development are discussed, emphasizing the importance of pragmatic awareness in successful teaching practice.*

Keywords: *Speech acts, classroom discourse, teacher talk, pragmatics, directive speech acts, classroom interaction, pedagogical communication, educational linguistics.*

ПРАГМАТИКА РЕЧИ УЧИТЕЛЯ В ПРОЦЕССЕ ОБУЧЕНИЯ

Аннотация: В статье рассматриваются прагматические функции речевых актов в дискурсе учителя в классной среде. Посредством систематического анализа аутентичных классных взаимодействий мы исследуем, как учителя используют различные категории речевых актов—

директивы, экспрессивы, репрезентативы, комиссивы и декларации—для содействия обучению, управления поведением в классе и развития отношений с учениками. Наши результаты показывают, что учителя преимущественно используют директивные и репрезентативные речевые акты, со значительными вариациями в зависимости от образовательного уровня, предметной области и педагогических подходов. Исследование демонстрирует, что осознанное внимание к использованию речевых актов может повысить эффективность преподавания, вовлеченность учащихся и динамику в классе. Обсуждаются последствия для программ педагогического образования и профессионального развития, подчеркивая важность прагматической осведомленности в успешной педагогической практике.

Ключевые слова: Речевые акты, дискурс в классе, речь учителя, прагматика, директивные речевые акты, классное взаимодействие, педагогическая коммуникация, образовательная лингвистика.

INTRODUCTION

Classroom discourse represents a unique communicative context where teachers employ language not merely to transmit information but to manage social interaction, establish authority, evaluate student performance, and scaffold learning. Since Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) groundbreaking work on speech act theory, researchers have recognized that utterances perform actions beyond their literal meaning. This functional perspective on language has particular relevance in educational settings, where teacher speech serves multiple simultaneous purposes.

This article examines how speech act theory can illuminate the complex pragmatic functions of teacher talk in classroom interactions. By understanding the distribution, frequency, and effectiveness of various speech acts in teachers' linguistic repertoires, we can develop more informed approaches to classroom communication and teacher education.

Theoretical Framework

Speech Act Theory in Educational Contexts

Speech act theory, initially developed by Austin (1962) and further systematized by Searle (1969, 1975), identifies how utterances perform actions through their illocutionary force. Searle's taxonomy of speech acts—representatives (assertions), directives (commands, requests), commissives (promises), expressives (praise, apologies), and declarations (pronouncements that change reality)—provides a useful framework for analyzing teacher discourse.

In educational contexts, Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model identified typical patterns of classroom discourse, wherein teachers initiate exchanges (often through questions), students respond, and teachers provide evaluative feedback. This triadic structure highlights how speech acts operate within larger discourse sequences in the classroom.

More recently, scholars like Cazden (2001) and Walsh (2011) have extended this work, examining how teacher speech acts not only control classroom interaction but also scaffold student learning and cognitive development in alignment with Vygotskian sociocultural theory.

The Pragmatic Functions of Teacher Talk

Teacher talk serves multiple pragmatic functions simultaneously:

1. Instructional functions: Explaining concepts, giving directions for activities, questioning to check understanding

2. Managerial functions: Organizing classroom activities, maintaining order

3. Interpersonal functions: Building rapport, providing encouragement, responding to emotional needs

4. Evaluative functions: Assessing student contributions, providing feedback

5. Metalinguistic functions: Drawing attention to language itself, modeling appropriate discourse

The balance among these functions varies significantly across educational contexts, teacher experience levels, and pedagogical approaches.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a mixed-methods approach to analyze teacher speech acts across different educational levels. Data collection included:

1. Audio recordings of 40 classroom sessions (10 each from primary, middle, secondary, and university levels)

2. Transcription and coding of teacher utterances using an adapted version of Searle's speech act taxonomy

3. Follow-up interviews with 20 teachers regarding their communicative intentions and awareness of speech patterns

4. Student feedback surveys measuring perceptions of teacher communication effectiveness

Analytical Framework

Teacher utterances were coded according to the following classification system:

- Directives: Instructions, commands, requests, suggestions

- Questions: Display questions (teacher knows answer), referential questions (genuine information seeking), procedural questions

- Representatives: Explanations, descriptions, clarifications

- Evaluative acts: Praise, criticism, acknowledgment, correction

- Expressives: Expressions of emotion, encouragement, empathy

- Metalinguistic comments: Commentary on language usage, vocabulary instruction

- Phatic communication: Social formulas, greetings, classroom management phrases

Frequency counts, sequential analysis, and qualitative interpretation were used to identify patterns in the distribution and contextual effectiveness of these speech act types.

Results and Discussion

Distribution of Speech Acts Across Educational Levels

Analysis revealed distinct patterns in the distribution of speech acts across educational levels. Primary school teachers employed a higher proportion of directives

(32%) and phatic communication (15%) compared to university instructors (18% and 5% respectively). Conversely, representatives increased from primary (18%) to university level (38%), reflecting greater content focus at higher educational levels.

Questions constituted a substantial proportion of teacher talk across all levels (25-30%), though their nature shifted from predominantly display questions at lower levels to more referential questions at higher levels. This shift aligns with changing pedagogical goals from knowledge verification to critical thinking development.

Directive Speech Acts

Directives emerged as a fundamental component of teacher talk, serving both instructional and management functions. Several patterns were observed:

1. Directness spectrum: Primary teachers tended to use more direct imperatives ("Open your books to page 50"), while secondary and university instructors favored indirect forms ("Could you summarize the main argument?"). This reflects both authority dynamics and assumptions about student autonomy.

2. Mitigation strategies: More experienced teachers employed various mitigating devices when issuing directives, including:

- Collective pronouns ("Let's examine...")

- Modal verbs ("We might want to...")

- Hedging expressions ("Perhaps you could...")

- Positive politeness strategies ("It would be helpful if...")

3. Sequential positioning: Directives often appeared in predictable sequence patterns, frequently preceded by orientational statements that established relevance and followed by explanatory moves that provided rationales.

Interview data suggested teachers were often unaware of these patterns in their directive usage, indicating the largely unconscious nature of speech act selection in classroom discourse.

Questioning as a Central Speech Act

Questions constituted the most frequent speech act type overall (28%), performing multiple functions beyond mere information elicitation:

1. Cognitive scaffolding: Sequenced questions often followed identifiable patterns of increasing cognitive demand, aligned with taxonomies like Bloom's.

2. Dialogic space: "True" referential questions created more authentic dialogic interactions, while display questions tended to reinforce traditional power dynamics.

3. Wait time correlation: Longer wait times after questions (exceeding 3 seconds) correlated with increased student response complexity and higher-order thinking.

4. Cultural and disciplinary variations: Question patterns varied significantly across subject areas, with mathematics classes featuring more procedural questions and literature classes employing more interpretive and evaluative questions.

Student survey data indicated that questioning patterns significantly influenced their perception of teacher effectiveness and classroom engagement.

Evaluative Speech Acts

Evaluative speech acts, particularly in the feedback position of IRF exchanges, revealed complex patterns:

1. Beyond binary evaluation: While simple positive/negative evaluation was common ("Good," "Not quite"), more effective teachers employed elaborated evaluation that specified the grounds for assessment.

2. Indirect evaluation: Many teachers used indirect evaluative strategies, such as:

- Reformulation of student contributions

- Extension of partial answers

- Probing questions that implied inadequacy

- Redirection to other students

3. Affective dimensions: Evaluation frequently contained affective components that went beyond cognitive assessment, building student confidence and classroom rapport.

4. Self-correction prompts: Some teachers systematically used speech acts designed to elicit student self-correction rather than providing direct evaluation.

The most effective evaluative patterns, according to student feedback, combined specific acknowledgment of student contributions with clear guidance for improvement.

Speech Acts and Teacher Identity

Analysis revealed that speech act patterns reflected and constructed teacher identity in the classroom:

1. Authority positioning: Speech act choices signaled different authority stances, from traditional hierarchical positioning (frequent directives, evaluations) to more facilitative approaches (questions, tentative representatives).

2. Expertise presentation: Representatives (explanations, clarifications) varied in their epistemic modality, with some teachers marking knowledge as absolute and others acknowledging uncertainty or alternative perspectives.

3. Interpersonal orientation: Variation in expressives and phatic communication reflected different prioritizations of the socio-emotional dimensions of teaching.

Teacher interviews suggested that speech act patterns often reflected implicit beliefs about teaching roles rather than conscious communicative choices.

Pedagogical Implications

For Teacher Education Programs

This study suggests several implications for teacher preparation:

1. Developing pragmatic awareness: Teacher education should explicitly address the pragmatic dimensions of classroom communication, helping novice teachers understand speech act functions and effects.

2. Strategic repertoire expansion: Training programs should focus on expanding teachers' speech act repertoires, particularly in questioning techniques and evaluative feedback strategies.

3. Contextual adaptation: Teachers need support in adapting speech act patterns to different educational contexts, student populations, and instructional goals.

4. Reflective practice: Recording and analyzing one's own classroom discourse can promote awareness of speech act patterns and their alignment with pedagogical intentions.

For Classroom Practice

For practicing teachers, this research suggests:

1. Balancing speech act types: Effective teaching requires conscious attention to the distribution of different speech act types, ensuring alignment with lesson objectives.

2. Creating dialogic space: Reducing dominance of teacher directives and closed questions can create more authentic dialogic interactions that promote student agency.

3. Cultural sensitivity: Awareness of cultural variations in speech act interpretation can help teachers communicate more effectively in diverse classrooms.

4. Metalinguistic modeling: Teachers can explicitly model and discuss effective speech acts for academic discourse, helping students develop their own pragmatic competence.

Conclusion

Speech act analysis offers a powerful lens for understanding the complex pragmatic dimensions of teacher talk in classroom settings. This study has demonstrated that teachers employ a wide range of speech acts that serve multiple simultaneous functions beyond their surface meaning. The distribution and effectiveness of these speech acts vary significantly across educational contexts and appear strongly linked to teacher experience, pedagogical philosophy, and instructional goals.

By developing greater awareness of speech act patterns in teacher discourse, both pre-service and in-service teachers can enhance their communicative effectiveness, better align their language use with their pedagogical intentions, and create more productive learning environments. Further research is needed to explore how speech act patterns interact with other dimensions of classroom discourse,

including multimodal communication, and how teacher speech acts influence the development of students' own pragmatic competence.

References:

1.Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.

2.Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Heinemann.

3. Johnson, K. E. (1995). Understanding communication in second language classrooms. Cambridge University Press.

4. Mehan, H. (1979). *Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom*. Harvard University Press.

5. Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and minds: How we use language to think together*. Routledge.

6. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

7. Searle, J. R. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 59-82). Academic Press.

8. Sinclair, J. M., & Coulthard, R. M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. Oxford University Press.

9. Tsui, A. B. M. (1994). *English conversation*. Oxford University Press.

10. Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge.

11.Waring, H. Z. (2016). *Theorizing pedagogical interaction: Insights from conversation analysis*. Routledge.

12.Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF sequence: A proposal for the articulation of theories of activity and discourse for the analysis of teaching and learning in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 5*(1), 1-37.