**CHAPTER I**

**INTRODUCTION**

This chapter describes the research background, research questions, the objectives, the significances and the limitation of the research.

1. Background

Communication is very important in social activities, as Allwood (1993: 2) stated that all people have to cooperate one another in conducting activities. In this case, communal information is required for the cooperation. He also added that the information can be communal through communication. The communication usually occurs in two forms, verbal and non verbal linguistic. The verbal activities may appear in discussing, debating or negotiating, while the non verbal activities are seen in communal building a house or communal working in the garden.

Communication also is very essential in teaching and learning process, for example, the process of lecturing occurring in universities. Communication between the lecturers and the students also considered as the fundamental substance for obtaining an effective learning. As Weheba & Kader (2007: 1) stated that communication in the teaching and learning process encourage students connect the concepts which they learn and apply the concept into their life. Furthermore, Zhao and Throssel (2011: 88) argued that in communicating with the students, the lecturers will not only bring out some utterances involving grammatical structures and words but they also perform actions through those utterances in order to send the messages by their utterances. In this speech situation the lecturer serve as the speaker and the students as the hearers. Bach (1994: 5) stated that such acts of speech in communication are called speech acts, which are defined as the acts of speech of the speaker in the connection to the hearers. It is not only about the words uttered by the speaker, but it has also to do with the speaker’s intentions to the hearers. Meanwhile, Sadock in Ilyas and Qushi(2014:2) explained that when people utter words, they bring out language for obtaining various functions such as expressing many kinds of feelings, begin to tell an excuse or even reprimand one. Sadock added that the matters are called speech acts: “acts performed in the speaking process”. He also emphasized that in the study of speech acts, there are three things have to be considered namely the use of language, intention of the speaker and, the interaction in a social context.

In relation to the use of speech acts in communication, Dasin Ilyas and Qushi(2014: 2) also stated that in the structures of speech act theory, the participants (speakers and hearers) who produce the language and making their intentions captured have to be participated. Das added that speaker is the source of the message, this message will be analyzed. Consequently, the hearer will capture the intention of the speaker. He also stated that the hearer is the receiver of the message, and they would recognize the meaning of the message and perform the actions accordingly. Additionally, Searle in Ilyas and Qushi (2014: 2) categorizes speech acts on the basis of their illocutionary purposes, namely what speech acts are performed by the speaker on his/her utterances, how the speech act are situated.

It is fundamental skill to conclude what is stated which would cause a successful communication. Nawaz and Malik (2013: 103) considered that succeeding such skills require the physical and social awareness and hypothesis about the knowledge of the people whom we are communicating with. This is the true meaning of what is defined as the Speech Act Theory. It is argued by Zhao and Throssel (2011: 88) that Speech Act Theory should be applied in the teaching of foreign language. Language teachers should not only develop the linguistic competenceof the students but also enhance their pragmatic competence. The statement is also supported by Zayed (2014: 1) who stated that English as foreign language (EFL) teachers do not have to concern only with grammatical and linguistic field, but they also should focus on the communicative competence due to the main purpose for learning a foreign language. Furthermore, he also stated that in the classrooms context, EFL learners are fundamental to learn the different types and reactions of speech acts in order that they can communicate effectively and acceptable with native speakers of English. This statement is in line with Thomas’ opinion in Grossi (2009: 53) stating that the students who are inadequate in communicative competence especially in pragmatic are difficult to use language smoothly in order to get particular aims and to comprehend language in context. Meanwhile, Fujinomori (2004: 5) added that acts, such as requests, apologies, complaints, and compliments, have periodically been considered as infinitely problematic for EFL/ESL learners at all levels. Widdowson in Vitale (2006: 16) even claims that even though students may have studied the rules of linguistic usage, they may be difficult to produce the language in context.

The phenomenon above also is asserted by Ashoorpour & Azari(2014: 40). They stated that inadequate pragmatic knowledge is the most problem faced by EFL learners in communicating with people from other cultures. He also asserted that EFL teachers mostly concentrate on the teaching linguistic competence and they do not consider the pragmatic or sociolinguistic of language. Finally, EFL learners may produce utterances that are faultlessly grammatical, but they may ignore the social values of the target language because they have inadequate pragmatic competence (appropriateness of meaning) to support grammatical competence (appropriateness of form). Similar opinion also stated by Brock (2005). They claimed that pragmatic incompetence in the L2 will lead the learners produce inappropriate expressions or inaccurate interpretations. Consequently, it can lead misunderstanding and miscommunication and can even leave the native-speaking interlocutor with the perception that the L2 speaker is either ignorant or impolite. Brock (2005) illustrates the importance of pragmatic competence. Two learners of English ask a native speaker, with whom they are unacquainted, to lend them a pen. One learner uses the phrase, “Borrow your pen,” while the other asks, “Could I borrow your pen?” Both requests are understandable. Both result in the desired response. However, in this context native speakers would likely respond more favorably to the request of the second learner over that of the first, simply because it is more appropriate. Those claims about the importance of pragmatic competence above show how fundamental and critical the pragmatic competence is.

In Sembilan Belas November University of Kolaka, especially in the English Study Program, all subjects which were learned by the students require them to produce English utterances. In this case, some subjects such as speaking, writing, reading , were considered to be able to force the students to produce more utterances in lecturing process because the dominant strategy used in teaching these subjects is discussion, even some lecturers in lecturing process obliged the students to produce utterances to foster the students’ confidence and bravery in speaking. However, when preliminary research was conducted by the researcher, seemly some students were able to produce some speech acts on their utterances but when they were asked about the speech acts that they produced, they did not realize, even they did not know at all about it because pragmatic was never put as a subject in the English study program curriculum. It means that they never learned pragmatics during their study. Therefore, the findings of this research were expected to be taken as one of references for the lecturers or the educators to teach the speech acts to the students and used the speech acts in lecturing process. The result of preliminary research also revealed that the students of this university were heterogeneous. The students consisted of various ethnics, not only the ethnics of Sulawesi, but also the ethnics which came from the other islands of Indonesia. Therefore, this university was considered very representative to represent Indonesian universities.

Based on the description above, the researcher was interested to conduct a research entitled ”Speech Act Analysis on the English Conversation by Indonesian University Students in an EFL Classroom”.

1. Research Questions

According to Flick (2009: 100) formulating research questionswill accommodate circumscribe a particular area of a more or less complex field for a researcher, which he/she considers as fundamental. Therefore the researcher formulated the research questions as follow:

1. What types of speech act are uttered by the students on their EFL classroom communication?
2. What are the functions and the forms of speech act uttered by the students on their EFL classroom communication?
3. What are the students’ perceptions toward the use of speech acts in EFL classroom communication?
4. The Objectives of the Research

To deal with the statements described above, the objectives of the research were formulated as follow:

1. To explore the types of speech acts uttered by the students on their EFL classroom communication.
2. To explore the functions and the forms of speech acts uttered by the students on their EFL classroom communication.
3. To examine the students’ perceptions toward the use of speech acts in EFL classroom communication.
4. The Significances of the Research
5. Theoretical benefit

This research was conducted as the support of speech acts theory in the development of linguistic theories. Additionally, Merdana, et al (2013: 2) stated that in spite of the importance of classroom speech acts, research on teachers and students’ speech acts has not been done adequately. In fact research on classroom speech acts is quite rare. Therefore, the researcher would fill the gap as an effort to break up the scarcity.

1. Practical benefits

The educators and the lecturers would get meaningful information of speech acts that are used in the lecturing process.

1. The Limitations of the Research

Marshall and Rossman (1999) stated that the research limitations demonstrate that the researcher understands the reality that he/she will not make overweening claims about generaliz ability or conclusiveness relative to what he/she learned. Therefore, this research was limited to the speech acts uttered or produced by the students of the first, and the third semester in the English Department of Sembilan Belas November University of Kolaka in the teaching learning process (the lecturing process). In addition, the number of respondents was also limited in this research. The respondents were only the ones who were knowledgeable about the speech acts. The researcher selected the classes purposively to investigate. The analysis of speech act was done by using Searle taxonomy.