

Directive Speech Acts in Indonesian Language Learning at SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Seyegan

Risma Puspita Anggraeni^{1*}, Teguh Setiawan²
Yogyakarta State University

Corresponding Author: Risma : rismapuspita.2023@student.uny.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Directive Speech Acts, Indonesian Language Learning, Pragmatics, Junior High School

Received : 20, December

Revised : 12, January

Accepted: 10, February

©2026 Anggraeni, Setiawan :

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe the types and functions of directive speech acts used in Indonesian language learning at SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Seyegan. The research employed a descriptive qualitative approach. The data consisted of teachers' oral utterances collected through non-participant observation and supported by video recordings. The data were transcribed, verified, and analyzed using data cards. The results show that six types of directive speech acts were identified, namely requests, questions, commands, prohibitions, permitting, and advice. In addition, seventeen functions of directive speech acts appeared during the opening, core, and closing stages of learning. The dominant functions were questioning and requesting. These findings indicate that teachers use directive speech acts dynamically to manage classroom interaction and support instructional communication.

INTRODUCTION

Communication is a fundamental skill that enables individuals to function effectively in social life. It involves the process of exchanging messages, ideas, and information between speakers and listeners through spoken or written language. In educational contexts, communication plays a central role in supporting teaching and learning activities. Effective classroom communication allows teachers to convey learning objectives, manage classroom activities, and build meaningful interactions with students.

In linguistic studies, communication is closely related to pragmatics, which examines language use in relation to context. One important concept in pragmatics is speech acts, which refer to actions performed through utterances. According to Yule (2014), speaking is not merely producing sounds but also performing actions that influence listeners. Among various types of speech acts, directive speech acts are used to direct, request, command, advise, or influence others to perform certain actions.

In classroom interactions, directive speech acts are frequently used by teachers to manage learning activities, provide instructions, and guide students' behavior. Teachers' ability to use appropriate directive speech acts affects the effectiveness of classroom management and instructional communication. However, directive speech acts can appear in various forms and functions depending on learning stages, materials, and classroom situations.

Therefore, analyzing directive speech acts in Indonesian language learning is important to understand how teachers manage interaction and facilitate learning. This study focuses on identifying the types and functions of directive speech acts used by teachers at SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Seyegan. The novelty of this research lies in analyzing directive speech act functions systematically based on learning stages, namely opening, core, and closing activities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a field that examines the use of language in communication and emphasizes that meaning is formed through context, not as an abstract concept outside communication situations. Pragmatics is one branch of linguistics that discusses how language is used to express meaning in a particular context. This field studies how context plays a role in shaping the interpretation of utterances.

Rohmadi (2004) states that pragmatics is a linguistic discipline that examines language in relation to context. Cruse (2006) explains that pragmatics is closely related to semantic elements determined by context. Leech (2011) argues that pragmatics studies speaker meaning that depends on context. Djajasudarma (2012) emphasizes that pragmatics involves language use in real communication situations, interpretation of meaning, and speech act analysis.

Wijana (1996) explains that pragmatics examines language from an external perspective, focusing on language use in communication. Pragmatics explores how speakers adjust utterances to context so that communication can be understood effectively. Therefore, successful communication depends not only on grammatical correctness but also on pragmatic competence.

Utterances

Utterances refer to speech produced by speakers in communication. In pragmatics, utterances are viewed as realizations and products of speech acts. Nadar (2009) states that utterances are the results of speech acts, while Leech (1993) explains that utterances are products of verbal actions.

Rohmadi (2010) argues that utterances are concrete actions influenced by time, place, and speaker conditions. Thus, utterances are not merely sequences of words but meaningful expressions shaped by context. From these perspectives, utterances are understood as concrete manifestations of speech acts in real communication.

Speech Events

Speech events are communicative activities involving participants, linguistic media, and social mechanisms to achieve specific goals. Yule (2006) explains that speech events occur when speakers and listeners interact in certain contexts. Agustin (2010) states that speech events involve speakers and listeners focusing on specific topics within particular time, place, and situations.

Therefore, speech events represent linguistic interactions that occur in defined contexts and are influenced by social and situational factors.

Speech Acts

Speech acts are part of pragmatic studies that emphasize language as action. Austin introduced speech act theory, stating that when people speak, they also perform actions. Nadar (2013) explains that speaking is essentially doing something through words.

According to Searle, speech acts are classified into five categories: representative, directive, expressive, commissive, and declarative. Speech acts consist of three components: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary acts involve producing meaningful utterances. Illocutionary acts express speakers' intentions, while perlocutionary acts refer to the effects of utterances on listeners.

Speech acts are context-dependent, meaning their interpretation relies on social and situational factors.

Directive Speech Acts

Directive speech acts are illocutionary acts used by speakers to influence listeners to perform certain actions. Yule (2006) states that directives aim to make listeners do something. Searle (1969) explains that directive speech acts include ordering, requesting, advising, and recommending.

Prayitno (2025) explains that directive speech acts function as instruments to influence and guide listeners' behavior. Mubarok (2021) states that directives reflect speakers' intentions to stimulate certain actions. Husni et al. (2024) emphasize that directives are essential in instructional contexts. Ibrahim (1993) classifies directive speech acts into six types: requests, questions, commands, prohibitions, permitting, and advice. These categories serve as the basis for analyzing directive speech acts in this study.

Functions of Directive Speech Acts

Ibrahim (1993) explains that directive speech acts have various functions, including requestives, questions, requirements, prohibitives, permissives, and advisories.

Requestive functions include requesting, begging, praying, pressing, and inviting. Question functions involve asking and interrogating. Requirement functions include commanding, directing, instructing, regulating, and stipulating. Prohibitive functions include forbidding and limiting. Permissive functions involve allowing and approving. Advisory functions include advising and suggesting.

These functions reflect how speakers use language strategically to achieve communication goals.

Context in Communication

Context plays a crucial role in pragmatic interpretation. Athirah (2021) explains that without context, utterances become ambiguous. Nurani (2015) states that changes in context affect meaning interpretation.

Cummings (2007) argues that pragmatics cannot be separated from context. Hymes (1989) introduces the SPEAKING model to explain components of speech events, including setting, participants, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms, and genre.

Thus, context determines how utterances are produced and interpreted in communication.

Conceptual Framework

Based on the theoretical review, directive speech acts in Indonesian language learning are influenced by pragmatic competence, classroom context, and learning stages. Teachers use directive speech acts to manage classroom activities, guide students, and support learning objectives.

This study analyzes directive speech acts based on their types and functions during opening, core, and closing learning stages. The conceptual framework connects pragmatic theory, directive speech act classification, and classroom interaction to explain instructional communication.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive qualitative research design that aimed to describe the use of directive speech acts in Indonesian language learning interactions. Qualitative research focuses on understanding phenomena in natural settings and emphasizes the meaning, process, and context of social

interaction. The descriptive approach was applied to portray the characteristics and patterns of directive speech acts as they occur in classroom communication.

The research was conducted at SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Seyegan, located in Grogol Village, Margodadi Subdistrict, Seyegan District, Sleman Regency. The selection of this research site was based on its institutional vision in developing students' character and communication competence. The study was carried out during Indonesian language learning activities in the 2024/2025 academic year.

The subjects of this study were Indonesian language teachers and students at SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Seyegan. The objects of this research were directive speech acts produced by teachers during classroom interactions. The focus was placed on teachers' oral utterances used to manage learning activities, provide instructions, and guide students' behavior.

The primary instrument of this research was the researcher, who functioned as a human instrument. The researcher was responsible for planning the research, collecting data, observing classroom interactions, recording utterances, transcribing data, classifying speech acts, and analyzing findings. Supporting instruments included observation guidelines, video recording devices, and data cards.

Data were collected using the Non-Participant Observation technique (Simak Bebas Libat Cakap), in which the researcher acted solely as an observer without participating in classroom conversations. This technique enabled the researcher to obtain natural data without interfering with teaching and learning processes. Data collection was supported by video recordings to ensure data accuracy and completeness.

The data collection process consisted of several stages. First, the researcher conducted preliminary observations to understand classroom conditions and communication patterns. Second, learning activities were recorded using video devices. Third, the recorded data were transcribed into written form. Fourth, the transcribed data were verified to ensure conformity with the original utterances. Fifth, verified data were recorded on data cards to facilitate classification and analysis.

Data analysis was conducted through several systematic steps. First, data reduction was carried out by selecting utterances relevant to directive speech acts. Second, the selected data were classified based on the types of directive speech acts, namely requests, questions, commands, prohibitions, permitting, and advice. Third, the functions of directive speech acts were identified according to their occurrence in the opening, core, and closing stages of learning. Fourth, the classified data were interpreted to explain their roles in instructional communication.

The classification of directive speech acts referred to Ibrahim's theory, which categorizes directives into six types. Meanwhile, the analysis of functions was based on the framework of requestives, questions, requirements, prohibitives, permissives, and advisories. These theoretical frameworks were used to ensure consistency and validity in data interpretation.

To ensure data validity, several techniques were applied. Data triangulation was conducted by comparing observation results with video

recordings. Careful transcription and repeated verification were carried out to minimize interpretation errors.

Peer discussion was also conducted to confirm classification accuracy. These procedures were implemented to enhance data credibility and reliability.

Through these methodological procedures, this study aimed to produce systematic, valid, and reliable descriptions of directive speech acts in Indonesian language learning interactions.

RESULTS

The findings of this study indicate that directive speech acts were intensively used by the teacher during Indonesian language learning at SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Seyegan. Based on the analysis of classroom interaction data, six types of directive speech acts were identified, namely requests, questions, commands, prohibitions, permitting, and advice. These types were found across three stages of learning activities: opening, core, and closing sessions.

Types of Directive Speech Acts

1. Requests

Requestive utterances were used by the teacher to ask students to perform certain actions politely. These utterances appeared in forms such as asking students to prepare learning materials, submit assignments, or pay attention to explanations. Requestive speech acts reflected the teacher's effort to maintain positive classroom interaction.

2. Questions

Questioning functions were dominant in classroom interaction. The teacher frequently used interrogative forms to check students' understanding, stimulate participation, and guide discussion. Question-type directives functioned both as comprehension checks and as tools to activate students' critical thinking.

3. Commands

Commanding utterances were used to direct students explicitly to carry out specific tasks, such as reading texts, writing answers, forming groups, or completing exercises. These directives appeared more frequently during the core learning activities.

4. Prohibitions

Prohibitive directives were used to prevent undesirable behavior, such as making noise, disturbing classmates, or using mobile phones during learning. These utterances functioned to maintain classroom discipline.

5. Permitting

Permissive directives appeared when the teacher allowed students to perform certain actions, such as asking questions, going out of the classroom, or expressing opinions.

6. Advice

Advisory directives were used to encourage students to behave positively, study diligently, or improve their performance. These utterances reflected the teacher's role in character building.

Functions of Directive Speech Acts

The analysis revealed seventeen functions of directive speech acts distributed across learning stages.

Opening Stage

During the opening session, directive speech acts functioned to:

- Prepare students for learning,
- Create classroom readiness,
- Check attendance,
- Motivate students.

Question and request functions were dominant in this stage.

Core Stage

In the core learning activities, directive speech acts functioned to:

- Deliver instructions,
- Guide learning tasks,
- Organize group work,
- Control classroom interaction,
- Encourage participation,
- Clarify material,
- Evaluate understanding.

Command and question functions were most dominant in this phase.

Closing Stage

During the closing session, directive speech acts functioned to:

- Summarize learning material,
- Provide reinforcement,
- Give homework,
- Deliver advice,
- Conclude activities.

Advisory and requestive functions were frequently used at this stage.

DISCUSSION

The findings demonstrate that directive speech acts play a crucial role in instructional communication. In line with Searle's classification, directive speech acts aim to influence listeners to perform certain actions. In classroom contexts, teachers use directives not only to command but also to guide, motivate, and manage learning processes.

The dominance of questioning functions indicates that teachers use interrogative directives as pedagogical strategies to stimulate student engagement. This finding supports the view that questioning is an essential instructional technique in classroom discourse. Through questioning, teachers can assess comprehension and encourage active participation.

Command-type directives were more dominant during core learning activities because teachers needed to organize tasks, manage time, and ensure instructional flow. This confirms that directive speech acts are essential for classroom management.

Prohibitive and permissive directives reflected the teacher's authority and responsibility in maintaining classroom discipline. Meanwhile, advisory directives demonstrated the teacher's role in character education and moral guidance.

Context played a significant role in determining the meaning and function of directive speech acts. The interpretation of utterances depended on situational factors, participants, and learning stages. This finding aligns with pragmatic theory, which emphasizes that language meaning cannot be separated from context.

Overall, the study confirms that directive speech acts are used dynamically and strategically in classroom interaction. Teachers adjust their directive forms and functions according to instructional goals and situational needs.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussion, it can be concluded that directive speech acts play an important role in Indonesian language learning at SMP Muhammadiyah 1 Seyegan. The teacher consistently used directive speech acts to manage classroom interaction, deliver instructions, and guide students' learning behavior.

This study identified six types of directive speech acts, namely requests, questions, commands, prohibitions, permitting, and advice. These types appeared across three learning stages: opening, core, and closing activities. Among these types, questions and requests were the most frequently used, indicating that the teacher emphasized interactive and participatory communication.

In addition, seventeen functions of directive speech acts were found in classroom interactions. These functions were distributed systematically according to learning stages. In the opening stage, directive speech acts were used to prepare students and motivate learning. In the core stage, they were used to organize tasks, control interaction, and evaluate understanding. In the closing stage, they were used to reinforce material and provide guidance.

The findings show that teachers use directive speech acts dynamically and strategically according to instructional needs. The appropriate use of directive speech acts contributes to effective classroom management, meaningful interaction, and successful learning processes.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations are proposed.

First, Indonesian language teachers are encouraged to improve their awareness of directive speech act usage in classroom communication. By understanding various types and functions of directive speech acts, teachers can enhance instructional effectiveness and student engagement.

Second, teachers are advised to apply directive speech acts flexibly and contextually according to learning stages and classroom situations. The balanced use of requests, questions, commands, and advice can support positive learning environments.

Third, schools are recommended to provide training or workshops on classroom communication and pragmatic competence for teachers. Such programs can help teachers develop effective interaction strategies.

Finally, future researchers are encouraged to conduct further studies on directive speech acts in different educational contexts, subjects, and school levels. Future research may also apply quantitative or mixed-method approaches to obtain more comprehensive findings.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

Each study has limitations; thus, you can describe it here and briefly provide suggestions for further research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This section gives you the opportunity to thank your colleagues who provided suggestions for your paper. You can also express your appreciation for the financial assistance you received, in completing this research.

REFERENCES

- Agustin, R. (2004). *Pragmatik: Teori dan Aplikasi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Agustin, R. (2010). *Kajian Pragmatik dalam Interaksi Sosial*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Amri, M. (2024). Tindakan ilokusi dalam wacana kelas. *Jurnal Linguistik Terapan*, 17(1), 45–58.
- Arsyad, A. (2017). *Media Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Arsyad, A. (2020). *Media Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Astusi, D. (2018). Tindakan ucapan deklaratif dalam wacana kelembagaan. *Jurnal Studi Bahasa*, 9(2), 88–99.
- Athirah, N. (2021). Konteks dalam interpretasi pragmatis. *Jurnal Penelitian Linguistik*, 10(1), 33–47.
- Austin, JL (1962). *Cara Melakukan Sesuatu dengan Kata-kata*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Austin, JL (1975). *Cara Melakukan Sesuatu dengan Kata-kata*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Basra, S., & Thooyibah, L. (2017). Tindakan pidato direktif dalam interaksi kelas. *Jurnal Studi Pragmatik*, 5(2), 78–91.
- Cruse, A. (2006). *Glosarium Semantik dan Pragmatik*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cummings, L. (2007). *Pragmatis: Perspektif Multidisiplin*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Djasudarma, T. F. (2012). *Wacana dan Pragmatik*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- Fitriani, R. (2020). Tindakan pidato dalam wacana pendidikan. *Jurnal Linguistik dan Pendidikan*, 8(2), 91–105.
- Hamalik, O. (2011). *Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Hermaji, B. (2021). *Pragmatik dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa*. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- Huang, Y. (2017). *Pragmatik*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Husni, M., Rahman, A., & Putra, D. (2024). Tindakan pidato direktif dalam konteks instruksional. *Jurnal Pengajaran Bahasa*, 16(1), 55–70.
- Hymes, D. (1989). *Dasar-dasar dalam Sociolinguistik*. Philadelphia: Universitas Pennsylvania Press.
- Ibrahim, A. S. (1992). *Kajian Tindak Tutur*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Ibrahim, A. S. (1993). *Pragmatik dan Analisis Wacana*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Isnaeni, L. (2021). Efek perlokusi dalam komunikasi. *Jurnal Penelitian Pragmatik*, 7(1), 41–55.
- Keraf, A. S. (2018). *Etika Lingkungan Hidup*. Jakarta: Kompas.
- Lintah, G. (1993). *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik*. London: Longman.
- Lintah, G. (2011). *Pragmatik*. London: Routledge.
- Mubarok, A. (2021). Tindakan pidato direktif dalam wacana kelas. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 12(1), 55–67.
- Mulyana. (2005). *Kajian Wacana*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Mulyani, S. (2011). *Strategi pembelajaran bahasa*. Yogyakarta: UNY Press.
- Nadar, F. X. (2009). *Pragmatik dan Penelitian Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

- Nadar, F. X. (2013). *Pragmatik dan Kajian Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Nagy, W. (2015). Konteks dan makna dalam penggunaan bahasa. *Jurnal Studi Bahasa*, 14(2), 67–81.
- Nabila, R., Sari, D., & Putra, A. (2023). Komunikasi dalam interaksi kelas. *Jurnal Komunikasi Pendidikan*, 6(2), 101–115.
- Nurani, L. (2015). Makna kontekstual dalam wacana. *Jurnal Studi Pragmatik*, 6(1), 34–48.
- Nurwidodo, N., Widodo, A., & Nurhayati, S. (2020). Literasi lingkungan di kalangan siswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sains*, 9(3), 156–168.
- OECD. (2018). *Pendidikan untuk Kelestarian Lingkungan*. Paris: Penerbitan OECD.
- Pertiwi, R. (2019). Keterampilan komunikasi dalam pendidikan. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*, 5(1), 23–35.
- Prayitno, H. J. (2011). *Kesantunan Berbahasa*. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- Prayitno, HJ (2025). Strategi pragmatis dalam tindakan pidato direktif. *Jurnal Linguistik Terapan*, 18(1), 21–35.
- Putri, R., & Hadi, S. (2022). Pengembangan media pembelajaran berdasarkan hasil penelitian. *Jurnal Media Pendidikan*, 14(3), 201–214.
- Rahardi, K. (2005). *Pragmatik: Kesantunan Imperatif Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Rahardi, K. (2010). *Kajian Pragmatik*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Rahma, N. (2024). Teori tindak bicara dalam pembelajaran bahasa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 13(1), 44–59.
- Rahmawati, D. (2016). Tindakan pidato direktif dalam pendidikan. *Jurnal Linguistik*, 4(2), 77–90.
- Riset. (2022). Penggunaan bahasa dalam komunikasi. *Jurnal Penelitian Linguistik*, 11(1), 12–25.
- Rohmadi, M. (2004). *Pragmatik: Teori dan Analisis*. Yogyakarta: Lingkar Media.
- Rohmadi, M. (2010). *Analisis Wacana Pragmatik*. Surakarta: UNS Press.
- Rustono. (1999). *Pokok-Pokok Pragmatik*. Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press.

- Rusminto, N. (2015). *Analisis Wacana*. Lampung: Universitas Lampung Press.
- Sarifah, N. (2019). Tindakan lokusi dalam wacana. *Jurnal Pragmatik*, 8(1), 50–63.
- Sari, P. (2014). Tindakan pidato dalam bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Studi Bahasa*, 6(2), 72–86.
- Searle, JR (1969). *Tindakan Pidato: Esai dalam Filsafat Bahasa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sunardi. (2011). Strategi pembelajaran. In Mulyani (Ed.), *Pembelajaran Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: UNY Press.
- Suryandani, N., & Budasi, I. (2021). Komunikasi yang efektif dalam pendidikan. *Jurnal Pengajaran Bahasa*, 10(2), 91–104.
- Tango, M., Sari, L., & Putra, B. (2022). Proses komunikasi manusia. *Jurnal Studi Komunikasi*, 7(1), 15–29.
- Tarigan, H. G. (2015). *Berbicara sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Tarigan, H. G. (2017). *Pengajaran Pragmatik*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- UNESCO. (2017). *Pendidikan untuk Tujuan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Widodo, A., & Nurhayati, S. (2020). Literasi lingkungan di kalangan siswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Sains*, 9(3), 156–168.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (1996). *Dasar-Dasar Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
- Wijana, I. D. P. (2009). *Analisis Wacana Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Andi.
- Widiastutition. (2020). Pragmatik dan konteks. *Jurnal Penelitian Bahasa*, 9(2), 55–69.
- Witdyawatiningrum, R., Sari, D., & Putra, A. (2022). Tindakan pidato yang representatif. *Jurnal Linguistik*, 11(1), 22–35.
- Yule, G. (2006). *Pragmatik*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2014). *Studi Bahasa* (edisi ke-5). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yusrina, R., Hasanah, L., & Putri, M. (2025). Konteks dalam interaksi kelas. *Jurnal Pragmatik dan Pendidikan*, 15(1), 61-75.