



## Speech Acts in Mandarin Language Learning at a Junior High School: A Pragmatic Study

Asti Ramadhani<sup>1✉</sup>, Arini Junaeny<sup>2✉</sup>, Jufri A.P.<sup>3</sup>

Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

### Keywords

*speech acts, Mandarin,  
pragmatics, language  
learning, classroom  
interaction*

### Abstract

This study examines speech acts in teacher-student interactions during Mandarin language learning at Cheng Hoo Integrated Islamic Junior High School, Gowa, based on Searle's (1969) speech act theory. Using a qualitative descriptive method, Data were collected through observation, audio recording, and field notes during two learning sessions with ninth-grade students. Analysis of 170 utterances revealed that directive speech acts were most dominant (58 utterances), followed by representative (23), declarative (20), expressive (14), and commissive (6). Speech acts served three primary functions: conative (68 utterances) to encourage student action, cognitive (46 utterances) to transfer knowledge, and affective (27 utterances) to build motivation, with 44 utterances performing dual functions. The integrated Islamic school context demonstrated harmonious integration of Mandarin learning with religious values through multilingual practices involving Mandarin, Indonesian, and Arabic. These findings indicate that directive speech acts effectively manage classroom dynamics while representative acts support material delivery. The study contributes to pragmatic theory in foreign language education and provides practical implications for designing communication strategies in culturally responsive teaching environments.

✉ Corresponding Author:

E-mail: [astiramadhani2905@gmail.com](mailto:astiramadhani2905@gmail.com)  
[arinijunaeny@unm.ac.id](mailto:arinijunaeny@unm.ac.id)  
[jufriandipalewai@gmail.com](mailto:jufriandipalewai@gmail.com)

## INTRODUCTION

Mandarin Chinese holds strategic importance as the world's second most widely spoken language after English, with approximately 1.1 billion speakers globally (Ethnologue, 2023). In Indonesia, Mandarin education is experiencing rapid growth, particularly following the implementation of the Merdeka Curriculum, with increasing numbers of schools offering Mandarin as an elective subject and companies requiring Mandarin proficiency among employees.

Effective language learning depends not only on linguistic competence but also on pragmatic competence the ability to use language appropriately in social contexts (Brown, 2007). Within pragmatics, speech acts constitute a fundamental area of study, examining how utterances perform communicative actions beyond their literal meanings. Searle (1969) categorizes speech acts into five types: representatives (stating facts), directives (requesting actions), commissives (committing to future actions), expressives (expressing psychological states), and declaratives (creating new conditions).

Previous research has demonstrated the significance of speech acts in classroom management and learning interactions. Marizal, Ramadhan, and Thahar (2021) found that directive speech acts significantly influence classroom management in Indonesian language instruction. However, studies specifically examining speech acts in Mandarin language learning at the junior high school level remain limited, particularly in contexts that integrate cultural and religious values.

Cheng Hoo Integrated Islamic Junior High School presents a unique context as an Islamic educational institution that integrates Islamic values with foreign language teaching. This integration creates a multilingual environment where Mandarin, Indonesian, and Arabic coexist in pedagogical interactions, potentially affecting speech act patterns and functions.

This study addresses two research questions: (1) What types of speech acts are used in Mandarin language learning at Cheng Hoo Integrated Islamic Junior High School? (2) What functions do these speech acts serve in the learning process?

### 1. Communication in Educational Settings

Communication in educational contexts involves the process of conveying information between individuals with the aim of mutual influence (Effendy, as cited in Najmi Hayatun, 2020). Effective classroom communication occurs when students comprehend teachers' messages. In Mandarin language learning, this process becomes particularly complex as it involves a foreign language with linguistic and writing systems fundamentally different from Indonesian, requiring culturally appropriate speech acts.

## 1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics, introduced by Charles Morris in 1938, is the branch of linguistics examining language use in context (Suhartono, 2020). Searle (1980) defines pragmatics as the study of how humans utilize language in communication processes, focusing on actions realized through utterances within specific social contexts. Thomas (1995) further conceptualizes pragmatics as "meaning in interaction," emphasizing that meaning-making is a dynamic process involving negotiation between speaker and listener within physical, social, and linguistic contexts.

## 2. Speech Acts Theory (Searle, 1969)

Speech acts theory, originally introduced by Austin (1962) in "How to Do Things with Words," was expanded by Searle (1969). This theory posits that language functions not merely to describe reality but to perform actions. Searle classifies speech acts into three dimensions:

- a. Locutionary Acts: The literal form of utterances, including phonetic (sound production), phatic (syntactic structure), and rhetic (semantic meaning) aspects.
- b. Illocutionary Acts: The communicative intent behind utterances, classified into five categories: representatives (stating facts or beliefs), directives (requesting actions), commissives (committing to future actions), expressives (expressing psychological states), and declaratives (creating new status or conditions).
- c. Perlocutionary Acts: The effects of utterances on listeners (physical actions, verbal responses, emotional changes).

Searle's theory emphasizes the principle of expressibility, which states that any communicative intention can be expressed through language, and felicity conditions, which are requirements for speech acts to be successful (Searle, 1969).

## 3. Language Learning

Language constitutes a system of arbitrary vocal symbols used by society members for communication and self-identification (Kridalaksana, 1985; Depdiknas, 2001). Brown (2007) argues that learning a second or foreign language involves not only understanding grammatical structures but also developing pragmatic competence. In Mandarin learning contexts at the secondary level, this becomes particularly important as students must navigate linguistically and culturally different systems.

#### 4. Functions of Speech Acts in Language Learning

Speech acts in language learning serve multiple communicative functions based on their roles in the pedagogical process (Hasanah, as cited in Anti, 2025):

- a. Cognitive Function: Transferring linguistic knowledge and facilitating comprehension through representative acts and questioning directives.
- b. Affective Function: Building motivation, expressing appreciation, and creating supportive learning environments through expressive and commissive acts.
- c. Conative Function: Directing student actions, managing classroom activities, and maintaining discipline through directive and declarative acts.

These functions often overlap in practice, with single utterances serving multiple pedagogical purposes simultaneously. In multilingual contexts, code-switching between languages adds complexity, as teachers strategically use different languages to optimize these functions while respecting students' cultural and religious identities (García & Wei, 2014).

## METHOD

This study employs a descriptive qualitative method. According to Sugiyono (2016), descriptive qualitative research is a method used to examine objects in their natural setting rather than through experimentation, where the researcher acts as the main instrument.

The research was conducted at Cheng Hoo Integrated Islamic Junior High School in Gowa, South Sulawesi. Data collection took place during two Mandarin language learning sessions with Grade IX students: the first session on September 26, 2025 (70 minutes) and the second session on October 20, 2025 (67 minutes). Data were collected through direct observation, audio recording of teacher-student interactions, and field notes.

Data analysis was based on Searle's (1969) speech act theory, which classifies speech acts into three aspects: locutionary acts (literal form of utterances), illocutionary acts (communicative intent), and perlocutionary acts (effects of utterances). The primary focus was on illocutionary acts, encompassing five categories: representative, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative.

To ensure data validity, this study employed theoretical triangulation and source triangulation. Data were analyzed using Miles and Huberman's (2014) interactive model, which includes data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Distribution of Speech Acts

From a total of 170 utterances analyzed in two learning sessions, the distribution of illocutionary speech acts showed that directive speech acts were most dominant with 58 utterances, followed by representative (23 utterances), declarative (20 utterances), expressive (14 utterances), and commissive (6 utterances). In addition, 49 utterances were identified as locution (literal form). This distribution reflects characteristics of foreign language learning at the secondary level, where teachers play a central role in managing classes and directing learning activities.

**Table 1.** Distribution of Speech Acts Based on Searle's Aspects (1969)

| Aspect of Speech Act      | Session 1 | Session 2 | Total      |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Locution (Literal Form)   | 23        | 26        | 49         |
| Directive Illocution      | 29        | 29        | 58         |
| Representative Illocution | 10        | 13        | 23         |
| Declarative Illocution    | 12        | 8         | 20         |
| Expressive Illocution     | 7         | 7         | 14         |
| Commissive Illocution     | 4         | 2         | 6          |
| <b>Total Utterances</b>   | <b>85</b> | <b>85</b> | <b>170</b> |

#### 1. Locutionary Acts

The analysis of locutionary acts shows that the teacher used a variety of Mandarin sentence structures. Of the 49 locutionary utterances, 30 were classified as semantic/rhetic locutions with complete structure and meaning, such as:

Example 1:

Utterance: "班长" Bānzhǎng (Class monitor)

Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance "班长" consists of a single word without a predicate or complete sentence, categorizing it as phonetic locution. This word is a simple call consisting of syllables in Mandarin, literally meaning "class monitor." Based on researcher observations, the teacher did not need to provide additional explanation as students already understood this utterance.

Example 2:

Utterance: "不要笑!" Bùyào xiào! (Don't laugh)

Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance was used by the teacher to reprimand students who started joking. Its syntactic structure clearly follows the negation pattern 不要 + verb 笑, thus categorized as phatic locution. The pattern 不要 + V is an imperative structure.

Example 3:

Utterance: "我现在有两个选择" Wǒ xiànzài yǒu liǎng gè xuǎnzé (I now have two choices)

Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance expresses the proposition that the teacher has two options for the next learning step. This utterance has a complete declarative structure with subject (我), time adverb (现在), verbal predicate (有), and object (两个选择). This utterance is informative and shows complete semantic structure.

## 2. Directive Speech Acts

Directive speech acts dominated classroom interactions with 58 utterances from a total of 170 analyzed utterances. This dominance reflects characteristics of foreign language learning at the secondary level, where teachers play a central role in managing classes and directing learning activities (Searle, 1969). Subtypes of directive acts included:

- a. Commanding (15 utterances)
- b. Asking (18 utterances)
- c. Requesting (9 utterances)
- d. Reprimanding (8 utterances)
- e. Prohibiting (4 utterances)
- f. Suggesting (4 utterances)

Example 4: Commanding

Utterance: "打开你们的书" Dǎkāi nǐmen de shū (Open your books)

Interaction: Teacher→ Student

In the first session, the teacher used the sentence "打开你们的书" (Open your book) to start a reading activity. This sentence was uttered when some students had not yet opened their books and were still interacting with their seatmates. Using a straightforward imperative statement, the teacher guided students to immediately open their books so the entire class would be ready to engage in the learning process.

Example 5: Asking

Utterance: "谁能告诉老师?" Shéi néng gàosù lǎoshī (Who can tell the teacher?)

Interaction: Teacher→ Student

In this utterance, the teacher asked the question "谁可以告诉老师?" (Who can tell the teacher?).

Although in the form of a question, the teacher's main intention was not just to get an answer, but to encourage students to provide a response and demonstrate their understanding.

#### Example 6: Requesting

Utterance: "老师，我想去厕所" Lǎoshī, wǒ xiǎng qù cèsuǒ (Teacher, I want to go to the toilet)

Interaction: Student→Teacher

In this utterance, a student requested permission from the teacher with the statement "老师，我想去厕所" (Teacher, I want to go to the toilet). This utterance reflects that the student understands the value of politeness in the classroom environment and asks for permission before leaving their seat.

#### Example 7: Reprimanding

Utterance: "Raflī, Furqon! 请站起来!" Raflī, Furqon! Qǐng zhàn qǐlái! (Raflī, Furqon! Stand up!)

Interaction: Teacher→Student

In the same session, the teacher reprimanded two students who were disrupting the learning process with the utterance "Raflī, Furqon! 请站!" (Raflī, Furqon! Stand!). This utterance not only functions as an instruction but also contains elements of correction and warning about student behavior.

#### Example 8: Prohibiting

Utterance: "安静!" Ānjìng! (Quiet!)

Interaction: Teacher→Student

The teacher also used prohibition statements such as "安静!" Quiet! (prohibiting noise) when some students started being noisy while the teacher was explaining the lesson. This statement indicates that the teacher attempted to stop inappropriate behavior so students' attention would return to the lesson.

#### Example 9: Suggesting

Utterance: "大家好好复习了 在 HSK 一到二" Dàjiā hǎohǎo fùxíle zài HSK yī dào èr (Everyone, review HSK 12 well) Interaction: Teacher→Student

The utterance "大家好好复习了 在 HSK 一到二" (review HSK 12 well) delivered in session 2 is a directive illocutionary speech act subtype suggesting. This utterance aims to give students advice to conduct independent learning activities in the form of reviewing HSK level 1 and 2 material outside class hours.

#### Example 10: Asking Additional

Utterance: "今天你们最近怎么样?" Jīntiān nǐmen zuìjìn zěnmeyàng? (How have you all been recently?) Interaction: Teacher→Student

This utterance is a directive illocutionary act subtype asking. The teacher uses this question to build rapport with students at the beginning of learning. Although in the form of a question about wellbeing, its main function is to create a warm classroom atmosphere and prepare students psychologically for learning. This strategy is effective in reducing language anxiety and creating a supportive learning

environment.

#### Example 11: Asking Checking Understanding

Utterance: "看到了? 清楚吗? 清楚了?" Kàn dào le? Qīngchǔ ma? Qīngchǔ le? (Can you see it? Is it clear? Clear now?) Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance is a series of confirmation questions used by the teacher to ensure all students can clearly see the writing on the board. This is a directive illocutionary act asking with cognitive conative function: checking students' visual understanding (cognitive) and ensuring they are ready to follow the lesson (conative). The use of three consecutive questions shows the teacher's concern for ensuring all students can access the learning material well.

### 3. Representative Speech Acts

Representative speech acts numbered 23 utterances in this research. This type of speech act was used by teachers to share factual information and explain learning materials.

Subtypes included:

- a. Explaining (12 utterances)
- b. Stating facts (11 utterances)

#### Example 12: Stating Facts

Utterance: "在星期三, 老师给好你们一个语言主题" Zài xīngqīsān, lǎoshī gěi hǎo nǐmen yíge yǔyán zhǔtí (On Wednesday, the teacher gave you a language theme)

Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance is a representative speech act subtype stating facts. The teacher informs about learning activities that took place in the previous meeting, namely giving a certain language theme. This utterance is used by the teacher to remind students about previous learning activities so they can connect old material with material to be learned in that session.

#### Example 13: Explaining

Utterance: "不是就是 digunakan untuk aktivitas yang terjadi dalam satu waktu" (不是...就是... is used for activities that occur at one time) Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance represents a representative speech act subtype explaining. The teacher clarifies the usage of the grammatical structure 不是...就是..., which expresses two alternative activities or choices occurring simultaneously. The explanation follows a scaffolded pedagogical approach: the teacher writes the structure on the board, provides the Indonesian equivalent "kalau bukan...maka..." for comprehension support, and concludes with a functional explanation of appropriate usage contexts. This multi-step strategy facilitates students' connection between the new grammatical form and its communicative function in Mandarin discourse.

#### Example 14: Claiming

Utterance: "Kayaknya Ilham memang susah menulis hanzi." (It seems Ilham is indeed having difficulty writing hanzi) Interaction Teacher→ Student

This utterance is a representative speech act subtype claiming, because the teacher conveys a subjective assessment considered true based on continuous observation of the student named Ilham's hanzi writing ability. Unlike objective factual statements that can be directly verified such as "Ilham hasn't finished writing," this utterance contains the teacher's personal interpretation using the modality "kayaknya" (seems like) indicating this is a claim.

### 4. Declarative Speech Acts

This study identified 20 declarative speech acts, which possess distinctive characteristics of changing reality or conditions through the utterance itself (Searle, 1969).

Subtypes included:

- a. Authorizing (7 utterances)
- b. Determining (5 utterances)
- c. Deciding (5 utterances)
- d. Punishing (3 utterances)

#### Example 15: Determining

Utterance: "十九八七六五四三二一!" Shí jiǔ bā qī liù wǔ sì sān èr yī! (Nine eight seven six five four three two one!) Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance is a declarative speech act subtype determining. The teacher conducts a countdown to set a time limit for students who are still tidying up their books. Illocutionary, the teacher creates a condition of formal obligation through language when the count reaches number one, students who have not completed the task will receive a point deduction.

#### Example 16: Authorizing

Utterance: "准备!" Zhǔnbèi (Prepare!) Interaction: Class Monitor→All Students

This utterance falls into the declarative speech act subtype authorizing. The utterance "准备" delivered by the class monitor is not just a direction to prepare, but functions to change the class state from an informal state (before the lesson starts) to a formal learning situation. Illocutionarily, this utterance authorizes the start of the lesson, so after being uttered, all students must be in a ready-to-learn condition.

#### Example 17: Punishing

Utterance: "Rafli, Furqon! 请站!" Rafli, Furqon! Qǐng zhàn! (Rafli, Furqon! Stand!)

Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance is a declarative speech act subtype punishing. The teacher instructs two students to stand as a

form of sanction because both were caught chatting with each other and not paying attention to the lesson. This punishment is a class habit or may have become a class rule because it is already understood by students so the utterance is immediately obeyed without needing additional explanation, namely students who do not focus will be punished to stand until the lesson is finished.

#### Example 18: Deciding

Utterance: "Oke, karena sudah mau shalat, 我们要祈祷(Wǒmen yào qídǎo we will pray)" Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance is a declarative speech act subtype deciding because the teacher directly determines that the learning process will be stopped and students must switch to the activity of finishing class prayer and continuing to perform shalat. This utterance is not just an announcement but creates a new decision that changes the direction of class activities through the teacher's words.

### 5. Expressive Speech Acts

This study identified 14 expressive speech acts, which express psychological attitudes of teachers or students toward specific situations (Searle, 1969).

Subtypes included:

- a. Praising (8 utterances)
- b. Criticizing (3 utterances)
- c. Complaining (3 utterances)

#### Example 19: Praising

Utterance: "对, 非常好" Duì, fēicháng hǎo (Correct, very good) Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance falls into the subtype praising, this utterance appears dominant in learning sessions. This utterance appears when students give the right answer, and the teacher responds with positive appreciation. Illocutionary, the teacher not only states agreement with the student's answer but also conveys appreciation that can build student motivation and confidence.

#### Example 20: Criticizing

Utterance: "Astaghfirullah" Interaction: Teacher→Student

This utterance falls into the subtype criticizing, because this speech act is used to mark dissatisfaction. The utterance "Astaghfirullah" is uttered by the teacher when finding students not focused during ongoing learning activities. Illocutionary, this utterance is a form of indirect criticism containing implicit reprimand. The use of religious phrases becomes a subtle but forceful pragmatic strategy toward changing student behavior.

#### Example 21: Complaining

Utterance: "Haiiiii" (complaining sound) Interaction: Student → Student

This utterance is included in the subtype complaining through the expression "Haiiiii", which appears as students' response to the audio played being too long, this utterance is expressed not to directly reject learning, but to show feelings of boredom and fatigue from listening to long audio. Complaining utterances express emotional conditions experienced by students without changing the learning activity structure.

## 6. Commissive Speech Acts

Commissive speech acts were the least frequently found type in this research, with only 6 utterances from a total of 170 utterances.

Subtypes included:

- a. Committing (3 utterances)
- b. Offering (3 utterances)

### Example 22: Committing

Utterance: "星期一" Xīngqí yī (Monday) Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance is a commissive speech act subtype committing. When the student asks "Kapan PR dikumpulkan?" (When should the homework be submitted?), the teacher responds "星期一" (Monday). Through this answer, the teacher commits to accepting and evaluating the homework on Monday. By setting this specific deadline, the teacher binds themselves to take action on that day, creating an obligation to receive and grade the submitted assignments. This establishes a clear commitment between teacher and student regarding the homework deadline.

### Example 23: Offering

Utterance: "Ok 朋友们 我们一起都学习了" Oky péngyǒumen wǒmen yīqǐ dōu xuéxíle (Okay, let's study together) Interaction: Teacher→ Student

This utterance represents a commissive speech act subtype offering. Rather than issuing a directive, the teacher proposes a collaborative learning activity, as evidenced by the inclusive marker "一起" (together). This lexical choice not only invites student participation but also commits the teacher to joint engagement in the proposed activity, distinguishing it from a command that would place obligation solely on students.

## Perlocutionary Effects

From 108 identified perlocutionary effects, physical actions (compliance) were the most dominant with 41 observations, followed by verbal responses (29), positive emotional changes (18), behavioral changes (14), and negative emotional changes (6).

### Example 24: Physical Action

When the teacher uttered "打开你们的书" Dǎkāi nǐmen de shū (Open your books), the previously quiet classroom atmosphere immediately changed to become more orderly. Students immediately took their books

and opened them without anyone asking questions or delaying.

#### Example 25: Verbal Response

In Example 24, when the teacher asked the question "谁可以告诉老师?" Shéi kěyǐ gàosù lǎoshī? (Who can tell the teacher?), the classroom atmosphere became more dynamic. Several students quickly raised their hands, indicating they had the desire to convey opinions, and some directly answered after being given the opportunity.

#### Example 26: Positive Emotional Change

When the teacher gave praise with the words "对,非常好" Duì, fēicháng hǎo (Correct, very good), the faces of students in the classroom showed clear changes. Students who had answered previously appeared to smile widely and show pride, while other students showed greater enthusiasm to participate in the next opportunity.

#### Example 27: Behavioral Change

The teacher uttered two student names and gave the direction "Rafli, Furqon! 请站!" Rafli, Furqon! Qǐng zhàn! (Rafli, Furqon! Stand!). As soon as that utterance was uttered, both students immediately stood up, indicating compliance with the teacher's instruction. However, the impact did not stop there, other students who were previously noisy or not concentrating also fell silent and paid attention.

#### Example 28: Negative Emotional Change

The teacher applied a countdown system "十九八七六五四三二一!" Shí jiǔ bā qī liù wǔ sì sān èr yī! (Nine eight seven six five four three two one!) to create a sense of urgency. Within seconds, almost all students quickly organized their books to not be late in completing tasks. Although this physical action went well, some students appeared rushed, anxious, or felt pressured by the condition.

### Functions of Speech Acts in Learning

Analysis of speech acts in this study was based on communicative language functions, specifically three main functions relevant to learning: cognitive function (referential), affective function (emotive), and conative function (directive).

**Table 2.** Distribution of Speech Act Functions in Learning

| Learning Function  | Session<br>1 | Session<br>2 | Total | Dominant Illocution Type                   |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------------------------------------|
| Cognitive Function | 24           | 22           | 46    | Representative, Directive<br>(questioning) |
| Affective Function | 14           | 13           | 27    | Expressive, Commissive                     |
| Conative Function  | 35           | 33           | 68    | Directive, Declarative                     |

| Learning Function                     | Session<br>1 | Session<br>2 | Total      | Dominant Illocution Type               |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|------------|----------------------------------------|
| Dual Function (Cognitive<br>Conative) | 15           | 14           | 29         | Directive (questioning,<br>commanding) |
| Dual Function (Affective<br>Conative) | 8            | 7            | 15         | Expressive (praising),<br>Directive    |
| <b>Total</b>                          | <b>96</b>    | <b>89</b>    | <b>185</b> |                                        |

### 1. Conative Function

The conative function dominated with 68 utterances, directing students to perform specific physical or verbal actions aligned with learning objectives.

Example 29:

Utterance: "打开你们的书" Dǎkāi nǐmen de shū (Open your books) Context: Teacher → Students

This directive clearly instructs students to prepare their learning materials. Students' immediate compliance—opening books without hesitation—demonstrates successful achievement of the conative function. Such utterances are essential for classroom management and maintaining learning flow, creating structured transitions between activities.

### 2. Cognitive Function

The cognitive function comprised 46 utterances, facilitating knowledge transfer and activating mental processes necessary for language acquisition.

Example 30:

Utterance: "谁可以告诉老师?" Shéi kěyǐ gàosù lǎoshī? (Who can tell the teacher?) Context: Teacher → Students

This questioning directive serves a cognitive function by stimulating retrieval processes the mental activity of accessing stored information from memory. Rather than simply testing comprehension, such questions engage students in active knowledge construction, encouraging them to articulate their understanding in Mandarin. This cognitive engagement is crucial for moving linguistic knowledge from passive recognition to active production.

### 3. Affective Function

Although less frequent with 27 utterances, the affective function plays a vital role in reducing psychological barriers and fostering motivation in foreign language learning.

Example 31:

Utterance: "很好!" Hěn hǎo! (Very good) Context: Teacher → Student

This expressive praise serves an affective function by providing positive reinforcement that builds learner confidence and creates a psychologically supportive classroom environment. In foreign language contexts where learners may experience heightened anxiety due to linguistic distance from their native language, such affective support is particularly important for lowering the affective filter and encouraging risk-taking in language production (Krashen, 1982).

### **Integrated Islamic School Context**

The unique context of Cheng Hoo Integrated Islamic Junior High School manifested distinctively through two interconnected dimensions: the integration of Islamic values and multilingual code-switching practices.

**Integration of Islamic Values:** Religious expressions permeated pedagogical communication, exemplified by the teacher's use of "Astaghfirullah" when expressing disapproval of student behavior. This utterance functioned simultaneously as linguistic criticism and religious reminder, embedding moral guidance within language instruction. Additionally, structured prayer rituals framed each learning session, with opening and closing prayers conducted in Arabic, creating a spiritual dimension to language learning.

**Multilingual Practices:** Classroom discourse involved strategic code-switching among Mandarin (target language), Indonesian (primary shared language), and Arabic (religious language). Teachers employed Indonesian for complex grammatical explanations, Mandarin for skill development, and Arabic for religious expressions. This translanguaging practice (García & Wei, 2014) allowed teachers to optimize comprehension while maintaining students' cultural and religious identities within the foreign language learning context.

These contextual features demonstrate that foreign language education in integrated Islamic schools operates within a complex sociolinguistic ecology where linguistic, cultural, and religious identities are negotiated simultaneously. Speech acts in this context carry multiple layers of meaning pedagogical, cultural, and spiritual creating a distinctive model of culturally responsive language teaching.

## CONCLUSION

This study reveals that speech acts in Mandarin language learning at Cheng Hoo Integrated Islamic Junior High School comprise five categories of illocutionary acts, with directive speech acts dominating (58 utterances), followed by representative (23), declarative (20), expressive (14), and commissive (6). Directive speech acts play an effective role in classroom management and organizing learning activities, while representative speech acts support the transfer of linguistic knowledge.

The functions of speech acts include the conative function (68 utterances) to encourage student action, the cognitive function (46 utterances) to transfer knowledge, and the affective function (27 utterances) to build motivation. There are also dual functions (44 utterances) that indicate the complexity of pedagogical interaction. These three main functions support one another in creating holistic learning.

The integrated Islamic school context enriches learning dynamics through harmonious integration between Mandarin language learning and religious values. The use of religious expressions in pedagogical communication strategies creates an inclusive learning environment that is responsive to students' cultural and religious identities.

These findings contribute to the development of pragmatic theory in the context of foreign language learning, particularly in educational settings that integrate local cultural and religious values. This study also provides practical implications for Mandarin teachers in designing effective communication strategies to support learning objectives.

## REFERENCES

- Anti. 2025. Tindak tuturnya guru pada pembelajaran bahasa dan sastra Indonesia SMPN 2 Muara Wahau. *Jurnal Sosial dan Teknologi*, 5, 11–24.
- Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brown, H. D. 2007. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2001. *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia* (3rd ed.). Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

Ethnologue. 2023. Mandarin Chinese. In *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (26th ed.).

SIL International.

García, O., & Wei, L. 2014. *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education*.

London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kridalaksana, H. 1985. *Kamus Linguistik*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Marizal, Y., Ramadhan, S., & Thahar, H. E. 2021. Tindak Tutur Direktif Guru dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia di SMA Negeri 2 Gunung Talang. *Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra dan Pengajarannya*, 4(2), 441–452.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Najmi Hayatun. 2020. Teori Belajar Bahasa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 7, 100–115.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. 2014. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. 1979. *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. 1980. The background of meaning. In J. R. Searle, F. Kiefer, & M. Bierwisch (Eds.), *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics* (pp. 221–232). D. Reidel.

Sugiyono. 2016. *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Suhartono. 2020. *Pragmatik konteks Indonesia*. Gresik: Penerbit Graniti.

Thomas, J. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Longman.