JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching
https://e-journal.undikma.ac.id/index.php/jollt
Email: jollt@undikma.ac.id
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v12i3.11001

July 2024. Vol.12, No.3
p-ISSN: 2338-0810
e-ISSN: 2621-1378
pp. 1191-1206

CONVERSATIONAL ANALYSIS: TYPES AND FUNCTION OF SPEECH ACTS IN EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTIONS

Hieronimus Canggung Darong
English Language Education, Universitas Katolik Indonesia Santu Paulus Ruteng, East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia

Corresponding Author Email: hieronimusdarong@gmail.com

Article Info
Article History
Received: April 2024
Revised: May 2024
Published: July 2024

Keywords
Conversational analysis;
Authority;
Speech acts;
Classroom interaction;
Learning environment;

Abstract

Understanding speech act production in EFL classroom interactions is crucial for enhancing teaching effectiveness and student engagement, as it sheds light on how language is used to convey meaning and manage social interactions in the learning environment. The purpose of this study was to analyze the speech act types and functions that were used by an EFL teacher and their students during classroom interactions. Observational data was collected and analyzed according to Conversation Analysis standards (CA). The findings of the study revealed that the types of speech acts produced by the teacher and students were influenced by their respective roles and statuses. Although the students produced fewer speech acts, they served the same functions as the teacher's speech acts in terms of controlling and managing classroom interactions. As a result, the speech acts of both the students and teacher distributed authority in different ways during turn-taking and commodity exchanges. The practical knowledge and pedagogical use of the teacher-student relationship as a unique social event in the classroom context has the potential to effectively manage classroom interactions.

How to cite: Darong, H.C. (2024). Conversational Analysis: Types and Function of Speech Acts in EFL Classroom Interactions. *JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching,* 12(3), 1191-1206, DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v12i3.11001

INTRODUCTION

Investigating speech act production in EFL classroom interactions is of benefit to know how language is utilized to express intentions, negotiate social roles, and convey meaning. Through an examination of speech act types and functions, scholars and teachers can identify patterns and techniques that support efficient communication and learning outcomes. Teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL) benefit greatly from this knowledge since it enables them to modify their teaching strategies to accommodate the various language and communication needs of their students (Husna, Rahman, & Abduh, 2022). Furthermore, understanding the dynamics of speech act production can promote a more inclusive and collaborative learning environment, where students feel empowered to actively participate in classroom discussions and activities. Thus, research on speech act contributes to the theoretical understanding of language use and has implications for enhancing instruction and student participation in EFL classes.

In the field of language learning, progress reports have utilized pragmatics to investigate how to enable learners to generate English as a second or foreign language. These reports begin by exploring different research types and the findings that illustrate how learners produce language. The study is focused on pragmatic language production, classroom interaction, teacher talks, questioning behavior, and other aspects of pragmatics (Bahing, Emzir, & Rafli, 2018; Boyd, 2015; Yetti, 2018).

Research on pragmatic-related issues in the context of EFL generally takes the form of interventional studies and observational studies (Martínez-Flor, 2013). Interventional studies

aim to address deliberate interventions used in a classroom setting to teach students certain pragmatic aspects of the target language. They investigate whether specific pragmatic components can be taught effectively, and whether the methods, approaches, and tactics used are successful in achieving this goal. Thus, the classroom is viewed as a space where students can acquire new information through carefully planned pedagogical activities that focus on pragmatics acquisition through language and action. Observational studies, on the other hand, involve the researcher investigating pragmatic concerns in a real classroom using the target language. The primary goal is to characterize any areas or features that may impact how the target language is acquired pragmatically.

Interventional studies have been conducted on pragmatic-related topics, focusing on the ability to teach various pragmatic aspects such as learning objectives, tasks, and instructional principles. These studies are closely related to specific instructional approaches, both implicit and explicit, which aim to promote pragmatic development in the classroom context (Bardovi-Harlig, Mossman, & Su, 2017; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2015; Limberg, 2016; Taguchi, Xiao, & Li, 2016; Taguchi, 2012; Tajeddin & Moghadam, 2012; Tajeddin & Pezeshki, 2014). Other studies aim to assist students in developing a deep and conceptual understanding of various contexts using specific methodologies and guiding principles (Carassa & Colombetti, 2015; Cohen, 2015; Limberg, 2015, 2016; Nicholas, 2015; Siegel, 2016; Tromp, Hagoort, & Meyer, 2016; Youn, 2014).

Observational studies have also been a focus of researchers in the field. For example, previous research has found that the creation of speech acts is influenced by pragmatic input. Therefore, it is recommended that clear input be provided to facilitate effective language development (Meihami & Khanlarzadeh, 2015; Thi, Nguyen, Pham, & Pham, 2015). Other studies have highlighted the role of factors such as L1, status, social distance, power, and rank as dynamic and complex processes that affect learners' creation of speech acts (Eshghinejad & Moini, 2016; Holmes, 2000; Ren & Gao, 2012; Wijayanto, Prasetyarini, & Hikmat, 2017; Zhu, 2012). Therefore, it is important for teachers to be aware of the input and methods that can assist learners in their language production.

Several studies have examined teachers' pragmatic strategies in classroom interactions, revealing the importance of not only the content of their speech acts, but also the manner in which they convey messages to language learners during activities (Darong, 2020; Darong et al., 2021; Lin, 2015; Ren & Gao, 2012; Saleem et al., 2021). However, these studies have neglected to explore the types and functions of speech acts that teachers employ to control classroom discourse. Classrooms are not only places of language learning, but also arenas where teachers and students engage in speech acts and information exchanges for achieving learning objectives. It is a social event, and can be seen as a mini-society with its own customs, rituals, and norms. Understanding the practical knowledge and pedagogical use of the classroom teacher-student interactions, as a unique social event within the classroom context, can be advantageous for fostering better classroom interactions. Therefore, this study aims to answer the research question: What are the types and functions of speech acts produced by EFL teachers and students during classroom interactions?

By offering a thorough investigation of speech act within the particular setting of EFL classroom interactions, this study adds to the body of current literature. While language use and communication patterns in a variety of educational contexts have been studied in the past, this study provides a targeted analysis into the dynamics of speech actions between teachers and students in the context of English as a foreign language (EFL). This study attempts to provide a fresh viewpoint on language instruction and pedagogy by using Conversation Analysis techniques to unearth nuanced insights into how language is used to manage authority and enhance learning within the EFL classroom.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Types and Function of Speech Act

Austin introduced the term "speech act" in 1962, which was later refined by Searle in 1969. According to Austin, speech acts are any language expression that serves a performative purpose, such as inviting, celebrating, warning, provoking, ordaining, and so forth. The type of speech act used depends on the context and is classified into three categories: locutionary, which deals with the literal meaning; illocutionary, which deals with the intended meaning; and perlocutionary, which deals with the actual consequence or effect (Yazdanfar & Bonyadi, 2016).

Following the Austin theory, Searle (1969) categorized illocutionary acts into five types: assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative. Later, this classification was expanded to six by adding the question category. Clark eventually created seven categories from these six, which include assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, effective, verdictive, and quotation. Regardless of the number and types of categories determined by various scholars, each category has a unique communicative purpose that works together with a specific context. In contrast, Bach & Harnish (1979) categorized speech acts into constative, directive, commissive, and acknowledgments.

Based on their functions, Bach and Harnish (1979) as cited in Azhari, Priono & Nuriadi (2018) classified speech acts, and each type serves different purposes. The constative type includes functions such as assertive, predictive, retrodictive, descriptive, ascriptive, informative, confirmative, concessive, retractive, assentive, disentives, disputive, responsive, suggestive, and supportive. Directive, on the other hand, serves six functions, including requestive, questions, requirements, prohibitive, permissive, and advisories. Commissive, meanwhile, serves only two functions, namely stating promises and offering (volunteer/bid). Finally, acknowledgment has eight functions, including apologizing, condoling, congratulating, greeting, thanking, bidding, accepting, and rejecting. In the educational context, Edmonson-House in Trosborg (1994) proposed another type of speech act called didactic, which has instructional functions that benefit both teachers and students in the teaching-learning process. According to Johnson (1997), cited in Sumedi & Dery Rovino (2020), and Coulthard, (1985), these functions include control and organizational function, motivational function, and evaluative function.

In the context of EFL classroom, the functions in question appear following discourse moves of teacher- students and students- students' interactions. In this regard, discourse moves is associated with the preceding and following context of utterances. Therefore, to express oneself in various ways, like giving orders, making statements, or asking questions, one must not only observe the world but also interact with those around them (Carr, Schrock, & Dauterman, 2012). Likely, to comprehend speech act theory, one must not only have linguistic proficiency but also understand the meaning behind the words and how speakers interact with each other to express meaning using syntactic patterns (Christison, 2018). Thus, integral to types, speech acts are concerned with language function, embedding both reality and meaning.

Language teachers might encounter difficulties when trying to understand speech acts. Cohen (2015) suggests that the inability to analyze speech acts in isolated pairs might arise from the lack of integration into a larger conversation where speech acts are expressed over several turns. Oversimplification of speech acts is the notion that speech acts can be understood as a single utterance or in pairs. Therefore, speech acts should be comprehended in the context of the whole conversation. To achieve this level of understanding, Nicholas (2015) asserts that language learners must fully grasp speech acts as they appear in genuine conversations, such as those that occur in classroom interactions.

Understanding speech acts is crucial for the development of other pragmatic features such as politeness, as stated by Taguchi et al. (2016), Tajeddin & Pezeshki (2014), and Wijayanto et al. (2017). These scholars argue that social distance between speakers, status levels, and speech acts can affect the frequency and use of politeness strategies. Moreover, successful comprehension of speech acts depends on learners' ability to interpret the cultural and linguistic context of the target language, as argued by Ren & Gao (2012), Saleem, Anjum, & Tahir (2021), Taguchi (2018), and Tamimi Sa'd & Mohammadi (2014). Failure to do so may result in negative pragmatic transfer. To avoid this, learners must not only develop metapragmatic awareness and pragmatic skills but also be made aware of potential pragmatic consequences of their language choices, as suggested by Economidou-kogetsidis (2015), Siegel (2015, 2016).

Apart from other factors, pragmatic motivation, input, and learners' approach have a significant impact on the development of speech acts. Tajeddin and Moghadam (2012) have demonstrated that motivation plays a crucial role in increasing L2 pragmatic production. Additionally, other researchers, such as Limberg (2016), Meihami and Khanlarzadeh (2015), Thi et al. (2015), and Thuy, Nguyen, Hanh, and Tam (2012), acknowledge the importance of input in assisting students with the production of speech acts. Furthermore, some studies suggest that learners' strategies, such as in requests and apologies, may also affect their production of speech acts. These strategies are linked to both pragmalinguistic proficiency and socio-pragmatic competency, as addressed by Tromp et al. (2016), Yazdanfar and Bonyadi (2016), and Zhu (2012). Limberg (2015) also claims that socio-pragmatic competencies work together to enhance the development of speech acts.

Furthermore, the method, approach, and tactic of teaching and learning activities have an influence on the production of speech acts. These factors can assist students in comprehending both the content and form of their utterances. An effective teaching strategy and methodology promote the enhancement of students' pragmatic abilities, resulting in language production and input exposure during interaction (Cohen, 2015; Couper & Watkins, 2016; Nguyen et al., 2020; Taguchi, 2018).

Although the previous studies provide positive outcomes, there is still a need for further research in this area. According to these studies, speech acts are influenced by various factors including input from teachers and students, as well as motivation, approach, and strategy. These studies mainly focus on how students produce language in the classroom. However, the specific types and functions of speech acts in the actual dialogues of classroom interactions have not been thoroughly investigated.

Teachers and students can both benefit from studying speech acts, as it can provide teachers with knowledge about the different types and functions of speech acts that either improve or detract from classroom interactions. In order to build a better understanding of the complex relationships and learning opportunities within the classroom, it is important to know how to properly use speech acts and assign appropriate functions (Canh & Renandya, 2017; Claessens et al., 2016). When learners are able to produce language and actions in response to teacher inquiries or other inputs, they are motivated to address both macro and micro linguistic aspects. Additionally, studying speech acts can provide solutions to difficult scenarios that teachers may encounter in the classroom. This can lead to more frequent dialogic teaching and meaning negotiation, resulting in mutual understanding between teachers and students in terms of information sharing and language development.

Conversation Analysis

Before conducting any study analysis, it is important to consider the methods used to analyze oral discourse in classroom settings. In other words, it is necessary to examine alternative ways of interpreting instructor speech acts in classroom interactions. Interaction

Analysis (IA), Discourse Analysis (DA), and Conversation Analysis are three widely used methodologies in Classroom Discourse Analysis (CA).

Interaction Analysis (IA) focuses on various procedures used to evaluate and explain how students and teachers behave in the classroom, with an emphasis on verbal and nonverbal communication patterns and social correlations that occur in the classroom (Richards & Schmid, 1992). It examines the interactions that take place between students and teachers. On the other hand, Discourse Analysis (DA) deals with spoken and written linguistics and tends to ignore the discourse process, which includes participants like teachers and students. DA is concerned with the linguistic aspects of the speaker as the product of written and oral communication modes (Brown & Yule, 1983). The first two methods allow predetermined structural-functional categories of data that are prescribed or imposed. In contrast, Conversation Analysis describes how meanings and pragmatic purposes are communicated during interactions and examines the structure of speech and the order of taking turns.

For this study, the third methodology, Conversation Analysis (CA), was chosen as the framework for analyzing the data. In the context of a classroom, using CA to demonstrate how meaning is co-constructed, negotiated, and shared by both learners and teachers could be useful. The purpose of applying CA in this study was to examine the utterances of both teachers and students and to enhance the negotiation of meaning during interactions. Unlike Discourse Analysis, which is primarily concerned with the speaker, and Interaction Analysis, which focuses on both verbal and nonverbal communication in the classroom, CA regards the utterances as a collaborative effort between teachers and students, making it the primary focus of the investigation. To reveal how interaction is structured, CA employs detailed transcripts of audio or video recordings.

To use Conversation Analysis in a study, it is necessary to use naturally occurring language samples rather than artificially created ones. The style of language being analyzed also differs, as Conversation Analysis focuses on oral discourse in turn-taking and exchange systems, whereas Discourse Analysis examines both written and oral language, and Interaction Analysis evaluates both verbal and nonverbal cues. These differences are relevant to the topic of the study, which focuses on speech acts used by teachers in their interactions with students, and thus support the use of Conversation Analysis (Marie & Rohan, 2011).

It is essential to stress the four core principles of CA that researchers need to adhere to. The first principle states that all interactions, including turn-taking, are orderly. This means that CA allows researchers to observe interactions as a whole, rather than focusing on just one participant. Both the speaker and the listener co-create the interactions. The second principle pertains to the design of turns. It suggests that each participant's contribution to the exchanges is context-dependent and context-renewing. Each turn in the interaction has a significant impact on the conversation and shapes the turns that follow. The third principle focuses on social action. It posits that individuals use their utterances at different times to accomplish an action, rather than just speaking or using the utterance as it is. Therefore, every action has a specific goal or intention that is evident in the conversation's order where the exchange occurs. The final principle concerns the bottom-up, data-based analysis approach. It highlights that CA is employed because it can identify genuine interactions without assuming the interactions' socio-cultural environment beforehand. These principles are essential to follow when using CA to analyze interactions in a classroom setting (Ghafarpour, 2016; Ingram & Elliott, 2015; Lam, 2018; Marie & Rohan, 2011).

Furthermore, applying CA principles to data analysis allows for the examination of the types and pragmatic functions of teachers' speech acts based on observations made during interactions. This study acknowledges that the classroom setting is dynamic and frequently influenced by turn-taking sequences used by both teachers and students. CA is used to analyze speech acts that affect how information is organized, and the implicit functions that align with

the social action principle of CA are indisputable. A speech act can have more than one type of function, and understanding the meaning based solely on verbal forms is insufficient. According to CA, interactions in which turn-taking occurs must be governed by conventions and regulations. Therefore, a teacher's speech act should not be viewed as a single utterance. Rather, it is shaped and renewed by the context, resulting from a previous move occurring in the turn-taking order or sequence of talk within the interactions that undoubtedly adhere to the CA principles.

For successful interactions between teachers and students, it is crucial for both parties to observe and predict each other's behavior. The ability to predict behavior is possible because of norms and regulations, which are emphasized by the CA principle of turn-taking design that takes context into account. The discourse move principle, which evaluates the types and functions of a teacher's speech acts, is realized through the order of sequence of talk or the turn-taking system that occurs during interactions. Conversation Analysis (CA) principles recognize this arrangement as a result of the meanings and social behaviors of the teacher and students involved in the conversations.

It is worth noting that CA views the classroom context as dynamic and co-created by the teacher and students as participants, reinforced by the multiple linguistic and educational goals present in the classroom. In this context, the data are allowed to speak for themselves, accurately depicting the interactions between teachers and students, and showcasing the teachers' speech acts in the interaction structure (Cancino, 2015).

RESEARCH METHOD

As part of a qualitative methodology, the study uses conversation analysis (CA) to examine teachers' speech acts during classroom interactions in a college context where English is being studied as a foreign language (EFL). This methodological decision was chosen because it carefully examined verbal exchanges, emphasizing sequence organization, turn-taking, and language usage in the classroom. Using CA in a qualitative framework allows the study to analyze the subtleties of classroom interactions in a methodical way, adding credibility and depth to the findings. This approach offers a deep understanding of language use in educational setting by enabling a careful investigation of the underlying rules and norms governing communication. Through CA, the research not only uncovers the intricacies of classroom interactions but also offers valuable insights into the role of language in teaching and learning processes, thereby enhancing the overall depth and validity of the study.

The subject of the study was a sixty-two-year-old professor with twenty-six years of teaching experience, chosen because the research aimed to investigate how oral expression interactions are handled. After obtaining permission from the faculty board and reviewing his academic profiles, he was deemed an appropriate participant due to his exposure to and proficiency in the English language.

The research instrument employed in this study mainly includes audio or video recordings of classroom interactions, along with field notes and possibly transcripts of the recorded interactions. These recordings serve as the cornerstone for conversation analysis, enabling a thorough examination of the teachers and students speech acts within the classroom context. The use of recordings allows researcher to capture the natural flow of communication and analyze the sequential organization of talk in detail. By relying on recordings and field notes, the study ensures a rich and authentic portrayal of classroom discourse, enhancing the depth and validity of the research findings.

Consequently, data collection techniques used by the researcher to understand teachers' speech acts in classroom interactions was through passive observation, which is a type of non-intrusive observation. The researcher was present in the classroom only for observation purposes and did not interact with the teacher or students. Taking notes during observation was essential, but audio recordings were necessary to verify the accuracy of the observational data.

The observed class was transcribed using the conversation analysis convention, based mainly on Jefferson (Hosoda, 2015), which considers the dominant IRE/F interaction pattern in the classroom. The transcript was carefully reviewed, and specific episodes were selected based on how well they contribute to the study's goal of examining the types and functions of teacher and student speech acts. An episode refers to a series of sequences that, taken individually and together, help accomplish a task or activity goal. Each episode involving teacher and student speech acts was examined in detail.

The speech act types in this study adhered to the classification proposed by Bach and Harnish (1979) and Edmonson-House (Trosborg, 1994).and the speech act instructional functions were taken from Johnson (1997) as cited in Sumedi & Dery Rovino (2020) and Coulthard (1985) due to their practical application in classroom interaction analysis. Since Conversation Analysis (CA) was used to analyze the corpus in this study, there was no level, skill, or even content structure for the observed classes. As such, it is used to analyze the actual interactions without presuming the applicability of the sociocultural framework in which the interactions take place.

To counteract potential biases, the researcher utilized verification procedures namely triangulation. In this regard, the researcher employed a variety of data sources and techniques, including field notes from observation sessions and audio and video recordings of classroom activities. This method captured both verbal and non-verbal clues, offering a thorough grasp of communication in the EFL classroom. The researcher reduced the possibility of bias by ensuring consistency and validity in the analysis by comparing and cross-checking data from several sources. Triangulation enhanced the depth of the study and allowed for a comprehensive interpretation of the results by incorporating knowledge from several viewpoints. Ultimately, by providing a strong framework for data gathering and analysis, this meticulous method improved the credibility of the research findings and raised trust in the validity of the study's conclusions.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Applying CA principles to data analysis allows for the examination of the types and pragmatic functions of teachers' speech acts. Based on observations made during interactions, this study acknowledges that the classroom setting is dynamic and frequently influenced by speech acts utterances following turn-taking sequences by both teachers and students. The speech acts uttered during the classroom interactions are shown in the following tables. The data on the types and functions were delivered in turn.

Table 1.
Speech Act Types

No	Illocutionary acts	Performers	
	Types	Students	Teachers
1	Constatives		
	Object/Protest	4	-
	Praise	-	32
	Answer/Reply	98	4
	Deny	4	-
	Describe	-	54
	Inform/tell	-	15
	State	-	119
II	Directives		
	Insist	-	47
	ask	4	115
	Summon/call	3	-
	urge	-	4

No	Illocutionary acts	Performers	
	Types	Students	Teachers
	warn	-	2
	advise	-	3
	forbid	-	6
	suggest	-	6
	Command/instruct	-	58
III	Commissives		
	promise	-	3
	Volunteer/bid	5	-
1V	Acknowledgement		
	thank	2	-
	greet	2	-
V	Didactives		
	correct	1	3
	Evaluate/repeat	2	47

The information in Table 1 indicates the different speech acts—illocutionary acts—that teachers and students have used in the classroom. These acts are divided into types called constatives, directives, commissives, acknowledgement, and didactives. While students primarily respond with replies, teachers primarily engage in constatives, which include activities like praise, answering, describing, informing, and expressing. Teachers mostly use directives to ask questions, provide orders or instructions, and assess or reiterate material; students are less likely to participate in these kinds of directives. The findings also show that students are occasionally involved in commissives like volunteering or bidding, in addition to less common but nonetheless present forms of appreciation like greeting or thanks. Ultimately, both students and teachers employed didactives like correcting and evaluating or repeating information, with teachers being more prominent in these activities. Thus, the data highlights a dynamic exchange of various illocutionary acts between students and teachers, with teachers taking on more directive and evaluative roles while students primarily respond to questions.

Table 2
Function of Speech Acts

Speech Acts	Types	function	
		General	Instructional
Teacher's	Constatives	1. Assertive 2. Informative 3. descriptive	1. Control and organizational 2. Motivational 3. Evaluative
	Directives	1. Requirements 2. Prohibitive 3. Requisites 4. Advisories 5.	Control and organizational
	Commissure	1. Promises 2. Offers	1. Control and organizational 2. Motivational
	Acknowledgement	1. Greet 2. Thank 3. accept	1. Control and organizational 2. Motivational 3. evaluative
	Didactics	1. Disputives 2. Descritpives 3. informatives	1. motivational 2. evaluative 3. control and organizational
Students'	Constatives	Responsive	Control and organizational
	Directives	Requestive	Control and organizational
	Commissive	Offer promise	Motivational
	Acknowledgment	Greet Thank	Control and organizational

	Didactives	Confirmative	Evaluative

The information given (Table 2) highlights the speech acts and how they fit into the classroom interaction. Teachers work primarily with constatives, which include declaratives, informatives, and descriptives. These types of utterances serve functions in control and organization, motivation, and evaluation. Teachers uttered directives in the form of demands, prohibitives, requestives, and advisories, primarily serving as means of organization and control. Teachers' stated complaints contain offers and promises that support organization, incentive, and control. Acknowledgments from teachers consist of greetings, thanks, and acceptance, serving functions in control and organization, motivation, and evaluation. Teachers use disputives, descriptives, and informatives as didactives to help with motivation, assessment, control, and organizing. Conversely, students engaged in constatives primarily through responding speech acts, which primarily fulfill organizational and control functions. The majority of their directives are requests, which also have control and organizational functions. Student comissives are characterized by promises and offers, which are primarily driven by motivational motives. Students' acknowledgments mainly consist of greetings and thanks, serving functions in control and organization. Ultimately, students' didactives are confirmatives, serving evaluative functions. Briefly, the data highlight the intricate dynamics of speech acts between teachers and students within the classroom interactions, each fulfilling specific functions related to control and organization, motivation, and evaluation, with varying emphases.

Discussion

The main findings drawn from the data (Tables 1 and 2), regarding the types and functions of speech acts in the classroom setting provide a thorough analysis of the speech acts that are uttered by the teacher and students, as well as their corresponding functions. Table 1 presents an overview of the distribution of speech acts between teachers and students by classifying them into constatives, directions, commissives, acknowledgment, and didactives. The types and functions of these speech acts are further explained in table 2, which shows that teachers mostly use constatives and directives to serve control and organization, motivating, and evaluation functions. Students' speech acts, on the other hand, are mostly responsive and serve to maintain order and control in the classroom setting.

The focus of this study is on identifying the different types of speech acts produced by teachers and students in classroom interactions, and their corresponding functions. Based on the data presented in Table 1, it is evident that the teacher is the dominant speaker during these interactions, having produced 518 speech acts compared to the students' 125. These speech acts are used to facilitate the teaching-learning process through various discourse moves, with the teacher's constative speech acts serving to express beliefs and intentions that align with the learning objectives.

The teacher's use of constative speech act demonstrates a belief while also expressing an intention that the hearer forms (or maintains) a similar belief (Hafifah, 2020). The teacher in this study is more influential and has a social role in relation to the learning objectives. As a result, stating, praising, informing, responding to, or describing the lesson is common to occur. Additionally, these forms in question performed general functions namely assertive, informative, and descriptive as a result of discourse movements that took place in the class (Table 2). While the majority of the constative speech acts that students generate have a responsive function because they respond to or answer the teacher's queries when the teaching-learning process is in progress (Yes, Sir, we will; Absolutely yes).

T : Today is a speaking class
We try to speak English, OK?
S : Yes, Sir, we will

T : Before we start, I'd like to ask you a question. Have you ever heard thr snow white story?
S : Absolutely yes.
T : Others?
Well, once upon a time there was a young beautiful lady lived in a village

Adding to the instructional function, the constative function has control and organizing, motivating, and evaluative roles in both teacher and student utterances. These duties are strongly tied to the teacher's role in structuring and regulating classroom conversation. It is control and organizational behavior to express or to say (assertively) something in teaching-learning activities, such as learning objectives or explanations (today is a speaking class; we strive to talk). In the meantime, the motivating function is concerned when the instructor, for instance, makes announcements, informs something, commands students, or instructs the students to do something (before we begin, let me ask you a question) (informative). The teacher's description of something, questions, and comments serve as an example of the evaluative function. (Have you ever heard the Snow White story?: Once upon a time,…).

When compared to student-produced directives, teacher-produced directives are much more effective. The teacher appears to be an unavoidable authority figure who controls everything in the classroom because he uses commands to assert his authority and existence. This is because the teacher wants the students to accomplish something, which is referred to as the psychological condition of "wants" (Nisa & Abduh, 2022; Suryandani & Budasih, 2021*)*. The teacher makes an effort to elicit verbal and nonverbal commitments from the pupils for some imminent future course of action. In this study, the teacher's directive speech act typically serves the following purposes: a request (requestive) (could you please), an advising (advisory) (next time, a little faster), a prohibition (prohibitive) (not other pages), and a demand (requirement) (Now, move to page five; Take a look at that page). Differently, students' speech act represents the requestives function. Students responded to the teacher's order by asking, "What about page four?" as is illustrated in the following excerpt:

T : Yeah, now move to page five
S : What about page four?
T : Take a look at that page. No other pages!
T : Well, page five Hello? Page five! Could you, please? Next time, a little bit faster
S : (being silent and opening their books)

The teacher and students utilized directing speech acts to regulate and organize the classroom discourse in terms of instructional function. It has been suggested that the classroom behavior standards are so well-defined that students interpret every teacher utterance as a potential order, and thus follow a broad rule of "scanning" for directed intent. Generally, the imperative or directions are given to subordinates or to those who know each other well, in this case, the teacher and students. Consequently, the teacher's use of directions implies their superiority over the students, who are subordinate to orders and commands. The power dynamics and social distance are factors that influence the form of instructions and the structuring of classroom discourse, as evidenced by studies conducted by Eshghinejad & Moini (2016), Manik & Hutagaol (2015), Tamimi Sa'd & Mohammadi (2014), and Yazdanfar & Bonyadi (2016).

The same as the production of acknowledgements, the production of commissives is in the students' "favor." According to the data in Table 1, the commissives and recognition are exclusively for the students. In terms of commissives, students' speech acts were concerned with a voluntary offer to provide a service or make a bid, which contributed to the conversation

in the classroom. As the teacher got no response from the students he asked for, another student replied (S2 replaced S1 in answering teacher's question). Whereas, teacher's speech commissive speech acts served functions as a promise for the students (A score for you) as shown in the extract below. In this respect, commisive speech acts from the teacher and pupils served an instructionally motivating purpose. The student who responded to the question and the teacher inadvertently encouraged other pupils to respond to all teacher's questions during the teaching-learning process by saying, "A score for you."

T : Answer my question please! OK. You, please! What is the message of the story?
S1 : Silent
S2 : It is about caring and loving each other
T : Good. A score for you.
S : Thank you

Additionally, students' acknowledgment speech acts covered the usual greeting and thank-you behaviors as found in the student's reactions to the teacher's admiration.. These occurred at the start, whilst, and end of class. As a result, it was merely a routine task with little bearing on classroom instructional moves.

The last type of speech act identified in this study is referred to as didactive, which is exclusively used in educational environments. The teacher in the classroom mostly employs didactive speech acts such as correcting, repeating, and evaluating. The teacher's use of these speech acts serves a variety of functions, including disputative, descriptive, and educational purposes. When the teacher questioned the students' answers (What do you mean? Which do you mean, A or B?) it serves disputive function. The utterance of constative was employed in descriptive function to classify, describe, and identify the expression of offering help (Tell him why you chose A). Meanwhile, the informative function served to counsel, inform, tell, or otherwise draw students' attention to anything (Brilliant. Very brilliant). Differently, students' didcative speech act dealt with confirmative function. It was utilized to confirm that the original statement was untrue, and it is confirmed (Tony Sir).

T : What do you mean? Do you mean A or B?
S1 : A
T : Good
T : Then, What else? Common, what else?
S : C
T : I don't think so
S2 : A
T : Good. Brilliant. Very brilliant Ricky. Tell him why you chose A.
S : Tony Sir
T : Sorry, Tony please do that!

In terms of the educational function, the teacher's didactive speech acts govern and organize the conversation in the classroom. The teacher was in charge of managing the commodity exchanges and interaction patterns. Unlikely, the primary focus of students' didactive speech acts was evaluative function. In this case, the student corrected the teacher since he had the student's name in the wrong place.

The results of this study suggest that the interpretation of speech acts must be contextualized within the entire conversation sequence. Context and word choice can be flexible, as evidenced by language input that precedes or follows certain statements, which supports the findings of earlier studies (Economidou-kogetsidis, 2015; Limberg, 2015; Martínez-flor, 2013; Ren & Gao, 2012; Tajeddin & Pezeshki, 2014). Therefore, both teachers and students must be aware of the pragmatic meaning of their language use in relation to the context.

The teacher has the responsibility to choose a subject, break it down into smaller pieces, and prevent digressions and misunderstandings in the classroom. Coulthard (1985) suggested that there are different types of organization and structure in every interaction, and a teacher can approach a lesson from a pedagogical perspective to create a pedagogical structure that shows the steps of the lesson. According to Sinclair et al. (cited in Coulthard, 1985), a lesson has both linguistic and pedagogical structures, and transactions have a structure that is expressed in terms of change.

It is important to recognize that the didactic aspect is a crucial objective of educational communication. Teachers are granted extensive communicative authority because of their expertise and their responsibility to fulfill the objectives of the course (Husna, Rahman, & Abduh, 2022). Given the teacher's social function in the classroom, they have the right to regulate and guide interactions and provide feedback to students on their performance.

Contrary to prior research suggesting that teachers are the sole controllers and managers of classroom activities (Babaii, Parsazadeh, & Moradi, 2018; Sundh, 2017), the current study indicates that students can also act as controllers, managers, and even evaluators. This is supported by certain types of speech acts used to structure and organize classroom discourse. Although it may not be as apparent, this fosters classroom dialogue and promotes patterns of interaction.

In the classroom, active participation and awareness of the nature and purposes of interaction are essential for effective communication. Both teachers and students have responsibilities that, when carried out appropriately, can improve classroom interaction. Successful teaching and learning of a second or foreign language also requires complete engagement in the discourse construction of the language classroom. Conversation analysis suggests that involvement in this context refers to the natural and pragmatic management, use, and production of speech acts and their functions. This study employed conversation analysis to examine naturally occurring language instead of analyzing artificial language, by examining the types and functions of speech acts in their original, authentic settings.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of speech act types and functions in EFL classroom interactions draws attention to the complex dynamics of teacher-student interactions. Teachers typically direct classroom interactions via constatives and directives, and students largely respond to these prompt, which help to maintain order and interactions in the classroom. The results highlight how important it is for teachers to be aware of their speech acts and how they affect students' comprehension and engagement in EFL classes. They also highlight how important good communication strategies are in promoting learning and interaction in the classroom settings.As such, the teacher's role is crucial in establishing a natural EFL classroom environment that facilitates these functions. Furthermore, this study revealed that students can also contribute to achieving speech act functions. Despite their inferior status, they can position themselves as teachers, managers, and controllers by monitoring interactions and speech in the classroom. It is important to note that speech acts made by teachers and students are shaped by context and influenced by preceding actions in turn-taking order or a sequence of talks that follow conversation analysis principles.

However, this study has several limitations. Firstly, only one subject was used in the investigation, and future studies with more participants may provide richer data on speech act productions in classroom interactions. Secondly, since this study was merely observational, conducting interventional research on speech acts in future studies may be more interesting. Additionally, this study's focus on type and function is insufficient to address pragmatic-related features of speech acts. There is a high demand for other topics such as the interventional teaching of speech acts in educational settings.

REFERENCES

Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Azhari, A.S., Priono, & Nuriadi (2018). Speech Acts of Classroom Interaction. International *Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture*, *4*(2), 24-45. Available online at https://sloap.org/journals/index.php/ijllc/

Babaii, E., Parsazadeh, A., & Moradi, H. (2018). The Question of Power in Language Classes from a Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective Once a student, always a student ? *Pragmatics and Society*, *8*(4), 542–570. https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.8.4.04bab

Bach, K., & Harnish, R. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Bahing, Emzir, & Rafli, Z. (2018). English Speech Acts of Illocutionary Force in Class Interaction. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, *9*(3), 113–119. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.9n.3p.113

Bardovi-harlig, K., Mossman, S., &, & Su, Y. (2017). The Effect of Corpus-based Instruction on Pragmatic Routines. *Language Learning & Technology*, *21*(3), 76–103.

Boyd, M. P. (2015). Relations Between Teacher Questioning and Student Talk in One Elementary ELL Classroom. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *47*(3), 370–404. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X16632451

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cancino, M. (2015). Assessing Learning Opportunities in EFL Classroom Interaction : What Can Conversation Analysis Tell Us ? *RELC Journal*, *46*(2), 115–129. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214568109

Canh, L. Van, & Renandya, W. A. (2017). Teachers ' English Proficiency and Classroom Language Use : A Conversation Analysis Study. *RELC Journal*, *48*(1), 67–81. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688217690935

Carassa, A., & Colombetti, M. (2015). Interpersonal Communication as Social Action. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, *45*(4–5), 407–423. https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393115580265

Carr, C. T., Schrock, D. B., & Dauterman, P. (2012). Speech Acts within Facebook Status Messages. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *31*(2), 176–196. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X12438535

Christison, M. (2018). Speech Act Theory and Teaching Speaking. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0712

Claessens, L. C. A., Tartwijk, J. Van, Want, A. C. Van Der, Helena, J. M., Verloop, N., Brok, P. J. D. & Wubbels, T. (2016). Positive Teacher-student Relationships Go beyond the Classroom , Problematic Ones Stay Inside. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *110*(5), 478–493. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2015.1129595

Cohen, A. D. (2015). Teaching Pragmatics in the Foreign Language Classroom : Grammar as a Communicative Resource, (July). https://doi.org/10.2307/41756418

Coulthard, M. 1985. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysi*s. Essex: Longman Group, Ltd.

Couper, G., & Watkins, A. (2016). Teaching the Sociocultural Norms of an Undergraduate Community of Practice. *Tesol Journal*, *7*(1), 4–39. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.187

Darong, H. C. (2020). Pragmatic Strategy of Indonesian English Teachers in Questioning. *JELTL (Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics)*, *5*(2), 145–162. https://doi.org/(doi: 10.21462/jeltl.v5i2.398)

Darong, H. C. (2021). Interpersonal Function of Joe Biden's Victory Speech (Systemic Functional Linguistics View). *Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation Volume*, *5*(1), 57–66. Retrieved from

https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JERE%0AInterpersonal

Darong, H. C., Kadarisman, A. E., & Basthomi, Y. (2020). Politeness Markers in Teachers' Request in Classroom Interactions. *Nobel, Journal of Literature and Language Teaching*, *11*(2), 217–233. https://doi.org/10.15642/NOBEL.2020.11.2.217-233

Darong, H. C., Kadarisman, A. E., Basthomi, Y., Suryati, N., Hidayati, M., & Niman, E. . (2020). What Aspects of Questions Do Teachers Give Attention To? *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, *10*(11), 191–208.

Darong, H. C., Niman, E. M., Su, Y. R., & Fatmawati. (2021). Pragmatic Function of Questioning Act in EFL Classroom Interaction. In : *1st ICEHHA* (pp. 1–16). Ruteng: EUDL (European Digital Library). https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.3-6-2021.2310650

Economidou-kogetsidis, M. (2015). Teaching Email Politeness in the EFL / ESL Classroom. *ELT Journal*, *69*(4), 415–424. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv031

Eshghinejad, S., & Moini, M. R. (2016). Politeness Strategies Used in Text Messaging : Pragmatic Competence in an Asymmetrical Power Relation of Teacher – Student, *2016*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016632288

Ghafarpour, H. (2016). Classroom Conversation Analysis and Critical Reflective Practice : Self-evaluation of Teacher Talk Framework in Focus. *RELC Journal*, *48*(2), 210–225. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216631173

Hafifah, M. (2020). Constative and Performative Utterances in Jokowi's Speeches. *Wahana Inovasi*, *9*(1), 85-91. Available online at: https://jurnal.uisu.ac.id/index.php/wahana/article/view/2649

Holmes, J. (2000). Politeness, power and provocation: how humor functions in the workplace. *Discourse Studies*, *2*(2), 159–185. https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1177/1461445600002002002

Hosoda, Y. (2015). Teacher Deployment of ' oh ' in Known-answer Question Sequences. *Classroom Discourse*, *7*(1), 58–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2015.1099111

Husna, A, Rahman, A, & Abduh, A. (2022). Analysis of Speech Acts Used by EFL Teachers in Class Interaction: A Case Study at High School Bosowa Makassar. P*inisi Journal of Art, Humanity and Social Studies*, *2*(5), 177-184. https://ojs.unm.ac.id/PJAHSS/article/view/36747

Ingram, J., & Elliott, V. (2015). 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

Lam, D. M. K. (2018). What Counts as " Responding "? Contingency on PreviousSspeaker Contribution as a Feature of Interactional Competence. *Language Testing*, *35*(3), 377–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532218758126

Limberg, H. (2015). Principles for Pragmatics Teaching : Apologies in the EFL Alassroom. *ELT Journal Volume*, *69*(3), 275–285. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv012

Limberg, H. (2016). Teaching How to Apologize : EFL Textbooks and Pragmatic Input. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(6), 700–718. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168815590695

Lin, C. (2015). An Exploratory Comparison of the Use of Modifiers by Native Speakers of English and Mandarin Chinese in Academic Lectures. *Text&Talk*, *35*(1), 77–100. https://doi.org/10.1515/text-2014-0027

Manik, S., & Hutagaol, J. (2015). An Analysis on Teachers ' Politeness Strategy and Student ' s Compliance in Teaching Learning Process at SD Negeri 024184 Binjai Timur Binjai – North Sumatra-Indonesia. *English Language Teaching*, *8*(8), 152–170. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n8p152

Marie, A. & Rohan, B. (2011). Using Conversation Analysis in the Second Language Classroom to Teach Interactional Competence. *Language Teaching Research*, *15*(4), 479-507. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811412878

Martínez-flor, A. (2013). Classroom Research on Pragmatics. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0133

Meihami, H., & Khanlarzadeh, M. (2015). Pragmatic Content in Global and Local ELT Textbooks : A Micro Analysis Study. *SAGE Open*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015615168

Nguyen, D., Liakata, M., Dedeo, S., Eisenstein, J., Mimno, D., Tromble, R., & Winters, J. (2020). How We Do Things With Words: Analyzing Text as Social and Cultural Data. *Review*, *3*(August), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2020.00062

Nicholas, A. (2015). A Concept-based Approach to Teaching Speech Acts in the EFL Classroom. *ELT Journal Volume*, *69*(4), 383–394. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv034

Nisa, L.K., & Abduh, M. (2022). Directive Speech Acts Analysis in Teacher and Student Interaction during Thematic Learning in Elementary School. *Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pendidikan*. *6*(2), 286-294. https://doi.org/10.23887/jppp.v6i2.49372

Ren, J., & Gao, X. (2012). Negative Pragmatic Transfer in Chinese Students' Complimentary Speech Acts. *Psychological Reports*, *110*(1), 149–165. https://doi.org/10.2466/07.17.21.28.PR0.110.1.149-165

Saleem, T., Anjum, U., & Tahir, S. (2021). The Sociopragmatic and Pragmalinguistic Strategies in L2 Pragmatic Competence : A Case of Pakistani ESL Learners. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *50*(2), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2021.1877176

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

Siegel, J. (2015). Using Speech Act Sets to Inform Study Abroad Instruction. *The Language Teacher*, *39*(6), 3–9.

Siegel, J. (2016). Pragmatic Activities for the Speaking Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, 1–8.

Sumedi, S.H. & Rovino, D. (2020). Speech Act Analysis of English Teacher Talk at SMP Negeri 1 Rangkasbitung. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, *10*(2), 121-131. http://dx.doi.org/10.30813/jelc.v10i2.2142

Sundh, L. (2017). The function of Teacher Questions in EFL Classroom Activities in Cambodia: A conversation Analytic Study. *Department of English Individual Research Project (EN04GY)*, 1–32.

Suryandani, P.D. & Budasi, I.G. (2021). An Analysis of Directive Speech Acts Produced by Teachers in EFL Classroom. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, *12*(2), 36-45. http://dx.doi.org/10.30813/jelc.v12i1.2823

Taguchi, N. (2012). The Effects of Practice Modality on Pragmatic Development in L2 Chinese. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12123.x

Taguchi, N. (2018). Description and Explanation of Pragmatic Development : Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods Research. *System*, *in Press*, 1–10.

Taguchi, N., Xiao, F., & Li, S. (2016). Effects of Intercultural Competence and Social Contact on Speech Act Production in a Chinese Study Abroad Context. *The Modern Language Journa*, *100*(4), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12349

Tajeddin, Z. (2012). Interlanguage Pragmatic Motivation : Its Construct and Impact on Speech Act Production. *RELC Journal*, *43*(3), 353–372. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212468481

Tajeddin, Z., & Moghadam, A. Z. (2012). Interlanguage Pragmatic Motivation : Its Construct and Impact on Speech Act Production. *RELC Journal*, *43*(3), 353–372. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212468481

Tajeddin, Z., & Pezeshki, M. (2014). Acquisition of Politeness Markers in an EFL Context : Impact of Input Enhancement and Output Tasks. *RELC Journal*, *45*(3), 269–286. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214555357

Tamimi Sa'd, S., & Mohammadi, M. (2014). A cross-sectional study of Iranian EFL learners' polite and impolite apologies Seyyed. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *10*(1), 119–136.

Thi, M., Nguyen, T., Pham, H. T., & Pham, T. M. (2015). The Effects of Input Enhancement and Recasts on the Development of Second Language Pragmatic Competence. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, (April 2015), 37–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2015.1026907

Thuy, T., Nguyen, M., Hanh, T., & Tam, M. (2012). The Relative Effects of Explicit and Implicit Form-focused Instruction on the Development of L2 Pragmatic Competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*(4), 416–434. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.01.003

Tromp, J., Hagoort, P., & Meyer, A. S. (2016). Pupillometry reveals Increased Pupil Size during Indirect Request Comprehension. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *69*(6), 1093–1108. https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2015.1065282

Trosborg, A. 1994. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints And Apologies*. New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

Wijayanto, A., Prasetyarini, A., & Hikmat, M. H. (2017). Impoliteness in EFL : Foreign Language Learners ' Complaining Behaviors Across Social Distance and Status Levels. *SAGE Open*, (July-September), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017732816

Yazdanfar, S., & Bonyadi, A. (2016). Request Strategies in Everyday Interactions of Persian and English Speakers. *SAGE Open*, (October-December), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016679473

Bahing, Emzir, & Rafli, Z. (2018). English Speech Acts of Illocutionary Force in Class Interaction. Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 9(3), 113–119. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.9n.3p.113

Boyd, M. P. (2015). Relations Between Teacher Questioning and Student Talk in One Elementary ELL Classroom. Journal of Literacy Research, 47(3), 370–404. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X16632451

Yetty, (2018). Politeness Strategy on Social Interaction Used by Munanese. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *1*(1), 59–65. https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v1i1.4043

Youn, S. J. (2014). Validity A rgument for Assessing L2 Pragmatics in Interaction Using Mixed Methods. *Language Testing*, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532214557113

Zhu, W. (2012). Polite Requestive Strategies in Emails : An Investigation of Pragmatic Competence of Chinese EFL Learners. *RELC Journal*, *43*(2), 217–238. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212449936