



The Pragmatic Function of Speech for Elementary Students: Indonesian Teaching in Australia

Setiawan Edi Wibowo^{1*}, Aurora Adina Cholomeischi², Tudor Colomeischi², Kordula Schulze³

¹ Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia

² Stefan cel Mare University, Suceava, Romania

³ Muenster University, Germany

*Corresponding Author. E-mail: setiawanediwibowo@uny.ac.id

Received: November 1, 2022; Revised: November 8, 2022; Accepted: January 26, 2023

Abstract: This study aimed to describe the pragmatic function of Indonesian language teaching in Australia and the speech act strategies used by foreign teachers to teach Indonesian in Australia. It employs a descriptive qualitative method with a case study approach to the pragmatic function construction in the classroom context. The data are negatively constructed speeches of teachers and students who join Indonesian language learning program, The Apec Lesson Study Project, in Australia. Data are collected through documentation with extended techniques, listening, and recording. Meanwhile, the data are analyzed by using a method of *padan* pragmatics. The research results show that the pragmatic functions in Indonesian language teaching in Australia can be estimated into various categories and subcategories of speech act: (1) combinative speech act, manifested into sub-speech acts asking for praising; and (2) directive speech act, manifested into sub-speech acts asking. These findings show how materials, methods, and techniques are combined with speech constructions that are appropriate to the student's level. Meanwhile, the speech act strategy used by foreign teachers is a direct literal speech act strategy.

Keywords: pragmatic function, speech act strategy, elementary multilingual students, education, language teaching

How to Cite: Wibowo, S. E., Cholomeischi, A. A., Colomeischi, T., & Schulze, K. (2023). The pragmatic function of speech for elementary students: indonesian teaching in Australia. *Jurnal Prima Edukasia*, 11(1), 106-119. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21831/jpe.v11i1.54229>



Introduction

An understanding of the intention of a speech is highly prominent as it could maintain the sustainability of the communication process. In linguistics, the field of derived science that studies this is pragmatics. Pragmatics can be functionally applied to many contexts, such as in political contexts (Al-Duleimi & Hammoodi, 2015; Fataya et al., 2020), education contexts (Mehdi & AbouNaaj, 2013; Shu, 2018), culture contexts (S. Wibowo & Rosalina, 2019), or any other context.

Indonesian has now become an international language to be studied, one of which is in Australia. In this context, Indonesian becomes a second language, so when viewed from pragmatics, it produces a different concept (Barati & Biria, 2011; Malmir, 2021; Aldukhayel, 2021). Why is that? It is because there is a cognitive influence on man (Xing, 2018). Therefore, students in Indonesia and Australia are included in the bilingual society because they can master several languages (Adibnia & Chermahini, 2020).

There is no research examining how Indonesian is taught in Australia, especially if the research is based on pragmatics as the basic theory of research. Several previous studies related to the topic of this study are graded language tests on second language teaching (Laborda & Álvarez, 2021), online language teaching (Quinlan, 2021), review of Language teaching with video-based technology (Chemla & Singh, 2014), effects of contextual relevance on pragmatic inference during the conversation (Feng et al., 2017).

In Indonesia, many regencies/cities are currently included in industrial areas, one of which is in Karawang Regency (West Java), Kendal (Central Java), and several cities and provinces in Kalimantan,

This is an open access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Sumatra, and Papua. There are many foreign workers in the area. Therefore, the Indonesian government, especially the Ministry of Education and Culture, has developed the Teaching Indonesian Language for Foreign Speakers '*Pengajaran Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing*' (BIPA). In practice, communication problems often appear in cross-cultural communication, including Teaching Indonesian Language to Foreign Speakers '*Pengajaran Bahasa Indonesia untuk Penutur Asing*' (BIPA). The main obstacle to the BIPA learning program is related to cultural transfer. The point lies in how a teacher communicates and interacts well with the students. Therefore, in a study, textbooks, modules, or even dictations have an important function (Hoai & Le, 2021).

The problem is whether the Indonesian being taught is correct and whether the way it is conveyed is in line with the functional aspects of the Indonesian language and the existing context. Therefore, the results of this study can be used as material for reflection and evaluation to create good Indonesian language teaching for bilingual students in Australia. Indonesian language teachers need to adjust their teaching and communication methods to achieve that point—one of the countries that teach the Indonesian language at the school and university level is Australia. The pragmatic function (Shi, 2015; Zhang, 2013) and speech act strategy (Suryanovika & Manda Negara, 2018) among cross-cultural speakers are properly made in the program. The selected teachers from native Indonesian and foreigners bring the Indonesian language popular because it is considered open in cultural context.

Based on the background of the problems revealed in the previous discussion, the crystallization of the research problem formulation is how the pragmatic function is contained in the speech of basic-level multilingual students learning Indonesian in Australia. Meanwhile, this study aimed to describe the pragmatic function of Indonesian language teaching in Australia and the speech act strategies used by foreign teachers to teach Indonesian in Australia.

Methods

It employs a descriptive qualitative method with a case study approach to the pragmatic function, as a research object, in the negotiating construction of Indonesian language teachings in Australia. At the same time, the subject is Indonesian language learners in Australia. The data used are negatively constructed speeches of teachers and students who joined an Indonesian language learning program, The Apec Lesson Study Project, in Australia. The data sources are the videos of the Indonesian language learning program. Data are collected through documentation with extended techniques, listening and recording. Meanwhile, the data analysis uses the method of padan pragmatics (Sudaryanto, 1993). The directive speech acts are interpreted with pragmatic analysis, which refers to the heuristic analysis model by Grice (1981). The pragmatic function refers to Searle (1983). Furthermore, the speech act strategies refer to Wijana (2009), covering direct literal speech acts, indirect literal speech acts, direct unliteral speech acts, and indirect unliteral speech acts.

Results and Discussion

The speech act is any form of language act constructed under the context of the speakers. Speech acts are also defined as linguistic and non-linguistic components that cover a complete language act regarding the participants of the conversation, the form of the message delivery, the topic, and the context. Furthermore, the explanation of the teachers' speech acts in Indonesian language classrooms is presented using Searle's theory (1983).

In Indonesia, there are many studies related to teaching Indonesian to foreign speakers, but there is no locus of research in Australia yet. It means that this research has taken place in Indonesia. So far, no one has collected data from other countries. Specifically, this study differs from Sundusiah's research (Sundusiah & Rahma, 2016), focusing on the poetry word games model in learning writing expression poetry in Indonesian language students for foreign speakers. Moreover, Gatut Susanto (Gatut Susanto, 2022) focuses more on the morphological process and semantic meaning of learners' vocabulary, students, and students. Meanwhile, this study reviews from a pragmatic perspective.

Furthermore, Arifin's research (Arifin, 2021) is related to the design of language listing skills teaching materials in Indonesia for foreign speakers (BIPA) "I like Indonesia". The difference with this study is that it focuses on students' speaking skills, not listening, and Wahyono's research focuses more on improving speaking skills. Meanwhile, (Jazeri, 2016) research entitled models of speaking skills

learning devices with a contextual communicative approach for international students focuses more on developing a communicative approach which is different from this research which focuses on content analysis of speaking skills.

In conveying the intention of speech, a teacher utilizes several variations of speech strategies: direct literal speech acts, indirect literal speech acts, direct unliteral speech acts, and indirect unliteral speech acts. The direct literal speech act is a speech construction which shows direct coherence among the speaker's structure, function, and intention. Short sentences have characterized direct speech acts. The shorter the speech is, the more direct it is. However, the theory can be understood if it is used in everyday communication. The identification in dividing the speech acts into direct or indirect speech acts of the teachers in the class finds similarities. The identification process is made by determining the linguistic marker.

The Realization of the Indonesian Language Teachers' Speech Acts in The Apec Lesson Study Project in Australia

The excerpts of the communication in The Apec Lesson Study Project show a system or communication pattern of asking (directive) – confirming (directive) – praising (representative). The speech act patterns used by the teachers are interrogative and declarative. On the other hand, the teaching process accommodates the students to express and communicate what they feel. There is no form of judgment on something prevalent and un-prevalent to the student's experience or like. The intended meaning of the segments is asking. The teachers try to determine the students' characteristics through a confirmative system.

Chatting has become a common hobby nowadays. People in the past interact by visiting, gathering, and asking about the interlocutors' conditions. However, in the millennial era, society can benefit from social media and other social apps virtually. Every community group possesses a language and employs that language to communicate (S. E. Wibowo, 2020) because people's lives cannot be separated from interaction (Jamzaroh, 2019). The speech act strategy used by the teachers is direct and literal. The direct construction can be found in sentences that agree with the intention. An interrogative sentence is used to ask.

Meanwhile, the literal meaning is found in every element, which becomes the linguistic marker. The point agrees with the intention of the speaker. Speech like that will give rise to many interpretations but does not lead to impoliteness (Rahardi, 2017; Blitvich & Sifianou, 2019; Locher, 2015).

Looking at the cultural differences between Indonesia and Australia, the speech is still at the polite level (Pilegaard, 1997; Gryllia et al., 2021). The learning process concludes that the negotiating constructions of the speeches in the Indonesian language teachings in Australia are: 1) communicative pattern of asking (directive) – confirming (directive) – praising (representative); 2) the type of speech act is combinative; 3) the speech act strategy employed by the teachers is a direct literal speech act; and 4) the intended meaning is asking.

The Combinative Speech Act of the Indonesian Language Teachers in The Apec Lesson Study Project in Australia

The combinative pragmatic function in Indonesian language teachings in The Apec Lesson Study Project in Australia occurs dominantly. It refers to a speech act leading to two intentions within a speech construction. The double intentions of speech are based on the speech patterns of the teachers in teaching. The speech patterns are Inviting (imperative) – asking (interrogative) – praise (declarative) – praising (declarative), asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative) – praising (declarative), asking (interrogative) – praising (declarative) – praising (declarative), asking (interrogative) – praising (declarative), asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative), and asking (interrogative) – informing (declarative).

Table 1. The combinative speech act of the Indonesian language teachers

No. Data	Speech Act Type	Speech Act Strategy	Speech Pattern	Intended Meaning
(D1)	Combinative	Indirect Literal	Inviting (imperative) – asking (interrogative) – praising (declarative) – praising (declarative)	Asking and praising
(D2)	Combinative	Direct Literal	Asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative) – praising (declarative)	Asking and praising
(D4)	Combinative	Direct Literal	Inviting (interrogative) – praising (declarative) – praising (declarative)	Asking
(D5), (D7), (D11), (D13)	Combinative	Direct Literal	Inviting (interrogative) – praising (declarative)	Asking
(D6)	Combinative	Direct Literal	Asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative) – praising (declarative)	Asking
(D8), (D9), (D12), (D17)	Combinative	Direct Literal	Asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative)	Asking
(D14)	Combinative	Direct Literal	Inviting (interrogative) – informing (declarative)	Asking

A detailed explanation of the combinative speech acts of the Indonesian language teachers in The Apec Lesson Study Project in Australia will be provided through the selection of the speech patterns based on their characteristics.

- (D1) **Speech:**
 Teacher : “All right. Up. All right. Mari kita berlatih dengan bola. Jadi, siap. Siapa namamu?” (“All right. Up. All right. Let's practice with a ball. So, get ready. What's your name?”)
 Tristy : “Saya suka.” (“I like.”)
 Teacher : “Siapa namamu?” (“What is your name?”)
 Tristy : “Nama saya Tristy.” (“My name is Tristy.”)
 Teacher : “Ya, bagus Tristy. Tristy suka apa?” (“Yes, good job, Tristy. What do you like, Tristy?”)
 Tristy : “Saya suka main komputer.” (“I like playing a computer.”)
 Teacher : “Bagus, Tristy. Dia suka main komputer.” (“Great, Tristy. : “She likes playing a computer.”)

The setting of the speech in (D1) is an opening of the lesson in the classroom, where the teacher attempts to deliver the material with particular methods, media, and learning strategies. The speech "All right. Up. All right. Mari kita berlatih dengan bola" is one of the practices. The speech function is informative. The utilization of the mixed code can be understood because it is used in the opening. It occurs because the setting is Australia. The teachers perform massive dialogues with an interrogative construction, “Siapa namamu?”. Speech partner answers do not indicate correct act sequences “Saya suka”. It means that the speech partner does not understand the speaker's intention.

Misconception within a speech typically occurs due to language factors and is found in segments (D1). The learning material is a hobby or passion. However, to facilitate and help the habituation of the communication system and patterns in the Indonesian language, the teacher started with the question, “siapa namamu?”. The topic of hobby comes up in that segment “Ya, bagus, Tristy. Tristy suka apa?”. The answer of speech partner “Saya suka main komputer” indicates coherence. Meanwhile, the pragmatic combinative function appears because it seems that speaker tries to ask and praise the speech partner by closing the speech “Bagus, Tristy. Dia suka main komputer”.

Speech (D1) includes a combinative illocutionary speech act with the intention of asking-praising. The teacher has a structural presupposition because he assumes a truth interpreted into an interrogative construction. The inference is direct, as the conclusion can be drawn from a single premise (the proposition used to conclude). The drawn conclusion should not be broader than the premise. Therefore, the speaker has associated the truth about the expression of the speech partner, so the constructed implicature is general conversation. The justification of the implicature indicates that the expected communication principle is a working principle which prioritizes quantity and relevance. The speech partner's answers indicate that the speaker only wants the right answer and is in line with the question. Such conversations are based on the situation and purpose of the conversation, which is the language learning process whose example of conversation is representational, interactional, and personal.

The selection of the speech act strategy, which utilizes a construction of inviting (imperative) – asking (interrogative) – praising (declarative) – praising (declarative), is a part of negotiating techniques. Such construction belongs to an indirect literal speech act strategy. The indirect side of the speech is realized in the construction of imperative-interrogative-declarative to bring up combinative intentions of asking and praising. Directive and expressive asking and praising refer to two different intentions. The diversity of the construction types also aims to achieve various intentions, which is the essence of speech unsustainability. Meanwhile, the literal aspect of a speech is similar. It happens because the construction elements of the speech intention are embedded within the speech construction. The elements of the invitation “interrogative”, “*siapa...?*”, and the expression “*bagus...*” refer to the identification. Therefore, the speech (D1) generally belongs to an indirect literal speech act strategy.

The pattern of inviting (imperative) – asking (interrogative) – praising (declarative) – praising (declarative) in practice belongs to the application of the negotiation technique. The combination of two or more linguistic constructions in which an interrogative construction is found is one of the characteristics of the negotiative technique. It aims to achieve agreement within the communication. The identification of the pragmatic communicative aspects concludes that the interlanguage pragmatic of the psycholinguistic process is a language transfer with a dynamic character—the use of the first language structure in learning the second or foreign language—grows up continuously along with the knowledge development of language learners and students.

When viewed from some of the terms of reference for deciding the intention of a speech, some segments of the speeches in the language learning process cause dichotomy.

(D2) **Speech:**

Teacher	: “Robert, nama kamu siapa?” (<i>“Robert, what is your name?”</i>)
Robert	: “Nama saya Robert.” (<i>“My name is Robert.”</i>)
Teacher	: “Ya, kamu suka apa?” (<i>“Yeah, what do you like?”</i>)
Robert	: “Saya suka main piano.” (<i>“I like playing the piano.”</i>)
Teacher	: “Main piano. Ya, bagus. Robert suka main piano.” (<i>“Playing piano. Yes, good. Robert likes playing the piano.”</i>)

The characteristic of the confirmative speech of asking-praising, like in (D2) and (D6), is that the teacher starts with interrogative “*Robert, nama kamu siapa?*”, “*Ya, kamu suka apa?*” and “*...Clowy, kamu suka apa?*”, and followed up with confirmative “*Main piano?...*” and “*Ah, menonton film drama atau komedi atau action.*”, and ended with praising “*... Yeah, bagus. Robert suka main piano.*” and “*Saya juga suka film komedi. Siapa yang suka nonton film komedi? Ya, film komedi bagus ya.*”. The pragmatic function of the speaker in an interrogative speech in the opening of (D2) and (D6) is the same as the other speech segments, which are intended to initiate the conversation with the speech partner. The dialogue process usually begins with an interrogative sentence. It is not only applied during teaching, but it is also applicable in everyday conversation. An interrogative speech allows the speaker and speech partner to have further communication. A confirmative speech like that functions as reinforcement so that misconceptions can be avoided. Furthermore, praising in a series of speeches is not familiar in Indonesia, especially at the end of the conversation. In Indonesia, a conversation that begins with interrogative-confirmative usually ends with a “thank you”. In some speech contexts, for example, when shopping in a traditional market, the negotiation process only ends up with price

confirmation, not followed with praising. These speech constructions are interesting to adopt in teaching and learning in Indonesia because we can find an effort of appreciation delivered by the speaker to the speech partner for personal privacy. Disapproval will be done with praise. In Middle Eastern countries, a conversation process usually begins with prayer and a wish. A conversation which strives to keep the motivation in the classroom should be manifested in teaching. Why not? A speech event will be positive, it presents praises and prayers in every segment.

The speech in (D2) and (D6) belong to the illocutionary combinative speech type with the intention of asking-praising. Language courtesy must be in line with the cultural elements of the society in which they live and the use of a language in communication. (Simarmata & Agustina, 2017). It includes realizing the intention in the form of written language. Variations in speech are found in three types of imperative sentences: tact principle on a politeness scale to minimize coercion, a statement of necessity, and an indirect scale. The implications are in the form of acceptance speech acts (Hermaji, 2013). The teacher has a structural presupposition because he assumes a truth interpreted into an interrogative construction. The inference is direct, as the conclusion can be drawn from a single premise (the proposition used to conclude). The drawn conclusion should not be broader than the premise. Therefore, the speaker has associated the truth about the expression of the speech partner, so the constructed implicature is general conversation. The justification of the implicature indicates that the expected communication principle is a working principle which prioritizes quantity and relevance. The speech partner's answers indicate that the speaker only wants the right answer and is in line with the question. Such conversations are based on the situation and purpose of the conversation, which is the language learning process whose example of conversation is representational, interactional, and personal.

The realization of the speech asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative) – praising (declarative) adapted to the context has a direct literal speech act strategy. An utterance's direct or indirect side is determined through the compatibility between the speech construction and intention. The dual intentions in (D2) and (D6), in which asking is realized with asking and praising made with exclamative sentences, are appropriate. Direct speech in language learning is necessary, so students do not bring up two interpretations of the speech. Moreover, the speech occurs in Australia, where people prefer short speech to the politeness culture in Indonesia. Meanwhile, the literal side is found in segments (D2) and (D6). The two segments contain linguistic elements which can be used as a marker of the speech intention. In (D2), the intention of asking can be identified with the question words “...siapa?” confirmative “Ya, kamu suka apa?” and “...Clowly, kamu suka apa?, continued with confirmative “Main piano?...” and “Ah, memonton film drama atau komedi atau action.”, and end up with praising “... Ya, bagus. Robert suka main piano.” and “Saya juga suka film komedi. Siapa yang suka nonton film komedi? Ya, film komedi bagus ya.” (D6), which can be found in the speech excerpt. Therefore, the speeches can be summed up as a direct literal speech strategy.

Language and attitude must be used appropriately, so we are not labelled impolite (Revita et al., 2020). Like (D1), the speeches in (D2) and (D6) have a speech pattern that belongs to negotiation techniques. The speech combination of asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative) – praising (declarative) is in line with the characteristics of the negotiation technique. The utilization of the patterns aims to achieve the purpose agreement in communication and to minimize the coming of multiple interpretations between speaker and speech partner. The identification of the pragmatic communicative aspects concludes that the interlanguage pragmatic of the psycholinguistic process is a language transfer with a dynamic character—the use of the first language structure in learning the second or foreign language—grows up continuously along with the knowledge development of language learners, and students.

(D4) **Speech:**

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Student | : “Aduh jatuh. Enggak apa-apa.” (“ <i>Oh, so far. It is ok.</i> ”) |
| Teacher | : “Rudy, nama kamu siapa?” (“ <i>Rudy, what is your name?</i> ”) |
| Rudy | : “Nama saya Rudy.” (“ <i>My name is Rudy.</i> ”) |
| Teacher | : “Bagus, Rudy. Dan kamu suka apa?”
(“ <i>Great Job, Rudy. : “And, what do you like?”</i>) |
| Rudy | : “Saya suka Kriket, Foot Ball, dan Bola Basket.”
(“ <i>I like Cricket, Foot Ball, and Basketball.</i> ”) |

Teacher : “Kriket, *Foot Ball*, dan Bola Basket. Ada bahasa Jerman, ya. *Yes, Bahasa Jerman. Up*” (“*a Cricket, Foot Ball, and Basketball.*” *Ada Bahasa Jerman, ya. Yes, German language. Up*)

The conversation occurred at Macarthur Anglican School, Camden, New South Wales, Australia, in The APEC Lesson Study Project in Indonesian language learning. During the learning process, the teacher used a medium, a ball, that served as a tool to point the students to answer the teacher's question, and it was done in turns. The participants were a teacher and students. The teacher was a woman named Melissa Gould, and the students were of the same age and nationality, Australia. In that segment, the speech partner was Rudy. The purpose of the speech was to teach the Indonesian language. The flow of communication went very well because the speech partner could answer the question of speaker asked smoothly. The emotional/psychological expression of the speaker looked psychologically calm and showed hope because the two hands of the speaker were tightly and closely put on the chest. The articulation of the speaker was loud and clear, with normal intonation. Meanwhile, the voice of the speech partner was not too loud. The built norm was standard, like the learning process in the classroom at a school. The relationship was typical, a teacher and students. Meanwhile, the language type used was spoken language, a dialogue in Indonesian.

The same illocutionary presupposition yet different speech construction is found in (D4). The illocutionary intention is asking-praising. The combinative illocutionary speech act in the segment was the continuation of the speech series at the event in an Indonesian language class in Australia. The teacher only shifted the focus of the speech partner from one student to the others through the ball as a learning medium. The speech segment began when the teacher passed the ball to one of the speech partners for a conversation. On that occasion, the ball hit Rudy. The thrown ball fell to Rudy, and he spontaneously said, “Aduh, jatuh. Enggak apa-apa. (Oh, it hit me. No problem)”, with his relatively good Indonesian language. The expression “...Enggak apa-apa”, expressed in the right context and articulation, indicated Rudy's well-mannered attitude. It was understood because the interlocutor was a teacher—a socially higher person in the context of learning in the classroom. In the excerpt of (D4), the teacher conveyed an exclamative construction twice to respond to the student's answers. He said, “*Bagus, Rudy. Dan kamu suka apa?*”, and “*kriket, football, dan bola basket. Ada Bahasa Jerman, ya. Yes, Bahasa Jerman. Up*”. Speaker's intention to ask a question was realized in “*Rudy, nama kamu siapa?*”. The intention to praise was realized in “*Bagus, Rudy. Dan kamu suka apa?*”, and “*Kriket, Foot Ball, dan Bola Basket. Ada Bahasa Jerman, ya. Yes, Bahasa Jerman. Up*”. The speech in (D4) belongs to a combinative illocutionary speech with the intention of asking-praising. The teacher has a structural presupposition because he assumes a truth interpreted into an interrogative construction. The teacher knew about speech partner Rudy. The inference is direct, as the conclusion can be drawn from a single premise (the proposition used to conclude). The drawn conclusion should not be broader than the premise. Rudy expressed the right answer, and the spontaneous event showed an understanding of the ongoing inference. Therefore, the speaker has associated the truth about the expression of the speech partner, so the constructed implicature is general conversation.

The justification of the implicature indicates that the expected communication principle is a working principle which prioritizes quantity and relevance. The speech partner's answer indicated that the speaker only wanted the right answer and was in line with the questions to achieve what she wanted. Such conversations are based on the situation and purpose of the conversation, which is the process of language learning in which the example of conversation functioned symbolically—representing the condition—, interactional—the teacher taught a daily conversation—, and personal— indicated by speaker's questions about name and hobby. It is undeniable that some elementary schools still apply mixed languages in the learning process, which are English and Indonesian, because the students enter the language teaching stage, which benefits from a language switching system. Garrison & Kanuka (2004) explain that the popularity of blended learning has mostly been derived from the logistical benefits of this type of instruction. However, blended learning offers pedagogical benefits as it can enhance learning and teaching opportunities and outcomes (Mizza & Rubio, 2020).

The speech pattern in (D4) could be categorized as applying the negotiative technique. The speech combination of asking (interrogative) – praising (declarative) – praising (declarative) is in line with the characteristics of the negotiation technique. The system of asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative) – praising (declarative) adapted to the context has a direct literal speech act strategy. An

utterance's direct or indirect side is determined through the compatibility between the speech construction and intention. The utilization of the patterns aims to achieve the purpose agreement in communication and to minimize the coming of multiple interpretations between speaker and speech partner. The dual intentions, in which asking is realized with asking and praising made with exclamative sentences, are appropriate. The linguistic marker in the literal aspect of asking is identified in the question words "...siapa?" and the literal aspect of praising lies on "Bagus...?" and "Kriket, Football, dan Bola Basket. Ada Bahasa Jerman, ya. Yes, Bahasa Jerman. Up". Therefore, the speeches belong to a direct literal speech strategy. The identification of the pragmatic communicative aspect concludes that the interlanguage pragmatic of the psycholinguistic process is a language transfer with a dynamic character—the use of the first language structure in learning the second or foreign language—grows up continuously along with the knowledge development of the language learners, which are from Australia.

A different case occurs in (D5), (D7), (D11), and (D13).

- (D5) **Speech:**
 Teacher : "Allana, Allana suka apa? (*Allana, Allana what do you like?*)"
 Allana : "Saya suka Bola Basket dan main komputer. (*I like playing basketball and computer*)"
 Teacher : "Ah, rajin sekali. Rudy sportif sekali, ya. Suka Kriket, Foot Ball, dan Bola Basket." (*Ah, you are so diligent. Rudy is a very sportsman, right. He likes cricket, football, and basketball*)
- (D7) **Speech:**
 Teacher : "Khalid, kamu suka apa?" (*Khalid, what do you like?*)
 Khalid : "Saya suka main gitar." (*I like playing the guitar.*)
 Teacher : "Ya, bagus main gitar. Robert suka main piano." (*Yeah, playing guitar is good. Robert likes playing the piano.*)

Imperative sentences like (D5) and (D7) is a form of the relationship harmony between the speaker and the interlocutor that can be maintained if each participant is always polite and respectful to each other. (Syah, 2018). Positive politeness strategies can emphasize solidarity, good relations, and equality between the speaker and the interlocutor (Purba, 2011). The use of language, both interactional and transactional, always involves politeness to maintain social relations among speakers (Ekawati, 2017). These various imperative constructions only mean directives imperative. Directive speech acts are carried out so that the speaker (the person invited to speak) does what the speaker says. (Manaf, 2011). The above speech segments show a short speech pattern, which is asking-praising. The speech pattern for asking-praising with a short different speech segment with the case of speech was revealed in the previous data. The series of speech construction that occurs in the learning process aims to facilitate pronunciation, clarify articulation and the understanding of the student's second language. The student's language skill is quite good as they are beginners. However, the fact that they meet some linguistic aspects of the Indonesian language—as the second language—shows good progress. The speech in (D5), (D7), (D11), and (D13) belong to illocutionary speech acts with a proposition of combinative illocutionary between directive and expressive for asking-praising. The interpretation is based on the linguistic marker, which is found in every segment of the speech. In (D5), the asking-praising intention is indicated by the presence of "Allana, Allana suka apa?" and "Ah, rajin sekali. Rudy sportif sekali, ya. Suka Kriket, Foot Ball, dan Bola Basket.". The speech in (D7) is determined by the presence of "Khalid, kamu suka apa?" and "Yeah, bagus main gitar. Robert suka main piano.". The linguistic marker in the speech of (D11) is "Dan, Ellie suka apa?" and "Bagus ya, semuanya sportif sekali.". Meanwhile, for the speech in (D13) it is found in "Ann, dan kamu suka apa?" and "suka cokelat. Saya suka cokelat juga.".

The whole intention of the speeches begins with the question "Kamu suka apa?" and ends with a statement of praise. It becomes a character or distinction. The utterance in (D1), for example, the

speech segment begins with the question “*Siapa namamu?*”. The question does not mean that speaker did not know the names of the speech partner. Yet, the question holds an implicature that the speech partner are expected to understand the speaker's speech and respond appropriately, according to the questions.

None the less, the presupposition in (D5), (D7), (D11), and (D13) is associated with the use of several linguistic elements. Speaker has a structural presupposition because she assumes a truth which is interpreted as interrogative constructions. It shows similarity to the previous data.

The entailment and inference are direct inferences as the conclusion can be drawn from a single premise (the proposition used to conclude). Students can answer the question speaker well. The conclusion drawn is similar to the premise. Therefore, the speaker has associated the truth about the expression of the speech partner, so the constructed implicature is general conversation. The justification of the implicature indicates that the expected communication principle is a working principle which prioritizes quantity and relevance. The speech partner's answers indicate that the speaker only wants the right answer and is in line with the question. Such conversations are based on the situation and purpose of the conversation, which is the language learning process whose example of conversation is representational, interactional, and personal.

The selection of the speech act strategy, which utilizes a construction of asking (interrogative) – praising (declarative), is a part of the negotiative technique selected by the speaker. Such speech construction belongs to a direct literal speech act strategy. The direct side of the speech is realized in the construction of interrogative-declarative to bring up combinative intentions of asking and praising. Directive and expressive asking and praising refer to two different intentions. The diversity of the construction types also aims to achieve various intentions, which is the essence of speech unsustainability. The exception appears when the intention diversity is constructed in a single type of speech act, a combinative act. The speech is intended to be continued by the speaker. Meanwhile, the literal aspect of a speech is similar. It happens because the construction elements of the speech intention are embedded within the speech construction. The element of interrogative “*...suka apa?*”, and expressive “*bagus...*” direct the identification. Therefore, in general, the speech in (D5), (D7), (D11), and (D13) belongs to the direct literal speech strategy.

In practice, the pattern of asking (interrogative) and praising (declarative) belongs to the application of the negotiative technique. The combination of two or more linguistic constructions in which an interrogative construction is found is one of the characteristics of the negotiative technique. Besides intended to achieve an agreement in communication, there are other functions applied by the speaker, which is the communicative speech partner. Speaker understands that most second language learners in primary school cannot speak Indonesian well and correctly, both spoken and written. Therefore, it is wondered if the speaker—an Indonesian language teacher in Australia—has a moral responsibility regarding language development. The fact that the Indonesian language has been popular lately and the common Indonesian language knowledge and skills indicate the main focus of the teaching is related to daily communication patterns. The identification of the pragmatic communicative aspects concludes that the interlanguage pragmatic of the psycholinguistic process is a language transfer with a dynamic character—the use of the first language structure in learning the second or foreign language—grows up continuously along with the knowledge development of language learners, and students. Students are progressively expected to have the ability to use the Indonesian language properly and correctly based on the speech context to improve intellectual ability and emotional maturity or be able to use the Indonesian language communicatively and pragmatically. Meanwhile, like the other languages in general, Indonesian functions as a tool for communication, not only knowledge.

The negotiative techniques with different construction are applied by the speaker. Read the excerpt of the following speech segment.

- (D8) **Speech:**
 Teacher : “Bagus sekali. James.” (“*Good job. James.*”)
 James : “Nama saya James, saya suka Kriket, Foot Ball, dan Bola Basket.” (*My name is James. I like cricket, football, and basketball*)
 Teacher : “Sama Rudy. Kamu temannya.” (“*with Rudy. You are his friend.*”)

It is quite interesting when the teacher does not use praising in the communication process, whereas it is still in the same theme and situation. The speech in (D8), (D9), (D12), and (D17) indicates the difference. The speaker only conveys an interrogative speech combined with a confirmative speech. The speech act type in those speeches can be identified as a combinative illocutionary speech act intended to ask-confirm. Such conversation indicates continuity in which the speaker perceives boredom within the process. Therefore, the speaker eliminates some of the speech construction that should be a part of the speech pattern at that time. Within the context, the speaker eliminates the intention of praising. The intention of praising always occurs, especially in (D1), (D2), (D4), (D5), (D6), (D7), (D11), and (D13) which belongs to the opening of the language teachings. There are a few possible reasons which bring the speaker to elliptic the construction: Speaker feels that the construction of asking-confirming-praising is often used, so she feels no longer the need to convey the speech; the speaker feels that the speech partner has understood the learning concept at that time; speaker misses it inadvertently. When viewed from the elliptic speech, the eliminated one is the question “*Siapa namamu?*” and the compliment, for example “*bagus sekali.*”. The typical form of confirmative construction can be identified with “*Sama... dengan...*”, “*Membaca buku?*” the repetition of the speech partner's answer, “*Kamu suka...*” the repetition of the speech partner's answers, and “*Oh...*” repeated answers of speech partner.

The presupposition in (D8), (D9), (D12), and (D17) associated with the use of some linguistic elements could identify that the teacher has two presuppositions, which are existential and structural because the speaker assumes a truth that is interpreted with an interrogative construction and the elliptic part—which is one of the repeated segments of speeches in teaching a language.

The process that the speech partner should make to understand the literal meaning is not found in the speaker's discourse, which is drawing a conclusion based on the expression and context of use. In making inferences, we need to consider implicature. Implicature is an indirect or implicit meaning which comes up along with the words expressed (explicate). So, the possible inference is direct and indirect. The direct Inference can be seen from the fact that the students can answer the questions well. The conclusion drawn is similar to the premise. Because the speaker has associated the truth about the expression of the speech partner, the constructed implicature is a general conversation—about a hobby. The justification of the implicature indicates that the expected communication principle is a working principle which prioritizes quantity and relevance. The communication function that the teacher delivers is related to representational, interactional, and personal functions. Meanwhile, an indirect inference does not appear to be clarified. Yet, the interactional and personal functions lie in the speaker assuming that the speech partner has understood the lesson because it is repeatedly presented. So, some students are perceived to be able to answer the same question.

As the speech occurs during language learning on speaking skills—understanding the pronunciation and meaning of an expression—a direct literal speech act strategy must be the prioritized option. A speech strategy with a construction of asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative) is a negotiative technique selected by the speaker. It belongs to a direct speech act because it is realized in an interrogative construction for the combinative intention of asking and confirming. The directive intention of asking and confirming refers to the same thing. Meanwhile, the literal aspect of a speech is similar. It happens because the construction elements of the speech intention are embedded within the speech construction. The interrogative elements are “*...suka apa?*”, and the repetition of speech partner answers. Arranging a speech pattern of asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative) in casuistic belongs to the negotiative technique. The combination of two or more linguistic constructions in which an interrogative construction is found is one of the characteristics of the negotiative technique. A review of the communicative pragmatic aspect concludes that the interlanguage pragmatic of the psycholinguistic process is a language transfer with a dynamic character.

A different speech also appears in the speech in (D14). Speaker uses a construction of asking (interrogative)-informing (declarative) with a combinative illocutionary speech act. The speech act strategy selected is direct and literal. The speaker's presupposition is existential and structural with direct and indirect inference. At the same time, the understood implicature is a conversation. The communication function is representational, interactional, and personal.

Meanwhile, the interlanguage pragmatic of the psycholinguistic process is a language transfer that is a dynamic character. Read the excerpt of the following speech segment.

- (D14) **Speech:**
 Teacher : “Cimmedy...Kamu suka apa? Suka coklat?”
 (“Cimmedy...
What do you like? You like chocolate”)
 Cimmedy : “Suka main atletik.” (*I like playing athletic*)
 Teacher : “Dia suka main atletik.” (*she likes playing athletic*)

Speech data described previously is greatly influenced by how the teacher teaches—indicating meaning—semantically—in line with the statement (Fayyazi & Pirloojeh, 2020). These lingual elements are included in the lingual markers in interpreting speech's meaning (Mao, 2017). Differences in pronunciation or inaccuracy can be understood due to different backgrounds, especially from a geographical point of view (Hejazi, 2021).

A Directive Speech Act of the Indonesian Language Teachers in “The Apec Lesson Study Project” in Australia

A is a speech that leads the interlocutor to do something according to what the speaker says. A directive speech act is also called an imposing speech act. The directive speech act of the Indonesian language teacher is always constructed imperative. The directive speech act of the Indonesian language teacher is manifested into the sub-speech act of asking.

Table 2. The Directive Speech Act of the Indonesian Language Teachers

No. Data	Speech Act Type	Speech Act Strategy	Speech Pattern	Intended Meaning
(D3), (D10), (D15), (D16), (D18)	Directive	Direct Literal	Asking (interrogative)	Asking

- (D3) **Speech:**
 Teacher : “Tristy suka apa?” (*What do you like, Tristy*)
 Seluruh Siswa : “Main komputer.” (*I like playing a computer*)
 Teacher : “Main komputer” (*playing a computer*)

A directive Illocutionary speech act to ask in the activity of learning the Indonesian language in Australia is found in the speech (D3), (D10), (D15), (D16), and (D18). Some of the characteristics of the speeches are similar to those of the speeches in (D8), (D9), (D12), and (D17), which is the teacher elliptic aspect of praising during the communication where, as it is in the same theme and situation. The difference lies in the fact that the speeches in (D8), (D9), (D12), and (D17) are in an interrogative construction combined with a confirmative speech, while those in (D3), (D10), (D15), (D16), and (D18) are in interrogative construction. The shortened speeches—in patterns and functions—should be similar for each student. The apparent reason is not far different from the combinative speech in the previous section that the speaker feels that the construction of asking-confirming-praising is often used, so the speaker perceives that she no longer needs to convey the speech; the speaker feels speech partner has understood the learning concept at the time; speaker missed it by inadvertence. When viewed from the elliptic speech, the eliminated one is the question “Siapa namamu?” and the compliment, for example, “bagus sekali.”

The presupposition in (D3), (D10), (D15), (D16), and (D18) associated with the use of several linguistic elements could identify that the teacher has two presuppositions, which are existential and structural because the speaker assumes a truth that is interpreted with an interrogative construction and the elliptic part—which is one of the repeated segments of speeches in teaching a language.

The process that the speech partner should make to understand the literal meaning is not found in the speaker's discourse, which is drawing a conclusion based on the expression and context of use. In making inferences, we need to consider implicature. Implicature is an indirect or implicit meaning which comes up along with the words expressed (explicature). So, the possible inference is direct and indirect.

The direct Inference can be seen from the fact that the students can answer the questions well. The conclusion drawn is similar to the premise. Because the speaker has associated the truth about the expression of the speech partner, the constructed implicature is the general conversation—about a hobby. The justification of the implicature indicates that the expected communication principle is a working principle which prioritizes quantity and relevance. The communication function that the teacher delivers is related to representational, interactional, and personal functions. Meanwhile, an indirect inference does not appear to be clarified. Yet, the interactional and personal functions lie in the speaker assuming that the speech partner has understood the lesson because it is repeatedly presented. So, some students are perceived to be able to answer the same question.

As the speech occurs during language learning on speaking skills—understanding the pronunciation and meaning of an expression—a direct literal speech act strategy must be the prioritized option. The functioning of students' speech construction is influenced by reading, as in his study (Fathi & Shirazizadeh, 2020). The speech strategy with various constructions of asking (interrogative) belongs to the negotiative technique selected by the speaker. It belongs to a direct speech act because it is realized in an interrogative construction for asking and confirming. The directive intention of asking refers to the same thing. Meanwhile, the literal aspect of a speech is similar. It happens because the speech intention's construction elements are embedded within the speech construction. The interrogative element of “...suka apa?” develop constructs a speech pattern of asking (interrogative) in casuistic belongs to applying the negotiative technique. Although we do not find any combination of two or more linguistic constructions within, speech is still one of the characteristics of the negotiative technique. A review of the communicative pragmatic aspect concludes that the interlanguage pragmatic of the psycholinguistic process is a language transfer with a dynamic character. This meaning does not lead to the concept of metaphor (Shariatzadeh & Haghbin, 2021).

Conclusion

The speech acts of the Indonesian Language Teachers in The Apec Lesson Study Project in Australia do not vary. The research results show the least use of speech act variations in expressing the intention of the speech. They can be divided into various categories and subcategories. They are as follows: (1) combinative speech acts, manifested in the sub-speech acts of asking-praising; and (2) directive speech acts, manifested in the sub-speech acts of asking. The speech act strategies of the Indonesian language teacher in The Apec Lesson Study Project in Australia are manifested into two categories: direct literal speech acts and indirect literal speech acts. The speech patterns are Inviting (imperative) – asking (interrogative) – praising (declarative) – praising (declarative), asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative) – praising (declarative), asking (interrogative) – praising (declarative) – praising (declarative), asking (interrogative) – praising (declarative), asking (interrogative) – confirming (interrogative), and asking (interrogative) – informing (declarative). Meanwhile, the speech act strategy used by foreign teachers is a direct literal speech act strategy. This research implies that it aims to develop basic Indonesian language teaching programs at the basic level, especially in developing teaching materials to be used.

References

- Adibnia, F., & Chermahini, S. A. (2020). *Comparison of Cognitive Inhibition in Monolingual and Bilingual Students*. 11(4). Retrieved from <http://lrr.modares.ac.ir/article-14-30455-en.html>
- Al-Duleimi, A. D. D., & Hammoodi, W. R. (2015). A Pragmatic Study of Strategic Maneuvering in Selected Political Interviews. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 05(01), 79–99. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2015.51008>
- Aldukhayel, D. (2021). The effects of captions on L2 learners' comprehension of vlogs. *Language Learning and Technology*, 25(2), 178–191. Retrieved from <https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/73439>
- Arifin, N. A. dan M. (2021). Desain Bahan Ajar Keterampilan Menyimak Bahasa Indonesia Bagi Penutur Asing (Bipa) “Aku Suka Indonesia.” *Fon: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 17(2), 265–271. <https://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/FON/article/view/4677>
- Barati, L., & Biria, R. (2011). The Impact of First Language Intonational Clue Selection on Second Language Comprehension. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 01(02), 33–38.

- <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2011.12005>
- Blitvich, P. G. C., & Sifianou, M. (2019). Im/politeness and discursive pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 145, 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.03.015>
- Chemla, E., & Singh, R. (2014). Remarks on the experimental turn in the study of scalar implicature, Part II. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 8(9), 387–399. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12080>
- Fataya, I. A., Mada, U. G., Studies, A., Program, M., Humaniora, S., Caturtunggal, B., & Sleman, D. (2020). *Negotiating Transgender Identity Amidst Increasing Cases of Discrimination in Donald Trump ' s Presidency Negosiasi Identitas Trans Ditengah Meningkatnya Kasus Diskriminasi Selama Kepemimpinan Presiden Donald Trump*. 174–191. <https://doi.org/10.24036/humanus.v19i2.45294>
- Fathi, J., & Shirazizadeh, M. (2020). *The Effects of a Second Language Reading Strategy Instruction on Iranian EFL Learners ' Reading Comprehension and Reading Anxiety*. 11(4). Retrieved from <https://lrr.modares.ac.ir/article-14-30800-en.html>
- Fayyazi, M. S., & Pirloojeh, H. S. (2020). *A Content Analysis of the Elementary School Farsi Reading and Writing Textbooks From Frame Semantics ' Point of View*. 11(4). Retrieved from https://lrr.modares.ac.ir/browse.php?a_id=22380&sid=14&slc_lang=en
- Feng, W., Wu, Y., Jan, C., Yu, H., Jiang, X., & Zhou, X. (2017). Effects of contextual relevance on pragmatic inference during conversation: An fMRI study. *Brain and Language*, 171, 52–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2017.04.005>
- Gatut Susanto. (2022). Proses Morfologis Dan Makna Semantik Kosakata Pembelajar, Pebelajar, Dan Pemelajar. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 11(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v11i1.2289>
- Gryllia, S., Baltazani, M., & Arvaniti, A. (2021). *PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen The role of pragmatics and politeness in explaining prosodic variability*.
- Hejazi, N. (2021). *Frequency of Linguistico-communicative Features in Scientific Language of Geology*.
- Hoai, H., & Le, P. (2021). *Textbook Mediation in EFL University Students ' Learning*.
- Jamzaroh, S. (2019). the Language Attitude of Culinary Entrepreneurs in Banjarmasin. *Humanus*, 18(2), 208. <https://doi.org/10.24036/humanus.v18i2.107171>
- Jazeri, M. (2016). Model Perangkat Pembelajaran Keterampilan Berbicara Dengan Pendekatan Komunikatif Kontekstual Bagi Mahasiswa Asing. *Litera*, 15(2), 217–226. <https://doi.org/10.21831/ltr.v15i2.11824>
- Laborda, J. G., & Álvarez, M. F. (2021). Multilevel language tests: Walking into the land of the unexplored. *Language Learning and Technology*, 25(2), 1–25. Retrieved from <https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstreams/783bc054-fd9a-4072-b8b0-95558a1d9aeb/download>
- Locher, M. A. (2015). Interpersonal pragmatics and its link to (im)politeness research. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 86, 5–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.05.010>
- Malmir, A. (2021). *The Interplay of Action , Context , and Linguistic vs . Non-linguistic Resources in L2 Pragmatic Performance : The Case of Requests and Refusals*.
- Mao, A. (2017). Free-Standing Interjections as Turn-Initial Pragmatic Markers—Examples from American Sitcom The Big Bang Theory. *OALib*, 04(08), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1103809>
- Mehdi, R. A. K., & AbouNaaj, M. S. (2013). Academic Program Assessment: A Case Study of a Pragmatic Approach. *Creative Education*, 04(01), 71–81. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2013.41010>
- Mizza, D., & Rubio, F. (2020). *Creating Effective Blended Language Learning Courses: A Research-Based Guide from Planning to Evaluation* (Vol. 25, Issue 2).
- Pilegaard, M. (1997). Politeness in written business discourse: A textlinguistic perspective on requests. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28(2), 223–244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166\(96\)00084-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(96)00084-7)
- Quinlan, J. D. (2021). Review of Teaching language online: A guide to designing, developing, and delivering online, blended, and flipped language courses. *Language Learning and Technology*, 25(2), 46–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.2000564>
- Rahardi, K. (2017). Linguistic Impoliteness in The Sociopragmatic Perspective. *Jurnal Humaniora*, 29(3), 309. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.v29i3.24954>
- Shariatzadeh, M., & Haghbin, F. (2021). *The Study of the Inverse Flow of Grammatical Metaphor in the Process of Popularization of Scientific Articles in the Mass Media*.
- Shi, Y. (2015). Exploring the Communicative Functions of Pragmatic Vagueness as a Discursive

- Strategy. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 05(03), 225–231. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2015.53018>
- Shu, X. (2018). Promoting Pragmatic Competence in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. *OALib*, 05(04), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1104398>
- Sundusiah, S., & Rahma, R. (2016). Model Poetry Wordgames Dalam Pembelajaran Ekspresi Tulis Puisi Pada Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Bagi Penutur Asing. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.17509/jpp.v15i3.1431>
- Suryanovika, C., & Manda Negara, I. (2018). Speech Acts of the Bronte Sisters' Characters. *Humanika*, 25(2), 75. <https://doi.org/10.14710/humanika.v25i2.20519>
- Wibowo, S. E. (2020). The Practice of Adu Rasa, Angon Rasa, and Njaga Rasa in the Speech Act of Javanese Kiai: An Ethnopragmatic Study. *Humanus*, 19(1), 136. <https://doi.org/10.24036/humanus.v19i1.105880>
- Wibowo, S., & Rosalina, S. (2019). *Pragmatic View on The Inscription Heritage of Tarumanegara Kingdom*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.23-3-2019.2284952>
- Xing, Q. (2018). Semantic Grammaticalization in the Construction “N₁; you V guo N₂” from Neo-Cognitive Pragmatic Perspective. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 08(06), 221–230. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2018.86019>
- Zhang, Y. (2013). Pragmatic Functions of Anti-Pre-Emptive Use of Person Deixis and Pre-Emptive Use of Social Deixis in Chinese. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 03(04), 305–307. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2013.34038>