

HUMANISTIC EXPRESSIVE SPEECH ACTS IN INCLUSIVE HOMESCHOOLING CLASSROOMS: A SOCIOPRAGMATIC STUDY

 <https://doi.org/10.30598/PEJLaC.v6i1.pp35-46>

Eka Yulianti Bur^{1*} , Areni Yulitawati Supriyono , Merlyn Titahena 

Novita Tabelessy² 

¹Universitas Pattimura, Jl. Ir. M. Putuhena, Ambon, 97233, Indonesia

²Unit Penunjang Akademik Bahasa, Universitas Pattimura. Jl. Ir. M. Putuhena, Ambon, 97233, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the forms of humanistic expressive speech acts used by community-type inclusive homeschooling educators based on gender, educational background, and age. Conducted in Semarang City from March to April 2023, the research took place at PRIMAGAMA Homeschooling and Anugrah Bangsa Homeschooling, focusing on community-type inclusive learning at the elementary school level. Data were collected using observation, tapping, non-participant observation, recording, and note-taking techniques. The research data consisted of 203 utterances obtained from six educators: three from PRIMAGAMA Homeschooling and three from Anugrah Bangsa Homeschooling. The analyzed data comprised educator utterances during learning activities that contained humanistic expressive speech acts. The results indicate that the forms of humanistic expressive speech acts used by community-type inclusive homeschooling educators based on gender, educational background, and age tend to utilize direct speech acts. Communication forms tailored to the psychological and physical development of students in inclusive classrooms lean toward direct speech act forms to prevent misunderstandings and communication breakdowns. This study contributes to reinforcing instructional communication practices in inclusive settings by demonstrating that selecting humanistic expressive speech acts aligned with educator characteristics as well as students' psychological and physical conditions can help establish clearer communication, reduce misunderstandings, and support the achievement of effective learning processes.

Keywords: *humanistic expressive, homeschooling, speech act, inclusion*

Article Information:

Correspondency author's email:
muhammadeerwin97@gmail.com

Article submitted: 05/12/2025

Last Revision: 20/04/2026

Article Accepted: 15/06/2026

Article Published: 25/06/2026

Copyright © Eka Yulianti Bur, Areni Yulitawati Supriyono, Merlyn Titahena, Novita Tabelessy

RESEARCH ARTICLE 

Publisher: Universitas Pattimura
(Manage by Language Study Center)



This work is licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)
CC-BY International licens

INTRODUCTION

Language serves as the primary medium for speakers to convey intentions, ideas, and messages to interlocutors, thereby facilitating effective communication. Fundamentally, communication is the process of conveying opinions, ideas, or information to others (Eliya et al., 2017). Within this process, language usage, particularly spoken language, is inextricably linked to communicative and interactive activities. One realization of language use in communication is speech acts, which serve as the mechanism through which speakers deliver messages to interlocutors as listeners. Consequently, speech acts function not merely as a medium for conveying information, but also as a form of action performed through language. This concept aligns with the speech act theory propounded by Austin (1962) and Searle (1983), who posit that language is not solely used to describe or state facts about the world, but also to perform

actions through utterances. Echoing this view, Yule (2014) states that speech acts are actions performed via utterances. Thus, speech acts constitute an essential component of communication, as speakers not only convey messages but also exert specific actions upon their interlocutors through spoken words.

Speech acts are an integral part of every communicative process, including instructional interactions between educators and learners. In this context, educators must employ appropriate language that corresponds to the learners' conditions to ensure effective communication. The ability to communicate and interact effectively is closely tied to an educator's social competence. Social competence refers to an educator's capacity, as a member of society, to communicate and interact effectively with students, fellow educators, educational staff, parents or guardians, and the broader community (Chatib, as cited in Zulaeha & Ariyanti, 2019). Therefore, language use in instructional settings extends beyond content delivery; it plays a crucial role in establishing positive interpersonal relationships between educators and students.

In instructional interactions, speech acts serve as a medium for educators to convey messages while simultaneously performing actions through language. Through speech acts, educators can express emotions, offer appreciation, demonstrate care, provide encouragement, and respond to students' conditions. Consequently, speech acts perform a vital function in fostering communicative learning interactions that support student development. In this study, particular attention is given to expressive speech acts executed with a humanistic orientation within instructional interactions. The term *humanistic expressive speech act* in this study is a composite concept synthesized from two distinct yet interrelated dimensions: the pragmatic dimension and the interpersonal-pedagogical dimension. The pragmatic dimension pertains to the expressive function of an utterance as conceptualized by Searle (1976), whereas the humanistic dimension refers to an orientation in language use that reflects respect for dignity, psychological needs, diversity, and student development in accordance with humanistic learning principles (Rogers, 1969; Ryan & Deci, 2017). Accordingly, this term is not intended to designate a new category of speech act but rather represents an integration of expressive function and humanistic orientation within instructional interactions.

Conceptually, an utterance is categorized as a humanistic expressive speech act if it satisfies two main criteria. First, the utterance fulfills an expressive function by conveying the speaker's psychological state, feelings, or attitudes. Second, the utterance contextually demonstrates an interpersonal or pedagogical orientation that supports respect, empathy, care, acceptance, appreciation, encouragement, positive reinforcement, or protection of student dignity. Based on this definition, not every expressive speech act automatically qualifies as humanistic, as the humanistic dimension is determined by the context and orientation of the utterance. For example, the utterance "Thank you for trying" qualifies as an expressive speech act because it conveys the speaker's appreciation. Simultaneously, it is humanistic in nature because it acknowledges the student's effort. Similarly, "It's alright, try again" demonstrates acceptance and encouragement to a student having trouble. Conversely, utterances expressing dissatisfaction or complaints do not automatically fall into the humanistic category if they are delivered in a manner that belittles, humiliates, or disregards the student's dignity.

Based on this framework, *expressive* and *humanistic* constitute two distinct, non-interchangeable analytical dimensions. The expressive dimension explains the pragmatic function of an utterance, whereas the humanistic dimension explains its interpersonal-pedagogical orientation toward students. Differentiating these two dimensions is necessary to ensure consistency in identifying and categorizing data throughout the research.

In addition to distinguishing expressive function from humanistic orientation, this study differentiates the relationship between linguistic form and communicative function. Direct and indirect speech acts represent analytical dimensions distinct from the expressive or humanistic classifications. Searle (1975) explains that indirect speech acts occur when a speaker performs one illocutionary act by means of another illocutionary act conventionally associated with a different grammatical form. Therefore, the analysis of direct and indirect speech acts focuses on the relationship between grammatical form and intended communicative function.

In this study, humanistic expressive speech acts can be realized through both direct and indirect forms. The utterance "I am happy that you completed the task" exemplifies direct expression because its form explicitly conveys the speaker's psychological state. Conversely, the statement "Wow, you managed to finish it!" can carry an expressive function of appreciation despite being realized through a form that does not explicitly use performative verbs such as *praise* or *appreciate*. Thus, direct and indirect categories must be treated as separate analytical dimensions to allow for a more precise explanation of both linguistic form and communicative function.

The execution of speech acts in teaching cannot be separated from the educator's role in creating a learning atmosphere that supports student development. Educators should speak, act, and behave positively, as the objective of education extends beyond mere subject delivery to encompass the formation of students' behavior, attitudes, and character. If educators limit their role strictly to teaching content, students' emotional and personality development will not be optimally nurtured. Under such conditions, students may acquire academic knowledge, but humanistic values and character formation may remain underdeveloped through the instructional process.

Educators need to build instructional interactions through speech acts oriented toward humanistic values. Appropriate utterances in learning interactions reflect democratic, open, friendly, polite, and humane attitudes (Sardiman, 2004). Conversely, non-humanistic speech acts fail to reflect humane values, such as harsh language that causes emotional harm. When students make mistakes, educators should deliver gentle corrections followed by compassionate guidance. Educators should also explain why an action is inappropriate without humiliating the student in front of others. In this manner, instructional communication serves not only to correct errors but also as a vehicle to foster security, uphold dignity, and nurture student development.

These values align with humanistic theory, which views human life through the lens of how individuals assign meaning to their experiences. In education, humanism applies a philosophy of humanity that prioritizes human development based on humanistic values (Zulaeha & Ariyanti, 2019). Education that humanizes individuals is fundamentally a process of guiding, developing, and directing basic human potential, both physical and spiritual in a balanced manner while respecting broader human values (Baharudin & Makin, 2007). Consequently, the learning process is aimed not only at academic achievement, but also at fostering students' growth as individuals with diverse needs, emotions, capabilities, and characteristics.

Humanistic learning theory seeks to understand learning behavior from the learner's perspective rather than solely from that of the observer. Successful learning within this framework is indicated by feelings of joy and enthusiasm, self-initiated learning, and self-driven changes in mindset, behavior, and attitude. This orientation is particularly relevant to

homeschooling, which provides flexibility to adapt learning processes to individual student needs. Homeschooling has evolved as an alternative educational pathway for parents seeking to fulfil their children's needs within a tailored learning environment. Generally, homeschooling operates across three instructional models: individual, group, and community-based learning (Mulyadi, 2007).

In this context, inclusive education becomes crucial as it positions learner diversity as an integral part of the educational process. Inclusive education aims to fulfill every individual's right to education without discrimination by offering high-quality educational opportunities to all children. Through this approach, every child receives an equal opportunity to actively develop their potential within a shared educational environment (Syafri & Wrastari, 2013). Thus, homeschooling can also serve as an educational alternative for children with special needs, with several institutions offering inclusive community classes.

Inclusive education places learner diversity at the center of the educational process. UNESCO emphasizes that inclusive education must ensure that all learners, regardless of background, identity, or ability, receive opportunities to participate and realize their potential. This perspective highlights the necessity of removing barriers to participation and learning while viewing student diversity as a strength rather than a liability (UNESCO, 2020).

This principle has direct implications for language use in teaching. Because students exhibit diverse abilities, characteristics, needs, and responses, educators must adapt their communicative strategies to individual student conditions. In such environments, language choice pertains not only to content delivery, but also to establishing security, acceptance, participation, and social rapport within the learning environment. Therefore, humanistic expressive speech acts play a vital role as a vehicle for building emotional support, increasing student engagement, and fostering positive interpersonal relationships in inclusive education. Research on inclusive education within non-formal institutions in Indonesia remains relatively limited. For instance, Munifah and Ardiyansyah (2022) demonstrate that inclusive practices in PKBM Homeschooling are achievable through curricular flexibility and collaborative support. These findings indicate that non-formal education possesses distinct characteristics for accommodating learner diversity. Nevertheless, their study focused more on support practices and curricular flexibility rather than language use in instructional interactions—specifically, the forms and functions of speech acts employed by educators.

Beyond that study, research on homeschooling in Indonesia has explored various dimensions, including academic achievement, self-development services, parental experiences, and the needs of students with special needs. For example, Al Mufti (2018) compared the academic achievement of primary students in inclusive schools and Primagama Homeschooling Semarang. Meanwhile, Puspitaningrum (2022) revealed that homeschooling serves as a viable educational alternative for children with cerebral palsy by enabling adaptations tailored to individual needs. Additionally, Daulay (2021) examined maternal experiences in conducting home education for children with autism spectrum disorder.

These studies demonstrate that flexibility and adaptability are crucial components of homeschooling implementation. However, existing research remains largely centered on educational management, parental experiences, learner needs, instructional support, and academic outcomes. The micro-level interactions of teacher language specifically humanistic-oriented expressive speech acts in inclusive homeschooling classrooms have not been

adequately addressed. This indicates a clear research gap regarding how humanistic values are linguistically realized in learning interactions.

Based on the literature reviewed above, three primary gaps establish the rationale for this study. First, while extensive research on speech acts in instructional settings has identified various types and functions of teacher talk, most studies focus predominantly on directive acts, classroom management, or power distribution (Prasetyo & Mulyani, 2018; Darong, 2024). Studies specifically examining expressive speech acts remain limited, particularly when expressiveness is linked to humanistic values in teaching.

Second, research on inclusive education and homeschooling underscores the importance of instructional flexibility, support, and adaptation to student needs (Munifah & Ardiyansyah, 2022; Puspitaningrum, 2022). However, few studies examine how educators realize principles of acceptance, empathy, appreciation, care, and encouragement through specific language choices in learning interactions. Yet, in inclusive environments, language plays a pivotal role in creating emotional safety and sustaining student engagement.

Third, a conceptual gap exists regarding the term *humanistic expressive speech act*. This term cannot be treated as a synonym for *expressive speech act*, as the two concepts differ in scope. Expressive speech act is a pragmatic category describing illocutionary function, whereas humanistic reflects a value system or interpersonal-pedagogical orientation. Similarly, direct and indirect categories relate to realization forms, which operate independently from expressive and humanistic categories. On this basis, this study employs an analytical framework that decouples four distinct dimensions: (1) expressive function, (2) humanistic orientation, (3) direct or indirect form, and (4) inclusive context.

This study establishes several indicators of humanistic communication as the foundation for identifying a humanistic orientation within expressive speech acts. The first indicator is *respect*, defined as language use that acknowledges students as individuals with rights, agency, and dignity. The second is *empathy*, comprising utterances that demonstrate an understanding of students' feelings, struggles, or perspectives. The third is *care*, involving utterances that show attention to students' conditions and needs. The fourth is *encouragement* or *motivation*, consisting of utterances that provide positive reinforcement to foster effort and engagement. The fifth is *acceptance*, marked by utterances displaying an accepting attitude without belittling or stigmatizing differences in ability. The sixth is *appreciation*, encompassing utterances that recognize student effort, success, growth, or contributions. The seventh is *protection of dignity*, defined as language use that avoids insults, negative labeling, threats, or verbal acts that humiliate students. These seven indicators are used to evaluate the degree to which an expressive utterance reflects a humanistically oriented interpersonal-pedagogical stance.

These indicators are not intended as new speech act categories, but as contextual criteria for determining the humanistic dimension of expressive speech acts. Accordingly, the data identification process is conducted in two stages. First, the utterance is identified by its illocutionary function as an expressive speech act. Second, the utterance is analyzed for its humanistic orientation, considering the interactional context and the relationship between educator and student. Decoupling these two stages enables the study to clearly differentiate between the pragmatic function of an utterance and its underlying interpersonal-pedagogical values.

Grounded in this framework, this study addresses the identified gaps by analyzing the humanistic expressive speech acts used by educators in community-type inclusive

homeschooling classrooms and examining usage trends across educator characteristics, namely gender, educational background, and age. Thus, the research goes beyond identifying speech act categories to explain how pragmatic functions are realized through humanistically oriented communication within inclusive educational settings.

Theoretically, this study utilizes Searle's speech act theory as its primary framework for identifying expressive functions, Rogers' humanistic theory as the foundation for interpersonal-pedagogical values, Self-Determination Theory to reinforce student psychological needs, and UNESCO's inclusive education framework to ground the educational context. Meanwhile, the concepts of direct and indirect speech acts explain how communicative functions are realized linguistically. Combining these theoretical frameworks enables a systematic integration of pragmatic, interpersonal-pedagogical, psychological, and inclusive education dimensions.

The context of this study is set within homeschooling institutions operating community-based learning under an inclusive framework. Homeschooling has grown significantly in Semarang, including institutions such as PKBM Anugrah Bangsa Homeschooling and PRIMAGAMA Homeschooling. Based on the program characteristics relevant to this study, two institutions offer such setups: PKBM Anugrah Bangsa (Ansa Homeschooling) and PRIMAGAMA Homeschooling. These institutions were selected because they conduct inclusive community classes serving a diverse student population, including learners with autism, slow learners, hyperactive children, and children with Down syndrome.

These conditions highlight the relevance of investigating humanistic expressive speech acts in inclusive homeschooling environments. Student diversity demands that educators not only deliver material effectively but also build communication that conveys acceptance, empathy, care, appreciation, and encouragement. Studying educators' speech acts is therefore essential for understanding how humanistic values are embodied through language in instructional settings. While previous research on homeschooling and inclusive education has been conducted by scholars such as Cheng & Donnelly (2019a, 2019b), Fasting & Breilid (2024), Holmqvist & Lelinge (2021), and Kunzman & Gaither (2020), studies specifically linking expressive speech acts, humanistic orientation, direct/indirect forms, and the context of inclusive homeschooling remain an important area for further development.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a descriptive-qualitative sociopragmatic design complemented by descriptive frequency analysis. A sociopragmatic approach was adopted because the research examines the use of speech acts in relation to the social context and communicative situations between educators and students. Meanwhile, a descriptive-qualitative approach was used to describe the forms, functions, and characteristics of humanistic expressive speech acts based on their context of use. Descriptive frequency analysis serves as a supplementary technique to illustrate data occurrence trends based on educator characteristics namely gender, educational background, and age.

The theoretical approach of this research utilizes a sociopragmatic perspective, whereas the methodological approach employs a descriptive-qualitative design. This choice aligns with the objective of the study, which does not aim to test cause-and-effect relationships or produce statistical generalizations, but rather to understand educators' language use within an inclusive learning context. In the initial draft, sociopragmatics was established as the theoretical framework, and descriptive-qualitative design served as the methodological framework.

The research was conducted in Semarang from March to April 2023 at PRIMAGAMA Homeschooling and Anugrah Bangsa Homeschooling. The focus of the study was community-type inclusive homeschooling learning activities at the elementary school level. These two institutions were selected because they conduct inclusive community learning and educate students with diverse characteristics. The research context includes students with conditions such as autism, slow learning, hyperactivity, and Down syndrome.

The study participants comprised six educators directly involved in inclusive community-class learning activities at the elementary school level, consisting of three educators from PRIMAGAMA Homeschooling and three from Anugrah Bangsa Homeschooling. Participant selection was carried out purposively based on the following criteria: (1) serving as educators/tutors in elementary-level inclusive community classes; (2) being directly engaged in learning interactions with students; (3) leading learning activities that naturally produce spoken data; and (4) agreeing to participate in the study.

Based on the demographic characteristics used in the analysis, the six educators comprised two male and four female teachers. The research framework also categorized teacher age into two groups (≤ 34 years and ≥ 35 years) and compared their educational backgrounds across bachelor's (S1) and master's (S2) degree categories. This classification provided the basis for analyzing usage trends of humanistic expressive speech acts. In total, 203 utterances were collected from the six educators.

The research data consisted of educators' utterances containing humanistic expressive speech acts during inclusive community-class activities. The data sources were derived from verbal interactions between educators and students during instructional processes at the two participating homeschooling institutions. A total corpus of 203 utterances was compiled across the six educators.

Data were gathered using several techniques: observation, non-participatory listening (*simak bebas libat cakap*), recording, and field notetaking. Observation was conducted to understand the learning situations and contexts, whereas audio monitoring and non-participatory listening were utilized to capture naturally occurring utterances without direct researcher involvement in the conversations. Recordings documented the interactions in full, while note-taking captured contextual information and utterance segments relevant to the research focus. These data collection methods were consistent with those outlined in the initial research design.

To prevent ambiguity regarding the corpus count of 203 utterances, this study defines an utterance as a unit of speech produced by an educator within a single interactional context that carries a distinct illocutionary function identifiable through context. Thus, the unit of analysis is not merely a conversational turn, a sentence, or a clause, but a single speech act conveying a specific communicative function. Expressive speech acts define the pragmatic function, humanistic orientation determines interpersonal-pedagogical value, and direct/indirect structures establish the relationship between linguistic form and communicative function. Accordingly, these three dimensions were not treated as mutually replaceable categories.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The research results show the forms of speech acts based on gender, educational background, and age. Based on their form, speech acts are distinguished into direct and indirect speech acts.

1. Gender

The gender category in this study is divided into 2, namely male and female. The number of male educators is 2 and the number of female educators is 4. The results of the analysis can be seen in the following diagram.

*Table 1. Forms of Humanistic Expressive Speech Acts
Based on Gender*

Category	Form	
	Direct	Indirect
Women	80	24
Man	65	34
TOTAL	203	

From Table 1, female educators use direct speech forms more frequently in inclusive community class learning, as evidenced by 80 instances of direct speech containing humanist expressive speech acts. In the male gender category, the form of speech used by educators is direct speech, as evidenced by 65 utterances containing humanistic expressive speech acts. An example of such speech can be seen in the following data example.

Context: Learning Activities Take Place at PKBM Ansa Community Type Homeschooling, 3rd Grade Elementary School. The Tutor Starts the Lesson. After Praying Together, The Tutor Asks About Last Week's Lesson.

- P1 : “Ye !” (dengan menepuk kedua tangan dan nada penuh semangat). “Apa Kabar hari ini?” (membuka kedua tangan seolah menyapa semua peserta didik dengan nada yang sedikit turun)
- Siswa : “Baik” (siswa menjawab secara serempak)
- P1 : “Minggu kemarin Kak Ika memberikan apa ya?” (nada ekspresif bertanya)
- P2 : “PR kak”. (dengan nada antusias menjawab)
- P1 : “sudah mengerjakan semua?” (maju mendekat ke P2)
- P3 : “belum” (dengan nada suara takut dan intonasi rendah)
- P1 : **(mendakati P3)**
“Puput belum mengerjakan ya?” (sambil membungkukkan badan menghadap ke siswa P3)
- P3 : (mengangguk).
 “Maaf Kak, Puput lupa.”
- Tutor : **“kalau begitu kita bahas bersama ya Put ?”**
(dengan intonasi nada rendah sembari mengelus lengan tangan P3).
 “Baik!” (nada sedikit tinggi).
 “Kita bahas bersama-sama ya. Nomer 1 silakan Puput yang baca soal.”

In the excerpt of the conversation above, P1 is the tutor, while P2 and P3 are the students. The tutor found a student who made a mistake by not doing their homework. However, the tutor did not immediately scold Student (2) in front of the other classmates. The tutor approached student (2) and reconfirmed in a low tone, **"Puput hasn't done it yet, right?"** The intention of that utterance is to ask whether P3 has done the homework or not, which was then answered with a nod, indicating that P3 confirmed it. The speech act performed by the tutor is classified as a humanistic utterance because it reflects care and affection towards the student who has bravely admitted their mistake and apologized in front of their peers.

Direct speech acts mean directly to the actual meaning according to what the speaker wants to convey without any implied meaning. The direct speech acts are more often used by female educators than by male educators. This is in line with Catalan (2003) and Juliano (2015) (in Julma Yulita & Tressyalina, 2023) who state that men speak more than female teachers in the communication process. However, women generally can express themselves more spontaneously and put on a more appropriate face for what they say than men. The dominant speaking strategy used by female teachers is to speak honestly and straightforwardly, thus tending to use direct speech acts.

2. Educational Background

Educational background is one of the categories in this research and is divided into subcategories of undergraduate and graduate education graduates. It was found that 5 educators are graduates of a bachelor's degree or education degree and 1 educator holds a master's degree or master's in educational management. The results of the analysis of humanistic expressive speech in the educational background category can be seen in the table below.

Table 2. Forms of Humanistic Expressive Speech Acts Based on Educational Background

Category	Form	
	Direct	Indirect
S1	92	10
S2	78	23
TOTAL	203	

The research results show that the S1 category tends to use the Direct form, as evidenced by 92 instances of humanist expressive speech in the direct form. In the S2 category, it shows 78 instances of direct speech. It can be concluded that educators with both bachelor's and master's degrees tend to use direct speech forms. In children with limited communication abilities due to psychological or physical developmental barriers, this certainly leads to differences in their communication styles (Nida, 2013). Forms of communication that are appropriate for the psychological and physical development in inclusive classrooms tend to use direct speech to avoid misperceptions and failures in the communication process.

3. Age

The research results based on age are divided into two subcategories, namely ≤ 34 and ≥ 35 years. The subcategories are based on the median average age of educators. The research results can be seen in the table below.

Table 3. Forms of Humanistic Expressive Speech Acts Based on Age

Category (in years)	Form	
	Direct	Indirect
≤ 34	75	21
≥ 35	97	10
TOTAL	203	

In the table above, in the age category ≤ 34 , there are 75 direct forms of expressive humanistic speech acts and 21 indirect speech acts. In the age category ≥ 35 , there are 97 forms of direct humanistic expressive speech acts and 10 indirect speech acts. It can be concluded that the form of humanistic expressive speech acts based on the age of the educator tends to use direct speech forms.

Children with limited communication abilities resulting from psychological or physical developmental challenges, such as those in homeschooling environments, naturally exhibit distinct communication styles. Communication forms adapted to children's psychological and physical development in inclusive classrooms tend to employ direct utterances to prevent misunderstandings and avoid disruptions in the communicative process.

CONCLUSION

The research results show that the forms of expressive humanistic speech acts of community-based inclusive homeschooling educators, based on gender, educational background, and age, tend to use direct speech acts. Based on gender, 80 forms of direct speech acts by female educators and 65 forms of direct speech acts by male educators were found. Based on educational background, 92 direct utterances from educators with a bachelor's degree (S1) and 78 direct utterances from educators with a master's degree (S2) were found. Based on the age of the educators, in the age category ≤ 34 , there are 75 instances of direct expressive humanist speech acts and in the age category ≥ 35 , there were 97 instances of direct speech acts.

Children who have limited communication abilities due to psychological or physical developmental barriers, such as those in homeschooling, certainly experience differences in communication styles. Forms of communication that align with psychological and physical development in inclusive classrooms tend to use direct speech to avoid misperceptions and communication breakdowns.

ETHICAL STATEMENTS

This study was conducted in accordance with academic research ethics principles, including scientific honesty, objectivity, data transparency, and respect for participants' rights. All data were obtained through appropriate procedures with participants' voluntary informed consent, while ensuring the confidentiality of their identities and personal information. The authors confirm that this manuscript is an original work, free from plagiarism, fabrication, and data manipulation, and that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. All sources and references have been properly acknowledged in accordance with academic writing standards, and the authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest related to this study.

REFERENCES

- Al Mufti, A. Y. (2018). Komparasi hasil prestasi belajar siswa sekolah dasar inklusi dan homeschooling. *Jurnal Educative: Journal of Educational Studies*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.30983/educative.v3i2.547>
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Baharudin, H., & Makin, M. (2007). *Pendidikan Humanistik*. Ar-Ruzzmedia.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.

- Cheng, A., & Donnelly, M. (2019a). New Frontiers in Research and Practice on Homeschooling. In *Peabody Journal of Education* (Vol. 94, Issue 3, pp. 259–262). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2019.1617576>
- Cheng, A., & Donnelly, M. (2019b). New Frontiers in Research and Practice on Homeschooling. In *Peabody Journal of Education* (Vol. 94, Issue 3, pp. 259–262). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2019.1617576>
- Darong, H. C. (2024). Speech acts production in EFL classroom interactions (A conversation analysis). *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 13(2).
- Daulay, N. (2021). Home education for children with autism spectrum disorder during the COVID-19 pandemic: Indonesian mothers experience. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 114, 103954. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2021.103954>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268.
- Eliya, I., Zulaeha, I., & Artikel, S. (2017). Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia Pola Komunikasi Politik Ganjar Pranowo dalam Perspektif Sociolinguistik di Media Sosial Instagram Info Artikel. In 286 *SELOKA* (Vol. 6, Issue 3). <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka>
- Fasting, R. B., & Breilid, N. (2024). Cross-professional collaboration to improve inclusive education. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 68(4), 661–676. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2023.2175248>
- Holmqvist, M., & Lelling, B. (2021). Teachers’ collaborative professional development for inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 36(5), 819–833. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2020.1842974>
- Julma Yulita, S., & Tressyalina. (2023). Tindak Tutur Direktif Guru Berbasis Gender dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Kelas XI SMA Negeri 1 Pancung Soal Kabupaten Pesisir Selatan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 2.
- Koteswarai, G., & Basavanna, M. (2017). Humanistic approach to education. *Journal of Indian Education*.
- Kunzman, R., & Gaither, M. (2020). Homeschooling: An Updated Comprehensive Survey of the Research. *Other Education: The Journal of Educational Alternatives*, 9(1), 253–336.
- Mulyadi, S. (2007). *Home Schooling Keluarga Kak - Seto: mudah, murah, meriah, dan direstui pemerintah*. Kaifa.
- Munifah, M., & Ardiyansyah, B. (2022). Sinergi pendampingan sebagai modal pembelajaran pendidikan inklusif di PKBM Yogyakarta. *INKLUSI*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.14421/ijds.080205>
- Nida, F. L. K. (2013). Komunikasi bagi Anak Berkebutuhan Khusus. *AT-TABSYIR, Jurnal Komunikasi Penyiaran Islam*, 1(2).
- Pedaste, M., Leijen, Ä., Kivirand, T., Nelis, P., & Malva, L. (2021). School leaders’ vision is the strongest predictor of their attitudes towards inclusive education practice. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1994661>

- Prasetyo, R. I., & Mulyani, M. (2018). Teacher's directives speech acts in teaching-learning interactions: Classroom discourse analysis. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 7(3), 213–221. <https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v7i3.26607>
- Puspitaningrum, D. A. (2022). Homeschooling bagi penyandang cerebral palsy. *The Indonesian Conference on Disability Studies and Inclusive Education*, 2, 89–101.
- Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to learn: A view of what education might become*. Charles E. Merrill.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic Psychological Needs In Motivation, Development, and Wellness*. Guilford Press.
- Sardiman, A. (2004). *Interaksi dan Motivasi Belajar Mengajar*. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). Speech acts and recent linguistics. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 263(1), 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1975.tb41567.x>
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500006837>
- Syafrida, E., & Wrastari, A. tri. (2013). Sikap Guru Terhadap Pendidikan Inklusi Ditinjau dari Faktor Pembentukan Sikap. *Jurnal Psikologi Perkembangan dan Pendidikan*, 2(01).
- Tiernan, B. (2022). Inclusion versus full inclusion: implications for progressing inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 37(5), 882–890. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2021.1961197>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education: All means all*. UNESCO.
- Uthus, M., & Qvortrup, A. (2024). Lessons learned from Norway: a values-based formulation of inclusive education. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2024.2354603>
- Walton, E. (2023). Why inclusive education falters: a Bernsteinian analysis. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2023.2241045>
- Yule, G. (2014). *Pragmatik*. terjemahan ed. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Zulaeha, I. (2016). *Teori, Model, dan Implementasi Pembelajaran Menulis Kreatif*. Unnes Press.
- Zulaeha, I., & Ariyanti, L. D. (2019). *Berbicara Ekspresif Humanis untuk Pendidikan* (1st ed.). Cipta Prima Nusantara.