

TEACHERS' REPROACH IN CASES STUDENTS MADE MISTAKES

Nguyen Thu Hanh

Office of Political – Student Affairs, Hanoi National University of Education

Abstract. This article focuses on research on the using of reproach act by teachers in secondary and high schools in Vietnam. Specifically, the study focused on understanding 448 reproach acts that teachers performed in communicating with students in situations where they made mistakes. To get an objective view of teachers' using of reproach act, the article also investigated the use of reproach behavior in literature works, movies (users are characters), and notes from daily dialogues (users are people around researcher). The results showed that the teachers reproached in significantly different ways such as: using other acts to present indirect reproach; using the primary performative of reproach to present illocutionary forces of other acts; using forms of interrogative, imperative, exclamatory, inversion or ellipsis sentence to express reproach acts; using mitigating devices to minimize the level of face-threatening of reproach; and so on. The results of the study are expected to contribute to the study of Vietnamese teachers' speech acts so that teachers can realize the importance of language in communicating with students and gain useful experiences for themselves. They can also be the data source for studying and learning language and are useful suggestions that can be applied in communication.

Keywords: speech act, reproach, teachers' reproach act.

1. Introduction

Within speech acts have been studied, reproaching has been a rather under-studied speech act in pragmatics literature. So far, research on reproach act has only been found in a few studies, but there have been no studies on reproach have been related to the teachers' using to respond to students' mistakes. Some researches on reproach have been available such as: Dang Thi Mai Hong surveyed and pointed out the types of reproach in Quang Binh's folk poetries [1]; Phan Thi Viet Anh applied the pragmatics theory in the study of reproach in folk poetries. The research has shown the types of direct and indirect reproach, politeness and gender in direct and indirect reproach in Vietnamese folk poetries [2]. In other studies, Nguyen Thu Hanh also discussed some content of reproach, including reproach event, primary performative and implicated/explicit performative, and indirect reproach [3], [4]. On the other hand, there are a few studies on teachers' speech acts in high schools, but none of them refer to teachers' reproach act in situations where students made mistakes. Since these studies have little relevance to the object of this study, they are only listed but not analyzed here. Some studies can be noted: Research on the face-threatening behavior of a teacher in the EFL classroom (Chen, I. J., 2017) [5]; Studies on teacher's feedback language (Hyland, F. and Hyland, K., 2001 [6]; Vu Thi Thanh Huong, 2005 [7]); Studies of communication, language interaction between teachers and students (Vu Thi Thanh Huong, 2014 [8]; Tran Thi Phuong, 2015 [9]).

Received October 20, 2020. Revised November 25, 2020. Accepted December 15, 2020.

Contact Nguyen Thu Hanh, e-mail address: hanhnt@hnue.edu.vn

Upwards, although reproaching in Vietnamese has appeared in a number of studies, it has not been surveyed and studied in teacher talk. The present study focuses on the recorded teacher's reproach that teachers used in communicating with students in situations where students make mistakes. Other data on reproach act was collected from literature works, movies, and from daily conversation were also considered and compared with the teachers' reproach to observe and give accurate conclusions to teacher reproach.

Reproaching act belongs to the group of expressives in Searle's classification of speech acts [10] and it is also an FTA of the participants involved in communication. (see P.Brown and S.C. Levinson (1978), G.N. Leech (2014) about the concept of "face", FTA and negative face, positive face) [11], [12]. Thus, it is necessary to find ways to minimize the level of face-threatening of this act or avoid face-threatening using of S and the H. Especially in the school environment, the use of FTAs of teachers is even more remarkable.

2. Content

2.1. Research methods

The main data of this study was collected from 60 lessons of different subjects in some secondary schools and high schools. They were recorded with the teachers' permit. The 60 recorded lessons were heard, written down and selected communicative situations in which students made mistakes. There are 446 students' mistakes found and teachers' responding towards the students' mistakes was 1106 speech acts. Then 1106 teachers' responding speeches were continued classifying and labeling type of speech acts. There are 52 different types of speech acts that were found, including reproach. As a result, there were 448 reproach acts that was chosen and used for the present study. In addition, other data sources of reproach acts collected from literature works, movies (users are characters), and notes from daily dialogues (users are people around researcher) were also used to compare and clarify features in the teachers' reproaches.

2.2. Research results

2.2.1. The concept of reproach act

Based on the concept of reproach of Nguyen Thu Hanh (2004) [3], this study adds and completes the definition: Reproaching is an illocutionary act whose illocutionary point is to express S's dissatisfaction on an action/behavior/attitude A of H when realizing that A was not true/bad/inappropriate and not good for H. S expressed his/her attitude towards H's fault because he/she also wanted H to realize that A was negative/not good for H, and wanted H to correct/not repeat A in the future. This act shows S's negative attitude towards H's positive face, and S's desire also infringes on H's negative face. Thus, this is a face-threatening act.

Based on the concept of the reproach act, when studying of the reproach of the teacher, some remarkable results were found out. However, in the framework of the article, only some outstanding results will be selected and shown below.

2.2.2. Teachers' reproach act

As mentioned above, the data for this study has been collected from three user groups: User 1 - Teachers' speech was recorded when they communicated to their students in cases students made mistakes; User 2 - Characters's speech in dialogues in literature works and movies; User 3 - People (anyone using daily dialogue) who used reproaching act was noted. The data is a reliable source of information to analyze and evaluate reproach act. The data is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Frequency distribution of reproach types of group users

Group	U1		U2		U3		Total
	<i>F</i>	%	<i>F</i>	%	<i>F</i>	%	
<i>Speech acts</i>							
<i>Direct reproach*</i>	105	32.61	115	35.71	102	31.68	322
<i>Indirect reproach</i>	343	42.82	258	32.21	200	24.47	801
Total amount of reproach	448	38.89	373	33.21	302	26.89	1123

Notes: *F*: Frequency; U1/ U2/ U3: User1/ User2...; *: Within the direct reproaches of the data there are 4 acts were found to use performative reproach of U3. So the total of reproaching acts is $1123 + 4 = 1127$ as mentioned above.

In total, there are 1127 reproaching acts are divided into two kinds: direct and indirect reproach. Teachers' reproachs are 105 (32.61%) of direct reproaches and 343 (42.82%) of indirect ones. Within each kind, the reproaching acts of each user group is expressed in different ways, as shown in the following sections.

2.2.2.1. Teachers used reproach act to present illocutionary point of other acts

A reproach might be used to present illocutionary point of other acts. Then, the primary performative of reproach and other illocutionary force indicating devices (IFIDs) are the basic for identifying the illocutionary acts that the reproach is implicated. A number of speech acts in Table 2 are indirect acts that are performed by the primary performative of reproach.

Table 2. Taxonomy of speech acts performed by reproach

Order	Speech acts/group acts	User groups						Total
		U1		U2		U3		
		<i>F</i>	%	<i>F</i>	%	<i>F</i>	%	
1.	Criticis	66	53.66	22	17.89	35	28.46	123
2.	Complain	7	13.46	29	55.77	16	30.77	52
3.	Correct	9	40.91	6	27.37	7	31.81	22
4.	Order	10	45.56	6	27.32	6	27.32	22
5.	Remind	7	46.47	2	13.33	6	40	15
6.	Advise/suggest	2	16.67	5	41.67	5	41.67	12
7.	Decry			9	75	3	25	12
8.	Instruct	3	25	5	41.67	4	33.33	12
9.	Prevent			5	41.67	7	58.33	12
10.	Expression of attitude (agree, support, approve, ...)			7	70	3	30	10
11.	Sulk			4	57.14	3	42.86	7
12.	Ridicule/ironize sarcastic			3	50	3	50	6
13.	Persuade			4	100			4
14.	Warn	1	25	3	75			4

15.	Urge					2	100	2
16.	Interrupt			1	100			1
17.	Grumble			1	100			1
18.	Moan					1	100	1
19.	Query					1	100	1
20.	Recite			1	100			1
21.	Relieve			1	100			1
22.	Scold			1	100			1
Total		105	<i>32.61</i>	115	<i>35.71</i>	102	<i>31.68</i>	322

Information from Table 2 indicates that reproaching act might be used to present illocutionary point of the 22 types of acts. It is noted that there is a significant difference in the number of types of acts and the frequency of using each act among user groups, U1, U2, U3, respectively: 8 - 20 - 16. For example, for the criticism act, U1 used 66 times, U2 used 22 times, and U3 used 35 times.

Table 2 also indicates that generally, the teachers produced fewer types of acts than U1 and U2, but the total number of frequencies was nearly equal (U1 used 8 types with 105 times, U2 used 20 types with 115 times, U3 used 16 types with 102 times). On the other hand, compare to the face-threatening acts, the number of teachers' other acts are greater, 12/22, but the actual frequency of using in each type is quite low. In fact, the reproach that the teachers used only focuses on a certain number of illocutionary force of acts such as *criticis*, *complain*, *correct*, *order*, *remind*, *advise/suggest*, *instruct*, and *warn*.

Within the 8 types of acts performed by teachers, when looking at their illocutionary meaning used in situations where students made mistakes, there are only two FTAs (criticism and complaint). It should be noted that the teacher used the two FTAs with the highest frequency, 73/105 times, compared to the left acts and compared to 49 times of U2, and 53 times of U3.

These allow to conclude, teachers did not pay attention to use their language when communicating with students when students made mistakes. They tended to use the reproach towards the illocutionary points of FTAs. It also means that in many cases of making mistakes, students have not been respected yet instead of being offended by teacher-talk. The following examples where teachers used reproach but aimed at critical or complaint illocutionary forces.

(1) Học cho mình mà cứ như đi học thuê cho bố mẹ, cho cô ấy (reproach → criticism) (*Studying is for yourself, but it is as if you did it for your parents and for me.*)

(2) Trời nóng như thế này rồi lại còn vẫn cứ thích gần nhau. Giãn bớt nó ra cho thoáng đi. (reproach → complain). (*It is too hot yet you're still sitting close together like that. Separate out for spaces.*). In this situation, students had set up tables and sat closely. The purpose of table setting and sitting so close together because they probably thought it would be convenient to exchange information when doing the upcoming test. The teacher seemed to realize their intention and complained.

2.2.2.2. Teachers used other acts to present indirect reproaches

Survey results show that it is quite common for teachers to use other acts to present illocutionary forces of a reproach (i.e. indirect reproach). See Table 3 below.

In Table 3, the indirect reproach of each user has remarkable points:

Table 3. Taxonomy of speech acts/group acts used to present indirect reproach

Order	Indirect reproach made by other acts/group of acts	User groups						Total
		U1		U2		U3		
		F	%	F	%	F	%	
23.	Ask	127	48.29	96	36.50	40	15.21	263
24.	Expression of attitude (agree, support, approve,...)	1	1.41	51	71.83	19	26.76	71
25.	Remind	45	83.33	5	9.26	4	7.41	54
26.	Complain	2	5.00	14	35.00	24	60.00	40
27.	Statement	16	40.00	10	25.00	14	35.00	40
28.	Criticise	4	14.28	7	25.00	17	60.71	28
29.	Advise	6	21.43	6	21.43	16	57.14	28
30.	Assert	22	84.62	4	15.38			26
31.	Mock	11	44.00	3	12.00	11	44.00	25
32.	Describe	14	58.33			10	41.67	24
33.	Request	18	100					18
34.	Exclaim	6	35.29	8	47.10	3	17.65	17
35.	Sulk	2	11.80	12	70.60	3	17.61	17
36.	Inform	12	75.00	4	24.00			16
37.	Lament	4	26.27	5	33.33	6	40.00	15
38.	Explain	5	41.67			7	58.33	12
39.	Direct			4	36.40	7	63.64	11
40.	Blame			6	66.67	3	33.33	9
41.	Warn	8	100					8
42.	Decry	2	25.00	2	25	4	50	8
43.	Wish/assume			1	12.50	7	87.50	8
44.	Guess	5	100					5
45.	Shout	5	100					5
46.	Comment	5	100					5
47.	Argue	1	20.00	4	80.00			5
48.	Remark	5	100					5
49.	Call	4	100					4
50.	Conclude	2	66.67	1	33.33			3
51.	Grumble	2	66.67	1	33.33			3
52.	Suggest	3	100					3
53.	Convince/persuad			3	100			3

54.	Repeat	2	100					2
55.	Jest/joke	1	50.00	1	50.00			2
56.	Hint	1	100					1
57.	Threaten	1	100					1
58.	Overstate	1	100					1
59.	Swear			1	100			1
60.	Idiomatic and proverbial expression			2	14.29	12	85.71	14
The total of each user		343 (42.82%)	258 (32.21%)	200 (24.97%)	801 100 %			

There is a difference in the number of types of acts that each user group performed the illocutionary point of the reproach and the frequency with which they are used.

- There are a total of 38 types of act used to create reproach. Each group uses a different number of types: U1 used 32, U2 used 24, U3 used 17. It should be noted that the teacher gave more types of acts to perform reproach than the other two groups.

- The result shows that within 38 types of acts used to perform reproach, 15 are face-threatening acts (FTAs). The teachers used 13/15 FTAs to perform the illocutionary force of reprimand. The FTAs are *complaint, critic, mock/ridicule, exclaim, sulk, lament, warn, decry, shout, grumble, joke, threaten, overstate*. Compared to U2 and U3, teachers gave more FTAs, U2 gave 10 and U3 gave 8. However, teachers' 13-FTA types have been used 49 times (6.12% of the total number of indirect reproach) while U2's 10-types has been used 55 times (6.87%), and U3's 8-types has been used 80 times (9.99%). As can be seen, teachers have used more FTAs to present their reproach, but the frequency of using the FTAs is less than that of U2 and U3. Some examples where teachers have used FTAs to reproach.

(3) *NA nhìn vào bài văn của mình hôm trước chưa? Thấy NA và Ph là, là... gọi là hợp tác trí tuệ chưa?* (mock → reproach) (Did NA look at your last essay? Look, NA and Ph are... are,... called "intellectual cooperation"? In this situation, the mocking of the teacher implies (by the phrase "intellectual cooperation") that two students are responsible for copying each other's essays.

(4) Teacher 1: *Ai giặt giẻ lau bảng đấy?* (*Who washed the board rag?*)

Student: (*talking together*) *bạn Bình, Bình, Bình (Bình, Bình, Bình.)*

Teacher 2: - *Tôi vắt ra một đồng nước đây này. (I squeezed out a bunch of water here.)*

- *Bây giờ cái giẻ lau bảng phải nặng 5 cân. (overstate → reproach) (The board rag now weighs 5 pounds.)*

- Within 38 types of acts used to perform reproach, 13 are face-saving acts (FSAs). The teachers used 12/13 FSAs to perform the illocutionary force of reprimand. The FSAs are *statement, advise, assert, describe, inform, explain, guess, comment, remark, call, suggest, convince* and *hint*. Compared to U2 and U3, teachers gave more FSAs, U2 gave 5 and U3 gave 4. Teachers' 12-FSA types have been used 98 times (12.23% of the total number of indirect reproach) while U2's 5-types has been used 27 times (3.37%), and U3's 4-types has been used 47 times (5.87%). It should be noted that although the teachers gave less types of FSA than FTA to perform reproach, the frequency of using the FSAs is more than that of FTAs (12.23% FSAs, 6.12% FTAs). An example where teachers have used FSA to reproach:

(5) Bạn M thì vẫn thế từ lớp 10 đến giờ, ngồi trong lớp lúc nào cũng hí hoáy nghịch một mình (describe → reproach) (*M has been still the same from 10th grade up to now, sitting in class but always playing something by yourself.*). Teacher described the current state of student M but implied that the student did not focus on the lesson while studying. The illocutionary force of the reproach seems to soften by the form of a describing.

- Although teachers have used up to 32 different types of speech act to perform indirect reproach, the habit of using only focuses on a few types: *ask, remind, assert, request, statement, describe, inform* (these acts have a number of occurrences ≥ 10). The rest of the acts have been used with lower frequency, in which many of them have been used only once. Looking at the names of acts that teachers have used with a high frequency, they are hardly face threatening acts. Hence, if they are used to perform the illocutionary point of reproach, they will reduce the level of threat of reproaching and make the illocutionary force gentle. Here are examples where teachers have used some speech acts (which occur with high frequency) to perform the reproach.

(6) Em nói chuyện gì đấy? (ask → reproach) (*What are you talking about?*)

(7) Bạn T vẫn nói tự do trong lớp (remind → reproach) (*T, you are still talking freely in class.*)

2.2.2.3. The reality of using the reproach act of teachers from the politeness point of view

Results from the survey data shows that teachers have presented the reproach act in both polite and impolite sides. The impolite expressions that teachers have made when using reproaches such as:

Firstly, using the FTAs as mentioned in sections 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2 teachers' use of impolite speech acts is shown in two sections: (i) using face-threatening acts to perform the reproach (i.e. present the indirect reproach through other FTAs) (see sections 2.2.2.1, examples (1), (2)); (ii) using primary performative of reproach to accomplish the illocutionary points of other FTAs (see sections 2.2.2.2 examples (3), (4), (5)).

Secondly, using some kinds of structures to perform reproach. In fact, when using reproaching act, teachers have used some kinds of structures: interrogative, imperative, exclamatory, inversion or ellipsis sentence, and so on. In some specific communication situations, these forms often make the reproach (whose goals aimed at students' errors) became heavier. For example:

(8) Viết đề cương như thế này á? (*Write outlines like this, really?*)

(9) Nói ít thôi! (*Speak less!*)

Thirdly, using the extension components. An utterance of reproach has a core that is a performative of reproach, and there may be extended components, standing before or after the performative. Teachers have used some extension components in reproach utterances such as vocatives, exclamation and modal particles.

Vocative is one of the IFIDs to recognize the illocutionary force of a reproach act because it shows S's attitude towards H, drawing H's attention into the propositional content. The vocatives might be used to minimize the level of face-threatening of the reproach, and vice versa.

The survey results show that teachers used vocatives in two ways: calling students' names before performing the reproach and using impolite pronouns, which directly threaten students' faces such as: “thằng” (used 8 times), “mày” (twice), “gang leader” (twice), “anh” (47 times), “chị” (6 times). The pronouns *mày, anh, chị* have no equivalent in English. See examples bellow:

(10) Vở ghi của **thằng Hải** đâu? (*Where's your notebook guy Hai?*).

(11) Nào thôi. Mấy σ...σ... **đại ca** ở khúc dưới nào, chú ý nào. (*Hey. You guys ... eh ... gang leader at the end of class, please pay attention.*)

Exclamation elements may appear before or after the primary performative of reproach. They are lamentations such as *oh my God*, *oh dear*, *oh*, *oh snap*, and so on, appear in the statement of reproach. The exclamation elements often do not belong to the propositional content, but they still denote S's attitudes. The exclamation elements always signify negative meaning because they express S's dissatisfaction. S directed his/her dissatisfaction at the proposition revealed later. For example:

In this situation, the teacher asked the student to summarize the previous lesson:

(12) Teacher: Tuyết nào? (*Tuyet?*)

Student: Em chưa. (*I didn't.*)

Teacher: Cũng chưa tóm tắt. **Thôi chết rồi!** (*Not summarized, either. Oh snap!*)

The teacher asked a student to take an example of rhetorical devices that they are learning, but student could not do.

(13) **Giời ơi**, biện pháp gì đang học đây ạ. (*Oh my god*, what rhetorical device are you studying here?)

Modal particles at the end of sentences: Modal particles in Vietnamese, if considered from the aspect of showing S's politeness, could be divided into modal particles denoting polite attitude, modal particles denoting impolite attitude, and modal particles denoting neutral attitude (i.e. polite or impolite depending on the particular communication context and speech act). Modal particles are also IFIDs, which shows the attitude of teachers' politeness.

Teachers used group of modal particles at the end of sentences that represent S's impolite attitude in reproach utterances, such as: *ah* (à) (30 times), *á* (6 times), *a* (9 times), *ấy* (3 times), *đấy* (20 times), *hả* (5 times), *nhá* (17 times), *nhé* (2 times), *nhỉ* (5 times), *nhờ* (4 times), *thế* (11 times),... (these words have no equivalent in English).

Nguyen Van Hiep (2005) stated "P à?" (*ah*), what S asked is a hypothesis. Thus, "à" is a particle that denotes politeness because S gave H the authority to affirm or reject the proposed hypothesis, it means that S has shown respect for H [13]. However, in the present study, the reproach act has the illocutionary point is aimed at H's error, so the particle "à" is used to indicate H's error confirmation (that is offensive to H's positive face). Hence, "à" when being used in a reproach utterance does not indicate a polite meaning. The particle "nhỉ", "nhé" are the same. See some examples:

(14) Cứ trả lời cho xong đi xong bỏ thế thôi **á**? (*Just answer for it to be done, then leave it?*)

(15) Lúc nào cũng muốn mớm cơm đến tận mồm **ấy**. (*Always wanted to feed rice up to the mouth.*) (this utterance meant to reproach students for not thinking about doing the exercise themselves, but always want the teacher to do all for them).

(16) Mũ (*bảo hiểm*) sao không thấy đội vào lại... ờ ờ... ờ lại để **thế**? (*Why didn't you wear your helmet uh uh... let it out?*).

Fourthly, the teachers have used impolite, mocking and sarcastic words in the reproach utterances. The reproach act becomes more and more severe in some cases when teachers intentionally used impolite, mocking, and sarcastic words such as "plug face plug nose in", "dropped" (in dropped pants), "intellectual cooperation" (copy each other's essay), "crazy", "honor" (when getting bad marks), "feed rice from one's mouth" (the teacher must do all the outline for the students), "the champion from bottom up",... For example:

(17) Anh Tr đúng không? Con tên là Tr đúng không? Cả Vật lí, cả Công nghệ con được **vinh danh** đấy. (*Tr, right? Your name is Tr, right? You are honored for both Physics and Technology.*) → The teacher intentionally sarcasted that the student had got bad grades on these subjects.

(18) Cát bài kiểm tra và lấy đề cương. Lấy bằng tay chứ không phải lấy bằng mồm. (*Put the test in bag and take out the outlines. Take them by hand, not by mouth.*)

Fifthly, consecutively speak out a series of face-threatening acts in a situation. In the survey datas, some cases the teachers consecutively speak out the face-threatening acts when the students made mistake. This acting makes the reproach become more pressure, and also makes the communication more stressful. It threatens the student's face as well. For example:

(19) Câu trả lời thế ai hiểu không? Câu viết vào trong vở, trong giấy kiểm tra như thế liệu rằng ai hiểu không? Trình bày lại cho có đầu có cuối xem nào. (*You answered like that, who understands? You write in your notebook, on the test paper like that who understands? Present it again so it has a beginning and an end.*)

The above impolite signs show that teachers have high social power, and they did not respect students in many situations. There is a large distance in the relationship between teachers and students. The high social power and large distance between teachers and students are shown in the fact that teachers allow themselves to use IFIDs (vocatives, exclamation elements, modal particles,...), impolite, mocking, sarcastic words, or some interrogative and imperative structures (which is considered impolite in case of reprimand in Vietnamese) in order to offend their students.

Besides the impoliteness, there are also signals that the teachers have used reproach act in polite ways.

Firstly, using close kinship vocatives has the effect of drawing the social distance between teachers and students. For example, using family titles “con” or using personal names. According to statistics, teachers have used intimate words “con” 20 times to call students; or the word “em” 48 times.

(20) Vở bạn T đâu? **Con** chưa chữa được bài nào đúng không? (*Where's T's notebook? You have not corrected any exercise, have you?*).

Secondly, using modifiers to mitigate the level of illocutionary force of act. These are downtoners: *maybe, perhaps, possible, probably*,... These elements indicate S's assessment of the proposition content of reproach is uncertain. When being used in the statement of reproach these downtoners could lessen the harshness of the reproach. So they are considered expressions of politeness. For example:

(21) Không có bạn nào giơ tay, **khả năng** là lớp đa phần các bạn không làm bài tập về nhà đúng không? (*No one raised hands, maybe most of you didn't do your homework, right?*)

Thirdly, giving indirect reproach by using FSAs or FFAs. According to survey data, there are 10 types of FSAs that were used by all three groups. These are acts that can mitigate the pressure of reproach such as: *Remind, statement, advise, inform, direct, wish/assume, call, suggest, convince, joke*. The teachers used 7/10 FSAs to indirectly present the reproach (*remind, statement, advise, inform, direct, call, suggest, joke*), U2 used 9/10 and U3 used 6/10. For example, a teacher used to advise act to indirectly reprimand a student for not giving his opinion when discussing in the lesson. It is noted that, according to Vietnamese, advising is not an FTA.

(22) Mình lớp 9 rồi mình cần phải có bản lĩnh riêng của mình, mình cần phải có chính kiến riêng của mình nữa. (*You are in grade 9, you need to have your own bravery, you need to have your own opinion.*)

The results of politeness and impolitenes have shown in this study are also the points should be noted (should be used and should not be used) when using reproach.

3. Conclusions

The presented research results allow to conclude: The reproach acts that the teachers spoke out in situations where students made mistakes have both positive and negative signs. Some of positive signs can be seen such as: using close kinship vocatives; using mitigating devices to minimize the level of face-threatening of reproach; creating indirect reproach by using FSAs or FFAs. These efforts of teachers both mitigate the illocutionary force of reproach act and make the relationship between teachers and students not stressful. However, the negative signs are more complicated than positive signs.

A number of impolite expressions of teachers' speeches are found: using FTAs to present indirect reproach with high frequency; using the primary performative of reproach to present illocutionary forces of other stronger FTAs; using interrogative, imperative, exclamatory, inversion or ellipsis structures, which make the illocutionary force of reproach became heavier in some situations; using rude vocatives; using negative exclamation (phrases) to express teachers' dissatisfaction; using ending modal particles of structures that represent teachers' impolite attitude; using impolite/ridicule/sarcastic words and phrases; or consecutively speaking out a series of FTAs in a situation which make the illocutionary force of reproach heavier. All of the above negative signs should be avoided to reduce the level of face-threatening of the reproach.

The results from negative signs showed that teachers had not paid attention to communicating with students in cases students made mistakes. And the negative signs that the teachers have shown from the use of reproach act reflect the following remarkable points:

Firstly, teachers offended both negative face and positive face of students, in other words, students were not respected in many situations when they made mistakes. Notably, in the survey data, there are 9 groups of mistakes that students made, in which the errors related to the knowledge and the tasks of the lesson account for 35.64%. Therefore, the teacher's impolite and disrespectful language might create a barrier to students' cognitive processes, especially in situations in which students made mistakes about the knowledge of the lesson.

Secondly, at Vietnamese schools, as Dao Thi Phuong (2014) [14] stated that, Hofstede et al (2010 - Cultures and organizations: Software for the mind (3rd ed). McGraw-Hill, New York.) had pointed out the power distance index in groups: families, schools, health facilities of 76 countries and territories around the world, including Vietnam. According to Hofstede, Vietnam is a country with high power index, ranking 70 out of 76 countries and territories (the average index of the world is 53). It means that teachers have high social power and the distance between teachers and students is large. The manifestation of power distance has certain effects on students. The ways the teachers presented the reproach acts towards students might prevent students from showing their opinion and taking an active role in the learning process. Instead of being active, they will be passive and not actively participate in educational activities.

Thirdly, from the perspective of pragmatics, teachers did not seem to have a communication strategy with students, especially in situations where students made mistakes. This fact reflects that the teachers have limited pragmatic knowledge. This is confirmed with more certainty when the majority of teachers who provided recorded lessons were asked to admit that they do not have knowledge about pragmatics and do not know how to communicate from a pragmatic point of view. The limitation of the teacher also partly affects the effectiveness of education in general. This is also an issue that needs to be taken seriously by educational managers.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dang Thi Mai Hong, 2001. *Reproach act in Quang Binh's folk poetry*, Young Linguistics 2000, Learning and Research Forum, Vietnam Linguistics Association, Hanoi, pp.398-404.
- [2] Phan Thi Viet Anh, 2009. *The reproach of the Vietnamese in lyrical folk poetry*, Master's thesis, Hanoi National University of Education, Hanoi.
- [3] Nguyen Thu Hanh, 2004. *Reproach act and Reproach event*, Master thesis, Hanoi National University of Education, Hanoi.
- [4] Nguyen Thu Hanh, 2020. "Indirect speech act trach (reproach) in Vietnamese". *HNUE Journal of Science, Social Sciences*, 2020, Vol.65, I.8, pp. 119-128.
- [5] Chen, I. J., 2017. "Face - threatening acts: conflict between a teacher and students in efl classroom". *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 2017, 7, 151-166. (<http://www.scirp.org/journal/ojml>)
- [6] Hyland, F., and Hyland, K., 2001. "Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback". *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 185-212.
- [7] Vu Thi Thanh Huong, 2005. "Using the question and answer method and cognitive questions in classrooms in the current secondary school". *Journal of Languages*, No. 4, pp.69-80.
- [8] Vu Thi Thanh Huong, 2014. "Turn-talking in classroom interactions". *Journal of Languages*, No.11, pp.25-33.
- [9] Tran Thi Phuong, 2015. *Research conversations in classroom between teachers and students (Hai Duong province)*, PhD thesis in Linguistics, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Vietnam National University, Hanoi.
- [10] J. R. Searle, 1975. "Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (Eds)". *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol. 3, pp.59-82, New York: Academic Press.
- [11] P. Brown and S. C. Levinson, 1978. *Politeness - Some universals in language usage*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [12] G. N. Leech, 2014. *The Pragmatics of Politeness*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- [13] Nguyen Van Hiep, 2005. *Vietnamese ending-sentence modal particles and polite strategy*, The 6th Inter-Asian International Conference on Linguistics, pp.125-139.
- [14] Dao Thi Phuong, 2014. "Manifestation of power distance in teacher - student relationship at school and some pedagogical implication". *Journal of Language and Life*, No.11 (229), pp.11-17.