

PRAGMATIC FAILURE ISSUE: STUDENTS' FAILURE TO RESPOND AN INVITING POLITELY

Rahmatul Khasanah

Program Studi Sastra Inggris, Universitas Teknologi Surabaya
yanakhasanahel@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study is conducted to investigate how non English department students produce pragmatic failures in responding the expressions, how do non English department students successfully respond to the pragmatics in responding to the expression and how do non English department students repair their pragmatic failure in responding the expressions. As the data analysis, the students' answers of questionnaires and students' answers of interviews are taken. This study uses descriptive qualitative method to analyze and interpret the results of questionnaires and interviews. The researcher believes that by studying the questionnaires' answers of non English department students and observing the students' answers during interviews can answer the research questions. Pragmatic failures are the failure of non English department students to understand the intended meaning of some expressions. There are two kinds of pragmatic failures which produced by non English department students to respond the expressions are pragmalinguistic failures and sociopragmatic failures. From data analysis of producing pragmatic failures of non English department students, most of students fail to respond to the given contexts politely. Implicitly, the more they fail to respond the context, the more they produce sociopragmatic failures.

Keywords: Pragmatic Failures, Sociopragmatic Failures, The Factors

Abstrak

Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk menyelidiki bagaimana mahasiswa jurusan non-Inggris menghasilkan kegagalan pragmatis dalam menanggapi ekspresi, bagaimana siswa jurusan non-Inggris berhasil merespons pragmatik dalam menanggapi ekspresi dan bagaimana mahasiswa jurusan non-Inggris memperbaiki kegagalan pragmatis mereka dalam merespons ekspresi. Sebagai analisis data, jawaban siswa terhadap kuesioner dan jawaban wawancara siswa diambil. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif untuk menganalisis dan menginterpretasikan hasil kuesioner dan wawancara. Peneliti percaya bahwa dengan mempelajari jawaban kuesioner dari mahasiswa jurusan bahasa Inggris dan mengamati jawaban siswa selama wawancara dapat menjawab pertanyaan penelitian. Kegagalan pragmatis adalah kegagalan mahasiswa jurusan non-Inggris untuk memahami arti dari beberapa ungkapan. Ada dua jenis kegagalan pragmatis yang dihasilkan oleh mahasiswa jurusan non-Inggris untuk merespons ungkapan tersebut, yaitu kegagalan pragmalinguistik dan kegagalan sosiopragmatik. Dari analisis data menghasilkan kegagalan pragmatis mahasiswa jurusan non-Inggris, sebagian besar siswa gagal menanggapi konteks yang diberikan dengan sopan. Secara implisit, semakin mereka gagal merespons konteks, semakin mereka menghasilkan kegagalan sosiopragmatik.

Kata Kunci: Kegagalan Pragmatis, Kegagalan Sosiopragmatik, Faktor-faktornya

I. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is one of the countries of having Multilanguage, Indonesian language and local language. Mostly,

Indonesian people use either local language or Indonesian language to communicate every day. The use of English is only in school's area, thus

most of Indonesian people often get pragmatic failure in their English communication.

For example, when someone travelled to Jogjakarta and met two foreign people, then both of an Indonesian and a Turkish got the conversation. It worked so well. In the middle of conversation there was a misunderstanding among two people.

Turkish: Are you Indonesian?

Indonesian: What do you think about me? Do you think I am not an Indonesian people?

Turkish: Oh, sorry I don't mean like that. I mean where do you come from?

The dialogue above is an example of pragmatics failures among Indonesian people with foreign people. The Turkish wanted to ask about an Indonesian's living place by saying "Are you Indonesian people?" In the fact, an Indonesian did not understand an intended meaning of Turkish's utterance and she gave an unexpected answer to the Turkish. Delivering an unexpected answer by Indonesian is called pragmatic failure.

The phenomenon of Pragmatic failure between Turkish and Indonesian occurs because both of them have different culture and different way of thinking. Different culture of Turkish people and Indonesian people is usually called cross-cultural. Cross-cultural is one of the causes of pragmatic failure in communication. It is delivered by Thomas (1983, p. 91), in his research "I use term 'cross-cultural', then, as a shorthand way of describing not just native-nonnative interactions, but any communication between two people who in any particular domain, do not share a common linguistic or cultural background."

As Thomas (1983) has explained in her research, in daily life, cross-cultural is not only happening between native and

non-native speaker but it also happens among the interlocutors who have different cultural background. Cross-cultural is one of pragmatic failure's factors. Different cultural background as Thomas has mentioned is not only different countries or different life, but it also happen on works' management, members of ethnic minority and the police, the teacher and the students at school and also the lecturer and new undergraduate students in university.

...any communication between two people who, in any particular domain, do not share a common linguistic or cultural background. This might include workers and management, members of ethnic minorities and the police, or (when the domain of discourse is academic writing) university lecturers and new undergraduate students. Thomas (1983, p. 91).

Her statement is a fact based on the reality in the field and interests the writer to do a research in pragmatic failure in university lecturers and new undergraduate students. Several studies had been conducted on pragmatic failures phenomena. Thomas (1983) investigated pragmatic failure in cross cultural communication. She investigated pragmatic failures of students in university of Lancaster. The result found that there were two kinds of pragmatic failures in a communication, pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failures.

In addition, Jianbin (2010) investigated the kinds of pragmatic failures produced by non English department students in Zhejiang University, China. The result found that most of non English department students produced both of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failure in their communication. The finding also showed the common expressions of producing pragmatic failures and the factors of

producing pragmatic failures. Ting (2013) also investigated the factor of producing pragmatic failures of students in Xiaogan University, China. His result showed that the phenomena of producing pragmatic failures in a communication are very common.

The overall studies show that the producing pragmatic failures by the students because they learn English without understand the culture. The studies also suggest introducing the pragmatics principle in English teaching. It is an important way to reduce the producing of pragmatic failures by students. It could help them to minimize producing pragmatic failure in their communication. Giving a cultural knowledge in their English learning is also one of the ways to minimize their producing pragmatic failures.

The cause of pragmatics failure has a relevance to those studies, such as speech acts, conversational implicature. When one of the studies is broken in speaking, it indicates that pragmatics failure is occurring in communication. The relation between pragmatics failure and speech acts theory is the way of speaker in delivering idea is not appropriate with the act. Perhaps, the speaker breaks one of speech acts' principles. In conversational implicature, pragmatics failure can happen when the listener does not understand with the speaker's utterance.

There are two kinds of manifestation of pragmatic failures are pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failure. Pragmalinguistic failure is the speaker's mistake in choosing appropriate words of utterance and the speaker's wrong belief about the hearer's competence. Sociopragmatic failure refers to the inability of the hearer to concern on the speaker's identity and social status. Producing pragmatic failures is influenced by some factors such as language awareness, students' language

acquisition, students' processing language in the brain, cross cultural understanding, etc.

The process of producing pragmatic failures is caused by many relevant factors which delivered by the experts theories. According to the experts' theories, pragmatic failure is started from someone's pragmatic competence. Pragmatics competence is someone's competence to understand an intended meaning of the context. It is integrated to linguistic competence. Linguistic and pragmatic competence is the part of language competence. Both of them are processed in brain as awareness in action to produce a product, understanding among the interlocutors. The process of linguistic and pragmatic competence are influenced by language, society and culture of someone.

According to Thomas' research, there are two kinds of pragmatic failures, pragmalinguistic failures and sociopragmatic failures. Producing pragmalinguistic failures concerns on linguistics' competence of interlocutors which is refers to interlocutors' understanding the grammar. Producing sociopragmatic failures concerns on the interlocutors' understanding of a culture such as politeness.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

According to the research question and objective study of the research, the use of qualitative method to analyze the gained data is the most appropriate method. Because it describes in details all of phenomena during the observation. Qualitative research seeks to understand and interpret social phenomena from the perspective of the human participants in a particular natural setting (Ary et al., p. 420). Creswell (2012, p. 205) stated that qualitative data collection is more than simply deciding on whether you will observe or interview people. Dornyei

(2007, p. 38) also states that qualitative research aims to describe social phenomena as they occur naturally without manipulation of the situation under the study. This study aims to describe the way to produce pragmatic failure by non English department students naturally. The data are collected, analyzed, and described in the form of words.

The students of non-English Department in UIN Sunan Ampel, Surabaya are the source of data of this research. There are twenty four students of non English department students taken as the subject of this research. They join English intensive program in UIN Sunan Ampel, Surabaya. There are 15 classes of intensive English program and each class consisted of 24 students. They were from different department. The beginner level of students is chosen in this research.

Questionnaire and interview are the instruments to collect data. The questionnaire is given as the starting step of the researcher to know the common expressions which often fail to be understood by the students. There are fifteen multiple choice questions included in the questionnaire. The students had to choose the best answer based on their understanding. The questions cover some aspects that were needed by the researcher such as knowing the producing of pragmatic failures in answering the questionnaire and the number of students produced pragmatic failures in answering the questionnaires. The questionnaire used is adopted from questionnaire from Ziran's.

After distributing the questionnaire, a semi structured interview is conducted by the researcher to know the students' producing pragmatic failures in responding the expressions.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Pragmatic failure is the main issue of this research corresponds to pragmalinguistic failure and sociopragmatic failure. As mentioned in chapter two, pragmatic failure is the inability of the hearer to understand the speaker's goal in his or her utterance (Ziran, 2004; Huang and Lihui, 2010, p. 43). The hearer's inability is caused by many factors; one of them is the inappropriate diction of the speaker. The inappropriate diction of the speaker refers to the pragmalinguistic failure; the speaker takes for granted that the hearer is able to understand his meaning and he, thus, makes an inappropriate utterance (Ziran, 2004; Huang and Lihui, 2010, p. 43).

There are many reasons of producing pragmatic failure in communication. One of them is the mistake in choosing the words as mentioned above. The effect of environment or society is also the reason of pragmatic failure, a sociopragmatic failure. The different cultural background and understandings are two of the causes of sociopragmatic failure among the interlocutors.

The phenomena of producing pragmatic failures of non English department in UINSA Surabaya do not only occur in pragmalinguistic contexts but also sociopragmatic contexts. The researcher found some phenomena which considered to sociopragmatic failures phenomena. There are only six contexts which produce sociopragmatic failures phenomena. Although the phenomena of producing sociopragmatic failures are not as many as pragmalinguistic failure, the main factor of producing pragmatic failures by non English department students is on sociopragmatic context.

Producing socio pragmalinguistic failure refers to students' misunderstanding cross culture while learning English. Students' failure to understand politeness is one of the factors of producing sociopragmalinguistic failure. There are many factors of producing sociopragmatic failure such as students' local cultural interference, students' misunderstanding social stratification and students' misunderstanding politeness. Students' local cultural interference is the main

factor of producing sociopragmatic failure by non English department students in UINSA Surabaya.

The identification of producing sociopragmatic failures is similar to the identification of producing pragmalinguistic failure. It is gotten from questionnaires result and it is formed in table. It also consists of the types of failure, questionnaire items, students' optional answer and percentages. The tables are formed by the same theme of each questionnaire item as follow as:

Table 1. Sociopragmatic Failure produced by non English department students

Questionnaire Items	Contexts	Correct answer	Failure (%)	Numbers of students
2	Addressing	Hey	25%	6
3	Introducing	Hello, it's nice to meet you and then shake hands.	8%	2
11	Thanking	You're welcome	8%	2
4	Making a requirement	Excuse me, I am still learning the language	33%	8
13	Introducing	What's the relationship between you and that woman?	25%	6
6	Inviting	Not for moment, thank you, Mrs. Keeler. I am full	71%	20

According to table 1, there are also five columns which consist of different functions. The first column is for questionnaire items which consist of producing sociopragmatic failures by non English department students. The second column is for the contexts of each number on questionnaires. The third column is for the correct answer of each context on questionnaire item respectively. The fourth column is for the percentages of producing sociopragmatic failures by non English department students. And the fifth column is for the numbers of students produce sociopragmatic failure of each context on questionnaire items.

Due to the percentage producing sociopragmatic failure, fail to respond an inviting is the highest. Since most of the students failure to understand a politeness to respond an inviting contexts. The context of inviting expression is the speaker is visiting to his friend's house at lunch time. As a good host, Mrs. Keeler invites the speaker to get his lunch. In this case, Mrs. Keeler is mother of the speaker's friend. Unfortunately, the speaker has gotten his lunch in the campus with his friends, thus he should refuse Mrs. Keeler's invitation. As a good response, the speaker should say 'not for moment. Thank you', to Mrs. Keeler. Its goal is to avoid a

misunderstanding between Mrs. Keeler and the speaker.

In the fact, the students did not choose '*not for moment. Thank you*' to respond the invitation and produce sociopragmatic failure to respond because they are not familiar to that response. They suppose if the best response is saying 'Thank you' to refuse an invitation politely because they used to say those simple expressions above in Indonesian's context. Their response of inviting expression because of their misunderstanding politeness. Implicitly, the students show they do not understand if English also has politeness theory inside.

Politeness is the main key of maintaining a harmonious relationship with others. It means that the interlocutors should maintain a politeness as the manner to avoid a misunderstanding and conflict within communication and interaction. The researcher's opinion is supported by Kasper (in Holmes: 711) that explained linguistic politeness is thus a matter of strategic interaction aimed at achieving goals such as avoiding conflict and maintaining harmonious relations with others. In contrast, most of non English department students do not maintain the harmonious relationship by crushing the concept of politeness. For instance, a student asks the researcher about her opinion. She curioses whether the researcher disagree or agree with her opinion. In additional, there is another student ends her opinion by saying 'it is unnecessary' as her answer to the researcher.

The responses of two girls above show if they crush the quality maxim of cooperative principle. The purpose of quality maxim of cooperative principle is maintaining the conversation among the interlocutors by telling the truth. Telling the truth should be considered too many

aspects, one of them is maintaining a harmonious conversation among the interlocutors. Their responses refer still refer to politeness concentration, a negative face of politeness. Either the first or the second girls' opinions represent their want to express their refusal expression of Mr. Keeler's invitation directly. It is no matter because their representations of refusal expressions belong to negative politeness, the addressee wants to have his freedom for action unhindered and his attention unimpeded (Brown and Levinson, 1978: 129). Their negative face of politeness could be an impoliteness if they broke the principals of politeness, one of them is rude.

Actually, those girls' opinion is appropriate answer but they express their answer so rude. Rude is one of the impoliteness conditions and refers to sociopragmatic failures. This condition is agreed with Locher and Watts in Locher and Derek, 5) as read as:

Negatively marked behavior, i.e. behavior that has breached a social norm . . . , evokes negative evaluations such as impolite or over-polite (or any alternative lexeme such as rude, aggressive, insulting, sarcastic, etc. depending upon the degree of the violation and the type of conceptualization the inappropriate behavior is profiled against).

Fail to respond politely is not only happen in inviting, making a requirement and introducing context, but it also occurs on apologizing context. In apologizing context, the students produce pragmalinguistic failures because of their unknowing the goal of the context. Thus, they carelessly guess to answer an apologizing context on questionnaire item number nine. Unfortunately, the students deliver their answer rudely. Therefore, they do not only produce pragmalinguistic failures but also

sociopragmatic failures because of their rude delivering expression. Their rude delivering expression refers to students' misunderstanding politeness to respond someone's conversation. There is a similarity phenomenon between inviting context on questionnaire number six and apologizing context on questionnaire item number nine, the students deliver their answer rudely. Their rude expression refers to impoliteness concentration because of its effect. The effect of responding the conversation rudely is the conversation could not be continued because of the broken of conversation's harmony. Beside a similarity, there is a difference of inviting and apologizing context. In inviting context, most of the students choose the correct answer rudely. Although they choose the correct answer, their rude expression is considered to sociopragmalinguistic failure.

In the other hand, the number of students who produce pragmalinguistic failure in apologizing context is higher because most of the students carelessly guess to answer the question. Most of the students deliver their opinions in two kinds of different expression, negative and positive face. Some students give their negative face of politeness during the interview. It means that they object to be explored their reason by the researcher.

Actually, negative face politeness is not a matter within conversation. The problem of sociopragmatic failure in apologizing context is students' expressions in delivering their opinions. Most of them respond the researcher's conversation rudely and aggressively. Aggressive and rude in this issue refer to students' high intonation and voices while delivering their responses to the researcher. Therefore, most of the students produce pragmalinguistic failures and sociopragmatic failures in

apologizing context on questionnaire item number nine.

Having integration phenomena of producing sociopragmatic failures do not only happen to apologizing and inviting contexts, but making a requirement and introducing context also have integration. Most of the students do not verbalize their language awareness. The factor of producing pragmatic failures in complimenting and apologizing context is students' language awareness. The students are not sensitive to understand the contexts, thus, they did not accomplish politeness contexts.

Similar to the phenomena of complimenting and apologizing, producing sociopragmatic failures on making a requirement and introducing context is caused by the disfunction of students' sensitivities. Therefore, it makes the students could not verbalize their language awareness to answer the question. It also makes them to break the quality maxim of cooperative principles and could not continue their conversation. In other word, they do not maintain a harmonious conversation and produce sociopragmatic failures.

Producing sociopragmatic failures is not only due to the wrong answer but also students' inability to express their feeling appropriately. There is an interesting phenomenon of students' expressions in responding a context. Some students give the appropriate answers but they also show their rude expression. The students' rude expression belongs to impoliteness concept and refers to sociopragmatic failures. Different with other students who give inappropriate answers but they deliver their opinions exaggeratedly

during the interview. Their exaggerated expression is a part of politeness, positive face. The students want to be involved in a conversation with the researcher.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The rest of pragmatic failures consists of six phenomena of producing pragmalinguistic failures and three phenomena of producing sociopragmatic failures. Out of fifteen questions only one item does not create a problem for the students and it belongs to sociopragmatic concerns. They all respond the question properly. There are many factors to get a perfect pragmatic such as mastering the vocabularies, reading carefully to avoid misunderstanding the meaning of context also having well sensitivity of the context. Having well crosscultural understanding of a context is also required to produces a successful of pragmatic.

Producing a successful of pragmatics is also needs to understand a cross cultural. Avoiding local cultural interference should be avoided to get cross cultural understanding and ease the students to understand the social stratification and politeness. The students will get their success pragmatic if those components of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic are accomplished. It indicates that the students have a good pragmatic competence and the students are able to verbalize their knowledge in communication is the main factor of a successful of pragmatics.

The frequency of producing sociopragmatic failures is higher than pragmalinguistic failures. Since most of the students fail to respond the context politely. Implicitly, they lack knowledge of politeness in communicating using English. Because they never get the knowledge of politeness in using English.

V. DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- Abbe, A., Gulick, L.M.V., & Herman, J.L. (2007). Cross-cultural competence in Army leaders: A conceptual and empirical foundation. Washington D.C: U.S. Army Research Institute.
- Brown, R., and S, Levinson. 1978. "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena." Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction. ed. E. N. Goody, PP. 56 - 289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cutting, Joan. (2002). Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students. London: Routledge.
- Dornyei, Zoltan. 2003. Questionnaire in Second Language Research: Constructing, Administration and Processing. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Publisher.
- Dornyei, Zoltan. (2009). The Psychology of Second Language Acquisition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jianbin, Zheng Lihui and Huang. (2010). A Study of Chinese EFL learners' Pragmatic Failure and the Implications for College English Teaching. *Polyglossia*, 18(Pragmatic Failures), 14.
- Horn, Laurence R. and Gregory Ward. 2006. The Handbook of Pragmatics. UK: Blackwell Publishing, Ltd.
- Jingwei, Ting. 2013. "Analysis Pragmatic Failure from the Perspective of Adaptation", *Cross Cultural Communication*, Vol. 9, No. 3, 2013.
- Jucker, Andreas H and Irma Taavitsainen. 2008. Speech Acts in the History of English. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Komorowska, Hanna. (2014). Awareness in Action the role of consciousness in language acquisition (A. Lyda & K. Szesniak Eds.). Poland: Springer International Publisher.

- Krathwohl, D.R., Bloom, B.S., & Masia, B.B. (1973). Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, the Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: McKay Co., Inc.
- Lihui, Zheng and Huang Jianbin. 2010. "A Study of Chinese EFL Learners' Pragmatic Failure and The Implications for College English Teaching", *Polyglossia*, Vol.18, 2010.
- Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ming-Yan Li, Zhuang Yan. 2010. "Reflection on the Nature of Pragmatic Failure", *US-China Foreign Language*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Serial No. 76), 2010.
- Salmani, Mohammad Ali. 1995. *A Socio-Pragmatic Comparative Study of Ostensible Invitations in English and Farsi*. Unpublished Thesis. Farsi: University of Isfahan
- Thomas, Jenny. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failures. *Applied linguistics*, 4(pragmatic failure), 110.
- Ting, Cheng. 2007. *A Study of Pragmatic Failures in English Majors*. Unpublished article. China: Xiaogan University.
- Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics* (2 ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, George. (2006). *The Study of Language* (3 ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.