



SURAKARTA ENGLISH AND LITERATURE JOURNAL

Vol 3 No.1 FEBRUARY 2020

Publisher Language and Literature Faculty, University of Surakarta

ISSN Print: 2621-9077 ISSN Online: 2621-9085

PRAGMATIC FAILURE OF STUDENTS CONVERSATION IN SPEAKING CLASS OF XI GRADE IN MA AL-HIKMAH TANON

¹Indah Musfirotul Fitria, ²Wuri Rahmawati

¹Faculty of Language and Literature, University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

indahmusfirotulfitria@gmail.com

²Faculty of Language and Literature, University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

sarasamelati@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In communication with others, sometimes people cannot hear correctly between speaker and hearer, but the conversation can be continued. Accordingly, the pragmatic role is needed. Nevertheless, many cases used pragmatically might fail for many reasons, such as: cross-culture understanding, even misunderstanding of grammatical form. That case happens not only in real life conversation, but also in the classroom. This article is aimed to analyze the pragmatics failures of English students' conversation in the speaking class. The discussion starts from the definition of Pragmatic and Speech act, and Pragmatic Failures in speaking class. It will be followed by the analysis of some conversations of the pragmatic failure in speaking class of EFL. This study shows that there are ten conversations of pragmatic failure. Based on those conversations, the researcher found the cases, firstly, there are kinds of speech act in English students' conversation in the speaking class, namely: directive, assertive, declaration depended on Levinson's theory. Moreover, secondly, pragmatic failure happens in English students' conversation in speaking class is pragmalinguistics failure.

Keywords: Pragmatics, Speech Act, Pragmatic Failure

ABSTRAK

Dalam berkomunikasi dengan orang lain, kadang terdapat beberapa orang yang tidak bisa mendengar dengan benar antara penutur dengan pendengar, tetapi, percakapan tersebut dapat berjalan dengan baik. Oleh sebab itu, peran pragmatik sangat dibutuhkan. Meskipun, terdapat banyak kasus bahwa menggunakan pragmatik mungkin tidak dapat berhasil karena beberapa alasan, seperti: pemahaman lintas budaya, ataupun ketidakpahaman mengenai bentuk aturan tata bahasa. Masalah tersebut tidak hanya terjadi pada percakapan kehidupan sehari-hari, akan tetapi juga didalam kelas. Artikel ini bertujuan untuk menganalisa kegagalan aturan tata bahasa pada percakapan siswa dikelas berbicara. Pembahasan pada artikel ini dimulai dari pengertian aturan tata bahasa dan perilaku berbicara, dan kegagalan aturan tata bahasa dikelas berbicara. Hal ini akan

disertai dengan analisa kegagalan aturan tata bahasa pada beberapa percakapan oleh siswadikelas berbicara. Pada penelitian ini, terdapat 10 percakapan yang mengandung kegagalan aturan tata bahasa. Berdasarkan pada percakapan-percakapan tersebut, peneliti menemukan beberapa kasus, Pertama, terdapat beberapa jenis perilaku berbicara pada percakapan berbahasa inggis siswa, seperti, *Directive, Assertive, Declaration*,hal ini berdasarkan teori Levinson. Dan kedua, kegagalan aturan tata bahasa yang ada pada percakapan berbahasa inggris siswa dikelas berbicara adalah kegagalan pragmalinguistik.

Kata Kunci: Aturan Tata Bahasa, Perilaku Berbicara, Kegagalan Pragmalinguistik

INTRODUCTION

Language is the most appropriate tool in human being to continue messages, ideas, emotions or even to develop the distinguish in language or culture during communication. Hence, language learners absorb a new language by the beginning the language, they already know in which learning a new language is usually affected by the first speaker of that language. In order to communicate contextually on a foreign language context, a language learners need to identify a pragmatics or context-bound feature through some meaningful activities and pragmatics awareness-raising tasks (Safont Jordà, 2004, p.25), in order to the foreign language teachers to consider the possibility of transferring pragmatic interlanguage features (Žegarac& Pennington, 2008, p. 147).

Pragmatics is seen as acceptance of language acquisition and one of the major components of the organization of knowledge of a language that's become one of the most critical concern in linguist scholars (Karthik, 2013, p. 1). In a narrow segment of linguistic view, "pragmatics learns the factors that order our choices in language in social interaction and influenced on other's choices" (Crystal, 2008, p. 379). Moreover, pragmatics deals only with aspects of the context coded in the pragmatics competency structure of linguists. More interestingly, pragmatics is known as the field of interdisciplinary language, sociology, psychology, and so on. Thus, Verschueren points out that it is a "general cognitive, social, and cultural perspective on linguistics phenomena related to the usage in forms of behavior" (as cited in Culpeper &Haugh, 2014, p. 7). In pragmatics, context can be defined as a series of suppositions that have critical effect on production, and interpretation of communicative acts.

Communicative is part of the important one in human live in order to establish a relationship in society. Teaching an excellent communication and the way to deliver to the students is essential, so that it does not create misunderstanding.

Pragmatics is a favorite term in EFL/ESL studies. It was a popular field of learning in the late sixties and early seventies. As a branch of applied sciences, pragmatics is concerned about the use of language and its positions that is systematically espoused from conformity of content or logical form (Horn & Ward, 2006). That is one of the keys to effective communication within a certain context is important.

In pragmatics, the issues discussed widely is speech acts, as with Levinson (1983), which said that all the problems with language use theory in general, the speech act theory may had aroused the most wide curiosity. In additional study of speech act, there are three main discussion about a level beyond the range of speech act utterances; Locutionary, Illocutionary, and Perlocutionary.

Locutionary act: the utterance of a sentence with determinate sense and reference

Illocutionary act: the making of a statement, offer, and convention force associated with it (or with its explicit performative paraphrase)

Perlocutionary act: the bringing about of effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence, such effects being special to the circumstances of utterance. (Levinson, 1983)

The pragmatic failure was firstly created by Jenny Thomas in her article Cross-cultural Pragmatic failure in 1983. She defined and classified pragmatic failure in the essay and set a based theoretical for the analysis of pragmatic failure in cross-cultural communication. Thomas argued that pragmatic failure refers to “the incapability to understand what is meant by what is said” (1983, p.22). Accurately speaking, Thomas only tries to analyze what pragmatic failure is like and does not give a specific concept to define what pragmatic failure is (Tang Jingwei, 2013).

Pragmatic failure occurs for there are different cultures, ethnic and different background knowledge between speaker and hearer. The real problem with pragmatic failure is that an interpretation that should not have achieved an optimal level of relevance and that hearer uses it as evidence to make attributions of beliefs and intentions to his interlocutor based on his cultural knowledge and contextual assumptions.

The pragmatic failure may transmit from developing and ability factors such as: 1) Negative transfer of discourse stretches or linguistic strategies, 2) Undue overgeneralizations of L2 forms to inappropriate settings, 3) Anxiety to communicate as clearly as possible, 4) Lack of cultural knowledge, 5) Excessive and restrictive usage of textbook language, 5) The limited language to which learners are exposed in the classroom (Thomas 1983; Tannen 1984; House 1990; Hurley; 1992; Kasper 1992; Hale 1996). (Sperber and Wilson, 1986-1995) Understanding the origins and causes of pragmatic failure certainly requires an awareness of how hearer process utterances, which processing strategy they use and why they reach a particular interpretation.

Pragmatic failure and speech act recently happen in the English teaching learning process on a conversation between teacher and students. This study focused on analyzing pragmatic failure and speech act in English teaching learning process. The theoretical approach used pragmatic failure by Jenny Thomas and the speech act by Levinson. Jenny Thomas defined and classified pragmatic failure in the essay and set a theoretical foundation for the analysis of pragmatic failure in cross-cultural communication. Levinson said that the main issue which any pragmatic theory must explain is a speech act, along with presuppositions and implicature. Based on the focus, it is broken down into some questions as follow:

1. What kinds of speech act in the English students’ conversation in the speaking class?
2. How does the pragmatic failure happen in the English student’s conversation in the speaking class?

The objective of the study is to explain the kinds of speech act in the English students’ conversation in the speaking class; to elaborate pragmatic failure happens in the English students’ conversation in the speaking class. The significance of the study is theoretically to accumulate the research on speech act and pragmatic failure. By doing this, researcher got many perspectives on the pragmatic study. Practically the study can give many advantages for the reader in understanding the conversation in the teaching learning process.

METHODOLOGY

The research method of the study can be explained as follows. Type the study is qualitative one with a descriptive approach through the pragmatic failure by Jenny Thomas and speech act by Levinson on English students' conversation in the speaking class. Type of the data consists of primary and secondary data. The primary data derive from the script of English students' conversation in the speaking class. The secondary data covers some data that support the analysis. The technique of the data collection is done through library research with the following steps; transcript the English conversation that relates to the speech act and pragmatic failure. The technique of the data analysis is carried out by applying the theory of pragmatic failure by Jenny Thomas.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this part, the researcher explains the result of the research. The data collected based on ten conversations in each conversation has a pragmatic failure. Then the data analysis consists of several parts, such as situation, conversation, and analysis.

Conversation 1

Situations:

Teacher comes into the class and asks one of the students to lead the prayer.

Teacher : "Please, lead the prayer!"

Students : "Yes miss, wait for five minutes."

Analysis:

In this conversation above, the researcher know that the conversation used the Directive type of Speech Act. This situation explained that the teacher gives a command to the students with uttering "*Please, lead the prayer!*", and the students answered with uttering "*Yes miss, wait for five minutes*", this answered categorized as **Pragmalinguistic Failure**, because usually, when the teacher comes they already pray and reciting Asmaul Husna. So, in this case, students were getting failed to understand what their teacher said.

Conversation 2

Situations:

After, the teacher and students pray together, the teacher greets the students.

Teacher : "Good morning? How are you doing?"

Students : "Morning, I'am learn to speak English Miss."

Analysis:

The students recognize the utterance "*good morning*" (greeting) and understand the intended meaning of it. They also understand how to response to the greeting by replying "*Morning*" to the teacher. However, in the later of utterance "*How are you doing?*" is not usual for them. They used to hear "*How is life?*" instead. In this case the pragmatic failure appears because of the word "doing". This failure categorized as **Pragmalinguistic Failure** because it relies on linguistic. The word "*doing*" as the students know is the example of Present Progressive. Some students still answered the question "*how are you doing?*" with uttering "*I'am*

learn speak English Miss". However, the answer was not what the teacher had hope for, while, the answer that the teacher expects, such as "*Morning, I'm fine, thank you*", or "*Morning, So so*". It is usually happened in the EFL class, because of the lack of linguistic knowledge of form and practice.

Conversation 3

Situations:

When the teacher comes in the classroom, the teacher checked the student's attendance.

Teacher : "Any students absent today?"

Students : "Really! Amazing."

Analysis:

Based on the conversation above, the researcher knows that the conversation categorized as **Pragmalinguistic Failure**, because the failure appeared when students are replaying the teacher's question. In this case students do not understand the teacher's question and lack of grammatical form.

Conversation 4

Situations:

When the teacher comes to the classroom, the teacher will give an information about something to the students.

Teacher : Before we start our lesson today, I've a news.

Students : Yes, already.

Teacher : Can you guess it?

Students : of course, I can

Analysis:

Based the situation above, the utterances have **Assertive types of Speech Act**. The teacher informs to students that they want to give news. Then some of the students give a response "*Yes, already*". This condition is a grammatical error form and gets a negative transfer. "*Yes, already*" this utterance used Indonesian English, and that means "*Ya, Sudah*" students usually use these utterances like this when they speak English. The next response of some students is ambiguity also. Before the teacher starts her lesson, she asks them "*Before we start our lesson today, I've a news.*" then students answers "*Yes, already.*" May be the students want to replay "*Yes, I know*" or they don't understand the teacher's meaning. And then in the utterance "*of course, I can*", that utterance is **Pragmalinguistic Failure**, because the students misunderstanding within their teacher is talking about.

Conversation 5

Students : I'm sorry Miss, I'm late.

Teacher : This is a quarter past seven right?

Students : Oh yeah, no problem.

Teacher : Sit down please!

Surakarta English and Literature Journal

Analysis:

Based on the conversation above, researcher know that the conversation categorized as **Pragmalinguistic Failure**, because the failure appeared when students are replaying the teacher's question. In this case students do not understand what the teacher's question and lack of grammatical form.

Conversation 6

Teacher : Last meeting, I've given you assignment? Haven't you?

Students : No, I don't know.

Teacher : Already finished, you can submit now!

Students : It's nothing personal.

Analysis:

The conversation above includes **Directive types in SpeechAct as asking**. The teacher reminds and asks to students about some assignments like "*Last meeting, I've given you assignment? Haven't you?*" One of the students answers "*No, I don't know.*" It means that they understand about the questions but in the next questions students do not understand because they answer "*It's nothing personal.*" The utterance unsuitable with the question because the meaning is the assignment is not essential. The pragmatics failure appears in this conversation, regarded as the wrong answers. It will cause the communication in this text error if they read the text overall with some wrong form of words.

Conversation 7

Teacher : Be ready class, we're gonna have a cloze test.

Students : No father.

Teacher : There is questions before I'll give you the paper?

Students : I don't know.

Analysis:

Based the situation above, the utterances have **Assertive types of Speech Act**. Teacher informs to students that they want to get a cloze test. Then some of the students give a response "*No father*". This condition is a grammatical error form and gets a negative transfer. "*No father*" in Indonesia means "*Tidak Papa*," students usually use this utterance when they have a joke with their friends. The next response of some students is ambiguity also. Before the teacher gives a paper, she asks them "*There are questions before I'll give you the paper?*" then students answers "*I don't know.*" May be the students want to replay "*I don't have a question*" or they do not comprehend the material.

Conversation 8

Students 1 : You can help me!

Students 2 : Sorry, I'm using it. You can borrow to your friends.

Students 1 : No problem thank you.

Analysis:

The situation above happens to two students that students 1 to ask help to students 2. Student 1 says "*You can help me!*" it means student 1 needs help to do something but the

response of student 2 is “*Sorry, I’m using it. You can borrow to your friends.*” The utterance has a meaning that student 2 uses something not doing something so the response of the student 2 is a pragmatic failure. They are also misunderstanding each other. The type of speech act in this conversation is **Directive with the meaning of asking.**

Conversation 9

Teacher : The questions consist of twenty in essay.

Students : Ohh, it is easy.

Analysis:

The teacher explained about a number of essay to the students with the utterance, “*The questions consist of twenty in an essay*”. And the response of the student is “*Ohh, it is easy*”. There are some considerations about student’s response. The students understand about the explanation or the student listened “*essay*” word, heard like “*easy*”. Based on Thomas theory, the limited language in which learners are exposed in the classroom is also a pragmatic failure. This conversation is the **Declaration of Speech Act.**

Conversation 10

Teacher : Less than five minutes, please!

Students : Am afraid.

Analysis:

The situation happens in the last session in the quiz, the teacher reminds students that time less than five minutes with the utterance “*Less than five minutes, please!*” then students answer “*Am afraid.*” In this response there is an error in grammatical form and do not a suitable response that student’s utterance. The type of speech act of the conversation is **Assertive.**

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis above, it can be concluded as follows, Firstly, most kinds of the speech act in the English students’ conversation in the speaking class are directive, assertive, declaration based on Levinson's theory. Secondly, the most pragmatic failure that happens in the English students’ conversation in the speaking class is Pragmalinguistics Failure. It causes of wrong grammatical form, a misunderstanding because of limited language knowledge is exposed by students based on the Thomas theory.

REFERENCES

- Jingwei, T. (2013). *Analysis of Pragmatic Failure from the Perspective of Adaption. cross-cultural communication*, 9, 75-79.
- Levinson, S. C. (1963). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Pangesti, S. (2014). Pragmatic Failure in Listening Class A Case Study of X Grade Students of SMK Tamansiswa Cilacap: Vol. 15, pp: 38-46. SMK Tamansiswa Cilacap, Indonesia.
- Saadatmandi M., S. M. (2018). *Teaching English Pragmatic Features in EFL Context: A Focus on Request Speech Acts*. Vol. 8, pp. 829-835. Islamic Azad University of Karaj Branch, Karaj, Iran.
- SafontJordia, M.P. (2004). *An Analysis on EAP Learners' Pragmatic Production: A Focus on Request Form*. IBERICA 8, 23-39.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural Pragmatic Failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4 (2), 91-112
- _____. (2013). *An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Routledge