



PRAGMATIC FAILURE TO PRAISE AND PRAISE RESPONSE TO ARABIC AND ENGLISH LEARNERS

by

Kamsinah¹, Nurasia Natsir², Nuraziza Aliah³, Noerhayati Amirullah⁴

¹Universitas Hasanuddin

^{2,4}Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Yappi Makassar

³Universitas Terbuka

Email: ¹kamsinah@unhas.ac.id, ²nurasianatsir@stiavappimakassar.ac.id, ³nurazizaaliah@ecampus.ut.ac.id,
⁴noeramirullah1958@gmail.com

Article Info

Article history:

Received Juni 04, 2022

Revised Juni 25, 2022

Accepted Juli 22, 2022

Keywords:

Pragmatics

Failure

English Students

Arabic Students

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to investigate the pragmatic failure in English and Arabic students at the UIN Alauddin Makassar's Faculty of Adab and Cultural Studies. The data for the study were gathered through observation, distribution of questionnaires in the form of a discourse completeness test (DCT), and interviews. Quantitative and qualitative research data were collected in this research. This study employed three statistical models or techniques: descriptive statistics, association rules (a priori algorithm), Chi Square, and qualitative analysis. The results show that there are three kinds of pragmatic failure that produced by the English and Arabic students such as sociopragmatic, pragmalinguistic, and psychopragmatic aspects. In addition, The researcher suggests to the next researcher to study more deeply about the types of pragmatic failure in other fields.

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



Corresponding Author:

Nurasia Natsir

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Yappi Makassar

Email: nurasianatsir@stiavappimakassar.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

During the past three decades, scholars whose study intersected with second language acquisition changed to researching communicative competence, whereas their initial research focus was linguistic competence. Canale and Swain (1980) and Hymes (1972) demonstrate that grammatical structure and lexicon are insufficient tools for understanding the intended meaning underlying an utterance, much alone the message the speaker wishes to express. As a result, there is a school of thought that says that speakers who are competent in some languages must develop communicative competences suitable to the cultural environment in which they are situated. The capacity to employ grammatically acceptable sentences in the appropriate context, which requires two types of competences, linguistics and pragmatics (Bachman, 1990). In relation to this idea, speakers must understand the significance of language functions and pragmatic functions in order to apply proper linguistic rules in the circumstance or context in which the language is spoken.

Mutual comprehension of speech between the speaker and the interlocutor is essential in communication because communication will take place as long as there is a shared understanding of what is spoken. As a result, a speaker must be able to select and employ appropriate language or speech in order for the meaning of an utterance to be understood by the speech partner. In this scenario, the accuracy of the language variety selection has a significant impact on communication fluency. Good communication will undoubtedly occur if the participants in a conversation can comprehend each other's language utilized; yet, in some circumstances of second language acquisition, an utterance generated by speakers, in this case second language learners, when communicating cannot always be direct partners comprehended. In speech, there are times when the speaker must repeat his speech or even use a more detailed language equivalent so that what is conveyed can be understood by the speech partner (Fatimah & Kamsinah., 2021).

Conditions such as the ones stated above cause a failure or congestion in the message delivery process, which causes a failure or congestion in the communication objectives. The incapacity of speakers and speech partners to understand what is intended by what is uttered is referred to as pragmatic failure in pragmatic studies. Initially, Thomas used the phrase "pragmatic failure" (1981). The pragmatic failure condition, according to Thomas, happens when the informant is unable to understand the speaker's meaning. It is not a question of whether an utterance is correct or incorrect, but of whether the utterance's meaning is conveyed.

Several research on cross-cultural comparative discourse, such as those undertaken by Gumperz & Tannen (1979), Blum-Kulka (1982), and Cohen & Olshtain (1981), demonstrate that various cultures process rules in different ways. If the goal is to make the student a truly good communicator, it must be recognized that, in addition to mastering the grammar of the language being studied, a comprehension of the target language's cultural norms should not be separated. Cross-cultural communication will be severely disrupted if this is not clearly understood. As with the occurrence of Indonesian students speaking with Australian students in English, they are prone to communication problems caused by variations in their home tongue and cultural norms.

In general, Indonesians place the topic of conversation at the end of the conversation, but Australians frequently begin with the topic. When Indonesians speak English, they tend to adapt their Indonesian pronunciation to English. As a result, the interlocutor frequently misunderstands the speaker's goal because the message transmitted is not always comprehended correctly by the interlocutor.

Objective of the Study

The failure of pragmatics in praise speech acts and praise replies of foreign language learners is the topic of this study. Based on the preliminary data, the researcher hypothesizes that there are numerous phenomena of pragmatic failure in English and Arabic students at the Faculty of Adab and Cultural Studies UIN Alauddin Makassar. Based on this hypothesis, the researcher assumes that English and Arabic students at UIN Alauddin Makassar's Faculty of Adab and Cultural Studies fail pragmatically while praising and reacting to praise.

This research is very important because the findings will be very useful in assisting lecturers or teachers of English and Arabic in improving lecture/learning materials in the process of teaching foreign languages in the classroom because it is hoped that with the findings in this study, teachers and lecturers will be able to get input. to improve the teaching and learning process more efficiently while balancing linguistic competence and pragmatic competence in the teaching.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Pragmatic Failure

Thomas initially used the term pragmatic failure in pragmatic studies (1981). According to Thomas, a pragmatic failure state occurs when you are unable to understand what is being said. He also stated that the issue of communication was not one of good or wrong, but rather of whether or not an utterance was delivered. He & Ran (1998) had another point of view on the failure of pragmatics (2009:26). They defined pragmatic failure as failing to achieve the intended results rather than common word and phrase faults that occur in language use.

The causes of pragmatic failure to deflect messages in communication, including speech acts, can be discussed from a pragma linguistic to a socio pragmatic perspective. Thomas (1981) divides pragmatic failures into two categories: pragma linguistic failures and socio pragmatic failures. The use of sentence-mode speech does not, without a doubt, produce confusion in the meaning of the speech. However, speech that is not in accordance with the sentence mode will generate a lot of perception, and the worst thing that will happen is that the intent in an utterance will be missed. Such circumstances are frequently the source of pragmatic failure.

The research on pragmatic failure varies greatly. Cruz's (2013) research tries to understand and overcome pragmatic problems in intercultural communication. This study focuses on students who are not native speakers of a language but are learning it as a second language. This study investigates how a teacher or instructor serves not only as a lesson deliverer, but also as a speaker whose words are perceived by students. Yuan Zhang also conducted research on pragmatic failure (2013: 97). The purpose of this study is to examine the failure of pragmatics in the usage of English in communication on social networks, specifically Facebook. Misinterpretation of the meaning of speech in the form of a Facebook status was one of the study's shortcomings. In this study, pragmatic failure occurs due to the wrong transfer of culture, lack of pragmatic competence, and others.

According to Thomas (1981), pragmatic failure is more damaging than linguistic failures, and the issue is exacerbated when it occurs in second language learners who are already at a high level (already 6th semester and above). He went on to say that when second language learners express themselves in a way that is consistent with their national standards, they may encounter faults that have nothing to do with grammar. This interlingual phenomena leads to pragmatic miscommunication or failure in cross-cultural communication. He differentiates between two types of pragmatic failure: pragma linguistic failure and socio pragmatic failure. When pragmatic



influences are translated to language signs or structures that are systematically different from what native speakers ordinarily do, this is referred to as pragma linguistic failure. Socio pragmatic failure, on the other hand, results from the learner's varied cross-cultural ideas of what constitutes appropriate language behaviour.

Pragmatic Condition

When second language learners recognize that first language pragmatic aspects are specific language features, House and Kasper (1987:20) and other scientists conclude that second language learners do not transmit the first language through pragmatic features to second language pragmatic performance. Other studies also support the research of Olshtain's (1983: 199) study, which claims that learners can only transfer if they comprehend universal first language pragmatics. Another transference barrier that has been proven to influence the extent to which a first language is transferred to a second language is socio-culture. Refer to Lado's (1957:113) research in his book *Linguistics Cross-Cultural*, where he underlined the influence of indigenous culture. He argued that in a second language learning environment, every second language learner is dependent on the form and meaning of the mother tongue as well as culture. (Eisentein & Bodman, 1986) studied verbal acts of appreciation in native and non-native English speakers. Due to some restrictions with non-native speakers in pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic characteristics, non-native speakers have difficulty expressing admiration in the context of speech act culture.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study was carried out in the Faculty of Adab and Cultural Studies, Alauddin Makassar State Islamic University (UIN). Observation, distribution of questionnaires in the form of a discourse completeness test (DCT), and interviews were used to collect study data. The purpose of the observation is to collect data and information on the respondent's mother tongue (Idris et al., 2020). The questionnaire takes the form of a discourse completeness test (DCT), with written data and voice data collected via online interviews. The research data was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. These processes are as follows: coding, tabulation, and quantitative analysis utilizing statistics and R analytical software. In this study, three statistical models or techniques were used: descriptive statistics, association rules (a priori algorithm), Chi Square, and lastly qualitative analysis.

4. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Thomas initially used the term pragmatic failure in pragmatic studies (1981). He defined pragmatic failure as "the inability to understand what is intended by what is stated." He also stated that communication is not a matter of right or wrong, but of conveying or not conveying the intention of a speech. The findings revealed two types of pragmatic failure in Arabic and English students when completing speech acts of praising and reacting to praise. The first form, pragmatic failure in the speech act of praising and reacting to praise, is in accordance with the context, the message to be transmitted has been described, but there is a negative transfer in the substance of the speech that permits misconceptions to occur. Furthermore, the second form, pragmatic failure in speech acts of praising and responding to praise, does not fit the context and creates ambiguity in the meaning of the speech so that the message to be conveyed is not in accordance with the context, giving rise to many perceptions that can lead to misunderstandings.

Pragmatic Failure to Praise and Praise Response to Arabic and English Learners

According to the findings, Arabic learners encounter pragmatic failure as a result of the socio-pragmatic aspect; pragmatic failure is more prevalent in social connections, followed by gender, and finally in message content. After examining all of the scenarios investigated in this study, each variable was found to have failed pragmatic responses offered by responders. In terms of socio-pragmatics, it was discovered that negative transfers made by Arabic learners when completing speech acts of praising or replying to praise using Arabic resulted in pragmatic failure. Furthermore, Darwis & Kamsinah (2021) stated that English learners' responses exhibit pragmatic failure in the socio pragmatic component, which is more prevalent in the message's content, followed by gender, and finally in social interactions. After assessing the 12 provided scenarios, each variable was determined to have failed pragmatic solutions offered by responders. In each instance, it is discovered that English learners make a negative transfer, resulting in pragmatic failure (Yulianti et al., 2022)

In this second form of speech, both Arabic and English data seen from the socio pragmatic aspect are not in accordance with the context of the praise that should be done. As for the content of the message which should praise appearance for wearing a branded jacket, it is said by praising personality. This creates ambiguity and can lead to misunderstandings (Kamsinah et al., 2021). The data shows that Arabic learners experience pragmatic failure which is influenced by pragma linguistic aspects. Where more dominant occurs in the illocutionary then followed by the form of language. Each variable found pragmatic failure of speech acts of praising and responding to praise used by respondents.

In the pragma linguistic part, the researcher examines the types of language and illocutionary forms utilized in praise and praise answers spoken by respondents in 12 previously studied scenarios. In this regard, the respondents' language and illocutionary forms were evaluated using paralinguistic theory, which reveals that dominant Arabic learners continue to feel negative transfers while praising and responding to praise, both in terms of language and illocutionary forms utilized.

The third type is psycho pragmatic. According to the statistics, Arabic and English learners experience pragmatic failure as a result of the influence of psycho pragmatic factors. Whereas it was discovered that there was a negative transfer from the utterances of praising and reacting to the praise employed from the three language psychology approaches that were tried to be analyzed for each learner. As a result, the research findings revealed that students' linguistic habits influenced the psychology or mindset of the respondents when giving speeches, resulting in pragmatic failure.

The speech employed is impacted by the thoughts and mentality of the speaker who has a negative transfer and is not consistent with the thinking and behaviour of the target language speaker. The pragmatic failure data has the potential to cause cultural misunderstandings between speakers and interlocutors. The failure of pragmatics in the first form is still understandable by the interlocutor, but the failure of pragmatics in the second form is extremely likely to be misunderstood since the speech is out of context or has an ambiguous meaning.

It can be concluded that in this study, pragmatic failure was found in Arabic and English learners with two forms of failure produced by socio pragmatic, pragma linguistic and psycho pragmatic aspects.

CONCLUSION

As discussed in the previous chapter, pragmatic failure manifests itself in three ways: socio pragmatics, linguistic pragmatics, and psycho pragmatics. These factors influence the occurrence of negative transfers, which cause Arabic and English students at UIN Alauddin Makassar to fail pragmatically. Two types of speech are used to describe pragmatic failure. In the first form, the expressed praise acts and responses are in accordance with the context, but there is still a negative transfer in aspects of socio pragmatics, linguistic pragmas, and psycho pragmatics. The second category, speech acts of praise and praise answers that are said are not in accordance with the context of the speaker's and the interlocutor's circumstances, the responses of praise and praise are unclear, and speakers and speech partners frequently encounter misunderstandings.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- [2] Blum-Kulka, S. (1980). Learning to Say What You Mean in a Second Language; a Study of the Speech Act Performance of Learners of Hebrew as a Second Language.
- [3] Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- [4] Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing A Measure of Sociocultural Competence: The Case of Apology 1. *Language learning*, 31(1), 113-134.
- [5] Darwis, M. & Kamsinah. (2019). The Contribution of Indonesian Language on Buginese Vocabulary Development: A Case Study of the Use of Buginese on Facebook social media. *Sawerigading*, 25(2), 107—118.
- [6] Eisenstein, M. & Bodman, J. W. (1986). „I very appreciate“: Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 167-185.
- [7] Fatimah, A., & Kamsinah. (2021). A Pragma-Stylistic Study of Illocutionary Act in Buginese Drama Texts. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Indonesian Linguistics Society (KIMLI 2021). Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 62(2). 41-44.
- [8] Gumperz, J. J., & Tannen, D. (1979). Individual and social differences in language use. In *Individual differences in language ability and language behavior* (pp. 305-325). Academic Press.
- [9] He, Z., & Ran, Y. P. (1988). A survey of pragmatics. *Changsha: Hunan Education Publishing House*, 157-162.
- [10] Hymes, D.H. (1972) “On Communicative Competence” In: J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds) *Sociolinguistics. Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, pp. 269-293.
- [11] Idris, A. M. S., Adliah, A., & Alfina, S. (2020). Multilingual Interaction in Classroom Context. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, 6(2), 381-393.
- [12] Kamsinah., Darwis, M., Fatimah, A., & Imran, M. A. (2021). Argument Structure in Indonesian Passive Voice: Universal Grammar Analyses. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Indonesian Linguistics Society (KIMLI 2021). Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 62(2). 346-350.
- [13] Lado, R. 1957. *Linguistics Across Culture*. USA: Ann Arbor.



-
- [14] Olshtain, E. 1983. Sociocultural competence and language transfer: the case of apology. In Gass, S. and Selinker, L., editors, *Language transfer in language learning*, Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 232-49.
- [15] Thomas, J. A. (1981). *Pragmatic Failure* [Unpublished MA dissertation]. *University of Lancaster*.
- [16] Yulianti, S., Arafah, B., Rofikah, U., Idris, A. M. S., Samsur, N., & Arafah, A. N. B. (2022). Conversational Implicatures on Saturday Night Live Talk Show. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(1), 189-19

THIS PAGE HAS INTENTIONALLY BEEN LEFT BLANK