

MANUSCRIPT EVALUATION RUBRIC

(To be fulfilled by Reviewers. Tick (√) where appropriate)

Reviewer Code	:	
Manuscript ID	:	3243
Title of the Article	:	Understanding pragmatics as a way to practice natural communication skills in various contexts of interactions

Criteria	Description(s)	Excellent	Fair	Insufficient
Scope of the research	The focus of this article concerns on the issue(s) of education.		√	
Title	The title is short, clear, and informative but does not exceed 20 words.		√	
Abstract	The abstract consists of the research background, purpose of the study, methods, results, and conclusions.			√
Introduction	The introduction briefly explains that this study is important to conduct.			√
	It defines the purpose of the work and its significance.			√
	It cited some key publications.		√	
	It mentions the research question(s).			√
	It shows the research's gap(s).			√
Methods	The method clearly explains the research design/approach.			√
	It mentions the subjects of the study.			√
	It clearly explains the conduct of the research procedure.			√
	It clearly explains the use of materials and instruments.			√
	It clearly explains the data collection technique(s).			√
	It clearly explains the data analysis technique(s).			√
Findings	The presentation of the findings is adequate and consistent.			√
	The tables and figures (if any) are arranged and explained well.		√	
	The findings answer the research question of this paper.			√
Discussion	The discussion explains how the findings relate to the original question or objectives outlined in the Introduction section.			√
	It provides scientific interpretation for each of the findings presented.			√
Conclusion	The conclusion presents the generalization of the findings and research discoveries.			√
	It provides limitation of the study and recommendations for future studies.			√
References	The references are relevant, current, and			√

Criteria	Description(s)	Excellent	Fair	Insufficient
	sufficient.			
Grammar and Cohesion	The language is clear and understandable.		√	
	The cohesion throughout the paragraphs is achieved.		√	

Reviewer Decision	Accept Submission	
	Revisions Required	√
	Resubmit for Review	
	Resubmit Elsewhere	
	Decline Submission	

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tidak ada metode penelitian bahkan temuan dan pembahasan dalam naskah. Hal ini memunculkan pertanyaan apakah naskah berdasarkan hasil penelitian atau hanya opini dari penulis saja dalam bentuk essay. Naskah dalam jurnal ilmiah harus ditulis berdasarkan kajian ilmiah dan sesuai dengan metodologi penelitian yang tepat. 2. Perbaiki naskah berdasarkan catatan dalam file naskah serta sesuaikan penulisan dengan guideline jurnal Al-ishlah 3. Perhatikan semua reviewer's comments serta perbaiki semua kolom dengan keterangan <i>insufficient</i> dan menyesuaikan dengan catatan/<i>comment</i>.

Understanding Pragmatics as a way to practice natural communication skills in various contexts of interactions

Leffi Noviyenty¹, Khairul Anwar²

¹ Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup, leffinoviyenty@iaincurup.ac.id

² Institut Agama Islam Tebo, alkhair2505@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

pragmatics competence;
natural and contextual
communication;
English as a foreign language

Article history:

Received 2021-08-14

Revised 2021-11-12

Accepted 2022-01-17

ABSTRACT

Students' problems in using English to communicate needs to be handled seriously. Teaching English is no more teaching the knowledge of English only but also the use of context. This is a library research that elaborates the important of pragmatics as a way for EFL students to improve their communication skills in various contexts of interaction and to strengthen the importance of pragmatic competence for non native English teachers in teaching natural English communication. Documentation is the technique of collecting data which uses checklist and fieldnote as the instruments. The main sources are theories about pragmatics and teaching communication from books and published journals. In order to obtain correct and precise results in analyzing data, a content analysis technique is used. The procedure of data analysis covers determining the design, which is linkage analysis, finding main data, theories about pragmatics from books, then finding contextual knowledge from published researches which related to pragmatics and teaching English communication, finally writing and interpreting the linkage to describe the results. The findings show that pragmatics should not limitedly act as the classroom instructions but as a competence to always be developed and practiced either for students or teachers. Pragmatics should be seen from its whole aspect in order to communicate naturally and contextually. It can also be concluded that the opportunities for pragmatic practice should be provided in order to achieve the goal of teaching English, that is ability to use English in various context of interaction.

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



Corresponding Author:

Leffi Noviyenty

Institut Agama Islam Negeri Curup; leffinoviyenty@iaincurup.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

- It has been a long time that the shortcomings of English-speaking skills have almost always been the core problems amid students. The assumption that students cannot communicate in English

is frequently the starting point for a research phenomenon. Ironically, many students are still unable to communicate in English despite the fact that grammar rules are mostly ignored, and cultural knowledge of the countries where English is spoken is not emphasized (Jaya et al., 2022). However, the influence of culture, contexts of interactions, and treatment of English itself all play a significant role in a person's success in achieving communication goals (Afriani, 2019). At the State Islamic Institute of Curup (in Indonesian abbreviation as IAIN Curup), not only students but also English lecturers are those who study English as a foreign language, and they may have similar communication constraints, such as limited contexts of interactions and culture. Furthermore, the writer frequently observes students speaking in English in an over literal fashion, so the expressions uttered are stiff and are not even used in real interactions by native English speakers.

The dominant viewpoint that speaking English may violate grammar rules has not increased students' and lecturers' confidence in using English. Perhaps, the habit of ignoring English grammar rules creates the incorrect habit of speaking as well. Conversations in English frequently lack a sense of language. The speaking course is presented as if its sole purpose is to encourage students to dare to speak in English. Even though speaking is only the first step in communication processes, aspects of knowledge about language, formulas, and rules *per se* are not sufficient to communicate successfully. There are extralinguistic aspects that greatly influence a person's success in communication. Pragmatic knowledge of a language is one of the important extralinguistic aspects. George Yule views pragmatics as the study of the meaning of communication between speakers and their translation by listeners or readers (Yule, 2022). Pragmatics in Yule's view prioritizes the meaning of the speaker to the listener rather than the meaning of the spoken vocabulary. In Yule thought, interpretation needs to be subsumed into pragmatics. Every context spoken by the speaker needs to know the meaning. The factors considered are the interlocutor, the location and time of the conversation and the situation of the conversation.

Researches in Indonesia English classroom found that Pragmatic approach in teaching English skills gives significant effect in improving students' knowledge about real context of interaction. Inserting some pragmatic aspects in listening material influences students' achievement in listening subject (Karyawati, 2020; Ubaidillah, 2020). In addition, how pragmatic is needed to be included in cross culture understanding subject in introducing cultures (Sanulita, 2019). One aspect of pragmatics, namely interference, is also often investigated descriptively in its relation to local culture or students' mother tongue culture. A study investigates the validity of assessing L2 pragmatics in interaction using mixed methods, focusing on the evaluation inference. Open role-plays that are meaningful and relevant to the stakeholders in an English for Academic Purposes context were developed for classroom assessment. For meaningful score interpretations and accurate evaluations of interaction-involved pragmatic performances, interaction-sensitive data-driven rating criteria were developed, based on the qualitative analyses of examinees' role-play performances. The conversation analysis performed on the data revealed various pragmatic and interactional features indicative of differing levels of pragmatic competence in interaction. The FACETS analysis indicated that the role-plays stably differentiated between the varying degrees of the 102 examinees' pragmatic abilities. The raters showed internal consistency despite their differing degrees of severity (Youn, 2015). But still the opportunity for pragmatic practice is limited. Moreover, Pragmatics is still introduced through separated aspects not as a need of communication. Pragmatic is still seen as a subject or knowledge rather than a competence that influence the whole interaction.

There is now an important body of research on pragmatics in language teaching, and existing studies have adopted either an observational or an interventionist approach. Interventional studies are the most relevant for the present study. The effect of instruction has been examined in relation to a variety of speech acts and pragmatic items (Alcon, 2015). Later research focused on how English as Lingua Franca (ELF) interactants managed to accommodate to each other, how they negotiated meanings and co-constructed utterances often employing ELF-specific pragmatic markers.

Researchers also investigated how ELF users turn to pragmatic transfer and code-switching whenever it is necessary to plug competence gaps arising in their use of English (Benjamins, 2021).

Most of researches above suggested the use of pragmatic approach as the instructions in the classroom and only in one skill, such listening, reading and speaking. This study promotes an understanding of pragmatics competence as in natural communication which covers many aspects of pragmatics, since the students and teachers in Indonesia act as non native English speakers. This study elaborates pragmatic that relate to the social language skills that we use in our daily interactions with others. This includes what we say, how we say it, our non-verbal communication (eye contact, facial expressions, body language etc.) and how appropriate our interactions are in a given situation. In acquiring pragmatic competence, learners must have access to the target language input and opportunities for pragmatic practice, such study abroad, formal classroom environment where pragmatics is not the target of instruction, and digitally-mediated context in which communication takes place in virtual environment (Taguchi, 2015).

This paper attempts to simplify the concept of pragmatics as a practical and applicable branch of knowledge that will assist someone learning a spoken language (in this case, English) in a natural way across various contexts of interactions. Aligned with the foregoing, the significance of this research is not only for students but also teachers to put forth their best efforts when learning spoken English. Motivate themselves to practice using English naturally in various contexts of interaction. As a result, Pragmatics is no longer regarded as a difficult subject with only theoretical significance, but opportunities for pragmatics practice should be provided in all contexts of teaching English.

METHOD

This is a qualitative study particularly library research. As a data collection method, literature study has benefits including exploring the basic theories and concepts that have been found by previous researchers, following the development of research in the field to be studied, gaining a broader orientation on the chosen topic (Sari & Asmendri, 2020). In collecting the data, documentation techniques is used (Arikunto, 2010). The main sources of this study are theories of pragmatics and teaching English communications. An assessment of the concepts and theories is carried out used based on available literature, especially from books and published articles published in various scientific journals. Checklist and fieldnotes are the instruments. Those relevant theories were analysed descriptively to elaborate the importance of pragmatic as a way to practice natural communication skills in various contexts of interaction. After all the data is collected, the next step is analyzing the data so that a conclusion is drawn. In order to obtain correct and precise results in analyzing data, a content analysis technique is used. Content analysis is an in-depth discussion of the contents of written or printed information from books and researches. The procedure of data analysis covers determining the design, that is linkage analysis, finding man data, theories about pragmatics from books, then finding contextual knowledge from published researches which related to pragmatics and teaching English communication, finally writing and interpreting the linkage to describe the results (Anwar, 2016).

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

WHY PRAGMATICS?

Addressing pragmatics will be more in-depth if it begins with some language studies. The flow of behaviorism is deemed unsuitable for use as a support for language studies. This is due to the following factors (Aitchison, 2011): 1) The school of behaviorism gave birth to the theory of human language acquisition based on experiments on animals, specifically rats. Measuring instruments (rats) do not measure what humans want to measure (language acquisition). Human language is unaffected by mouse behavior. 2) Rats' behavior, which responds to repeated stimuli, cannot be applied to humans. Humans are highly creative in their abilities to speak in response to stimuli (questions). This

creativity cannot be controlled in the same way that a lamp cannot control the behavior of a mouse. In humans, the same question, even if asked repeatedly, can yield different answers depending on the context. 3) Human responses cannot be predicted and are not dependent on the input obtained. 4) In humans, reinforcement is not based on grammatical right or wrong, as it is in mice, but can be broader in terms of meaning and context in an interaction, even if it is grammatically incorrect.

Language acquisition in humans has a very broad nature that is not limited to stimulus, reinforcement, and other verbal responses. Language is systematic, is used for communication, applies in language communities or cultures, exists in humans, and has universal characteristics such as duality, displacement, reliance on structure, creativity, interchangeability, feedback, separateness or discretion, productivity, logic, function, and contextualization (Steinberg & Sciarini, 2013). When compared to pragmatic studies, structural grammar, transformational grammar, and case grammar do not cover all aspects of language studies. These interpretations are based on function and context. The three fields of language study mentioned above generally only investigate linguistic contexts in the form of sentence structures, transformation processes, logical relationships, meanings between categories, or sentence cases. All three do not address the issue associated with the role of semantics and context in sentence's functional communication. Pragmatics investigates all of these flaws. In pragmatic studies, the context includes not only linguistic contexts (discourse and syntactic contexts), but also situational contexts (extralinguistic aspects) such as personality, attitudes, behavior, and ways of language, as well as direct contexts such as setting, participation, forms of language (oral or written), topics, and functions of speech acts. Thus, pragmatics investigates not only the formal structure of a language but also its functional structure, which is related to the formal structure's functioning in acts of communication. Language's function as a tool for conveying information and concealing various intentions will be better understood as a result.

Even the communicative grammatical model has prompted pragmatic research (Leech, 2016). This can be seen in the components of this model, which include: a pragmatic component that considers the context and function of speech acts, a semantic component that considers language as a means of communication and meaning, a syntactic component that considers strategies and the selection of elements of communication tools, and a phonological component that considers the form of the sentence that is born, as well as the word order. Because they were born in the form of sentences that are appropriate to their meanings, contexts, and functions, the selection of elements of communication tools and lexicon always refers to contexts, so that intentions can be conveyed with the right strategy and can be granted. For example, *I intend (intention) to ask someone in the discussion room to put out their cigarette*. The function of my speech act in this case is an order. According to this model, I must select a communication tool that is appropriate for the purpose and context. Because the setting is formal, such as a discussion room, I must devise a strategy to ensure that my speech act becomes a polite order, allowing me to achieve my goal. According to the lexicon, the form of the sentence that I came up with could be: "Sorry sir, I hope you don't mind putting out your cigarette. Thank you very much". Naturally, with the appropriate intonation.

Table 1. Chomsky's and Miller's theories

No	Noam Chomsky	Max Miller
1	Children are born with the rules of language structure and grammar.	Language development in children follows the child's logical and cognitive development.
2	Children, rather than imitating adults, give birth to new hypotheses when developing their language.	Although children have not yet correctly created a structural sentence, they have pragmatically understood the meaning of the sentence.
3	Language in children is universal and develops in accordance with the child's	Children's language develops as a result of social interaction and constructive

age, just like the heart, liver, and other organs.	activities. Context is explicitly expressed through an intonation, but it is interpreted implicitly.
--	--

Let us take a look at the following example of communication using Indonesian language in a communicative situation between a little child and his mother: “Ya .. gi ...” (When the child was asked about where his father is). The child has not made a correct sentence structurally, but through context, the mother will understand the word the same as what the child actually wants to say, namely: “Ayah sedang pergi”. Let us consider the other example: “Ma ... cang ...” (the child spoke while pointing out a banana on the table). The foregoing sentence will be understood pragmatically as: “Ma, saya mau pisang itu”. Syntax, semantics, and pragmatics are three interconnected aspects of language studies. It can be seen in figure 1 alongside some details of explanations that follow:




Figure 1. Interrelationships among pragmatics, semantics, and syntax

In figure 1, there researcher tries to draw how actually pragmatics covers syntax and semantics which will be related to context of communication. Initially, language was only studied through its syntax, which was limited to linguistic forms or sentence structures (NP, VP, and etc.), but as awareness grew, it became apparent that it was also necessary to examine the logical meaning that existing within sentences apart from the structure. The study of a language is aided further by the fact that sentences will not be communicatively meaningful if they are studied solely for their structures (syntax) or logical meanings (semantics), but a language must also be examined in contexts (pragmatics). The semantic and syntactical aspects of sentences are automatically examined as a single unit of understanding when studying a language pragmatically. The pragmatic context, which includes the linguistic context, including syntax and semantics as well as the extralinguistic contexts, demonstrates the relationships among the three. Semantics, on the other hand, examines contexts but is limited to logical meanings. This can be seen in the stages of the semantic components, which are influenced by the context and function of the speech act, while pragmatics broadens the context. Pragmatics is heavily reliant on semantic descriptions, which are formed from structures, though they are not always syntactically correct. The following explanations show where transformational grammar and pragmatics intersect (Chomsky, 2014).

First, the transformation process serves a communicative purpose. At the level of intention and purpose, using question words that are meant to ask questions and the reduction of a subject “you” in a sentence like “open the door!” are all interpreted pragmatically. The foregoing sentence “open the door!”, according to its deep structure, convey a message of “you open the door”. Second, competence and performance in transformational grammar are heavily influenced by social and environmental factors because language and culture develop concurrently. The pragmatic context includes environmental, social, and cultural factors (Chomsky, 2014).




Figure 2. Surface and deep structure (Chomsky, 2014)

The Generative Transformation Grammatical Principles are made up of three parts (Chomsky, 2014). They consist of syntactic component (Generative), semantic components (give meaning), and phonological component (providing sound sequence). The phonological and semantic components interpret the output of the syntactic components. Phonologically, sound or intonation affects the meaning of sentences, which can give birth to different interpretations. Interpretations and sound alongside intonation are part of the extralinguistic contexts in pragmatics. In Indonesian language, this case can be seen from these three examples: 1) "Kucing makan tikus mabuk", 2) "Kucing makan tikus mabuk", and 3) "Kucing makan tikus mabuk". The emphasis on sound or intonation in various words will result in different meanings. Furthermore, the three grammatical components of the transformation are always considered in pragmatics and are even reciprocally interconnected. Third, according to Bachman as cited in (Han, 2021), language competence, which is a key component in transformational grammar, subsume the competences of language organization and pragmatics. Language organization competence includes grammatical competence and textual competence. Pragmatic competence consists of illocutionary competence (the ability to express language functions and interpret them: manipulative, imaginative, interactional, and etc.) and sociolinguistic competence (sensitivity that makes a person able to express language functions according to context). Thus, the role of pragmatics in transformational grammar is clearly visible.

PRAGMATICS AND ITS ASPECTS OF UNDERSTANDING

Yule (2022) provides four limitations of pragmatic studies.

Speaker's meaning

Pragmatics examines language in terms of the communicative meaning spoken by the speaker, rather than just the sentences spoken. This perspective focuses on interpreting what the speaker means in his sentence. For example, someone said, "a monkey stole my guava". There are two possible interpretations of the foregoing sentences. They are: (1) Monkey in the most literal sense, a

long-tailed animal that stole my guava; and (2) Monkey in the contextual sense is someone I despise. For another example, taken from a staging of communication using Bengkulu's language, someone said, *"Elok kerjo kau tu"*. The foregoing sentence conveys two interpretative messages: (1) The speaker expresses gratitude for good work; or (2) The speaker expresses displeasure with poor work.

Contextual meaning

Pragmatics interprets the meaning of the speaker's utterance by taking into account the context in which it was uttered. In pragmatics, a context can take the form of setting (where, when, and in what situation the speech is delivered), participation (to whom the speech is addressed), function, topic, language form, and cultural context, as well as the linguistic context itself. Consider the following sentence examples conveyed by using Indonesian language: 1) *"Saya ayam, Lusi kelinci"*. This utterance will be pragmatically meaningful due to the involvement of the context, specifically the setting (location) in a satay restaurant. 2) *"Maaf, kalau anda tidak keberatan, boleh saya pinjam penanya?"* This utterance serves as a polite request and is addressed to someone who is more respected.

How to get more communicated than said

Pragmatics investigates how the listener can interpret what is actually meant by drawing conclusions from the speaker's utterances. How does the listener interpret something implied in the sentence? For instance, in the Indonesian language, someone said, *"Andi selalu mengganggu saya. Saya tidak nyaman jika duduk di kelas di sebelahnya. Dia sungguh anak yang nakal. Kemarin buku saya dirobeknya"*. Even though the word "benci" (which means hate) is not explicitly used, the listener can conclude that the speaker truly despises Andi. For another example, someone said, *"Anak saya Lusi dapat ranking I di kelasnya. Si Andi ranking II umum di sekolahnya. Si bungsu Robert juga Ranking II"*. The listener can conclude that the speaker is proud of his children and that they are all intelligent.

Expression of relative distance

Pragmatics investigates the selection of sentences based on the physical (oral-written), social (boss-subordinate), conceptual, and distance closeness between the speaker and listener (kinship, older-younger). For instance, If I mean to ask my parents for money, by using Indonesian language, my spoken language will be as follows: *"Pak, Bu, saya butuh uang untuk beli buku"*. Subsequently, my written language will be: *"Yang tercinta Ayah dan Bunda, Ananda mohon maaf karena selalu merepotkan. Seperti halnya saat ini, ananda harus membeli buku lagi. Ananda mohon, Ayah dan Bunda berkenan mengirimkan nanda uang"*. The speech will also be different because I will be speaking to someone I admire. A different form of spoken language will be different when I am communicating with my close friend. For example, using Bengkulu's language, I say, *"Oi antu, kemano be kau ko?"*. If it is said by a close friend who has not seen each other in a long time, rude and impolite speech will be considered appropriate and familiar.

Pragmatic studies are also said to be "pragmatics wastebasket" (Mognon et al., 2021) because pragmatics becomes a "waste basket" for things that are deemed useless and unimportant in the study of syntax and semantics. In the study of syntax, sentences are only analyzed based on their structure (NP, VP), so sentences that are not arranged according to structure are considered incorrect. In semantic studies, sentences are analyzed in terms of logical meaning between categories, so sentences that are judged to be illogical are considered incorrect. The two studies (syntax and semantics) do not look at other meanings, and the true meaning may be more than just sentences that are pronounced grammatically and logically. Pragmatists study and analyze the things that the two studies consider incorrect in order to perfect communicative meaning. For example, using Bengkulu's language, someone said, *"Lusi nak kemano"*. The expected answer can be: *"Ambo ndak pai ke pekan"*. Semantically if answered *"Daaak ..."*, then it is incorrect because it is illogical. Another example, by using Indonesian language, a child said, *"Maaa ... mandi"*. The sentence is incorrect syntactically because

there is no subject, and the NP and VP are unclear. It is regarded as true if the sentence is uttered "Maaa, saya mau mandi". Both of these sentences are correct if pragmatics is applied to them because the things that are stated incorrectly are more closely examined from the various contexts involved. The previously first example demonstrates the context of social pleasantries. The other example demonstrates the context of the child's language.

Deixis and distance

Deixis is 'pointing' by using language about unknown things, but both the speaker and listener understand what is pointed out in context. Distance is closely related to deixis because this deixis 'shows' something at a certain distance from the speaker. The distance referred to is not only whether something is close or far from the speaker, but also social status (respected, lower class), closeness of relationships (family, friends, relations), psychological distance (can be seen or not), time interval (yesterday, now, tomorrow), and grammar deixis (direct and indirect speech in English). The following is an example of deixis, by using Bengkulu's language, based on how far or close something is to the speaker: "Ambo buang iko disitu be yo". The word *iko* and *disitu* means this and there. The context is known by both the speaker and the listener, that *Ambo* (I) will throw the damaged VCD that is in his hand into the wastebasket which is quite far from him. For another example, someone said, "Ambo telpon kau klak yo". The word *klak* (later) indicates temporal deixis (time).

Reference and inference

A reference is a linguistic action used by speakers or writers to help listeners or readers identify something. Inference is the conclusion reached by listeners or readers based on their understanding of what the speaker or writer is attempting to identify. Knowledge background of what is being discussed is used to make inferences. In English, reference examples are frequently found. There are several categories of references. The first is referential and attributive uses. Referential and attributive uses are used for something that is not specific or unknown. The examples can be: 1) There was a woman looking for you earlier (unspecified); 2) I want to find a husband who has a good religion (Not yet known); 3) No one recognizes the thief. (Attributive: whoever did the theft). The second is reference to identify expressions or co-text and objects. The examples can be: 1) May I borrow your Jaguar? (Referring to the jaguar car); 2) The pink lipstick is eye-catching (It could be lipstick in the sense of an actual object or lip color. It could also refer to a woman wearing pink lipstick). The third is anaphoric reference. This is used when we have to mention who and what we are talking about repeatedly. The examples can be: 1) Zee and Zaa are my favorite cats. Take good care of them while I'm away. 2) I like your house. The bathroom is spacious (The bathroom in your house).

Presupposition and entailment

A presupposition is something that the speaker believes before making an utterance (Yule, 2022). In the meantime, entailment is a semantic relationship that follows this assumption logically and is absolute. For example, someone said, "My hand was cut by a knife". The entailment refers to "my hand is injured". This means that it is impossible to cut but not injured. Some examples of presupposition can be viewed in Table 2.

Table 2. Examples of presupposition

No	Types	Sentence Examples	Presupposition
1	Exsistential	Your handphone is good	You have a handphone
2	Factive	I'm glad you are recovering	You are sick
3	Non-Factive	I dreamed you were at home	you are not at home
4	Lexical	He stopped swimming	He used to swim, or He swam then suddenly

5	Structural	Where did you get this doll from?	stopped. You get a doll
6	Counter Factual	If only I were beautiful	I am not beautiful

(Yule, 2022)

Cooperation and Implicature

During a conversation, the speaker and listener have unconsciously collaborated to achieve an appropriate understanding between what the listener wishes to convey and what the listener means. There are several maxims about the principle of cooperation that can help create conversations that are mutually understandable. They are the maxims of quantity, quality, connection, and manner. The maxim of quantity refers to speaking according to the portion needed, not excessive. The maxim of quality indicates speaking the truth. Do not talk about something that you do not have strong evidence. The maxim of connection demonstrates speaking about things that are relevant or have something to do with what is needed. The maxim of manner refers to saying clear sentences, in the correct order. Don't confuse. If these maxims are not met, then use Hedges (Yule, 2022) as displayed in some examples in Table 3.

Table 3. Hedges and their examples

No	Hedges	Examples
1	Quantity	<i>As you know, the Director is coming tomorrow.</i>
2	Quality	<i>If I'm not mistaken, the Director will come tomorrow.</i>
3	Connection	<i>Hmm by the way, Mr. Director will come tomorrow.</i>
4	Manner	<i>It's a bit confusing, but Mr. Director will come tomorrow.</i>

(Yule, 1996)

An utterance can allow the emergence of several implicatures. For example, "Hey, is there Leffi in the canteen?". Other examples of implicatures can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Implicatures and their examples

No	Examples of answers or responses	Implicature
1	"Let's go to the library first"	Don't want to meet Leffi, maybe don't like Leffy
2	"Hurry up before she leaves"	Want to go to the cafeteria too, maybe to ask for a treat.
3	"It's fun, it's like eating for free again".	Leffi likes to treat.

Implicatures can also be recognized according to their types. Table 5 presents some examples of implicatures categorized by their types:

Table 5. Implicatures and their types

No	Implicature	Sentence Examples	Implicature
1	Conversational	A: Did you eat the apples and oranges that were on the table? B: I ate apples	B didn't eat oranges.
2	Scalar	I have visited a few big cities in Indonesia.	Only a few, not all big cities in Indonesia.
3	Particularized conversational	A: Let's go to the movie! B: Mr. Anas has many tasks.	B couldn't go to the movie because he had to do an assignment.

Politeness and interaction

Politeness or politeness principles will be assessed during an interaction because politeness is more of a psychological attitude, behavior that is applied to a social environment. The culture and norms that govern society have a strong influence on politeness. The examples of politeness can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Examples of politeness

No	Types	Examples
1	Self, say nothing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Indonesia, in general, when a much younger person passes an elderly person, he should walk down while lowering his hands. In Padang in particular, when calling for public transportation, you should wave your right hand, because if you use your left hand, it is considered impolite.
2	Positive general	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Excuse me sir, sorry to interrupt, I want to ask, where is Mr. Rudi's house, sir?" (Compare with "Sir, where is Mr. Rudi's house?") "Excuse me miss, if you don't mind, I am thinking of borrowing your phone, is that okay?" (Compare with "Ma'am, can you lend me your phone?")

Pragmatics is a knowledge branch of signs, also known as semiotics (Storch, 2019). A philosopher by the name of Charles Morris, who was very interested in the study of signs, also known as semiotics, is credited with popularizing the use of the term pragmatics as to refer to semiotics. The study of the formal relations of one sign with another sign (studying the relationship of lingual units with other lingual units: a sign with a sign); the study of the relationship between signs and objects where the signs are applied (marked) (or the relationship between the signifier and the signified). The theory is then more commonly known as the trichotomous theory, which describes these three branches.

The ability of speakers to effectively communicate is what is meant by the term "pragmatics." Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics that focuses on the rules that govern the application of language within a specific social setting. These rules include guidelines for what should be said, how it should be said, when it is acceptable to say it, and how to make the language used acceptable to others. To put it another way, this domain incorporates a language speaker's capacity for social interaction. A speaker needs to have a complete comprehension of the rules that govern the society in which they wish to participate in order to be accepted into that society's language. This comprehension must include an awareness of how to make appropriate and correct use of particular speech acts and language functions. When it comes to the actions that should be taken when communicating, (Leech, 2016) identifies at least three distinct levels of "action" that serve as the foundation for a speech. They are (1) locutionary acts; (2) illocutionary acts; and (3) the effects of speech itself (perlocutionary act).

Politeness and interaction

Politeness or politeness principles will be assessed during an interaction because politeness is more of a psychological attitude, behavior that is applied to a social environment. The culture and norms that govern society have a strong influence on politeness. The examples of politeness can be seen in Table 6.

PRAGMATICS IN COMMUNICATION SKILLS

If the teacher is competent in pragmatics, he will be able to communicate effectively with his students. The study of how to communicate effectively through the use of language is called pragmatics. The competence of pragmatics enables teachers to become skilled in communicating with students using a meaningful material that is relevant to their lives and interests. Meaningfulness means that the students can directly digest the teacher's speech as a raw material for them to think about, as inviting students to think is the core of the learning process. Meaningfulness means that the students can learn something from the teacher. To put it another way, encouraging students to think critically will help them learn more effectively while simultaneously raising academic achievement.

In one scenario, students will have no trouble comprehending a content that is considered to be very difficult if the teacher is able to explain it in an appropriate and measured manner. On the other hand, students will be perplexed by a content that is considered to be very easy if the teacher explains it in a manner that is not communicative. Because of this, you shouldn't be surprised if, on occasion, students make claims about the teacher and 'judge' them, saying things like "it's nice to study with the teacher" or "it's not good to study with the teacher, it doesn't work." This assertion is presumed to have arisen as a result of the ineffective communicative language utilized by the teacher. As a result, it has been discovered that there are seven verses that the teacher wants in the learning process, and they are as follows: (1) wanting to maintain harmonious communication with students; (2) wanting to make learning materials easy to understand; (3) wanting to make students critical; (4) wanting the learning process not to be monotonous; (5) wanting students not to sleep during the learning process; (6) wanting communication between students to be communicative; and (7) wanting to motivate students to keep learning. If the teacher incorporates the following pragmatic concepts into the teaching and learning process: (1) speech acts; (2) the principle of cooperation; (3) implicature; and (4) politeness theory, this teacher's dream will come true. First, there is the speech-act theory, which is a principle that the language of the teacher (reading and learning material) can be well understood when associated with the context in which the utterance occurs. This indicates that in the process of learning, students will understand what the teacher communicates to them if the students and the teacher are in the same context situation (Zubkov, 2020): learning context, both have the same perception about: (1) learning objectives; (2) what was done; (3) how to do; (4) what and how to assess; (5) what media is used.

The teacher's main reference in the learning process is attributive to what is called speech acts based on the intention of the speaker (the teacher) when speaking (teaching in class) (Haghighi et al., 2019). The teacher is required to make Searle's opinion as cited in (Nielsen, 2020) during the process of learning because it is the main reference for the teacher: (a) expressive: to express feelings and attitudes regarding the state of the relationship; (b) commissive: to state that the teacher will do something; (c) directive: to make the speaker (teacher) do something; (d) representative: to tell students about something; (b) commissive: to state that the teacher will do something; (c) directive: to make the speaker (teacher) do something; (e) declarative: to describe changes in a relationship state. The teacher in acting speech makes an effort to ensure that the concepts he teaches to his students can be grasped easily in order for the class to be successful. These objectives include: (1) conveying information; (2) asking for information; (3) ordering; (4) refusing; (5) expressing feelings; (6) elevating; (7) requesting attention; (8) making requests; (9) requesting affirmation; (10) demonstrating a sense of solidarity; and (11) expressing gratitude to the partner who said what was said. Because of this, speakers (teachers) are required to abide by the rules that are present in a speech.

The rules in Grice's speech (Huang, 2017) are known as the principle of cooperation and the principle of courtesy. According to this theory, first, whatever language is conveyed during the learning process must be functional, that is, it must serve a purpose. Second, the cooperative principle: In the learning process, teacher communication ideally employs Grice's maxim, namely conversations that take place among community members (read-in class) and are based on a fundamental principle, namely the principle of cooperation. This communication's cooperation is

reflected in four types of speech maxims: (1) the quality maxim: try to make the learning material correct: (a) don't say anything you believe is incorrect: (b) don't say anything that is not supported by strong evidence! (2) the quantity maxim: (a) try to make learning materials that meet the needs of students; (b) ensure that learning materials do not exceed the needs of students; (3) the relevance maxim: try to make the learning material relevant to the topic of discussion. (4) the manner maxim: try to make the learning material easy to understand by: (a) avoiding ambiguity; (b) being brief; and (c) being regular. Third, implicature, not all of the teacher's speech and language is 'nice and comfortable,' such as the principle of cooperation, which is expressed directly. This principle can be 'violated' by the teacher under certain conditions. By communicating ideas indirectly (implied meaning). Violations of the cooperative principle maxims will result in implicatures, such as indirectly conveying ideas and messages, saying something but meaning something else, what is said is not the same as that intention, and understanding the meaning of this idea is highly dependent on the context of the conversation. For example, if the blackboard is dirty, the teacher will not say, "Please clean the blackboard," but will instead say, "I will write something on the blackboard," implying that students should clean the blackboard. It is hoped that the involvement will improve the teacher-student relationship because we 'always think' in terms of communicating in the context of mutual respect. It is assumed that a teacher with good implicature skills already knows the students' 'culture' because the implicature will only 'connect' if the teacher and students are in the same cultural context. Fourth, Politeness: Brown and Levinson's concept (Levinson, 2019) of politeness is self-image in terms of social and public attributes, honor, self-esteem. This indicates that in the learning process, teacher and student politeness is a symbol of authority that underlies the communication process so that it will stimulate the enthusiasm of teachers and students to learn. It can be claimed that the more polite the teacher, the higher the students' interest in learning.

The concept of politeness is expressed through a weight that consists of three social parameters: first, the level of disturbance, regarding the absolute weight of certain actions in a particular culture; for instance, the request "May I borrow your car?" has a different weight than the request "May I borrow your pen?" In an ideal learning environment, teacher communication about content should not be burdensome to students and must be relevant to their context; second, the social distance between teachers and students should not be excessive. In the learning process, teachers should not "distance themselves" from students; teachers should be friendly; and third, the interlocutor's power. In the learning process, the teacher does not present himself as the "sole dictator" in the classroom; rather, the teacher becomes the students' partner.

Six politeness maxims are mentioned in Leech's politeness theory (Leech, 2016), which discusses the interpersonal rhetorical framework. They subsume (a) the maxim of wisdom: the teacher minimizes student losses or maximizes gains for students and vice versa. The longer the teacher's speech, the greater the students' desire to be polite and the speech that is said indirectly tends to be more polite than the speech that is said directly; (b) the maxim of generosity: the teacher maximizes respect for students; (c) the maxim of acceptance: the teacher maximizes the loss for oneself and minimizes the gain for oneself; (d) humility maxim: the teacher maximizes self-respect and minimizes self-respect; (e) compatibility maxim: the teacher maximizes compatibility among students; (f) sympathy maxim: the teacher maximizes sympathy and minimizes antipathy towards students. For teachers and from now on, it is time for us to 'end' the suffering of students in understanding the 'disconnected' teacher's language and speech. There will be a 'reward' for teachers if they can improve communication strategies in class with pragmatic competence in order to inspire students to learn fully.

Pragmatic competence is regarded as the most difficult aspect of language to master when studying a foreign language. Without pragmatic competence, it is difficult for a foreign language learner to communicate effectively, even if he is able to pronounce words correctly and construct complex and lengthy sentences. In comparison to grammatical errors, the significance of pragmatism in foreign language communication is emphasized with great force. Grammatical errors can hinder

communication between non-native and native speakers, but they are still considered non-fundamental errors because it is highly likely that non-native speakers have not mastered grammar. Here, the evaluation of native speakers is limited to the question of whether or not the foreign speaker is fluent. In contrast to pragmatic errors, which give the impression of rudeness or unfriendliness when committed by non-native speakers. This pragmatic incompetence is a direct reflection of the personality and behavior of social structure speakers. The significant connection between pragmatics and the concept of politeness implies that an understanding of politeness strategies is necessary for a person's communication to continue and be successful. Teaching that focuses on pragmatic aspects, such as the introduction of language politeness strategies, is crucial in foreign language learning activities. Real communication in a foreign language is certainly more difficult for language learners than communication in their native tongue. At least, this is what is observed among students enrolled in English study programs. For instance, when asking his friend to close the door (directive speech act), the student was unable to do so in an appropriate and courteous manner. The phrase "open the door!" is commonly used in requests to friends to open the door. Even though there are numerous politeness strategies available for communicating the message. One of them is using positive politeness strategies as if the speaker is participating in the "opening the door" task by saying "will you please open the door?" or "please open the door!" There could be numerous causes for this situation. There are differences between the mother tongue and English, including differences in socio-culture, social context, politeness strategies, situations, feelings, or intonation, as well as differences in the complexity of vocabulary and grammar. Since students have learned the addressed form, they have been exposed to a variety of politeness markers in the English language. However, it appears that understanding of this is limited to lexical knowledge, i.e., what words or expressions are used to express the speaker's wishes, and not an understanding of why the politeness form was selected in the speech act and in which communication situation it is used.

CONCLUSION

Pragmatics as a knowledge that studies speakers' meaning, contextual meaning, expression, deixis, reference, implicature and politeness in interaction is necessary to learn as a way to practice natural communication skills in various context of interaction. It elaborates detail aspects of contexts which influence the speakers' intention in communication. The success of learning a language is to be able to use the language to communicate. As long as the message is understandable, the communication takes place. Understanding pragmatic will influence the successful of communication significantly.

Various aspects of language can be the subject of linguistic study. It covers not only verbal but also non-verbal aspects of language; a linguistic study examines not only the explicit but also the implied; it depends on the context (namely the semantic system that exists parallel to the structure of the language). In conclusion, it is emphasized that language is influenced by culture, which must be taken into account when interpreting meaning in the relevant context.

The ability to speak a language is the capacity to correctly apply grammatical rules in accordance with the rules of that language. While communication is the ability to use these grammatical rules naturally in different interaction contexts in order for the intended meaning to be understood. Speaking skills should be geared toward communication skills, so that the purpose of learning a language is established from the outset. Because Pragmatics is the science of language that teaches how language is used in communication, it will help language learners communicate as naturally, contextually, and appropriately as possible like native speakers of that language. This study is limited in understanding pragmatic as a way to practice natural communication, it discuss the aspect of pragmatic and how it could be useful not only for students but also teachers. A further study on finding the ways for teachers to bring pragmatic into the classroom and the quantitatively measurement research on the effect of pragmatic for each student or teacher are truly suggested.

REFERENCES

- Afriani, Z. L. (2019). PERAN BUDAYA DALAM PEMEROLEHAN BAHASA ASING. *Disastra: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1(2), 42. <https://doi.org/10.29300/disastra.v1i2.1900>
- Aitchison, J. (2011). *The articulate mammal: An introduction to psycholinguistics*. Routledge.
- Alcon, Eva. (2015). *Pragmatic learning and study abroad: Effects of instruction and length of stay—ScienceDirect*.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0346251X14001389?via%3Dihub>
- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Bumi Aksara.
- benjamins, John. (2021). *The pragmatics of English as a lingua franca | John Benjamins*. <https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/ap.00005.hou>
- Chomsky, N. (2014). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (Vol. 11). MIT press.
- Haghighi, H., Jafarigohar, M., Khoshsima, H., & Vahdany, F. (2019). Impact of flipped classroom on EFL learners' appropriate use of refusal: Achievement, participation, perception. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32(3), 261–293.
- Han, S. (2021). A Literature Review of the Research Method in the Study of L2 Pragmatic Competence of Chinese Tertiary-Level Students. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 18(12), 377–382.
- Huang, Y. (2017). Neo-Gricean pragmatics. *The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics*, 47–78.
- Karyawati, Y. S. (2020). *PENERAPAN PENDEKATAN PRAGMATIK DALAM PEMBELAJARAN BAHASA INGGRIS PADA SISWA SMP*. 6(2).
- Leech, G. N. (2016). *Principles of pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Levinson, S. C. (2019). Interactional foundations of language: The interaction engine hypothesis. In *Human language: From genes and brain to behavior* (pp. 189–200). MIT Press.
- Mognon, I., Scholten, I., Hukker, V., & Hendriks, P. (2021). Pragmatics is not a monolithic phenomenon, and neither is theory of mind: Response to Kissine. *Language*, 97(3), e218–e227.
- Nielsen, N. M. (2020). Expanding Searle's analysis of interrogative speech acts: A systematic classification based on preparatory conditions. *Scandinavian Studies in Language*, 11(1), 7–19.
- Putera Jaya, H., Petrus, I., & Lingga Pitaloka, N. (2022). Speaking Performance and Problems Faced by English Major Students at a University in South Sumatra. *South Sumatera. Indonesian EFL Journal*, 8(1), 105–112.
- Sanulita, H. (2019). *Pemanfaatan Pendekatan Pragmatik dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Berbasis Pemahaman Lintas Budaya*.
- Sanusi, Anwar. (2016). *Metodologi Penelitian Bisnis* (keenam). Salemba Empat.

- Sari, M., & Asmendri, A. (2020). Penelitian Kepustakaan (Library Research) dalam Penelitian Pendidikan IPA. *Natural Science: Jurnal Penelitian Bidang IPA Dan Pendidikan IPA*, 6(1), 41–53. <https://doi.org/10.15548/NSC.V6I1.1555>
- Steinberg, D. D., & Sciarini, N. V. (2013). *An introduction to psycholinguistics*. Routledge.
- Storch, A. (2019). The idea of a yell: On metapragmatic discourse. *International Journal of Language and Culture*, 6(1), 10–28.
- Taguchi, N. (2015). “Contextually” speaking: A survey of pragmatic learning abroad, in class, and online. *System*, 48, 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SYSTEM.2014.09.001>
- Ubaidillah, A. (2020). Pendekatan Pragmatik Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris. *Al Ibtida'*, 8(2). <http://ejournal.kopertais4.or.id/mataraman/index.php/alibtida/article/view/4318>
- youn, soo Jung. (2015). *Validity argument for assessing L2 pragmatics in interaction using mixed methods*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0265532214557113>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford.
- Yule, G. (2022). *Oils Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Zubkov, A. D. (2020). MOOCs in blended English teaching and learning for students of technical curricula. *Proceedings of the Conference “Integrating Engineering Education and Humanities for Global Intercultural Perspectives,”* 539–546.