

**STUDENTS' PRAGMATIC AWARENESS IN COMPREHENDING
WRITTEN DISCOURSE OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF IAIN
BUKITTINGGI**

Nofa Minanda¹, Eliza², Merry Prima Dewi³

¹IAIN Bukittinggi

Email: minandanofa22@gmail.com

²IAIN Bukittinggi

Email: lizachio@yahoo.id

³IAIN Bukittinggi

Email: merryprimadewi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Knowledge of pragmatic has been crucial element to the students English Department. The main focus of the research to find out the level of students pragmatic awareness by using percentage, the research was due to the problem found some students still used inappropriate respond to the pragmatic situation. The design of this research was a descriptive quantitative research in which the sample was taking by using random sampling technique with 25 samples at IAIN Bukittinggi of English Department. Additionally, the analyzing of the data was done by Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT) test which is consist of 17 situation, made the description about the students pragmatic awareness in comprehending written discourse, analyzing the data using percentage, describe the data, found the level and making conclusion. The result showed that students pragmatic awareness in comprehending term in deixis is 61% it means the level is good. In performing term of speech act is 79% it means the level is good. Moreover, in understanding maxim is 62% it means the level is good. All of the students pragmatic awareness in comprehending written discourse is 67% it means the pragmatic awareness in comprehending written discourse of English Department of IAIN Bukittinggi is good. The implication of this study to know the level of pragmatic awareness in written discourse of English Department of IAIN Bukittinggi.

Keywords : *Pragmatic, Pragmatic Awareness, Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT)*

INTRODUCTION

Language is a tool of communication that is used by people to communicate with the other using sign such as words and body language. Oktavianus (2006) stated that Language is used for communication between the members of the society. Language related to many aspects such as society, culture, knowledge, religious, and economic system. Mastering language makes people can easily to express and share their feeling, ideas, and knowledge to others. Without the presence of language, it is hard to imagine how people cooperate and get along with other.

As an s international language English is used by people in the world for communication. This is the reason why the students should be able to master the English. This course is very important to be acquired by students to be able to communicate with people in the world, because without language people will not be able in social interaction.

English is learned for many purposes such as for getting a job, communicating, developing technology and so on especially for communication, English can be used for written or spoken one. Unfortunately, some language learners difficulties to get ability in speaking, in this case they fail in understanding or grasping information from what people said, although they have learned it in their school.

In Indonesia, English becomes a foreign language which is taught formally in the school. The purpose of teaching English in Indonesia is to enable the students to develop their skills in communication both spoken and written. English is learned by the students at junior high school, senior high school until university. As a foreign language, English is not only for students' academic aspect to get good mark but also as a tool for communication in the world to work after school.

In university, especially English education department, there are skills and components that should be learnt by the students. The skills are writing, speaking, reading, and listening. Beside, the components are vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation (Amaral et al., 2013). In addition, the linguistic study such as sociolinguistics, introduction to linguistics, and psycholinguistics are also learnt by the students. In Introduction to Linguistics the parts of linguistics that learnt are semantics, pragmatics, morphology, and phonology (Nikula, 2002a).

As a part of linguistic study, pragmatics is a study about context and the meaning. Tazik, n.d. state that pragmatic is sub-filed of semantic. While semantics focuses on the meanings of signs, and the relationship between these meanings, and includes the study of meanings of chunks of text. However, when these utterances are interpreted with reference to the context, including the setting, speakers, background knowledge, and so on, this falls into the realm of pragmatics. Pragmatics suppresses on the speech act, conversation implicature, talk in interaction and etc. According to *Page 1 of 327*, n.d. pragmatics is the study of meaning, not as generated by the linguistic system, but as conveyed and manipulated by participant in a communicative situation. Beside, Nikula (2002a) state that pragmatics has been defined as a general functional perspective on language. So, its means that pragmatics study of linguistic explores about the use of language especially in context and meaning in communication.

Tuğba & Ekin (2013) In pragmatics, there is a pragmatic awareness which is particularly difficult for those studying in English as a foreign language (EFL) context and most learners fail to interact successfully with native and non native English speakers due to pragmatic failure or negative pragmatic transfer. It means that pragmatic awareness is important to social interaction. Pragmatic awareness is defined as the learner's ability to realize pragmatic features, pragmatically infelicitous utterances or explicit knowledge about pragmatics when they speak to the others. According to Rafieyan et al.(2014) Pragmatic awareness is essential for the students because pragmatics is used in social interaction and the effect the use of language and the context when speaking. So, they have used pragmatics in speaking to respond in conversation based on the context.

Basically there are several types of pragmatic which are divided into 8 parts, there are: deixis, speech act, presupposition, context, inference, anaphora, politeness and maxim. First is deixis, deixis is the way language related with the context and reflected to the structure of language itself. Second is speech act, speech act is one of pragmatic part. Third is presupposition, presupposition is assumption by listener toward what the speaker have said. Fourth is context, context is the mental representation of those aspects of what is physically out there that we use in arriving at an interpretation. Fifth inference, inference is additional information used by the listener to create a connection between what is said and what must be meant. Sixth is anaphora, anaphora is can be defined as subsequent reference to an already introduce density. Seventh is politeness, politeness is the emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize. The last is maxim, maxim is a brief statement that contains a little piece of wisdom or general rule of behavior. These type were used in daily conversation.

Furthermore, the students were asked give respond for the situation that was given to them from Rahimi Domakani et al. (2013) about several topics such as; asking the teacher to fix their computer, asking to turn the music down, and ask the teacher to repeat. The respond that was provided were appropriate and inappropriate. The respond should be inappropriate. But, the students said that the respond as appropriate.

In conclusion, the students were asked give respond for the situation that was given to them about several topics such as; asking the teacher to fix their computer, asking to turn the music down, and ask the teacher to repeat. The respond that was provided were appropriate and inappropriate. The respond should be inappropriate. But, the students said that the respond as appropriate, it seems the students did not aware about pragmatics. However, for

this purpose in mind the current study aims to find out the level of Students' Pragmatic Awareness in Comprehending Written Discourse.

METHOD

This study was categorized into the test, the test is Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT). The WDCT test is to measure the pragmatic awareness and speech act realization ability of the participants. The design of this research is descriptive quantitative research.(Cahyanti et al., 2019) descriptive research is a research which purposes to collect some information which is related to the situation when doing research. Beside, according to Gay (2000) descriptive research involves collecting data in order to test hypothesis or to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. In this research the population was the fifth semester of English Department of IAIN Bukittinggi. The random sampling is used as sampling technique with 25 samples. The Written Discourse Completion Test is used as research instrument and data would interpret by using the following table.

Range of Percentage	Categorizes
80% - 100%	Excellent
60% - 79%	Good
50% - 59%	Fair
0% - 49%	Poor

Dasar – Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan (Suharsimi Arikunto : 2010)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The were 17 situations and 3 indicators of pragmatics awareness test. The indicators were: deixis, speech act, and maxim.

Findings

The findings of the research; first, the level of pragmatic awareness in comprehending term of deixis at fifth semester of English Department of IAIN Bukittinggi is good. Second, the level of pragmatic awareness in performing term of speech act at fifth semester of English Department of IAIN Bukittinggi is good. Third, the level of pragmatic awareness in understanding maxim at fifth semester of English Department of IAIN Bukittinggi is good. The data below is the distribution of analysis of the data:

Table 1. The Data Description of Students Pragmatic Awareness

No	Indicator	No item of situation	Appropriate	Inappropriate
1.	Deixis	3	60%	40%
		14	72%	28%
		15	40%	60%
		17	72%	28%
	Mean	-	61%	39%
	Level		Good	
2	Speech act	1	60%	40%
		2	96%	4%
		9	100%	0
		10	60%	40%
	Mean	-	79%	21%
	Level		Good	
3	Maxim	4	4%	96%
		5	72%	28%
		6	4%	96%
		7	88%	12%
		8	72%	28%
		11	88%	12%
		12	92%	8%
		13	84%	16%
		16	56%	44%
	Mean	-	62%	38%
	Level		Good	
Level of pragmatic awareness			67%	Good

The table above shows the percentage of each situation based on the indicator. The indicators were divided into three: deixis, speech act and maxim. There were 4 situations on deixis, 4 situations on speech act and 9 situations on Maxim. The data analysis can be seen in the explanation below.

Table 2. The Percentage Of Students Pragmatic Awareness Seen by Deixis

No	Indicator	Item	Appropriateness	The students answer of appropriateness	
				Appropriate	Inappropriate
1.	Deixis	3	Appropriate	60%	40%
		15		40%	60%

		14	Inappropriate	72%	28%
		17		72%	28%
	Sum			244%	156%
	Mean			61%	39%
	Level			Good	

The table above shows that pragmatic awareness on deixis. Deixis is the way language related with the context and reflected to the structure of language itself. Deixis is divided into personal deixis, spatial deixis, and temporal deixis. Based on table there 4 situation on deixis which are 3, 14, 15, 17. The percentages of the “appropriate” answer by the students are 57% which means the level is fair while the percentage of “inappropriate” answer 38%. Thus there are several students that still has low pragmatic awareness.

Table 3. The Percentage of Students Pragmatic Awareness Seen by Speech Act

No	Indicator	Item	Appropriateness	The students answer of appropriateness	
				Appropriate	Inappropriate
1.	Speech act	1	Appropriate	60%	40%
		9		100%	0%
		2	Inappropriate	96%	4%
		10		60%	40%
Sum			316%	84%	
Mean			79%	21%	
Level			Good		

The table above shows that pragmatic awareness on speech act. Yule said that the term speech act to describe actions such as requesting, commanding, questioning or informing. It can define that a speech acts as the action performed by a speaker with an utterance. Speech act is divided into indirect speech act and direct speech act. Based on table there 4 situation on speech act which are 1, 2, 9, 10. The percentages of correct answer by the students are 79% which means the level is good while the percentage of incorrect answer are 21 %.

Table 4. The Percentage of Students Pragmatic Awareness Seen By Maxim

No	Indicator	Item	Appropriateness	The students answer of appropriateness	
				Appropriate	Inappropriate
1.	Maxim	5	Appropriate	72%	28%
		7		88%	12%

		8		72%	28%
		12		92%	8%
		13		84%	16%
		4	Inappropriate	4%	96%
		6		4%	96%
		11		88%	12%
		16		56%	44%
	Sum			560%	340%
	Mean			62%	38%
	Level			Good	

The table above shows that pragmatic awareness by maxim. Maxim is a brief statement that contains a little piece of wisdom or general rule of behavior. A short, pithy statement expressing a general truth or rule of conduct. Maxim is divided into maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevant, and maxim of manner. Based on table there 9 situation on speech act which are 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16. The percentages of “appropriate” answer by the students are 62% which means the level is good while the percentage of “inappropriate” answer are 37%.

Discussion

This research was done by giving pragmatic test to see the students pragmatic awareness. There 25 students that done the pragmatic awareness test to find out the student level of pragmatic awareness of fifth semester of English education department in IAIN Bukittinggi. From the analysis of the data, the researcher found the percentage of the student’s answer in pragmatic situation.

The pragmatic test items which is used WDCT given included situation related pragmatic. In this study only 3 types were taken as indicators. The indicators were deixis, Speech act, and Maxim.

Deixis is the way language related with the context and reflected to the structure of language itself. Deixis is divided into personal diexis, spatial deixis, and temporal deixis. Levinson stated that deixis belong to the area of pragmatic because it directly involves the relationship between the structure of language and the context in which it is used. In deixis, there are several students that still had low of pragmatic awareness. The student reason answered the appropriate option in situation such as: this is appropriate because they using “please” and the word “in five minutes” it is a time line to his personnel and it is a bit not appropriate. Meanwhile, the student’s reason answered the inappropriate option: it is not

appropriate because he urges his colleagues to asked help with say “in five minutes”. It means the some student can relate the context of situation and related them with appropriate option while the others still not aware of that. The second indicator is Speech act. Yule (2006) stated that the term speech act to describe actions such as requesting, commanding, questioning or informing. It can define that a speech acts as the action performed by a speaker with an utterance. Speech act is divided into indirect speech act and direct speech act which using ‘could you’, ‘can we’, ‘did we’. From the explanation, some of the student reasons answered the appropriate option: This is appropriate because he using the word ‘could you’ and ‘please’. The student reason answered the appropriate option: it is inappropriate because he did not ask sorry and he only thinks about himself. It means that most of the students aware of speech act in situations that were given to them. They understood when it need to use speech act based on context. It show they pay attention on the usage of ‘could we’ ‘can we’ or ‘could you’ which mean they are aware of speech act based on situation and context.

The last one is maxim. Maxim is a brief statement that contains a little piece of wisdom or general rule of behavior. Tuama & Al-Saedi (2005) said that Maxim is divided into maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevant, and maxim of manner. Some of the example of maxim in conversation is like trying to avoid obscurity, ambiguity, be brief and be orderly. The students reason answered the appropriate option in a situation that included maxim was: this is appropriate because he has asked sorry for his late. Moreover, the student’s reason answered the appropriate option: it is inappropriate because the interviewer has been waiting for her about half an hour. It show that some of the students aware that they trying to be brief and not wasting time which men they actually aware of maxim. Besides, the others view from the politeness side so they choose the other option which mean they not aware of maxim.

Moreover, it was found that the student pragmatic awareness is good level in comprehending term of deixis. In addition, It was found the students level is good in performing term of speech act. The last, the students pragmatic awareness was in good level in understanding maxim. In conclusion, the student’s pragmatic awareness in deixis, speech act, and maxim is good .

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

This research was about an analysis of students' pragmatic awareness in comprehending written discourse at fifth semester of English Department in IAIN Bukitinggi. This study was done to answer the questions about the level of students' pragmatic awareness in IAIN Bukitinggi. From the data description and analysis, it was found that:

1. In deixis, the result show that 61% of the students answer appropriate and 38% of the students answer inappropriate from 4 situation. Which means the level was good in comprehending term of deixis.
2. In speech act, it was found that 79% of the students answer appropriate and 21% of the students answered inappropriate from 4 situations. Which means the level was good in performing term of speech act.
3. The last is maxim, it was found that 62% of the students answer appropriate and 38% of the students answer inappropriate from 9 situations. Which means the level was good in understanding maxim. In conclusion, the students pragmatic awareness was good, because it was 67%.

Suggestion

In conclusion the researcher suggest that the students pay more attention about pragmatics and aware to use pragmatics in written discourse.

REFERENCES

- Amaral, G., Bushee, J., Cordani, U. G., KAWASHITA, K., Reynolds, J. H., ALMEIDA, F. F. M. D. E., de Almeida, F. F. M., Hasui, Y., de Brito Neves, B. B., Fuck, R. A., Oldenzaal, Z., Guida, A., Tchalenko, J. S., Peacock, D. C. P., Sanderson, D. J., Rotevatn, A., Nixon, C. W., Rotevatn, A., Sanderson, D. J., ... Junho, M. do C. B. (2013). No 主観的健康感を中心とした在宅高齢者における 健康関連指標に関する 共分散構造分析 Title. In *Journal of Petrology* (Vol. 369, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Cahyanti, A. D., Farida, F., & Rakhmawati, R. (2019). Pengembangan Alat Evaluasi Berupa Tes Online/Offline Matematika dengan Ispring Suite 8. *Indonesian Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 2(3), 363–371. <https://doi.org/10.24042/ijmsme.v2i3.4362>
- Nikula, T. (2002a). Teacher talk reflecting pragmatic awareness: A look at EFL and content-based classroom settings. *Pragmatics*, 12(4), 447–467. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.12.4.03nik>

- Nikula, T. (2002b). Teacher talk reflecting pragmatic awareness. *PragmaticsPragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, 12(4), 447–467. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.12.4.03nik> Page 1 of 327. (n.d.).
- Rafieyan, V., Sharafi-Nejad, M., & Eng, L. S. (2014). Effect of pragmatic awareness on comprehension and production of conventional expressions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(7), 1352–1358. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.7.1352-1358>
- Rahimi Domakani, M., Hashemian, M., & Mansoori, S. (2013). Pragmatic Awareness of the Request Speech Act in English as an Additional Language: Monolinguals or Bilinguals? *Research in Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 88–110.
- Tazik, K. (n.d.). Journal of English Language. In *Social Sciences* (Issue 222, pp. 1–15).
- Tuama, H., & Al-Saedi, J. (2005). *a Pragmatic Study of the Cooperative Principle and Grice'S Maxims in Lois Lowry'S the Giver. November 2013.* <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.28837.45289>
- Tuğba, M., & Ekin, Y. (2013). Pragmatic Awareness of EFL Teacher Trainees and Their Reflections on Pragmatic Practices. *ELT Research Journal*, 2(4), 176-190–190.