

From: I Made Rai Jaya Widanta (rai_widanta@yahoo.com)

To: editor@ijllnet.com

Date: Thursday, October 26, 2017 at 03:29 PM GMT+8

Dear IJLL Editor,

Thank you very much for the review of my article.
I herewith send you the payment receipt.
We only pay 160 USD as we only need 1 copy of
printed journal.

Here is the sender detail:

Name of sender : I Made Rai Jaya Widanta
Sending Country : Bangladesh
Amount in USD : 160 USD
Payout Amount in Taka : BDT 12.420,02
Money Transfer Control Number : 4072582719

Thank you very much. Please let me know in case of any
other information.

With regard,
I Made Rai Jaya Widanta

On Friday, October 20, 2017, 12:05:59 AM GMT+8, Editor, IJLL <editor@ijllnet.com> wrote:

Dear I Made Rai Jaya Widanta,

Please find the review result of your research paper as attachment.

The journal is now indexed with and included in Cabell's, Ulrich's,
EBSCO, Index Copernicus International, and Gale. Moreover the journal
is under the indexing process with ISI, ERIC, DOAJ, JSTOR, Econlit,
and Scopus.

Please acknowledge the receipt of the review reports.

With thanks,

Dr. Michael King
The Chief Editor
International Journal of Language and Linguistics

 Receipt IJLL SOMA.pdf
914 465

I Made Rai Jaya Widanta <r...
To: Editor, ULL

Wed, May 3, 2017 at 1:41 AM

- Inbox
- Unread
- Starred
- Drafts
- Sent
- Archive
- Spam
- Trash
- Views
- Folders
- + New Folder

Dear The Chief Editor of ULL
(Dr. Michael King)

I herewith send you the receipt of my article publication fee. The payment was transferred from western union. Should there be any other information or condition, please feel convenient to let me know.

Look forward to hearing from you soon.

Your faithfully,
I Made Rai Jaya Widanta

Show original message

ULL RECEIPT 1.pdf
351.2x6

ULL RECEIPT.pdf
784.4x6

... aspects. Like on JL, not invited to rest room. Each speaker was given chance to be hotel staff and was given ten minutes to produce speech acts of refusals and requests by students' responses were noted and recorded to be a document which is analysis.

During the learning, students were given materials which was duration. An approach was designed and implemented to find an appropriate class activity. The approach was revealed from a long trial and error process. The teaching was eventually succeeded in creating a model, including learning materials. It in form of role play activity was given upon of activity. Both results of the test in form of students' production of requests were explicated, scored and analyzed. Scoring was done by a native speaker of analysis using paired t-test was used to see how effective was analysis was described in the form of table and narration.

The results were rated by a native speaker and each respondent (given for R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, and R6). The rating was based on rate ranging from 0 - 4. The lowest rate was 0 and the highest rate was 4. Both analyzed with paired t-test to see whether (or not) respondents's performance.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result of statistical analysis using paired t-test, indicated that r competence raised after they were given English learning. Basically, their to produce speech acts which response shall be in accordance with be caused by the fact that they are less severe to produce never speech acts which are pragmatic competence. However, it was proved that request produce speech acts utterances of refusals better than request. This may that they felt easier to produce utterances when they learn or comprehend given trigger.

	Minimum	Maximum	Average
State			

How Should Pragmatics be Taught at Vocational College?

I Made Rai Jaya Widanta¹,

¹Mechanical Engineering Department, Politeknik Negeri Bali, Jalan Kampus Bukit Jimbaran, Kuta Selatan 80364, Badung, Bali, Indonesia, Phone (0361) 701981, Fax. (0361) 701128
rai_widanta@yahoo.com

Made Budiarsa²

²Dept. of Linguistics, Culture Sciences Faculty, Udayana University, Pulau Nias st., Denpasar, Bali, 80232, Ph/Fax: 0361-250033

I Wayan Simpen²

²Dept. of Linguistics, Culture Sciences Faculty, Udayana University, Pulau Nias st., Denpasar, Bali, 80232, Ph/Fax: 0361-250033

I Made Netra²

²Dept. of Linguistics, Culture Sciences Faculty, Udayana University, Pulau Nias st., Denpasar, Bali, 80232, Ph/Fax: 0361-250033

Abstract

Despite some investigations on how pragmatics is to be taught in English classes, there has not been an acceptable solution offered to the teaching of pragmatics in higher education institution like vocational college. This qualitative research was aimed at finding how pragmatics is taught at vocational college. A group of 23 (twenty three) students majoring in tourism were chosen purposively. The research participants were given treatment of pragmatic-based English teaching. Test 1 (T1) was carried out in prior to the treatment and Test 2 (T2) was given upon the treatment. On the test, oral role play cards consisting of scenarios for the research participants to produce request and refusal utterances were used as testing device. The teaching of pragmatics in class was done for ten sessions using some handouts in which aspects of pragmatics were inserted. In the teaching sessions, implicit and explicit approaches were implemented. In addition, the teaching syntax (teaching stages) consisting of three stages was particularly designed for this purpose. Students were also to fill questionnaire to see how they think about the model developed for the pedagogical activity. The T1 and T2 results were explicated, scored, and analyzed using statistical device of paired samples t-test. The statistical result indicated that the approach and teaching stages designed were effective to improve students' pragmatic competence.

Key words: *pragmatic teaching and learning, English, vocational college.*

1. Introduction

Inserting pragmatics into teaching materials and pedagogical activities has been a special attention of many English language educators recently. Thus, many experts in the field of applied linguistics tried to find effective strategies to do the attempt. A number of endeavor has been done by some scholars to find out how pragmatics should be taught, one of which is with an explicit approach. One concept which underlies strongly the teaching of pragmatics was optimizing students' awareness of pragmatics (Bardovi-Harlig, 1996; Kasper, 1996; Hartford, 2006). Teachers are recommended to develop teaching materials which are able to rise students' awareness. To do so, teachers are to provide students with rich input of pragmatics by reading semantic formulas and asking students to listen to the teachers' information (Safont-Jorda, 2004). To facilitate students with extended practice, some linguists used cards consisting of scenarios which could trigger students to produce speech act utterances during a learning activity. This method was effective to promote students' speaking activities. Inserting pragmatics into teaching materials was also realized by involving sociological aspects of language including "power", "distance", and "rank of imposition" (PDR) (Brown and Levinson, 1987) in scenarios. A part form oral role play using cards, discourse completion task (DCT) was the instrument used to optimize students' production of speech acts nonverbally (Gordon, 2004). However, DCT was not as effective as oral role play card in triggering students' speaking.

As a determining factors of success in the pragmatic learning, students' attention and awareness was also a focus of some other studies. The teaching was designed in such way to provide students with an easy and practical learning, for instance, by providing learning stages (Denny, 2008). By using NAPKIN (*need, accurate into the subject matter, practice, knowledge review, internalization, nature application*) approach, Denny (2008) was successful in developing an experimental learning model to expose students with pragmatics. The strategy indicated that students could promote better pragmatic competence. Apart from this stages, Lenchuk and Ahmed (2013) introduced a lesson plan in teaching speech act of complimenting. The learning stages include *warming up, reading, acquiring compliment, listening, speaking, DCT and listening*. The steps of teaching was designed to introduce students with the native speakers' language choices, such as expression, words, as well as semantic formulas.

Apart from the previous studies which (some of them) focused on sociopragmatics and (some others) focused on pragmlinguistics (Leech, 1985), Alcon Soler (2012) tried to see and design pragmatic teaching strategies form the two aspects. Sociopragmatic is stressing on involvement of sociological or cultural aspects in making learning materials and in learning activities, pragmlinguistics refers to linguistic resources, such as grammar, forms, expression, intonation, and pronunciation used to design learning materials. By using oral role play card, Alcon Soler (2012) proposed a set of step of teaching pragmatics which consists of *identifying refusal in interaction, explaining refusal speech act explicitly to provide information on pragmlinguistics and sociopragmatics, indentifying sequence of refusal, giving students chance to practice producing speech acts utterances*. The method was found effective to improve students competence.

Yuan (2012) also found that pragmatic teaching as a complicated process and therefore proposed two aspects to be given real attention, they are "content" and "learning process". The content of teaching includes teaching pragmatic knowledge, knowledge of intercultural, and learning strategies. Learning process includes task-based learning (TBL) approach, intercultural approach, and language strategies approach. Both aspects was supportive to promote students pragmatic competence improvement. And, Rycker (2014) studied impact of intercultural or interlanguage pragmatic learning. By taking data from writing activities, which focused on refusal strategies students made in refusing an international business proposal, it was recognized that American students tended to refuse by doing mitigation and used more statement of thanks when making refusal than NS students.

Research of pragmatic teaching on foreign and second language above are basically interrelated. Explicit teaching of pragmatics was implemented by Jorda (2004), Alcon Soler (2012), and Rycker (2014), however Jorda (2004) focused on *request* speech acts using DCT. Alcon Soler (2012) investigated whether (or not) explicit pragmatics teaching could bring about differences or changes on students' pragmatic awareness. The research gave a positive input on teaching of refusal speech acts using oral role play card. Rycker (2014) investigated whether senior high school students competent pragmatically. Data collecting instrument used was that producing non-naturally occurring data. Development of learning model was undertaken by Castillo (2009) and Lenchuk and Ahmed (2013). By using a number of informants, such as ESL and EFL teachers, NSs and NNSs, TESOL students and professors, Castillo (2009) successfully investigated learning steps similar to the NAPKIN (Denny, 2008). However, the research was only focused on investigating speech acts of compliment. Lenchuk and Ahmed (2013) also succeeded in developing a learning stages and a lesson plan for teaching pragmatics. Even though Denny (2008) successfully invented a concept of experimental learning with NAPKIN stages and lesson plan, but the study was a class action research which covers smaller scup than the research and development. In addition, that research was only concerned with speech act of negotiation.

Bardovi-Harlig (1996) found out that pragmatic exposure is very important for learners and can be exposed with authentic input from teachers by explicit teaching of pragmatic. In line with the research, Gordon (2004) and Yuan (2012) viewed how pragmatics could be inserted in the teaching materials. Gordon (2004) inserted socio-cultural aspect of PDR into teaching materials. Yuan (2012) gave inspiring ideas to involve pragmatics into text book and used DCT and text book test to find out research data. All literatures reviewed above could not accommodate the needs on developing pragmatic-based teaching model at vocational college, either concerning context, theory, respondent, data analysis, as well as data collecting instrument. The visible gap brought and made this research a useful investigation to undertake to see how pragmatic shall be taught at vocational college. This research was aimed at finding out an approach to teach pragmatic at vocational college.

2. Methodology

The qualitative research was undertaken in a vocational collage. A group of twenty three students in semester three majoring in Tourism was involved as respondents. The respondents chosen purposively were given pragmatic teaching using the designed, examined and validated approach of implicit-explicit-implicit. Prior to the teaching, respondents were given test one (T1) to see how competent they were pragmatically. This is used as the base line of their competence. T2 was given after they were given the treatment. The test used was oral role play cards. There were four cards used as the pragmatic testing device. The cards are divided into two divisions, two request cards and two refusal cards. The request cards were divided into two parts, request with high rank of imposition (Rq R+) and request with low rank of imposition (Rq R-). Refusal cards were also divided into two parts, common refusal (Rf B) and specific refusal (Rf K). Each card has special scenario. The scenarios were chosen and determined by sing exemplar generation model (Rose, 2000). It is a method to indicate the most frequently used speech acts of request and refusal in hotel. To execute the exemplar generation, a group of hotel staff from a number of hotel chosen purposively were given a form to list some speech acts situation of request and refusal from the most frequently used to the least one. The lists from the respondents were selected and ranked pursuant to their frequency. The two most frequent situations from each speech act were chosen to be the topic for the oral role play cards.

Upon T1 execution, the respondents were then taught with pragmatic-based English teaching materials. The teaching was undertaken for ten sessions. Upon the teaching respondents were given test two (T2). Pragmatic-based English teaching materials were made up of two contents, pragmalinguistics and sociopramatics aspects. Like on T1, respondents were paired up invited to test room. Each member was given chance to act as the hotel staff and guest. Each pair was given ten minutes to produce speech acts of refusals and requests by based on the cards' scenario. Students' responses were noted and recorded to be a document which is very necessary for data analysis. During the learning, students were given materials which were adjusted with learning duration. An approach was designed to find out an appropriate approach for the class activity. The approach was resulted from a long trial-and-error process. The model developed pursuant to the needs for the teaching includes learning syntax, learning materials, and assessment device. T2 in form of oral role play activity was given upon the ten-session teaching activity. Both results of the test in form of production of request and refusal utterances were explicated, scored and analyzed. Scoring was done by an expert speaker of English. A statistical analysis using paired sample t-test was used to see how effective the approach was. Result of analysis was described in the form of table and narration. Test results were rated by a native speaker and each respondent was given four points (point for Rq R+, Rq R-, Rf B, and Rf K). The rating was based one rating rubric with 5 scales ranging from 0 – 4. The lowest rate was 0 and the highest rate was 4. Both test results were then analyzed with paired sample t-test to see whether (or not) respondents were more competent pragmatically.

3. Result and discussion

Result of statistical analysis using paired sample t-test indicated that respondents' pragmatic competence raised after they were given English learning. They were more competent to produce speech acts utterances. This is caused by the fact that they feel confident to produce speech acts of request and refusal. The treatment was really helpful to make them aware of pragmatic aspect. However, it was proved that respondents were able to produce speech acts of refusals better than request. This may be caused by the fact that they felt easier to produce utterances as they understand the concept of pragmatics.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. error	Statistic
Total score T1	23	4	12	8,48	.435	2.086
Total score 2	23	12	16	12,70	.239	1.146
Valid N (listwise)	23					

They are three findings found after data analysis. Those tersebut should be similar with how they are wrapped properly.