# Pragmatic Development in Foreign Learners of Indonesian

*by* I Made Rai Jaya Widanta

# Pragmatic Development in Foreign Learners of Indonesian

**I Made Rai Jaya Widanta, Putu Dyah Hudiananingsih, Anak Agung Raka Sitawati, and I Wayan Dana Ardika**
State Polytechnic of Bali

## Abstract

This study was aimed at mapping pragmatic competence development of foreign learners' of Indonesia. The participants involved were ninety foreign learners of Indonesian in five institutions in Bali who have been learning the language for two semesters. They were grouped into two groups, forty five students were in experiment and the other forty five were in control group. The comparison result showed that students performed better after they have learned Indonesian language for two semesters. It can be implied that teaching Indonesian language should incorporate language content and other aspects, such as Indonesian culture, pragmatic, cross culture understanding, and they should be inserted in syllabus.

**Keywords**: Pragmatic development, Sociological aspects, Speech acts refusals, Foreign learners, Indonesian language.

# Desarrollo pragmático en estudiantes extranjeros de Indonesia

## Resumen

Este estudio tuvo como objetivo mapear el desarrollo de competencias pragmáticas de los estudiantes extranjeros de Indonesia. Los participantes involucrados fueron noventa estudiantes extranjeros de Indonesia en cinco instituciones en Bali que han estado aprendiendo

el idioma durante dos semestres. Se agruparon en dos grupos, cuarenta y cinco estudiantes estaban experimentando y los otros cuarenta y cinco estaban en el grupo de control. El resultado de la comparación mostró que los estudiantes obtuvieron mejores resultados después de haber aprendido el idioma indonesio durante dos semestres. Se puede dar a entender que la enseñanza Del idioma indonesio debería incorporar contenido lingüístico y otros aspectos, como la cultura indonesia, la comprensión pragmática y transcultural, y deberían insertarse en el programa de estudios.

**Palabras clave:** Desarrollo pragmático, Aspectos sociológicos, Rechazos de actos de habla, Estudiantes extranjeros, Idioma indonesio.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Relying on communicative competence (CC) model, second language (SL) or foreign language (FL) learning ends at enabling learners to use the language for a verbal interaction. Furthermore, the learning is intended to make learners communicatively competent and to use the language necessarily for a given social context (Hymes, 1972). CC includes linguistic forms of language and knowledge of when, how, and to whom is the language appropriately used (Hymes, 1971). In order to achieve this goal, learners of the language have to cope with some sub-aspects, such as grammatical competence, strategic competence, and sociocultural competence (Canale and Swain, 1980), grammatical competence, strategic competence, sociocultural competence, and discourse competence (Canale, 1983), or linguistic competence, strategic competence, sociocultural competence, actional competence, and discourse competence (Celce-

Murcia, Dornyei, and Thurrell, 1995), grammatical competence, textual competence, illocutionary competence, and sociolinguistic competence (Bachman, 1990). One of aspects which is given much attention is pragmatics competence. Canale and Swain (1980) andCanale (1983) noted that the construct of pragmatics has been recognized as an essential aspect of CC, particularly as it is tied with grammatical knowledge (Bachman and Palmer, 1996). Pragmatic isthe study of language from point of view of the users, especially the choice they make, the constrain they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication (Crystal, 1985).

This notion emphasizes on meaning implied by speakers of the utterances apart from the form of language they produce. The skill and ability on how to use the language to achieve goal in language interaction in sociocultural context (Kasper, 1997) is of much importance. Thus, speakers of target language (TL) have to have knowledge of language learned and cultural or social context. These two essential aspects, known as pragma-linguistics and socio- pragmatics (Leech, 1983; Thomas, 1983) were noted to be a must for speakers' success in communication. Pragma-linguistic is linguistic resource needed for communicative acts or speech acts, such as request, refusal, complaint, compliment, apologies, and others. Speakers of the language have to be able to recognize functions of linguistic forms in order for them to be able to speak accurately. Apart from it, they also have to be able to recognize when or in what context the forms are appropriately used, known as socio-pragmatic. It is the

sociological realm of pragmatic to appropriate social behavior in the TL community. In other word, socio-pragmatic constitutes knowledge of how to select an appropriate choice of linguistic forms for a particular goal in a particular setting.

Learners' effort to master the two branches of pragmatic will certainly determine whether or not they are pragmatically competent. As learners are not only expected to be able to use and produce utterances which are understandable or grammatically correct, but are also expected to produce utterances which are socio-culturally appropriate, they have to be aware of mastering pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence contains a significant factor whichdetermines the success of communication. Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000) noted that pragmatic competence is a set of internalized rules of how to use language in socio-culturally appropriate ways. Although pragmatic competence (PC) is stated to mainly consists of two aspects,they are pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic (Leech, 1983; Thomas,1983), PC is very much determined by some aspects during the language acquisition, such as exposure to authentic input or availability of pragmatic inputs (Kasper, 1997), method of instruction, learners' proficiency, length of exposure, and pragmatic transfer.

Pragmatic transfer is the influence exerted by learners' pragmatic knowledge of languages and cultures other than L2 on their comprehension, production and learning of L2 pragmatic knowledge. It occurs when the social perceptions underlying language users' interpretation and performance of linguistic action in L2 are influenced by their assessment of subjectively equivalent L2 context (Kasper,

1992). As Leech's (1983) division of pragmatics, pragmatic transfer also consists of two divisions, they are pragma-linguistic transfer and socio-pragmatic transfer. Socio-pragmatic transfer occurs when social perception language users' interpretation and performance of linguistic action in L2 are influenced by their L1 context. And, pragma-linguistic transfer occurs when illocutionary forces or politeness value in L1 influences learners' perception and performance of form-function mapping in L2.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

Even though some research in prior had investigated various speech acts, they were still in same topic of investigation, that is pragmatic transfer. Pragmatic transfer focusing on 'suggestion', 'effect of L1 pragmatic transfer', and 'negative transfer' were the least. The first research was undertaken by Bu (2011), the second research was carried out by Alhadidi (2017), and the third one was undertaken by Wang (2015). The second most pragmatic transfer, particularly on 'refusal strategies' was undertaken by Tavakoli & Salva (2013) and Jafari (2018). However, research on 'request strategies' was the most frequently done by scholars, such as Noda (2013), Hui (2010), Loutfi (2016), Syahri & Kadarisma (2007), and Alam & Gill (2016).

Bu (2011) investigated how Chinese perform English speech act of 'suggestion' strategies when they communicate. Besides, the study was also in attempt to see what kind of pragmatic transfer in

suggestion strategies occurs in intercultural communication as well as how it occurs. Involving thirty participants (ten English native speakers, ten Chinese learners of English, and ten native Chinese speakers), and by using discourse completion task (DCT), Chinese learner of English tended to use direct suggestion and hedged suggestion more frequently than English native speakers group. The transfer of pragmatic was done from culture of Chinese. The research proposed that, in field of pedagogy, teacher should incorporate materials about cross-cultural differences into instruction syllabus for teaching. In addition, in the teaching activities, teachers and materials designers have to expose students with formulae of suggestions which are made as contextual as possible. In other case, Alhadidi (2017) researched the effect of L1 pragmatic transfer on the acquisition by Saudi speakers of English. 42 participants of Saudi speakers of English were involved and multiple choices questionnaire was employed to examine participants' pragmatic awareness of various SA. Specifically, it was undertaken to see if Saudi English speakers rely on their L1 pragmatics when they communicate in English, and do the beginner and advanced speakers transfer pragmatics from L1 to L2 equally. Data were collected by using online survey through Google forms and analyzed by using SPSS particularly that of paired sample t-test to compare result of T1 and T2. Result of analysis showed that beginner level of EFL learners tend to rely on L1 due to shortage of L2 pragmatic knowledge. During process of SLA they actively transfer knowledge of their native language to generate their L2 acquisition process. In contrast, advanced group did not show L1 pragmatic during

the acquisition meaning that the higher the level of proficiency, the less L1 pragmatic is transferred.

Existence of pragmatic transfer was also studied by the work of Wang (2015) by searching if negative transfer was also potential to occur. By focusing on Chinese students' writing in English writing version, Wang (2015) tried to deal with investigating errors students made particularly in using attributive clauses and influences and interferences they made. Research data were obtained from sixty English students' composition and interview responses. The collected data were sorted out to see frequency of mistakes. The analysis was also done to see interference in English writing, in terms of how many errors were made, how interferences influenced Chinese students writing. Result of analysis indicated that there were five error categories made, including avoidance strategies, redundant pronoun, and omission of preposition, underused, misplaced and redundant relative words. It was also found that transfer error occurred in students' writing as they consciously or unconsciously turned to their L1 and they translate every words, i.e. English words with Chinese meaning. Suggestion to find more valid data was given by improving the study limitation, use of more than university as locus, combine written version with oral test, and use of formal and informal situation.

Tavakoli & Salva (2013) also investigated pragmatic transfer done by forty four Persian speakers (twenty of whom were Persian EFL leaners, twenty of whom were native speakers of Persian). By implementing DCT, data were collected via three scenario role plays. Apart from it, the study was also undertaken to explore participants'

frequency and content of refusals strategies in L1 regarding the social status of P and D and proficiency level of EFL learners. Based on analysis result, it was found that there was a significant difference between Persian native speakers and high proficient EFL learners in terms of content and frequency of refusal strategies. EFL learners seemed more direct and employed more specific response to theirrefusal than Persian native speakers. In other side, Jafari (2018) was investigating pragmatic transfer on Iranian EFL learners' refusal strategies. By involving sixty EFL Iranian learners of advanced level and using instrument of multiple choices DCT was applied to collect data on realization of pragmatic recognition ability of participants. Result of study revealed that L1 interference caused 50% failure of Iranian EFL elementary learners. Intermediate and advanced learners mostly had difficulty in pragmatic recognition of English language. It can be implied that pedagogical intervention shall introduce pragmatic and culture aspects.

Noda (2013) studied how American learners of Japanese implemented 'request' in written e-mail. The study aimed at searching if there was evidence of L1 pragmatic transfer from English language to Japanese and if social aspects of power (P), distance (D), and rankof imposition (R) affect request realization. DCT with ten situations were applied for participants to make request. Learners' performance were compared to that of native Japanese speakers to see if there were any differences and similarities between the two performances. Data of requests were analyzed from point of view of 'explanatory sequence, request strategies, and politeness' and 'sentence final form'. Results of

analysis revealed that American learners wrote noticeably fewer explanation sequences than Japanese native speakers. The learnerswere influenced by Power (P) but Japanese native speakers were not. Japanese learners could produce shorter explanatory sequence than Japanese native speakers in all situations. Negative transfer occurred in the use of direct questions from English. Lastly, the learners could use more limited apology strategy than Japanese native speakers.

Research on request by Hui (2010) was undertaken to examine the hypothesis that 'there are some common and unique pragmatic features in English text'. Aiming at drawing pragmatic transfer that emerges in English email written by Chinese L2 English speakers this research involved thirteen participants with different English proficiency (based on their IELTS score) and exposure. One hundred and four emails was analyzed to obtain research data. Research participants were also given questionnaires to see factors that affect their pragmatic performance. The result of analysis indicates that level of proficiency did not affect their pragmatic performance. The extentof pragmatic transfer of each individual participant was complex, triggered by some aspects, such as English proficiency, exposure to English, and confidence in using the language. Most participants, when making request SA, were found to be direct on the sentence levelbut indirect on the level of discourse.

Request speech act production was also investigated by Loutfi (2016). The research was undertaken to Moroccan EFL learners producing request in order to investigate if L2 pragmatic competence acquisition is still desired. The research was aimed at comparing the

average frequency of direct and indirect strategies used by native Moroccan English learners and native English speakers. Like Hui's (2010) study, this research was also undertaken to see if proficiency gives impact to transfer they made. The study raised up a hypothesis, i.e. 'transfer decreases as the study level increased'. The subject involved was sixty people (forty Moroccan learner of English and twenty native speakers of English). Request strategies were set by using frame work of CCSARP (Blum-Kulka, 1991). Data was collected using DCT with 7 situations that focused on investigating transfer of pragma-linguistics and socio-pragmatics. The fact finally successfully drew that there was transfer from L1 to L2 done by Moroccan learners of English where pragmatic competence was found to play a major role in the communicative failure of Moroccan learners of English. The result was emerging some pedagogical implications, such as teacher should include teaching pragmatic competence in curriculum to raise students' pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic awareness of target language. Thus, teacher should be equipped with knowledge of pragmatic variation, how to teach pragmatic in L2 and how to asses it. In addition, students should be exposed to authentic L2materials.

Loutfi's (2016) work seemed to be similar with Syahri & Kadarisma's (2007) study which investigated pragmatic transfer in request realization by sixty eight Indonesian university students majoring in English study. The research was focused on recognizing how pragmatic transfer occurred in SA of request in EFL learners and to present enactment of language learners' SA which specifies one

type of SA realization. The participants pursuing 450 TOEFL score were involved in the project and were given data colleting instrument of DCT including fifteen situations using variable of Power (P) and Distance (D). Result revealed that external modification was appearing more frequently than internal modification. Indonesian learners of English are considered to be influenced by their native culture norms. The research participants were also found to be able to embed some supportive move prior to executing head acts, and inserted move in initials position. However, the study did not figure out pedagogical implication to be proposed for instructional needs.

Alam & Gill (2016) also did a work on request and apology done by two groups of speaker, Pashto English learners and Siraiki English learners. The study was focused on investigating effectiveness of pragmatic transfer of both speakers from L1 to L2, their accomplishment of SA of apology and request in target language, as well as what specific culture and linguistic resources are transferred, why they use pragmatic transfer and how it affects pragmatic competence. DCT and semi structured interview were applied to eight participants of both speakers who were from English cultural and linguistic background. Result of the discussion revealed that both speakers showed different performance. Pashto English speakers were more pragmatic and indirect in realizing request SA and were more direct in apology SA. Meanwhile, English speakers of Siraiki were more indirect and polite during their accomplishment of both SA.

This study examines the following question:

1. What is participants' pragma linguistic development like?

2. What is their socio pragmatic development like?

## 3. RESULTS and DISCUSSION

This study involved ninety foreign learners of Indonesian who had been learning Indonesian language intensively for one year. The research participants are from various countries, like that in Eastern Europe, Germany, some African countries, and American and Asian countries. Their ages ranged between twenty and thirty five years old. They were studying Indonesian language at some university administering Darmasiswa program, such as Bali State Polytechnic, Saraswati Teacher Training Institute at Tabanan-Bali, Saraswati Institute of Foreign Language at Denpasar-Bali, Udayana University, and Indonesia Art Institute Denpasar. The number of participants studying in those universities varied. Of the total number ofparticipants, twenty nine participants studied in the Indonesia Art Institute of Denpasar, twenty three studied in Udayana University, seventeen students studied in Saraswati Institute of Foreign Language at Denpasar, fourteen students studied in State Polytechnic of Bali, andseven people studied in Saraswati Teacher Training Institute at Tabanan. The participants were from different majors in  their countries, such as agriculture, tourism, law, economic, social sciences, humanity. Some of them had graduated and were employees at companies.

Data was collected using tool of discourse completion task (DCT). It was chosen as the main tool as it is considered to be able to elicit data of utterances of participants even though it gives nonverbal data. However, it is believed to be able to give as much as possible utterances with a lot shorter time to be compared with oral role play. The DCT which focused on refusal was designed to affix the former study. It consisted of nine scenarios of refusal. The scenarios were set by using three aspects of sociological such as power (P), distance (D), and rank of imposition (R) (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The three aspects were mixed in accordance with needs. The role play card consisting of nine scenarios were given to participants upon the learning session at the end of learning. Of the nine situation of the role play scenarios, three scenarios contain lower status interlocutor, equal status interlocutor and higher status interlocutor.

All participants were to fill in the role play card on their own. They were given thirty minutes to finish the work. Upon its completion, all students' works were collected. All sentences which consist of refusal speech acts were listed. The sentences were  listedand rewritten on a special paper. The paper consists of table to list all sentences (grammatical sentences, ungrammatical sentences, errors useof words and patterns in accordance with each situation, correct use of sentences and pattern in accordance with each situation). All data wereanalyzed and were compared with the former data. The differences of data (former and recent data) were then exposed in the result and discussion part.

Students' pragmatic competence development of particularly the experiment group was showed and proven with two research data, —score obtained after test and their production of speech acts. The test result was comparison between their pre-test and post-test score, either total score, average score as well as percentage obtained.

Students' Achievement

The table beneath draws comparison between pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic errors of the group last test result and their recent test result. The comparison was used to conclude whether or not participants gained improvement on their pragmatic competence prior to their learning Indonesian language for a period of one semester.

| Table 1: Score Comparison of both Groups | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group | Test 1 | Test 2 | Score Increase | Increase Percentage |
| Control Group | | | | |
| Total Score | 980 | 2.145 | 1.160,5 | |
| Average | 21,77 | 47,66 | 25,78 | 53,44% |
| Experiment Group Total | 983,5 | 3.192,5 | 2.216,5 | |
| Average | 21.85 | 70.49 | 49.25 | 69.34% |

The table 1 above clearly indicates that there was difference between achievement of control and experiment group. Both groups started from similar base line score (980 and 983.5 respectively). Both

group average score of pre-test (T1) was 21,77 and 21,85 respectively. These base line scores, although had slight difference, was considered similar one another. They were considered representative to present one starting point. However, they experienced different increase after post-test (T2). Experiment group's score generally dominated the control group's score. In term of total score, the control group gained score 2.145 and the experiment group gained 3.192,5. From the quantitative data, it can be drawn that the control group and experiment group's average score increase were 47.66 and 70.94 respectively.

Total score increase of control and experiment group was noted different, −1.160.5 and 2.216,5 respectively. Seeing from their score increase, it can be drawn that the control and experiment group'saverage score increase was 25.78 and 49.25 respectively. It showed that the experiment group competence was still higher than that of control group. Lastly, their competence difference was proven with percentage of score increase they obtained. Both groups obtained increase in scores however with different percentage. The control group score increase percentage was 53.44% which was still lower than that obtained by the experiment group, i.e. 69.34%. The increase certainly was resulted by some different reasons.

Pragmatic competence development was proven to exist among participants of research (the experiment group members). Their improvement in scores obtained was an explicit facts that they were considered more competent than they were based on their production in the former research. This may be resulted by factors, one of which is

learning model. However, this research was not focused to discuss participants learning method.

Students' Pragma-Linguistic and Socio-Pragmatic Competence Improvement

Students' Pragma-Linguistic Competence

Pragmatic competence improvement of students was indicated by result of comparison between participants' recent production and former production. The research participants were assigned to respond to DCT containing nine situations of refusal. By focusing on their refusal speech acts production, researchers paid attention to pragmatic transfer they wrote on their written response to DCT. The transfer was focused on students' Indonesian refusal speech acts used when they responded to seven different pragmatically-situated invitations.

Transfer of pragmatic which leaded in to errors occurred much more frequently in area of pragma-linguistics better than socio-pragmatic (Widanta, et al., 2019) even though they had decreased a lot in based on recent data. The modal verb boleh meaning 'may' was used correctly. Anda boleh pergi referring to 'you may go' was used correctly where, according to pervious research data, it was used with omission of modal verb boleh so that it sounded less appropriate. Other inappropriate use of modal also occurred. Modal verb akan('will') used inappropriately and incorrectly exchanged with harus('must' or 'have to'), for instance in utterance kamu akan bekerja satu hari lagi ('you will work one more day') was expressed correctly with utterance kamu harus bekerja satu hari lagi ('you have to work one more day'). In addition, functionally mistaken utterance found in

previous research data kamu bekerja untuk hari ini ('you work today') was used functionally recently to be kamu harus bekerja hari ini ('you have to work today'). The improper use of both modals seemed to be impact of less formal English version. The speakers seemed to get used to use in formal sentence by omitting modals.

The absence of verb in previous data like in utterance semua yang terbaik untuk ujian was used properly and successfully in recent research data to be kita lakukan yang terbaik untuk ujian ('do the best for the exam). The improper use of it might be the influence of English daily word 'all the best for exam' which were popular in informal talk. The most difficult and complicated Indonesian language utterance uttered by one of participants in previous research hari examnya saya belajar juga, tidak ada mungkin is literally translated into 'exam day I also study, there is no possible'. The utterance omitted some parts of sentence, such as subject, preposition, and pronoun. In recent research it was properly uttered with error free to be saat ujian saya jugabelajar, saya tidak mungkin meminjamkan buku saya ('on exam day I also study, therefore it's impossible for me to lend you my book).

Other data of pragma-linguistic transfer occurred on theutterance 'ya pak, sebentar. Saya punya istirahat untuk makan siang sekarang' ('I am sorry just a moment sir. I have a rest for lunch for a while'). The utterance is less proper as it relied on the way howEnglish speakers use the verb 'have' (punya) to mean 'take'. This error of the previous research was then successfully revised by the participant in completing DCT of recent research data to be 'ya pak, sebentar. Saya beristirahat untuk makan siang sekarang ('I am sorry

just a moment sir. I take a rest for lunch for a while'). The word 'beristirahat' (take rest) is very common compound verb in Indonesian. Error of using preposition 'ke' ('to') and 'di' (at/on/in) has been confusing for them. They used to misuse both prepositions and said 'saya mau mengatar anda di sana' ('I want to take you at there'). However, at recent research data, the participant could properly distinguish function of those words and wrote 'saya mau mengantar anda ke sana'.

Other English-oriented utterance was used and transferred into Indonesian expression, like in 'aku mau pergi dengan kamu, aku akan senang' (I'll go with you, I will be happy). This utterance was still sounded less proper. The use of modal 'akan' seemed less necessary. Apart from it, sequence of the sentences needs to be adjusted. In this research, the participant was able to modify it that it sounded natural by saying 'saya senang pergi dengan anda' (I'm happy to go with you). Transfer of pragma-linguistic seemed to occur when values in L1 influences learners' perception and performance of form-function mapping in L2 (Kasper, 1992).

The word tidak ('no') as a negative marker was used much previously, as in utterance oh **tidak**, saya sakit dan tidak bisa pergi ke konser (oh no, I am sick and cannot go to the concert). It seemed to be derived from English negative expression to negate or refuse one's offer or invitation. However, Indonesian language norm does not necessarily need to use it explicitly but maaf ('sorry') to refuse politely instead, which is used commonly in recent data. It is used properly

recently as in maaf, saya sakit dan tidak bisa pergi ke konser (sorry, I am sick and cannot go to the concert).

Wrong perception used to be occurred in using connective 'for' to mean telling reason (which literarily mean untuk in Indonesian language) and preposition ke ('to') which follows verb 'go' in English. They used to utter terima kasih pak **untuk** invitasi, saya akan coba, saya mau **ke** Kesantunan Bahasa pada seminar minggu depan di kampus (thank you sir for the invitation, I'll try, I want to come to the 'Kesantunan Bahasa' on seminar next week at campus). The connective **untuk** was merely derived from English term 'for', however its real translation should be **karena** to express a reason. And, omitting verb pergi ('go') was a mistaken decision in that expression. In addition, shifting parts of sentence was embodying rigid utterance. Another similar case occurred in sentence terima kasih **untuk** dipromosikan chef (thank you for promoting me a chef). This case indicates that respondent merely transferred English word 'for' to referto untuk in Indonesian language. Lastly, mere transfer occurred when speaker used modified English term 'invitation' to be 'invitasi' in Indonesian. Their revision is successfully realized in recent research data to be a standard Indonesian utterance terima kasih pak atas undangannya, saya akan coba pergi ke seminar Kesantunan Bahasa di kampus minggu depan (thank you sir for the invitation, I will try to come to the seminar 'Kesantunan Bahasa' at campus next week). Apart from the above case, prepositions untuk (for) and dengan (with) were also confusing for the respondent. The respondent of the former research produced sentence hati-hati **untuk** sepeda motor (be careful

for bike) which was mistaken functionally. The intervention for aperiod of time afterward seemed to make the respondent aware of the mistake and successfully produced correct sentence hati-hati **dengan** sepeda motornya (becareful with the bike). He was even aware of the use of article 'the' (-nya) which was used to indicate the finite object. In previous work, respondent also got confused to differentiate and use article 'the' (–nya) which is combined with noun or object it is attached to, thus he wrote tidak apa-apa, saya bisa mengganti**nya** itu (no problem, I can change it). Upon having input through in-class and self-directed learning, the respondent was able to make correct sentence with tidak apa-apa, saya bisa mengganti**nya** or tidak apa-apa, saya bisa mengganti itu (no problem, I can change it).

Lack of knowledge of Indonesian language also led in negative transfer which failed to demonstrate proper meaning. In previous research data, participants' knowledge of word class particularly verb (V) and noun (N) was driving a misunderstanding of meaning. The noun kehadiran ('attendance') was used interchangeably with hadir ('attend') as in terima kasih untuk mengundang, saya akan **kehadiran** (thank you for the invitation, I will be presence). For one thing as explained above, terima kasih ('thank you') should be followed with karena sudah mengundang ('for inviting'). And saya akan **hadir (V)** (I will be **present** (Adjective) as in recent research data is the correct use instead of kehadiran (N) as modal verb akan ('will') should be followed with V. This case implied that speakers' knowledge of the target language (TL) positively affects their production performance. Or in other word, learners' TL language proficiency really affects their

TL pragmatic competence, which conversed the ideas proposed by Hui (2010).

Other case which proved that lack of TL knowledge leads in insufficient pragmatic competence occurred in the use of personal pronoun. The utterance written by research participant in previous studies tidak apa-apa, **kami** adalah teman ('No problem, we are friends') contributed to error on pragma-linguistic. Research participant seemed to be confused with difference between kami and kita ('we') and abused those pronouns. Kita 'we' is used when the speaker also include the listener(s), and kami 'we' does not include the listener (s). The recent research data showed that the participant was a lot more competent pragmatically as he could use pronoun kita ('we') properly by writing tidak apa-apa, **kita** adalah teman (no problem, we are friends).

Learners' perception on TL which led in pragmatic transfer was also related with the use of imperative forms. Previous research data showed that research participant used verb but failed to modify the verb to make imperative form. Verb mengemudi ('drive or ride') in mengemudi dengan aman (ride with care) needs to be affixed with –lah or preceding with tolong ('will you please'). Recent research fostered the participant's success in improving their knowledge of pragma-linguistics on TL and could produce imperative sentence far more proper by writing tolong mengemudi dengan aman (please ride with care). Their knowledge and proficiency on grammar particularly on use of negative marker bukan (not) and tidak (not) was improved. In previous data gathered through test, participant failed to differentiate

both markers and produced utterance saya bukan marah karena situasi itu (I am not angry because of this situation). The participant was able to differentiate the use of both markers that bukan is followed by 'noun' and 'adverb', and tidak is followed by 'verb' and 'adjective', therefore his sentence was saya tidak marah karena situasi itu (I am not angry because of the situation).

Omission was frequently done by respondent. The omission was done as they lacked of vocabulary or inventory of expression. Respondent in previous research data produced sentence terima kasih untuk baru (thank you for the new), which was actually referred to terima kasih karena anda telah mengganti buku tersebut dengan yang baru (thank you for changing the torn book with the new one). This sentence was quiet long to express. Some experience during a semester study seemed benefited them they could revise the sentence, although not very complete sentence, with nearly similar meaning sentence by writing terima kasih karena bukunya telah digaanti dengan yang baru (thank you for changing the book with a new one). This sentence is very acceptable. In line with it, uncommon expression anda tidak **akanharus** menggantinya dengan yang baru (you will not have to change it with a new one) also occurred. This is an English acceptable use of modals which is uncommon in Indonesian. This case underwent process of transfer without any adjustment. This transfer seemed to occur as respondent lacked of TL knowledge and tried to produce linguistic rule of TL. However, upon experiencing some learning, respondent could be aware of natural Indonesian expression by writing anda tidak perlu menggatinya dengan yang baru (you don't need to

change it with a new one). One apparent transfer which is resulted from L1 to L2 concept transfer is formulating noun phrase (NP). As English NP formula sequences modifier – noun, learners usually adopt the L1 formula to be transferred to L2 formula, thus 'new book' was expressed with baru buku as in tidak apa-apa bro, tetapi aku mau **baru buku** minggu depan (no problem bro, but I want **a book new** next week). Recent research data successfully fostered correct Indonesian language NP structure of N-modifier as the respondent pragmatic competence improved.

Indonesian language verb conjugation seemed to confuse respondent of previous research. The use of positive form of verb mempromosikan (to promote), passive form dipromosikan (is promoted), or compound verb berpromosi* (* is not a common form in Indonesian) were still confusing. They were used not in accordance with their function. The respondent were able to used them correctly according to their function in data of recent research, by writing maaf saya tidak mau dipromosikan menjadi chef (sorry, I don't want to be promoted a chef), perusahaan mau mempromosikan saya menjadi chef (the company wants to promote me a chef). However, berpromosi is an unacceptable form of verb to use.

Linguistic errors respondents of previous research fostered in pragma-linguistic area dealt with usage of forms. The forms included sentence structure, NP structure, different between two similar words, verb-conjunctions, possessive adjectives, negative marker of tidak and bukan, and word classes. In line with students' pragmatic competence, participants of recent study was considered, if not very, competent

considering mistakes they made in pragma linguistic area. This fact has been also supported with scores they gained after being given test 2. The notion was also coinciding with the reality that they were still a number of error, although not significant, on recent research data.

Students' Socio-Pragmatic Competence

Student socio-pragmatic errors seemed to exist a lot less frequent than that of pragma-linguistic in recent research data being compared to previous research data. The competence was indicated with how successful the respondents were in producing speech acts. Parameter used to measure whether or not their utterances were in line with concept of socio-pragmatic was aspects of social status, including Power (P), Distance (D), and rank of Imposition (R) (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

There were some utterances produced by respondents in previous research which broke the rules of PDR. Sentence kapan anda mau berbelanja ke supermarket, katakana padaku) (when do you want to shop to supermarket, please tell me) broke the notion proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) that politeness shall be exposed when the hearer has higher (+) P, D, R or either. On the basis of this, the Indonesian sentence written by respondent was not relevant. Respondent used pronoun anda (you) to address his boss (pursuant to the role play) and address himself with padaku (to me). In real life situation of eastern culture particularly Indonesia, addressing someone having more honorific status requires that speakers have to use more honorific properties. The expression in recent study was successfully adjusted by respondent to meet the hearer's status by using addressing

words bapak (sir) to replace anda and kepada saya (to me). The addressing term bapak is a formal word to address a man we respect or to address a man in formal situation instead of using anda and kepada saya (to me) is also more polite for a hearer in such as a situation.

Sentence Ya pak, sebentar, sepuluh menit dan saya bisa mengantar **anda** ke supermarket (Yes, sir, one moment, ten minutes and I will be able to take you to supermarket) was produced with same sample of improper situational lexicon. As the hearer was respondent' superior at work in a formal setting whom he must respect, anda ('you' for colloquial interlocutor) is again violating politeness principle. This situation claimed that hearer or interlocutor had P+ and D+ and according to Brown and Levinson (1983), writer had to foster a more polite expression. Therefore, respondent in recent research who was considered more competent successfully counter with an expression underlined that hearer's Ya pak, sebentar, sepuluh menit dan saya bisa mengantar **bapak** ke supermarket (yes sir, one moment, just ten minutes and I will be able to take you to supermarket).

In line with communicating with interlocutor having P+ and D+, respondent's sentences: (1) Terima kasih untuk dipromosikan chef (Thank you for being promoted a chef) and (2) Maaf bos saya sibuk untuk keluarga saya (I'm sorry boss, I am busy for my family) also violated politeness principle. A part from respondent's pragma-linguistic incompetence by using passive verb dipromosikan to refer to active verb mempromosikan, sentence (1) failed to promote politeness which inform that the utterance was intended to be addressed to someone having higher social power and farther social distance. Thus,

recent research respondent was stated socially more competent to produce Terima kasih pak, karena bapak mempromosikan saya menjadi chef (thank you very much sir, for promoting me a chef). In addition, the use of term bos (boss) in sentence (2) was irritating. The use of term bos in such formal context was not promoting politeness and a respectful expression but an insulting word instead. The recent research respondent could revise it with a more proper sentence which comfort hearer or reader by writing Maaf **pak**, saya sibuk dengan urusan keluarga (I am sorry sir, I am busy with my family). The words 'more competent' to be given to the writer in this case was due to a little shortage of socio-pragmatic sense he had which led in a bit (although far less) insulting feeling of hearer or interlocutor as the writer would better state Terima kasih pak, tetapi saya minta maaf,saya sibuk dengan urusan keluarga (Thank you sir, but I am so sorry, I am busy with my family).

The predicate of 'pragmatically competent' pursued by respondents of recent research was due to encountering of previous research respondents' failure to construct both pragma-linguistically and socio-pragmatically appropriate sentences or utterances. There were a number of errors categories respondents of previous research made as the indicator based on which they were predicated less or not competent pragmatically. Wang (2015) found in his research that there were four error categories participants tended to make in his research, including 'avoidance strategies', 'redundant pronoun', 'omission of preposition' and 'underused, misplaced, and redundant relative words'. However, research participants in this research (in first test) were

found to make more number of errors of both pragma-linguistics and socio-pragmatics. The pragma-linguistic errors included 'misused of modal verb', 'misused of preposition ke (to) and di (at/on/in)', 'transfer of L1-into L2 verb', 'misused of negative markers tidak (not) and bukan (not)', 'misused L1 preposition **for** in L2', 'misused of word class N and V', 'misused of active and passive verbs', 'misconception of kami and kita', 'misused of imperative sentence', and 'direct transfer of L1 noun phrase (NP) to L2'. In addition, socio- pragmatic errors basically dealt with violation of politeness, including 'misused of proper pronoun for hearer or interlocutor with higher social status', and 'absence of politeness marker'.

Pragmatic transfer or generally pragmatic performance the respondents had exposed during the research was pursuant to various reasons. They are some different notions scholars in inter-language pragmatic (ILP) proposed. Pragmatic transfer performance was not influenced by level of proficiency or in other word, level of learners' L2 proficiency did not affect their pragmatic performance (Hui, 2010). This fact, although done in a bit different aspect, was coinciding the research finding that grammatical competence cannot predict speakers' pragmatic competence (Sanjaya, et al., 2017). However, it was in contrast with result of work undertaken by Alhadidi (2016) that beginner level of EFL learners tended to rely on L1 due to shortage of L2 pragmatic knowledge, and Lutfi's (2015) works that transfer decreased as the study level increased. Lastly, Syahri and Kadarisma's (2007) was also supportive to these notions that Indonesian learners of English are considered to be influenced by their native culture norms.

The last research result, and also that undertaken by Lutfi (2015) and Alhadidi (2016) were found very supportive to the recent research finding.

## 4. CONCLUSION

Referring to the research result, it can be concluded that Darmasiswa students were competent pragmatically although not considered very competent. There were two general facts indicating their competence, they are participants test score comparison (between test 1 and test 2), and their speech acts production being compared to that of previous research. However, they were also considered to be not very polite since there were some points of errors both in pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic area they made. In previous research data, pragma-linguistic errors seemed to dominate the errors. Those errors were various including misused of modal verb, preposition, verb, misused of N and V, misplace of Indonesia noun phrase (NP) properties, and socio-pragmatic errors, including misused of proper noun for interlocutor with higher social status, and omission of politeness marker. And recent research data did not show such significant errors. Ideas whether or not L2 proficiency affect students' pragmatic performance is still mystery, since some research finding agreed on the notion and some other research proposed contradictive notion.

Pursuant to the controversial notions, there would be better to undertake further research to prove which of the two notions is visible. Thus, a replicated research needs to be undertaken to find a solution. It can be implied that intervention should be based on the finding. Specifically, the teaching of Indonesian should incorporate language content and other aspects, such as Indonesian culture, pragmatic, cross culture understanding, and should be inserted in syllabus (Bu, 2011; Jafari, 2018).

**Note**

1. TL is referred to the Indonesian language the foreign learners learn.

2. T1 is the first test given to the participants at the end of first semester.

3. T2 is the first test given to the participants at the end of second semester.

4. DCT is the data collecting tool in form of role play cards.

**Acknowledgment**

# REFERENCES

ALAM, M. F., GILL, ANEELA. 2016. **Pragmatic Transfer: An Interlanguage Study of Pashto and Siraiki English Language Learners.** Gomal University Journal of Research, Special Issue III. ISSN: 1019-8180. pp. 143-151.

ALHADIDI, AMAL HAMDAN. 2017**. Investigating the Effect of L1 Pragmatic Transfer on the Acquisition of English Language by Saudi Speakers**. International Journal of Linguistics ISSN 1948-5425.Vol. 9, No. 4. pp. 63-77

BACHMAN, L. 1990. **Fundamental considerations in language testing.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

BACHMAN, L. F., & A. S., PALMER. 1996. **Language Testing in Practice: Designing and Developing Useful Language Tests**. Oxford etc.: OUP.

BROWN, P. LEVINSON, S. C. 1987. **Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BU, JIEMIN. 2011. A Study of Pragmatic Transfer in Suggestion Strategies by Chinese Learners of English Studies in Literature and Language Vol. 3, No. 2, 2011 p. 28-36.

BLUM-KULKA, S. 1991. **Interlanguage pragmatics: The case of request**. In Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research, R. Philipson, E.Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith and M. Swain (eds), 225-272. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

CANALE, M. 1983. From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. I

J. C. Richard & R.W. Schmidt (Eds), language and communication (pp.2-27). London: Longman.

CANALE, M, AND SWAIN, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing Applied Linguistics, 1, 1-47.

CELCE-MURCIA M., DÖRNYEI Z., & THURRELL, S. (1995). **A pedagogical framework for communicative competence: A Pedagogically motivated model with content specifications**. Issues in Applied Linguistics 6(2), 5–35.

CELCE-MURCIA, M., & OLSHTAIN, E. (2000**). Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers.** Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

CRYSTAL, D. 1985. **A Dictionary of linguistics and phonetics (2$^{nd}$ed.).** Oxford: Blackwell.

HUI, SHI. 2010. **Pragmatic Transfer in English Emails Produced by Chinese L2 English speakers: A Study of the Underlying Cultural Ethos, and the Effect of Speakers' English Proficiency and Exposure to English**. A Master Thesis.

STOCKHOLMS UNIVERSITET. HYMES, D. (1997). **On communicative competence.** In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics pp.269-293.

INDAWAN, SYAHRI AND KADARISMA, A, EFENDI. (2007). **Universitas Negeri Malang**. TEFLIN Journal, Volume 18, Number 2. PP. 123-147.

JAFARI, FATEMEH & HOSSEIN SADEGHOGHLO. (2018). **Pragmatic Transfer of Iranian EFL Learners.** The case of Refusals Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research Volume 5,

Issue 2, 2018, pp. 32-40 Available online at www.jallr.com ISSN: 2376-760X.

KASPER, G. (1997). **Can pragmatic competence be taught?** (NetWork#6). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center. Retrieved August 20, 2004, from http://www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06/

KASPER, G. (1992)**. Pragmatic Transfer**. Second Language Research 8 (3): 203-231.

LOUTFI, AYOU. (2016)**. Pragmatic Transfer in Moroccan EFL Learners' Requests 1**. Asian Journal of Education and e-Learning (ISSN: 2321 – 2454) Volume 04 –Issue 01.

Asian Online Journals (www.ajouronline.com). (2016). Pp.15-24.

LEECH, G. (1983). **Principles of pragmatics**. London: Longman. Google Scholar.

NODA, TAKAKO. (2013)**. Pragmatic Transfer in Japanese Requests in Emails Purdue University**, takako_125_coco@hotmail.com. Master thesis. West Lafayette. Indiana, pp.1-93.

SANJAYA, NYOMAN SUKA ET AL. (2017). **The Effect of grammatical accuracy and gender on inter-language request strategy.** TEFLIN Journal Vol.28, Number 2, July 201, pp.212-235.

TAVAKOLI, M., SHIRINBAKHSH, S. (2013). **Backward Pragmatic Transfer: The Case of Refusals in Persian.** International Journal of Society, Culture & Language, **2**(1), ISSN 2329-2210., pp. 1-24.

THOMAS, J. (1983). **Cross-Culture Pragmatic Failure.** Applied Linguistics. 4:2, 91-112.

WANG, YIFEI. (2015). **Negative Transfer of Mother Language in English Compositions by Jiujiang University Students**. Article available at http://www.shs-conferences.org.

WIDANTA, ET AL., (2019). **Pragmatic errors and transfer of foreign learners of Indonesia: the case of refusals**. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, May 2019. Vol 10. No.3 pp.501- 508.

## APPENDIX 1.

Discourse Completion Task (DCT)

Baca situasi berikut dan lengkapi dengan **penolakan.** Jangan menghabiskan banyak waktu untuk memikirkan jawaban yang harus disediakan. Oleh karenanya, silakan menjawab sealamiah mungkin dengan menulis respon tersebut. (Read the following situations and complete them with **refusal.** Do not spend a lot time to think of the respond. Write it as natural as possible).

Situasi 1: (Menolak permintaan ijin yang dibuat oleh lawan wicara dengan status lebih rendah; Pemilik Restoran – Anak buah. Situation 1: (Refusing a permit asked by a lower status interlocutor; Restaurant owner – staff)

Anda adalah pemilik restoran. Salah satu dari pegawai anda menghadap ke kantor anda dan mengatakan: "Saya tahu bahwa akhir pekan merupakan saat-saat ramai di tempat ini. Banyak pengunjung yang datang untuk makan malam. Namun, karena ulang tahun anak

saya, saya minta ijin karena akan menyiapkan acara tersebut". You are a restaurant owner. One of your employees meets you and says "I realize that weekends are very busy moment. A lot customers come fordinner. However, since my child's birthday, I would ask permit to be absent on that day as I have to prepare the party. Anda mengatakan (You will say):

Situasi 2: (Menolak permintaan bantuan yang dibuat oleh lawan wicara dengan status sama; Teman – Anak buah)

Situation 2: (Refusing a request of help asked by an equal status interlocutor; Friend – Friend)

Teman sekelas anda datang untuk meminjam catatan bahasa Indonesia anda karena dia tidak menghadiri perkuliahan beberapa kali pertemuan. Dia mengatakan "Mmm, saya akan mengikuti ujian bahasaIndonesia besok, namun saya tidak memiliki catatan karena tidak menghadiri perkuliahan selama beberapa kali pertemuan." Your classmate come to borrow your Indonesian subject note as he was absent on the Indonesian lecture for few meetings. He says: "mm, I will have Indonesian exam tomorrow, but I don't have the note as Iwas absent for a few meetings during the lesson". Anda mengatakan (You will say):

……………………………………………..

………………………………………………………………………

………………………………

………………………………………………………………………

………..……………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………..………

Situasi 3: (Menolak suruhan yang dibuat oleh lawan wicara dengan status lebih tinggi; Staff –

   Atasan)

Situation 3: (Refusing a command made by a higher status interlocutor; Staff - Superior)

Anda sedang istirahat untuk makan siang. Atasan anda tiba-tiba menyuruh anda mengantarnya ke supermarket untuk berbelanjadengan mengatakan: "Supir pribadi saya masih cuti hari ini dan saya mau berbelanja ke super market. Bisakah anda mengantar saya berbelanja sekarang?" You are taking a rest for a lunch. Your superior suddenly asks you to take him/her to shop at supermarket and says: "My driver is on a leave today and I want to shop at super market. Canyou take me to the super market? Anda mengatakan (You say).

Situasi 4: (Menolak ajakan yang dibuat oleh lawan wicara dengan status sama; (Anda – Teman)

Situation 1: (Refusing an invitation made by an equal statusinterlocutor; You – Friend)

Teman anda memiliki 2 tiket konser. Dia ingin agar anda bisa menemani dia, dengan mengatakan: "Saya punya 2 tiket konser. Bisakah anda menemani saya menonton konser besok". Your friend has 2 tickets for a concert. He wants you to accompany him, by saying:"I have two tickets for a concert. Will you accompany me to see concert tomorrow" Anda mengatakan (You say):

Situasi 5: (Menolak undangan yang dibuat oleh lawan wicara dengan status lebih tinggi; Anda – Dosen)

Situation 5: (Refusing an invitation made by a higher statusinterlocutor; (You - Lecturer)

Dosen anda akan mempresentasikan suatu makalah di suatu seminar. Anda diundang untuk mengikuti seminar tersebut karena materi tersebut berkaitan dengan bidang studi anda. Dia mengatakan: "Saya mempresentasikan tentang 'Kesantunan Berbahasa' pada seminar minggu depan di kampus. Bisakah anda hadir pada seminar tersebut? Your lecturer will present an article in a seminar. You are invited to join the seminar as the article is related to your area of study. He says: "I will present 'Language Politeness' in a seminar next week at campus. Will you be present on the seminar? Anda mengatakan (You say):

……………………………………………………………………………..

……………….………………………………………………………………

…………………………………

Situasi 6: (Menolak undangan yang dibuat oleh lawan wicara dengan status lebih rendah; Dosen –Mahasiswa)

Situation 6: (Refusing an invitation made by a lower status interlocutor; Lecturer – Student)

Anda seorang dosen. Salah satu mahasiswa mengundang anda untuk hadir pada acara pernikahannya. Dia mengatakan: "Selamat pagi, maaf saya mengganggu waktu bapak. Saya mau mengundang bapak untuk hadir pada acara pernikahan saya minggu depan, saya sangat mengharapkan kehadiran bapak" You are a lecturer. One of your students invites you to attend his wedding. He say: "Good morning, I

want to invite you to attend my wedding next week. I really hope you're coming" Anda mengatakan (You say):

Situasi 7: (Menolak tawaran yang dibuat oleh lawan wicara dengan status lebih rendah; Superior – Staff)

Situation 7: (Refusing a permit asked by a lower status interlocutor; Restaurant owner – staff)

Salah satu karyawan anda meminjam dan menabrakkan motor anda sehingga salah satu spionnya pecah. Dia sanggup menggantinya dengan mengatakan: "Saya minta maaf karena telah menjatuhkan motor anda sehingga sepion kanannya pecah. Saya akan menggatinya dengan sepion baru". One of your employees borrows your motorcycle and crashes it that one of its mirrors is broken. He is committed to change it, by saying: "I am sorry for the crash that damages one of your motor cycle's mirrors. I will change with the new one" Anda mengatakan (You say):

………………………………..…………………………………………
………………………………….
………………………………………………………………………….
…………………………………………………………………….………
…………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………
………………………………..……………………………………………

Situasi 8: (Menolak tawaran yang dibuat oleh lawan wicara dengan status sama; You - Friend)

Situation 8: (Refusing an offer made by an equal status interlocutor; Restaurant owner – staff)

Teman anda meminjam buku catatan bahasa Indonesia anda uniukdifoto kopi. Setelah dikembalikannya, buku tersebut robek. Dia mengatakan: "Saya minta maaf karena telah merobekkan buku anda. Saya akan menggantinya dengan yang baru" Your friend borrows yourIndonesian note to get it copied. He found it torn. He says: "I apologize as I tore your book. I will change it by the new one" Anda mengatakan (You                                    say):

…………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………

Situasi 9: (Menolak tawaran yang dibuat oleh lawan wicara dengan status lebih tinggi; Anda – Chef) Situation 9: (Refusing an offer made by a higher status interlocutor; You - Chef)

Anda bekerja di sebuah hotel sebagai tukang masak. Anda akan dipromosikan menjadi Chef dan diberikan gaji bulanan yang lebih tinggi. Namun anda menolaknya karena anda akan mengundurkan diri. Dia mengatakan: "Anda akan dipromosikan sebagai Chef minggu depan dan diberikan gaji yang lebih tinggi. Saya harap anda maumenerima tawaran ini" You work in a hotel as a cook. You will be promoted to be a Chef and be given higher salary. However, you refuse it as you will resign because of a family reason. Anda mengatakan (You                                    say):

…………………………………………………………………………

…………………………………………………………………………..…

# Pragmatic Development in Foreign Learners of Indonesian

12  Submitted to Manchester Metropolitan University
Student Paper
<1%

13  Xiaoyu Yang. "A Review of Negative Language Transfer Regarding the Errors in English Writing in Chinese Colleges", Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2019
Publication
<1%

14  www.asjp.cerist.dz
Internet Source
<1%

15  www.atlantis-press.com
Internet Source
<1%

16  repositorioinstitucional.buap.mx
Internet Source
<1%

17  id.123dok.com
Internet Source
<1%

18  carla.umn.edu
Internet Source
<1%

19  Submitted to Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
Student Paper
<1%

20  Submitted to Universitas Brawijaya
Student Paper
<1%

21  "Theme-Centered Interaction (TCI) in Higher Education", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2019
Publication
<1%

22  Submitted to La Trobe University
Student Paper
<1%

23  www.scielo.edu.uy
Internet Source
<1%

24  bec.uac.bj
Internet Source
<1%

25 I Made Rai Jaya Widanta, Ni Putu Somawati, I Wayan Dana Ardika. "Students' L2 Refusal Appropriateness and Accuracy", Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2019
Publication
<1%

26 eprints.mdx.ac.uk
Internet Source
<1%

27 gupea.ub.gu.se
Internet Source
<1%

28 9lib.co
Internet Source
<1%

29 Suzanne Graham, Bob Powell. "From GCSE to A-level: a natural progression?", The Language Learning Journal, 2007
Publication
<1%

30 Yao Yao, Bertha Du-Babcock. "English as a Lingua Franca in Mainland China: An Analysis of Intercultural Business Communicative Competence", International Journal of Business Communication, 2020
Publication
<1%

31 Ming-Fang Lin, Miao-Hsia Chang, Yu-Fang Wang. ""How Dare You Have Another Relationship!": An analysis of cross-cultural and interlanguage corrections", International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 2019
Publication
<1%

FINAL GRADE

# /0

GENERAL COMMENTS

## Instructor

PAGE 29

PAGE 30

PAGE 31

PAGE 32

PAGE 33

PAGE 34

PAGE 35

PAGE 36

PAGE 37

PAGE 38

PAGE 39

PAGE 40