Journal of Learning and Instructional Studies

Pragmatic Competence or Pragmatic Knowledge and Its Role in Linguistic Communication

Author(s): Arif Triyuono, Ulfah Ridhwan Dirham

SCROLL DOWN TO READ THIS ARTICLE

PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE OR PRAGMATIC KNOWLEDGE AND ITS ROLE IN LINGUISTIC COMMUNICATION

Arif Triyuono[1] , Ulfah Ridhwan Dirham[2]

Universitas Indraprasta PGRI, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract: The current study has two objectives. First, to examine and discuss types of pragmatic competence or pragmatic knowledge that a speaker may possess. Second, to find out the vital role of pragmatic competence or pragmatic knowledge in linguistic communication. The method used in this research was library research. It was evident from the findings that pragmatic knowledge or pragmatic competence must include the knowledge of implicature, presupposition, speech acts, reference, deixis, definiteness and indefiniteness and their use in linguistic communication. A conclusion was also drawn that pragmatic knowledge or pragmatic competence had a vital role in language acquisition or language learning. A lack of pragmatic knowledge may lead to pragmatic failure, i.e., the inability to understand what the speaker means with his words in actual linguistic communication.

Key Words: Pragmatic, Pragmatic Competence, Pragmatic Knowledge, Linguistic Communication

Abstrak: Penelitian ini memiliki dua ujuan. Pertama, untuk mengkaji dan mendiskusikan jenis pengetahuan pragmatik yang mungkin dimiliki oleh seorang penutur. Kedua, untuk mengetahui peran penting kompetensi pragmatis atau pengetahuan pragmatis dalam komunikasi linguistik. Metode yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah penelitian kepustakaan. Terbukti dari temuan bahwa pengetahuan pragmatis atau kompetensi pragmatis harus mencakup pengetahuan implikatur, presuposisi, tindak tutur, referensi, deiksis, ketakrifan dan ketaktakrifan dan penggunaannya dalam komunikasi linguistik. Kesimpulan juga ditarik bahwa pengetahuan pragmatik atau kompetensi pragmatik memiliki peran penting dalam pemerolehan bahasa atau pembelajaran bahasa. Kurangnya pengetahuan pragmatik dapat menyebabkan kegagalan pragmatik, yaitu ketidakmampuan untuk memahami apa yang dimaksud penutur dengan kata-katanya dalam komunikasi linguistik yang sebenarnya.

Kata Kunci: Pragmatik, Kemampuan Pragmatik, Pengetahuan Pragmatik, Komunikasi Linguistik

*Corresponding author: Arif Triyuono. Universitas Indraprasta PGRI. Jl. Nangka Raya No.58 C, RT.5/RW.5, Tj. Bar., Kec. Jagakarsa, Jakarta Selatan, Daerah Khusus Ibukota Jakarta 12530, Indonesia. Email: atriyuono@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatic competence is the key to effective communication in a second or foreign language. It is "the ability to use language appropriately in a social context" (Taguchi, 2009). In addition, pragmatic competence in foreign language contexts is also defined as the knowledge of communicative action or speech acts, how to perform it, and the ability to utilize the language in proper ways based on the context or contextual factors (Kasper 1997; Kasper & Roever 2005). In this paper, the notions of pragmatic competence and pragmatic knowledge are used interchangeably.

As humans are social beings, the process of communication is inseparable from their daily life. In particular, people need to interact with each other in their community life, as they cannot live by themselves. Through the communication process, people can change their minds, thoughts, and intentions instead of only delivering messages to others. They also need media to express their thoughts and messages. Thus, language is the most appropriate medium in which they produce utterances while assigning various pragmatic and semantic values.

In the process of communication, various methods are often employed to interpret and comprehend what a speaker says and indicates because of several factors such as the language itself (the types, genres, origins, etc.), the participants in the discourse, the purposes or function of communication, and the context of the discourse. In good communication, the message has to be delivered in an appropriate context. The context is related to the language itself. In order to connect the context to the language, we need to understand pragmatics, which can be defined as how language is used in communication (Leech, 1983). Therefore, everyone must have good communication competence consisting of the capacity and the ability to communicate in varied situations. In sum, communicative competence is an absolute requisite to establish effective communication.

Communicative competence is a specific concept in pragmatic competence that involves linguistic competence and participants' context. The notion of pragmatic competence, which is a part of linguistic study, describes the facility to recognize the appropriateness of utterance in context and to comprehend the linguistic form (Kasper & Rose, 2002). Consequently, the facility to distinguish between different contexts in terms of unique requirements of formality, politeness, and so on is an inseparable component of pragmatic knowledge.

Pragmatic competence is the ability to use language appropriately in a context and to achieve a specific purpose (Thomas in Anne O'Keeffe, Brian Clancy, Svenja Adolphs, 2011). According to Bialystok (2001), pragmatic competencies include: first, the ability of the speaker to use language for different purposes; second, the ability of the listener to pass through language and understand the speaker's true intentions, for example, actions of indirect speech, irony, and sarcasm; and finally, the order of the rules by which greetings gather to create discourse. This definition involves the knowledge of various speech acts which is the ability to use language for different purposes, the knowledge of implicature which is the ability to understand a speaker's real intentions, and the knowledge of conversation structure which is commands of the rules by which utterances are strung together to create discourse. Watts (2003) proposed that pragmatic competence includes both the conversational maxims proposed by Grice and the rules of politeness. Summing up, pragmatic competence involves a mastery of using a language appropriately and achieving a specific purpose in various contexts. On another note, pragmatic competence cannot be separated from linguistic competence. It is an essential factor in developing pragmatic competence. Pragmatics sheds light on the use of language and its relationship with its user.

LITERATURE REVIEW
1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics relates to the speaker's meaning. Yule (2010) states that pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has consequently more to do with the analysis of what people meant by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. It means that people need language to communicate. The listener comprehends the meaning that wants to deliver. According to Mey (2001), pragmatics is a human manner to use language in the communication process, bases itself on the study of these premises and determines how they influence, and make effective, use of human language. This definition can be inferred that humans use language to communicate not always directly can be understood what is being talked, sometimes human needs to think of what is being conveyed by the speaker.

Another suggestion comes from Fromkin et al. (2009) state that pragmatics focuses on our comprehension of language context, which should be relevant. The first context is the linguistic context that interprets the phrase and sentences, while the second is the situational context that is almost entirely nonlinguistic in the speaker's environment. Based on the definitions above, the writer takes the conclusion that pragmatics is a study to recognize or to know the meaning of what is being said by the speaker and it occurs between the speaker and hearer during communicating with each other. Horn (2006) states that pragmatic theory discussed the implicature, presupposition, speech acts, reference, deixis, and definiteness and indefiniteness.

According to Mey (2001), Grundy (2000), implicatures are divided into two, conventional and conversational. In conventional implicature, "the meaning does not depend on a particular context of language", but on specific words, and in conversational implicature, "the meaning is implied in conversation, that is something which is left implicit in actual language use" (Mey, 2001, p.45). In conversational implicature, there are two aspects, generalized conversational and particularized conversational. In the first, the interpretation can be done without looking at the context, and in the second, the interpretation should be done by looking at the context.

2. Pragmatic Competence and Pragmatic Knowledge

The form of pragmatic competence is a fundamental component of communicative competence. It has a broad concept of how to use language effectively in an appropriate way. According to Thomas Anne O'Keeffe, Brian Clancy, Svenja Adolphs (2011), pragmatic competence is the ability to use language effectively to get the aims and comprehend the context. Barron (2003, p.10) stated that pragmatic competence is knowledge of the linguistic resources available in a given language for realizing particular illocutions, knowledge of the sequential aspects of speech acts, and finally, knowledge of the appropriate contextual use of the particular linguistic resources. Similar definition by Murray (2009, p. 239) that pragmatic competence can be defined as an understanding of the relationship between form and context that enables us, accurately and appropriately, to express and interpret intended meaning. Moreover, Kasper (2001) states that pragmatic competence is located within the model of communicative competence. Therefore, its relationship with grammatical competence is either viewed in interaction with grammatical competence or independent from it.

Pragmatic knowledge can be defined as the knowledge that a speaker has about different ways how language is used in different settings and for different purposes. An example of this is how you would speak less formally with your best friend than with her parents. It is also frequently defined as how individuals communicate meaning and how they produce contextually-appropriate utterances, sentences, or texts. It also consists of sociolinguistic and functional knowledge as stated by Bachman and Palmer in Weir, Cyril J. (2005).

METHOD

This research utilized the library research method. The data for this study were samples of language use requiring a context or contexts to interpret what the speaker(s) mean(s) in his(their) utterance(s). They were collected from a variety of related articles and references from the library. It was so done as George (2008, p. 1) said: "Like its twin, scientific experiment, library research is a form of structured inquiry with specific tools, rules, and techniques." This research basically followed three main steps of library research such as: (a) consulting reference tools, and searching databases, (b) identifying and obtaining sources, and (c) evaluating sources in the light of the research objectives outlined above.

The data were evaluated and analyzed in terms of Yule's (2010) framework. They were analyzed in terms of speaker meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). Therefore, this study is concerned with the analysis of what a speaker meant by his utterances (pragmatic perspectives) than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves (semantic perspectives).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the evaluation and analysis of data described above, the present study found out that there were six domains of language use where the understanding of context was required to interpret the speaker meaning. They were implicature, presupposition, speech acts, reference, deixis, definiteness and indefiniteness. Consequently, a speaker's knowledge about his language must include his knowledge about these six domains of language use or also known as seven domains of pragmatics. This pragmatic knowledge has also been referred to as pragmatic competence.

Following up the above findings, the discussion of pragmatic competence or pragmatic knowledge that a speaker may have in his linguistic competence and its use in daily communication consists of the speaker's knowledge about implicature, presupposition, speech acts, reference, deixis, definiteness and indefiniteness, and pragmatic competence versus grammatical competence. In the language learning context, the knowledge about these seven pragmatic components has to be learned by a learner so he can be competent in both pragmatics and grammar.

1. **Implicature**

   Implicature is the additional meanings in utterances that are different from the literal meaning itself. Understanding implicature is not an easy matter for the speaker, but it is being cooperative and intending to communicate something. That something must be more than just what the words meant. An implicature also means an additional conveyed when people literally say. People use language to communicate and give meaning to their utterances, showing more meaning than what is being communicated from what is said. The sentences which contain implicature sometimes can be calculated by understanding the meaning, not the actions from what is said by the speaker. In other words, we can say that implicature is something that is not said by the speaker and the hearer must assume the meaning of the speaker's utterances without being part of what is said. Speaker (S) utilizes pragmatic principles to unite this gap and counts on hearer (H) to demand the same principles for the goals of utterance interpretation. Some examples of implicature are below:
   a. *Are you watching this movie?*
      The possible interpretation (implicatures) for the utterance might be: *This movie bores me* or *Can we turn the television off*?
   b. *A: Do you want to go for sushi tonight?*
      B: We have bills due.

Speaker A assumes B to be cooperative but, B answered differently from the question. The possible implicatures for the utterance might be: *We do not have much money to eat out because we have to pay the bills*.

c. *Hey Ann, have you stopped running since we talked last?*
The possible implicatures for the utterance might be: *She has got little fat*.

From the above examples, can be inferred that the utterances of implicatures are not part of what is being said by the speakers. Ignoring the potential speaker meaning in this context may result in pragmatic failure which is prone to communication breakdown.

1.1. Conversational Implicatures

A characteristic mark of Gricean implicatures in general and scalar in particular is the result of a defeasible inference. Conversational implicature inferences depend on the existence of norms for the use of language to preserve the assumption of cooperation, such as the widespread agreement that communicators should aim to tell the truth. The basic assumption in conversation is that unless otherwise indicated the participants are adhering to the cooperative principle and the maxim. For example:

Charlene: *I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.*
Dexter: *Ah, I brought the bread.*

After hearing Dexter's response, Charlene has to assume that Dexter is cooperating and not totally unaware of the quantity maxim, but he didn't mention the cheese. If he has brought the cheese, he would say yes, because he would be adhering to the quantity maxim. He had to intend that she inferred what was not brought. In this case, Dexter has conveyed more than he said through a conversational implicature.

In order to determine the appropriateness of a conversational contribution and a cooperative effort, according to Gricean Maxims known as Cooperative Principle (CP) people should interact with each other, cooperate, and one relies for analysis on the CP in order to understand each other. There are four maxims associated with it: Quality, Quantity, Relevance (Relation), and Manner. On Grice's conception, it requires speakers to reason not only in terms of their language but also their understanding of the context and each other's goals and intentions. The cooperative principle is the driving force behind conversational implicature.

1.2. The Examples of the Cooperative Principle:

1. The Maxim of Quality means the speaker has to tell the truth or be truthful.
Aunt: *"What were you doing in there?"*
Niece: *"Nothing."*
Aunt: *"Nothing! Look at your hands. And look at your mouth! What is that struck?"*
Niece: *"I don't know, Aunt."*
Aunt: *"Well, I know. It's jam – that's what it is. Forty times I've said off you didn't let that jam alone skin you."*

In the above conversation, Aunt is asking her Niece, and she finally says: *"I've said off you didn't let that jam alone skin you."* Her niece does not tell the truth about her condition because she is afraid to say what is going on, the evidence shows that her hands and mouth are full of jam. This conversation violates this maxim because the niece is not being truthful and lack evidence.

2. The Maxim of Quantity means the speaker does not contribute more or less than he or she needs to.
Mark: *"What did you have for lunch today?"*
Diana: *"Baked beans on toast."* (Answer 1 gives a normal answer)
Diana: *"Food."* (Answer 2 gives not enough information)

Diana: "*I had 87 warmed-up baked beans (although eight of them were slightly crushed) served on a slice of toast 12.7 cm. by 10.3 cm. which had been unevenly toasted...*" (answer 3 gives too much information)

In the conversation between Mark and Diana, Diana's answer number 2 and 3 violate this maxim because Diana does not contribute as much as she needs to. She gives too much information to Mark for answer number 3, and for answer number 2, she gives not enough information. Only answer number 1 does not violate this maxim.

3. The Maxim of Relevance means the speaker has to be relevant in answering the question.

Ann: "*Have you seen Mary today?*"

Brad: "*I'm eating.*"

In the conversation between Ann and Brad, Brad's answer violates this maxim because the answer is not relevant to the question. This situation might be Brad does not want Ann to ask where Mary is and he ignores the question.

4. The Maxim of Manner means the speaker has to be clear, brief, avoid ambiguity, and orderly.

Interviewer: "*Mr. Peres, if we can get down to concrete facts ……. .*"

The interviewer is asking about the situation that is being raised and hoping that Mr. Peres will give a clear, brief answer about the situation happening, also avoid ambiguity and it is an orderly answer.

The following examples were taken from Chinese food TV commercials (Chen, 2019):

1. **An Analysis of Cooperative Principle in Chinese Food TV**
   a) **The Maxim of Quantity in Chinese Food TV Commercials**
   Example 1: "When you are tired or sleepy, drink Dongpeng Vitamin Drinks.
   —— Dongpeng Vitamin Drinks."
   This ad is for a drink. Dongpeng Vitamin Drinks serve as functional beverage that can help their users relieve fatigue and increase energy.
   b) **The Maxim of Quality in Chinese Food TV Commercials**
   Example 2: "Healthy oil is produced in the golden area. —— Fulinmen Oil."
   This ad is designed for Fulinmen Oil, introducing its producing area and quality.
   c) **The Maxim of Relation in Chinese Food TV Commercials**
   Example 3: "Tasty toffee is produced by good milk in grassland.
   —— Golden Monkey Toffee."
   Example 3 is for milk sugar, stressing the producing area. It shows that Golden Monkey is made of high-quality materials.
   d) **The Maxim of Manner in Chinese Food TV Commercials**
   Example 4: "Good water can please people, even a drop.
   —— Master Kong Mineral Water."
   Example 4 is for a public welfare activity held by Master Kong, representing the producer's expectation of the product.

2. **Presupposition**

Peccei (1999, p.19) describes presupposition as inferences about what is assumed to be true in the utterance rather than directly asserted to be true. The inferences are very closely linked to the words and grammatical structures actually used in the utterances, but they come from our knowledge of the way language users conventionally interpret these words and structures. The presuppositions of an utterance are the pieces of information that the speaker assumes (or acts as if she assumes) in order for her utterance to be meaningful in the current context. *A presupposition* is what the speaker assumes to be the case prior to making an utterance. It is an implicit assumption about the world or

background belief relating to an utterance the truth of which is taken for granted in discourse. Following are examples of presuppositions:

a) *Ann no longer sings a song.* (Presupposition: *Ann once sang a song.*)
b) *Did you stop smoking?* (Presupposition: *You once stopped smoking.*)
c) *Have you called Sue?* (Presupposition: *Sue exists.*)

In presupposition, the speaker has assumed in the form of utterances, not sentences, and is concerned with how speakers' assumptions are typically expressed in linguistic rules including a large number of words, phrases, and structures. Based on the theory which was revealed by Yule (2010), the presupposition is divided into six types that are existential presupposition, factive presupposition, lexical presupposition, structural presupposition, non-factive presupposition, and counter-factual presupposition:

a. **Existential Presupposition** is the assumption assumed to be committed to the existence of entities named by the speaker and assumed to be present in a noun phrase. **The possessive words like 's, my, your, his, her, their, and our lead to a particular strong presupposition about the existence of something**.
For example:
Presupposition on President Barack Obama's Speech (Marbu, Pasaribu, & Pasaribu, 2015):
  1) *Our nation is at war.* (A nation exists and is at war)
  2) *b) These are the indicators of crisis, subject to data and statistics.* (There is a crisis in the country)
  3) *This generation of Americans has been tested by crises that steeled our resolve and proved our resilience.* (Generation of Americans exists and has been tested by crises)

As in utterance (a), Obama assumes that he, as a speaker, and his audience have the same nation namely America. From the utterance, it presupposes the existence of the nation and describes the referent. Therefore, it presupposes that *a nation (America) exists and the nation is at war*. It is true that the nation is facing the threat of terrorism and the crisis in the country. In utterance (b), it describes the existence of a crisis including economic rescission in the country that occurred before Obama is inaugurated. The utterance presupposes *there is a crisis in America*. And in (c), the trigger of presupposition is on the phrase *the generation of Americans*. It presupposes that the generation exists and they are American because it describes the entity name and the existence of the generation.

b. **Factive Presupposition** is the assumption that is true and identified by the presence of some verbs such as *know, realize, regret, be, aware, odd, glad,* and other phrases. The use of these verbs triggers the presupposition that what follows is a fact.
For example:
Presupposition on President Barack Obama's Speech:
*We know that America thrives when every person can find independence and pride in their work. (*America thrives when every person can find independence and pride in their work)

The trigger of presupposition in the three utterances lies in the word *know* followed by the word *that.* The use of the word *know* is already strong enough for Obama to have the assumption that the audiences have mutual knowledge about the fact of the utterances he conveyed, so it must be true.

c. **Lexical Presupposition** is the assumption that in using one form, the speaker can act

as if another meaning will be understood.

For example:

Presupposition on President Barack Obama's Speech:

This is the journey we <u>continue</u> today.

(American people have done the journey before)

Obama assumed that all audiences have already known and experienced all surrounding events and problems in the country. So, he used the word *continue* in utterance (a) *This is the journey we continue today*. Obama presupposes that the *American people have done the journey before*.

d. **Structural Presupposition** is the assumption of a certain sentence structure that is part of sentence structure and is already assumed to be true. The part of sentence structure is contained in words and phrases.

For example:

Presupposition on President Barack Obama's Speech:

What the cynics fail to understand is that the ground has shifted beneath them. (The cynics fail to understand)

In order to analyze the utterances, the writer found the triggers of the presupposition based on the structural presupposition theory. The structural presupposition uses the What-questions to convey the fact that cannot be denied more available on the structure of the utterances. As in utterance (a), the speaker used the word *what* to convey the fact that *the cynics fail to understand.*

e. **Non–factive Presupposition** is the assumption that is assumed not to be true. Non–factive presupposition is identified by verbs like *dream, imagine, pretend*, and so on.

For example:

Presupposition on President Barack Obama's Speech:

"*We will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist.*"

(*The corruptors clench their fist*)

This type of presupposition makes an assumption that is not true to the fact or has ambiguous meaning because of using unsure words in the utterance. Obama is addressing the corruptors who have rampantly acted in the country. In utterance (a), *we will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist*. Obama presupposes that *the corruptor clenches their fist*. It is because of the use of the word *if* causes the statement to be not true. This type of presupposition is very few in his speeches because Barack Obama used facts, real information, and true assumptions to convey his idea or promise in his speeches.

f. **Counter-factual Presupposition** is the assumption that what is presupposed is not only untrue but also the opposite of what is true or contrary to the fact.

For example:

If you were my friend, you would have helped me.

(You are not my friend)

The word *if* in the utterance *If you were my friend, you would have helped me* is the trigger of which the utterance is not true and is contrary to the real situation that is *you are not my friend.*

Presupposition on President Barack Obama's Speech:

There is not any counterfactual presupposition found in the first and second speeches. The counter-factual presupposition is the assumption that are real and contradicted the fact. Barack Obama did not need such assumptions in his speech because he prefers real information and facts in conveying his ideas and promises in order to attract his

audiences 'attention.

3. Speech Acts

Speech acts theory was introduced by Austin in David R. McCabe (2011) in "How *to Kill Things with Words"* the published version of his William James Lectures delivered at New York in 2011. In Austin's point, every utterance has a descriptive and effective aspect. Austin substituted a three-way contrast among the kinds of acts that are performed when language is put to use, namely the distinction between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts (Horn, 2006). A Locutionary act is an act that is performed to communicate actual uttering (the particular sense and reference of an utterance) or the basic act of utterance in producing a meaningful linguistic expression like phonetics, phonology, and linguistic semantics. An Illocutionary act is an act performed in saying something of an utterance, such as making a statement, offer, promise, thanking, asking a question, explanation, and so forth for a communicative purpose. The perlocutionary act is a consequence of speaking, whether intended or not. It represents the change achieved each time in a particular context.

Example of speech acts (Austin) in *London Has Fallen Movie* (Tutuarima, Nuraeningsih, & Rusiana, 2018):

a. **Locutionary Act (form and semantics meanings)**

Raza: Did Philippine Intelligence track you? (speaker)
Kamran: (He listens and doesn't replay what Raza's said.) (hearer)

Based on the example above, it proved that the utterance which belongs to the locutionary act is just a real message from the speaker and the hearer did not give the reaction what the speaker's said. All of the utterances which belong to the locutionary act in this movie were having the same condition; when the speakers were saying something, then the hearer just stayed and listened to them. From the example above, when Raza (*speaker*) said: *"Did Philippine intelligence track you?"* Kamran (*hearer*) was passing through the speaker without giving a reaction, and there was no intention from the hearer to replay what the speaker said.

b. **Illocutionary Act (speech act)**

Trumbull: How bad is it? (speaker)
Staff: It is pretty goddamn bad, Sir. All lines of communication have been compromised, both civilian and military. (hearer)

In the examples above the speaker is trying to convey what they wanted or what they wanted to say. The speaker tries to explain. When *Trumbull* (*speaker*) said *How bad is it?* When Trumbull as the first speaker wants to hear the explanation from the staff (hearer), the staff then informed Trumbull (speaker) about the situation and said *"it is pretty goddamn bad, Sir. All lines of communication have been compromised, both civilian and military"*. When the staff (hearer) was saying such utterances, it means that the hearer wanted to give the response based on what the other speaker said.

c. **Perlocutionary Act**

Staff: Sir, I got your son on video chat. (speaker)
President Asher: Excellent. He had his first date last night. (hearer)

When the speaker is saying something, then the hearer directly moves and does what the speaker want. When the *staff (speaker)* said "Sir, I got your son on the video chat," and the president *(hearer)* is giving a reaction "excellent, he had his first date last night," here the hearer is giving a happy reaction, and the speaker is receiving a good response from the speaker.

Searle in Barry Smith (2003) stated that the speech act describes the action changing the discourse of a speaker's utterance both oral or written and is divided into five categories for illocutionary acts that are representative, directive, commisive,

expressive, and declarative.
Example of speech acts using Searle's theory (**Basra & Thoyyibah, 2017**):

Table 1. Representative Speech Act is a speech act that has the function of making a conclusion or assumption.

Utterances	Representative act categories
"Yeah, so 4." (actually, it means "yes, so there are four questions altogether")	Concluding
"This is from Aurora."	Claiming
"I think this is such a hard question."	Assuming
S: "Maybe meatball." T: "Oh…meatball, okay."	Concluding/stating
S: "20" T: "20 of February, alright."	Concluding/stating

Table 2. A directive Speech Act is a speech act that has the function of getting the listener to do something, such as a suggestion or a request.

Utterances	Directive speech act Categories
"Uhmm... do you know, oh what is that, another expression rather than saying fine?"	Asking
"So can you please introduce yourself?"	Requesting
"I want you to make two questions about me and also about the person sitting next to you."	Commanding
"You can have a sit Lintang."	Inviting
"Tell me, Lintang!"	Ordering

Table 3. Commisive Speech Act is a speech act that commits the speaker to doing something in the future, such as a promise.

Utterances
"Now, we are going to have a conversation, okay."
"I am going to open this one first."
"They will believe it."
"Okay guys, so we are going to have a break."
"We are going to continue it again after the break."

4. Reference

A reference is linked to something a person or a thing which is a name, some living or imaginary entity or concept, or group of entities. A reference can be a noun phrase or concept that is used in an utterance or something that is referred to. For example, in the sentences below, the reference of the words *Howard* and *Robert Blair* are the particular persons called Howard and Robert Blair.

1a. Howard is your cousin, isn't he?

1b. Howard is your cousin's name, isn't it?

Two or more referring expressions may have the same referent, but they do not necessarily have the same meaning an example is below:

Robert Blair

the husband of Mildred Stone Blair

the father of Patrick and Robin Blair

the city editor of the Morgantown *Daily Enquirer,* and so on.

5. Deixis

Deixis refers to pointing using language that is a word or phrase such as, *this, that, these, those, now, then, here*. It introduces subjective, attentional, intentional, and context-dependent properties into natural languages and also points to the time, place, or situation in which a speaker is having a conversation. Deixis is personal pronouns, demonstratives, adverbs, and tense in terms of place, time, and person. As with other closed class types, deixis is semantically imperfect and it is pronounced: "DIKE-tik." Deixis is more complex than it really is, for example of deixis that found in Beauty and the Beast Movie below:

The Beast: "***I* (1)** *received eternal damnation for one*."

The Beauty: "*Who are* ***you* (2)**?"

The Beast: "***He* (3)** *stole a rose*."

The Beast: "***She's* (4)** *the daughter of a common thief*."

There is first, second, and third-person deixis.

The Beast: "You gave her a bedroom?"

Place deixis focus on the place where the speech event occurs. So, the word (bedroom) can be included in spatial deixis (place deixis) focusing on the place where the speech event occurs and dealing with the distance.

6. Definiteness and Indefiniteness

The prototypes of definiteness and indefiniteness in English are the definite article *the* and the indefinite article *a/an*, and singular Noun Phrases (NPs) determined by them. Reference is the symbolic relationship that a linguistic expression has with the concrete object or abstraction it represents. Reference is the relationship of one linguistic expression to another, in which one provides the information necessary to interpret the other. Even though in English, the category of definiteness and indefiniteness is not a grammatical category, the concept is the same. In English, the indefinite article *a/an* is used with countable nouns in the singular number.

A sentence with an indefinite NP as in (3) receives the logical analysis in (3a), which is paraphrased able back into semi-ordinary English as in (3b) (Horn, 2006).

(3) A student arrived.

a. x [Student(x) and Arrived(x)]

b. There exists something which both is a student and arrived.

7. The Role of Pragmatic Knowledge or Pragmatic Competence

Thomas in Anne O'Keeffe, Brian Clancy, Svenja Adolphs (2011) contrasts "pragmatic competence" with "grammatical competence". These two types of competence combine into a speaker's "linguistic competence". In other words, a speaker's overall language competence comprises two complementary components, or "sub-competences", which are here called "grammatical" and "pragmatic". A speaker's 'linguistic competence' would be made up of grammatical competence ('abstract' or decontextualized knowledge of intonation, phonology, syntax, semantics, and so on) and pragmatic competence (the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context). In Thomas's perspective, grammatical competence refers to syntax knowledge, phonology knowledge, and intonation. Grammatical competence does not depend on pragmatic competence.

Krisnawati (2011) found that learners of the English language must develop pragmatic competence in order to communicate effectively. A lack of pragmatic competence can have unexpected impacts on the speaker. For example, if the speaker is considered a rude and aggressive person, such as the development of pragmatic competencies for English Foreign Language students must be a major concern. The first task is to speak, especially in verbal speech acts. The second task is to write a complaint letter. This article shows that developing pragmatic awareness through verbal and written acts of a complaint is needed (Nuridin, 2018).

It is only skilfully combined linguistic and pragmatic knowledge that can lead to communicative competence in foreign language learning. The object is used to describe properties independently of the language used (conceptual properties). In English, linguistic expression can be classified into a number of types, including:

1. *Expression of Introduction* is used to make an introduction to a new person.
- *Let me introduce myself, my name is Mark.*
- *Allow me to introduce my mother to you.*

2. *Expression of Greeting* is used to greet people.
- *Hello Mark, how is your day going?*
- *Goodbye Mark, until next time.*

3. *Expression of Gratitude* is an expression used to show appreciation.
- *Congratulations on your achievement.*
- *Happy Birthday, Ann.*

4. *Expression of Apology* is used to ask for an apology.
- *Forgive me for being rude.*
- *Please, accept my apologies.*

5. *Expression of Ability and Disability* is used to express ability and disability.
- *Yes, I can stop by to your office.*
No, I cannot move here.

Leech (2016) provided an example to illustrate the importance of grammar competence (the abstract formal system of language) and pragmatics competence (the principles of language use):

(1) Hello, **can you me please tell where the station is?**
(2) Hello, tell me where the station is.

Sentence (1) shows that the speaker is still learning English, in particular, the correct word order, which shows there is probably interference from the learner's L1. However, sentence (2) shows that the speaker may just be impolite, as a more indirect request is

more commonly used in English. "Grammatical error may reveal a speaker to be a less than proficient language-user, pragmatic failure reflects badly on him/her as a *person*" (Thomas in Anne O'Keeffe, Brian Clancy, Svenja Adolphs, 2011). Due to these underlying issues, pragmatic competence is usually prioritized instead of grammatical competence. Grammatical competence often deals with the technical aspects of a language, i.e., the phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and lexicon of that language. However, pragmatic competence concerns how that grammatical competence is used appropriately in a particular context without being impolite or misunderstood.

CONCLUSION

Pragmatic knowledge or pragmatic competence has a vital role in language acquisition or language learning. The ability and facility to use linguistic competence in a contextually appropriate manner depend not only on grammatical competence, but also on pragmatic knowledge or pragmatic competence. A lack of pragmatic knowledge may lead to pragmatic failure, i.e., the **inability to understand what speaker means with his words in linguistic communication**. Consequently, teaching and learning English as either a second or a foreign language need to consider the vital role of pragmatic knowledge and take the mastery of pragmatic knowledge or pragmatic competence into account in the curriculum.

As pragmatic knowledge, which is often used interchangeably with pragmatic competence, refers to the knowledge that a speaker has about different ways how language is used in different settings and for different purposes and also to the ways individuals communicate meaning and how they produce contextually-appropriate utterances, sentences, or texts. It also consists of sociolinguistic and functional knowledge. The pragmatic knowledge or pragmatic competence must include the knowledge of implicature, presupposition, speech acts, reference, deixis, definiteness and indefiniteness and their use in linguistic communication.

Further, individuals possess an inherent systematic grammar when the language is their own native language. They know how to use linguistic expressions in a contextually appropriate manner, usually, they also have pragmatic competence or pragmatic knowledge. In other words, it can be concluded that pragmatic competence or pragmatic knowledge closely relates to linguistic competence and systematic grammar, which are often used together in various expressions. In actual communication, interlocutors make an effort to get the message of the communication across as effectively as possible. They have to use implicatures, presuppositions, speech acts, referents, deixis, as well as definiteness or indefiniteness.

REFERENCES

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics; Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Bardovi-Harlig, J., K., Felix-Brasdefer, C., Omar, A. S. (2006). *Pragmatics and language Learning*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Basra, S.W., & Thoyyibah, L. (2017). A speech act analysis of teacher talks in an EFL classroom. *International Journal of Education, 10*(1), 73-81.

Bialystok, E. (2001). *Bilingualism in development: Language, literacy, and cognition*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chen, C. (2019). An analysis of cooperative principle in Chinese food TV commercials. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research. 7*(6). 60-68.

Fromkin, V., Robert, R., & Nina, H. (2009). *An introduction to language.* Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Gass, Susan M. (2013). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. New York: Routledge.

George, M.W. (2008). *The elements of library research: What every student needs to know*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Grice, H.P. (2006). Logic and conversation. In Adam Jaworski & Nikolas Coupland (Eds). *The discourse reader, 2nd Ed*. 66-70. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Grundy, P. (2000). *DoingpPragmatics*. New York: Arnold Publisher.

Horn R. L., & Gregory.W. (2006). *The handbook of pragmatics.* Charlton: Blackwell Publishing.

Kasper, G. & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning. In Eli Hinkel (ed.). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, pp. 317-334. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associations.

Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(4), 502-530.

Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language.*

Krisnawati, E. (2011). Pragmatic competence in the spoken English classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 1 (1), 105-115.

Leech, G.N. (2016). *Principles of Pragmatics.* New York: Routledge.

Marbun, R.R, Pasaribu, T, & Pasaribu, D. (2015). An analysis of presupposition on President Barack Obama's speech on his first and second inaugural addresses,158-190.

McCabe, David R. (2011). *How to Kill things with words*. New York, MASS: T&T Clark International.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics an introduction*. Blackwell: Publisher Inc. Massachusetts.

Michigan: Blackwell.

Murray, N. (2009). Pragmatics, awareness raising, and the cooperative principle. *ELT Journal, 64*(3), 293-301.

Nuridin, W. (2018). Developing pragmatic competence of Indonesian EFL learners through teaching speech acts of oral and written complaints. *Englisia, 6*(1), 27-34.

O'Keeffe, A., Clancy, B., Adolphs, S. (2011). *Introducing pragmatics in use.* New York: Routledge.

Pilar, M., S., J. (2005). *Third language learner: Pragmatics production and awareness.* Canada: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Smith, B. (2003). *John Searle: A contemporary philosophy in focus*. London, Cambridge University Press.

Taguchi, N. (2009). Pragmatic competence in Japanese as a second language: An introduction. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *Pragmatic competence*, pp. 1-18. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Tutuarima, Z., Nuraeningsih, & Rusiana. (2018). An analysis of speech act used in "London Has Fallen" movie. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning, 7*(2), 160-169.

Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weir, Cyril, J. (2005). *Language testing and validation: An evidence-based approach*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

http://www.slideshare.net/mobile/sheroz_ramzan/types-of-presupposition-62498362.

https://glossary.sil.org/term/reference.