

## ENGLISH PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE OF *COL* LANGUAGE SPEAKERS IN USING DIRECTIVE ACT AT LUBUKLINGGAU

Afifah Wahyuningsih<sup>1</sup>, Sastika Seli<sup>2</sup>, Dewi Syafitri<sup>3</sup>

Universitas PGRI Silampari

[afifahwahyuningsih12@gmail.com](mailto:afifahwahyuningsih12@gmail.com)

*Submit*, 13-08-2023

*Accepted*, 04-10-2023

*Publish*, 06-10-2023

### ABSTRACT

This research aimed to explain the English Pragmatic Competence of *Col* language speakers in using directive act and to find out the extent to which *Col* language pragmatic competence influence the production of English pragmatic competence in directive act. The method used descriptive qualitative. The research subjects were 20 students who studied English consisting of students, collage students and graduates at Lubuklinggau. The data were collected by using questionnaire and pragmatic competence test. After that, the data were analyzed with description. The result of this research is that the pragmatic competence of *Col* language using directive acts is more understandable because respondents understand the use of language in the right situation may be different. The tests that have been carried out show that many of the respondents' answers are appropriate. They use English only in educational domains such as schools, colleges and courses. Therefore, the frequency of use of English is limited and other languages are used more frequently. In almost all expressions there is no significant negative transfer from L1 and L2 production to English, as all percentages below 50% except 57,5% command expressions have little influence on English production. These errors were found in the use of expressions in several formal situations, but they were not significant because not many pragmatic errors were found. In conclusion is that *Col* people understand how to use appropriate expressions in different situations, namely formal and informal situations, even though only the expressions of command have little influence.

**Keywords:** *Col Language Speakers, Directive Act, Pragmatic Competence*

### INTRODUCTION

Communication is the art of passing information from one person to another so that they can be received in the manner they were meant (Iloafu, 2016). Thus, communication is considered as a deliberate act to convey a message such as explaining something to others or persuading to do something. Basically, communication is very important in determining the success of everything in meeting personal and group needs. Of course, in carrying out daily activities from waking up in the morning until

going back to sleep, we are always involved in communication activities using language.

Language is something coming from the inside of the speaking subject manifest in the meaningful intentional purpose of the individual speaker (Castillo, 2015). People can give and get information or messages for others with language (Sari, 2020). One does not just use language and say words without understanding the conversation with other people as interlocutors because if they do not understand it can cause misunderstandings between one another. So, when a speaker says something, it can affect the actions and feelings of someone who is the other person talking to. Therefore, one's ability to speak by considering the reaction of the other person is important to communicate properly, well and smoothly. As well as someone who uses language, it is equipped with the rules and norms he or she uses. So that, a person's competence is not only limited to the use of language but also the use of language. In other words, one must also master pragmatic competence.

Pragmatic competence is created and understood in a speaker, namely when they use the language at that time and where the conversation takes place. Therefore, someone who is multilingual, they may have different pragmatic competencies when they use a new language pragmatic competence constitutes a significant factor in determining the success of communication. Pragmatics is about the reason behind speakers' or writers' choice of language influenced by their knowledge and awareness of the community accepted norms (Lestari, 2017). For example, from research conducted by Blum-Kulka (in Koike, 1989) native English speakers, when learning Spanish as L2, will transfer their speech act knowledge and hope to find equivalent means of grammatical rules and pragmatics in L2, but they may abuse it. So, they speak Spanish but use English grammar in producing it. This example demonstrates the transfer of pragmatic competence in First Language (L1) in Second Language (L2) learning. In Indonesia, teaching English as a Foreign Language may have several different problems and English is a foreign language whose language structure is very different from that of the mother tongue. English and many languages in Indonesia are derived from different proto-languages. English comes from Proto Indo-European and languages in Indonesia come from Proto-Austronesian. Therefore, the assumption that appears has two different hypotheses whether students' English pragmatic competence

can be influenced by their L1 or L2. Some students use *Col* as their L1 when learning English in Lubuklinggau.

*Col* language is the native language of Lubuklinggau residents and some students in Lubuklinggau use the language and as L1 students while studying English. According (Seli & Kristi, 2020), the maintenance of the *Col* language in Lubuklinggau is 'good' or 'positive' in the realm of family life and friendship. People are proud to use it to communicate around the domain, because *Col* language is a regional language which is a distinctive language that distinguishes the indigenous people of Lubuklinggau from the immigrant community, but they are sometimes a little uncomfortable to use it in the scope of education, work and other public places. This is because the people of Lubuklinggau are multilingual, they can speak more than one language. *Col* speakers also speak the national language in formal situations. They also communicate using other regional dialects or lingua franca such as Palembang Malay with Lubuklinggau Dialect (PMLD). That way someone needs to use speech acts so that the conversation fits the situation and context

Speech act is an action performed via utterances (Yule, 1996). It means that when someone says something, he is not only saying but also uses it to perform act. Furthermore, Austin in Huang (2007:93) stated that speech act is how to do things with word. Speech act consists of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. From three kinds of acts, the illocutionary acts are the acts that have an important relation with pragmatics since the function of it is the acts when the speaker utter or inform something and the hearer need to do an action. So, in this research researcher focuses on illocutionary act especially directive act. Directive act is often found in everyday conversation and used when learning English such as expressions suggestions, orders, commands, questions, requests and so on. The form of the directive act can be found in utterances which contain words, phrase, clause, and sentences (Fitria, 2019).

Based on the description above, it is important to conduct this research to find out whether L1 competence in using English when *Col* language speakers learn English in formal education. This research conducted in Lubuklinggau entitle “English Pragmatic Competence of *Col* Language Speakers in Using Directive Act at Lubuklinggau”. The formulation of the research problems were how is English Pragmatic Competence of *Col* language speakers in using directive act and to what

extent does *Col* language speakers' pragmatic competence influence the production of English pragmatic competence in directive act.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This research conducted in the city of Lubuklinggau, South Sumatra. In this research, researchers conducted a descriptive qualitative research. The data may be derived from some *Col* native speakers who live in Lubuklinggau and are learning English at least six months as their foreign language. It carried out in Lubuklinggau. The researcher identifies *Col* language people who can be included to become the subject of this research is by doing. The setting can be in Lubuklinggau with twenty respondents with criteria such as students (students who study English at the course), college students (students studying English in Universitas PGRI Sialampari Lubuklinggau) and graduated students (students who have studied English). To analyze the data, there are some procedures which were carried out such as Identification and coding, classification, data reduction and description.

## RESEARCH RESULT

There are two types of discourse tests presented in three parts, namely, multiple choice test, completion test and questioner. The results of the discourse test are presented in the following tables.

**Table 4.1 The Result of Multiple-choice Pragmatic Competence Test of *Col* Language Speakers in Lubuklinggau**

No	Types of Speech Act	Expression	Frequency of Respond	
			Appropriate	Less-appropriate
1.	Directive	<b>Asking Permission</b>		
		Situation 1	18	2
		Situation 2	17	3
		<b>Giving Suggestion</b>		
		Situation 1	9	11
		Situation 2	19	1
		<b>Command</b>		
		Situation 1	8	12
		Situation 2	5	15
		<b>Inviting</b>		

	Situation 1	19	1
	Situation 2	18	2
	<b>Prohibition</b>		
	Situation 1	15	5
	Situation 2	19	1

**Table 4.2 Discourse Completion Test Result for Directive Act**

No	Types of Speech Act	Expression	Frequency of Respond	
			Appropriate	Less-appropriate
1.	Directive	<b>Asking Permission</b>		
		Situation 1	8	12
		Situation 2	17	3
		<b>Giving Suggestion</b>		
		Situation 1	9	11
		Situation 2	19	1
		<b>Command</b>		
		Situation 1	7	13
		Situation 2	14	6
		<b>Inviting</b>		
Situation 1	19	1		
Situation 2	5	15		
<b>Prohibition</b>				
Situation 1	17	3		
Situation 2	6	14		

**Table 4.3 The Result of the Most and the Less Used of Expressions**

No	Types of Speech Act	Expression	Frequency of Respond	
			Most Used	Less Used
1.	Directive	<b>Asking Permission</b>		
		a. May I...	10	-
		c. Would it be alright if I...	-	12
		<b>Giving command</b>		
		a. Please be careful!	12	-
g. It's better to...	-	12		
<b>Giving Suggestion</b>				
a. You should...	12	-		
c. You ought to...	-	10		
<b>Inviting</b>				
i. Come and join the party!	19	-		
c. we would be delighted if you...	-	1		
<b>Prohibition</b>				
e. Be prohibited	-	1		
d. Can not	19	-		

**Table 4.4 The Negative Transfer of L1 and L2 into English Production**

Types of Speech Acts	Asking	Giving	Command	Inviting	Prohibition
Frequency	20	24	46	19	23
Percentage	25%	30%	57,5%	23,75%	28,75%

## DISCUSSION

Pragmatics is about the use of utterances in context, about how people manage to convey more than what is literally encoded by the semantics of sentences (Griffith, 2006). This means that pragmatic knowledge is about the interaction of semantics with our knowledge, by paying attention to how people convey it according to the existing context. English pragmatic competence can be influenced by their L1 or L2, in Lubuklinggau some students use *Col* as their L1 when learning English. *Col* language is the native language of the people of Lubuklinggau and some students in Lubuklinggau speak the language as L1 students while learning English. In this research, the researcher tried to find out how is English Pragmatic Competence of *Col* language speakers in using directive act and to what extent does *Col* language pragmatic competence influence the production of English pragmatic competence in directive act.

From the result of the findings, the researchers marked the options chosen by the respondents into 'appropriate' and 'less appropriate'. 'Appropriate' means the expression and respond of the act is polite and appropriate to the setting of the utterance. 'Less appropriate' means the expression and the respond is less polite and inappropriate to the utterance or situation given because some words may not be suitable to the situation.

➤ **English Pragmatic Competence of Col Language Speakers in Using Directive Act**

a. The Data Findings from the Test in Part I

The results of the tests that were tested in part 1 have several expressions, namely asking permission, giving, command, inviting and prohibition.

**Data 01**

**Asking Permission**

- **Situation 1:** *"Do you mind opening the door for me?"*
- **Responses:**

a) <i>"Not at all"</i>	→	Less appropriate
b) <i>"OK"</i>	→	Appropriate
c) <i>"Yes, of course"</i>	→	Appropriate
- **Situation 2:** *"May I come in?"*
- **Responses :**

a) <i>"Of course"</i>	→	Less appropriate
b) <i>"Yes!"</i>	→	Appropriate
c) <i>"You are welcome"</i>	→	Appropriate

Asking for permission means expecting someone to agree to your request. In English, these expressions mostly use modal auxiliaries to show politeness, such as 'can I', 'do you mind', 'may I' or 'can I'. From data 1 the expression asking permission for situation 1 above answered *"not at all"* 2 respondents, while for *"ok"* there was 5 respondent and for *"yes of course"* there were 13 respondents.

While for the expression asking for permission for situation 2 above answered *"Of course"* 14 respondents, while for *"Yes!"* there was 3 respondents and for *"You are welcome"* there were 3 respondents. Therefore, were more respondents who chose the appropriate expression than the less appropriate one. It can be seen that 18 respondents chose the appropriate answer in situation 1 and there were 17 respondents in situation 2. While only a few chose the less appropriate answer, it can be seen that there were 2 respondents who chose less appropriate in situation 1 and there were 3 respondents in situation 2.

In responds the situation *"May I come in?"* most of the respondent chose *"Of course"* that is appropriate to the situation when asking permission to the person that the speaker know. The expression of *"You are welcome"* is also appropriate to used but only 3 respondents chose it. And utterance *"Yes!"* is not appropriate to the situation given. in

this question, it shows a formal situation, this can be seen in the word "*May I*", which is the appropriate answer, namely "*you are welcome*". Then the use of the expression asking permission that has been obtained from the test part 1, has no influence on English pragmatic competence even though there are different situations.

## Data 02

### Giving Suggestion

- **Situation 1:** "*I think I run out of papers*"
- **Responses :** a) "*Let's buy the new one!*" → Appropriate  
                   b) "*Why not buy some at the store*" → Less appropriate
- **Situation 2:** "*I'm afraid my mom will angry because I come home late*"
- **Responses :** a) "*It's better to say sorry*" → Appropriate  
                   b) "*why she is angry?*" → Less appropriate

Giving suggestion or advice means offering someone idea or plan to consider. According to Searle (1969) giving advice is a kinds of speech act which the speakers believe will benefit the hearer. He also makes distinction between advice and request as advising is more like telling what is the best for the person rather than what she/he would do. There were more respondents who chose the appropriate expression than the less appropriate one. From data 2 the expression giving suggestion for situation 1 above answered "*Let's buy the new one!*" 9 respondents, while for "*Why not buy some at the store*" there was 11 respondents.

While for the expression giving suggestion for situation 2 above answered "*it's better to say sorry*" 19 respondents, while for "*why she is angry*" there was 1 respondent. Therefore, were more respondents who chose the appropriate expression than the less appropriate one. It can be seen that 9 respondents chose the appropriate answer in situation 1 and there were 19 respondents in situation 2. While only a few chose the less appropriate answer, it can be seen that there were 11 respondents who chose less appropriate in situation 1 and there were 1 respondent in situation 2.

Based on the data analysis, from the situation given the respondent mostly understand how to use expression of giving suggestion but some of them also misunderstood to the expression. Few respondents chose and applied the expression of asking. They know the utterance of giving suggestion but confused when use it related to the situation.



**Data 03****Command**

- **Situation 1:** *"I cook some dish in the kitchen since morning"*
- **Responses :**
  - a) *"Eat your dinner now!"* —————> Appropriate
  - b) *Do you mind to eat your dinner?* —————> Less appropriate
  - c) *Eat now, Dad!"* —————> Less appropriate
- **Situation 2:** *"The exam is about to begin."*
- **Responses :**
  - a) *"Turn off your phone"* —————> Appropriate
  - b) *"let's do this"* —————> Appropriate
  - c) *"it's better to start now"* —————> Less appropriate

Command means telling someone to do something/controlling over someone. The expression of command is short and straightforward. The examples of command are *close the door!*, *sit down!* and *take it, please!*. They are expressed in imperative forms. From data 3 the expression command for situation 1 above answered *"Eat your dinner now!"* 8 respondents, while for *"Do you mind to eat your dinner?"* there was 8 respondent and for *"Eat now, Dad!"* there were 4 respondents.

While for the expression command for situation 2 above answered *"Turn off your phone"* 2 respondents, while for *"Let's do this"* there was 3 respondents and for *"It's better to start now"* there were 15 respondents. The results show that the respondents chose and used the less-appropriate expression to give command. It can be seen that 8 respondents chose the appropriate answer in situation 1 and there were 5 respondents in situation 2. While only a few chose the appropriate answer, it can be seen that there were 12 respondents who chose less appropriate in situation 1 and there were 15 respondents in situation 2.

From the 2 situations of command above, shows that many respondents are less appropriated based on the situation given. and only a few respondents chose the appropriate answer.

**Data 04****Inviting**

- **Situation 1:** *"I think I come late to school"*

- **Responses:** a) *"Get into the car, I get you there"* → Less appropriate  
c) *"Would you come to my car?"* → Appropriate
- **Situation 2:** *"Hey tomorrow is your wedding day"*
- **Responses:** a) *"Yes, would you like to come?"* → Less appropriate  
b) *"come and join my wedding party"* → Appropriate  
c) *"Please, come"* → Less appropriate

Inviting can be interpreted as an attempt to invite the recipient to attend or participate in a particular event or perform an action, which should be beneficial to him (Al-Darajji, Voon Foo, Ismail & Abdullah, 2013). From data 4 the expression inviting for situation 1 above answered *"Get into the car, I get you there"* 19 respondents and for *"Would you come to my car?"* there were 1 respondent.

While for the expression inviting for situation 2 above answered *"Yes, would you like to come?"* 1 respondent, while for *"Come and join my wedding party"* there was 18 respondents and for *"Please, come"* there were 1 respondent. There were more respondents who chose the appropriate expression than the less appropriate one. It can be seen that 19 respondents chose the appropriate answer in situation 1 and there were 18 respondents in situation 2. While only a few chose the less appropriate answer, it can be seen that there were 1 respondent who chose less appropriate in situation 1 and there were 2 respondents in situation 2.

From the data above, the respondents know how to inviting to the situation. They are use good words which is appropriate to the situation, it can be seen form the number of informants who choosing the right answer.

#### Data 05

##### Prohibition

- **Situation 1:** *"Hi Jenny, you are ... to submit assignments past the deadline"*
- **Responses :** a) *"not allowed"* → Appropriate  
b) *"not"* → Less appropriate  
c) *"can't"* → Less appropriate
- **Situation 2:** *" You...copy my exam answers"*
- **Responses :** a) *"Can't"* → Appropriate  
c) *"Not allowed"* → Less appropriate

Prohibition is a person uses the word "prohibit" to stop someone else from doing or breaking a rule. From data 5 the expression prohibition for situation 1 above answered "Not allowed" 15 respondents, while for "not" there were 3 respondents and for "Can't" there were 2 respondents.

While for the expression prohibition for situation 2 above answered "Can't" 19 respondents and for "not allowed" there were 1 respondent. There were more respondents who chose the appropriate expression than the less appropriate one. It can be seen that 15 respondents chose the appropriate answer in situation 1 and there were 19 respondents in situation 2. While only a few chose the less appropriate answer, it can be seen that there were 5 people who chose less appropriate in situation 1 and there were 1 respondent in situation 2.

The data show most of the respondent understand the way to use the expression of prohibition but just few of them misunderstood to the expression. It can be seen from the number of informants who choosing the appropriate answer in both of the situation.

#### b. The Data Findings from the Test in Part II

The results of the tests that were tested in part 2 have several expressions, namely asking permission, giving, command, inviting and prohibition.

#### Data 01

##### Asking Permission

- **Situation 1:** " When in class, your cell phone rings, then you ask permission to pick up the phone"
- **Responses:** "May I go out to pick up the phone?", "Excuse me sir, may I step outside for a moment to pick up this phone", "Excuse me, sir, can I pick up the phone?", "Excuse me sir, can i go to outside now? because this is urgent call from my mom", "Sir, Can I pick up this phone?", "May I be excuse Mr/mrs?", "Excuse me, sir, may I have permission to pick up the phone", "Sorry sir, could i pick up the phone", "I'm sorry miss, may i pick up my phone?", "Sorry miss, might I pick up the phone?", "May I pick my phone up, sir?"
- **Situation 2:** " When you are at your friend's house, and you ask permission to open the photo album that is on the table"

- **Responses** : *“May I go out to pick up the phone?”*, *“May I open this photo album?”*, *“Bro can I see your photo”*, *“May I open the album photo?”*, *“Mer, Can I open this album?”*, *“May I open your photo album?”*, *“Aisyah, can I see this photo album?”*, *“May i open the photo?”*, *“May I open it?”*, *“Hei. May I open the photo album?”*, *“May I open the photo album?”*, *“May I”*, *“I’m so great if you let me to open this photo album”*, *“May I see the photo album that is on the table”*, *“May i see your photo album”*, *“May I open the photo album”*.

The first expression is asking permission, from test part 2 which was carried out by 20 respondents. Respondents answered according to the situation prepared by the researcher. Based on the answered by the respondents, it can be seen that the respondents who answered the expressions were more less appropriate than those that were appropriate in situation 1. It was seen that there were 8 respondents who answered appropriate and 12 respondents who answered less appropriate. Then in situation 2 based the answered by the respondents, it can be seen that there were more respondents who answered appropriate expressions compared to those that were less appropriate in situation 2. It was seen that there were 17 respondents who answered appropriate and 3 respondent who answered less appropriate.

## **Data 02**

### **Giving Permission**

- **Situation 1** : *“You and your friends have finished doing the reading test and it turns out that the results you got were very bad”*
- **Responses** : *“what should I do to get a score like yours”*, *“I suggest myself to study harder”*, *“never give up”*, *“I think we must more study hard and practice”*, *“I suggest that we must study hard”*, *“You should study more”*, *“Please give advice guys”*, *“You need to practice more”*, *“I think we should study hard for the next reading test”*, *“Let’s study again”*, *“I suggest you to study hard”*, *“No problem. I have been trying”*, *“I must study hard”*, *“I will study harder”*, *“Maybe we should do better in next test”*, *“You have to study hard”*

- **Situation 2:** *"If your friend asked for suggestions on what to wear to her birthday party tonight"*
- **Responses :** *"wear what makes you confident", "I suggest you to wear formal clothes", "why not invite other friends", "I think you must wearing pink dress because thats so cute and beautiful when you wearing a dress", "How about wear this dress?", "It's better to wear red dress", "My advice is you just use that one", "The first dress is better to use tonight", "You can wear which can make you feel comfortable", "Just wearing which one make you comfort", "I suggest you to wear black and white dress", "You better wear this one", "I suggest you to wear beautiful dress to her birthday party", "try this dress", "I think you should wearing a dress", "It will be better of you wear this".*

The second expression is giving suggestion, respondents answered according to the situation prepared by the researcher. Based on the answered by the respondents, it can be seen that the respondents who answered the expressions were more less appropriate than those that were appropriate in situation 1. It was seen that there were 9 respondents who answered appropriate and 11 respondent who answered less appropriate. Then in situation 2, based the answered by the respondents, it can be seen that there were more respondents who answered appropriate expressions compared to those that were less appropriate in situation 2. It was seen that there were 19 respondents who answered appropriate and 1 respondent who answered less appropriate.

### **Data 03**

#### **Command**

- **Situation 1:** *"You are as the moderator in a group discussion but your friends are too noisy. You need to calm them down."*
- **Responses :** *"Silent please! Could you pay attention to the presenters?", "Silent please!!", "Excuse me...can you be quite please!", "Please friend, pay attention to the discussion", "Be quiet, please!", "Ladies and gentleman, better for US to give our attention for the presenter", "Could you", "Keep silent please", "Keep silent!", "Keep silent*

*please”, “Please don't be loud, we are presenting in front of here, please pay attention”.*

- **Situation 2:** *" You are in the room with the Air Conditioner and your friend suddenly comes in by letting the door open."*
- **Responses :** *“Ane, Close the door!”, “Don't enter to the room!!!”, “Would you mind to close the door because the AC is on”, “Hey, please close the door again”, “Can you just close the door?”, “Could you close the door, please”, “Can I”, “Please close the door”, “Close the door please”, “Hey, close the door”, “I'll call him, and tell him to close the door again”.*

The third expression is command, respondents answered according to the situation prepared by the researcher, based on the answered by the respondents, it can be seen that the respondents who answered the expressions were more less appropriate than those that were appropriate in situation 1. It was seen that there were 7 respondents who answered appropriate and 13 respondents who answered less appropriate. Then in situation 2, based the answered by the respondents, it can be seen that there were more respondents who answered appropriate expressions compared to those that were less appropriate in situation 2. It was seen that there were 14 respondents who answered appropriate and 6 respondent who answered less appropriate.

#### **Data 04**

##### **Inviting**

- **Situation 1:** *" You want to invite friends over for dinner at your house tonight"*
- **Responses :** *“Come have dinner at my house tonight”, “I want to invite you to have dinner at my house tonight”, “Would you like to have dinner with me”, “please come to my home tonight, we will have dinner together”, “Would you like to come to my house this night?”, “Please come to my house tonight for dinner”. “Are you available tonight”, “Would u join on my dinner tonight”, “Let's come to my house for dinner”, “Let's join dinner in my house tonight”, “Please, come to my house for dinner tonight”, “Come and have a dinner with me at my house”, “I invite you to have*

*dinner at my house tonight, I'm so happy if you're coming", "Please come", "Do you want to join in my dinner for tonight", "Would you like to come to my home for dinner?"*

- **Situation 2:** *" You want to invite your classmates to your brother's wedding"*
- **Responses :** *"let's go to my brother's wedding", "I invite you all to attend my brother's wedding", "your brother is having an event would you like to come", "Let's join to my brother wedding party", "I'm very happy if all of you come it", "I'd like you to come to my brother's wedding", "Come on, guys, come to my brother's wedding", "Will you come to my brother's wedding", "My brother invites us to his wedding party", "Guys, I invite you to come in my brother's wedding", "Please, come to my brother's wedding", "Come party with us at my brother's wedding", "I have invitation of My brother's wedding, come & join swith us", "Come and join my brother wedding party", "Would you come to my brother's wedding", "Could you like to come my brother's wedding".*

The fourth expression is inviting, from test part 2 which was carried out by 20 respondents. Respondents answered according to the situation prepared by the researcher, based the answered by the respondents, it can be seen that there were more respondents who answered appropriate expressions compared to those that were less appropriate in situation 1. It was seen that there were 19 respondents who answered appropriate and 1 respondent who answered less appropriate. Then in situation 2, based on the answered by the respondents, it can be seen that the respondents who answered the expressions were more less appropriate than those that were appropriate in situation 2. It was seen that there were 5 respondents who answered appropriate and 15 respondents who answered less appropriate.

#### **Data 05**

#### **Prohibition**

- **Situation 1:** *" When you see someone who wants to litter"*
- **Responses :** *"Hey, do not litter", "Don't throw trash there, it's not a trash"*

*can”, “do not throw garbage carelessly”, “Do not litter!!!”, “You can't do that, throw the trash in its place”, “Please! Throw the trash in the trash bin”, “Don't throw trash there”, “Sorry”, “Excuse me, this is not your home that you can throw everything carelessly”, “No no, you should throw it in the trash”, “No littering, please”, “Better you throw trash in the trash”, “Don't put the litter everywhere” “Not allowed”, “Throw you litter in the box”, “Don't litter”*

- **Situation 2:** *“When you see your classmates eating during class, even though it's not allowed”*
- **Responses :** *“Eat it later, wait until class is over”, “Please don't eat in class, obey the school rules”, “don't eat in class it's impolite”, “Don't eating!! This is impolite”, “You can't do it”, “Eating are not allowed during the lesson”, “Please, if you can, don't eat during class, you will be scolded later”, “Better you to do not eat during class”, “You can't eat during the class, just get out if you want to eat”, “Hei, don't. Its still learning”, “It is not allowed to eat in the class”, “Better you eat in the canteen”, “Don't eat in during class”, “Not allowed”, “If you want to eat you may eat in outside”, “Don't eat during class”.*

The last expression is prohibition, respondents answered according to the situation prepared by the researcher, based the answered by the respondents, it can be seen that there were more respondents who answered appropriate expressions compared to those that were less appropriate in situation 1. It was seen that there were 17 respondents who answered appropriate and 3 respondent who answered less appropriate. Then in situation 2 based on the answered by the respondents, it can be seen that the respondents who answered the expressions were more less appropriate than those that were appropriate in situation 2. It was seen that there were 6 respondents who answered appropriate and 14 respondent who answered less appropriate.

c. The Data Findings from the Test in Part III

The results of the tests that were tested in part III have several expressions, namely asking permission, giving, command, inviting and prohibition. The expression



of asking permission, the expression that is often used is *"may I"*, there were 10 respondents who chose the expression, then for the expression command, the expression that was often used, namely *"please be careful"*, there were 12 respondents who chose the expression, then for the expression giving, the expression that was often used, namely *"you should..."*, there were 12 respondents who chose the expression, then for the expression inviting, the expression that is often used is *"come and join the party"* which chose the expression, there were 19 respondents and for the expression prohibition, the expression that was often used, namely *"cannot"*, which chose the expression, there were 19 respondents.

Meanwhile, for expressions that are less used, such as expressions of permission asking, expressions that are rarely used, namely *"would it be alright if I..."* who chose the expression, there were 12 respondents, then the expression command, the expression that was rarely used, namely *"it's better to..."*, who chose the expression, there were 12 respondents, then the expression giving suggestion, the expression that was rarely used, namely *"you ought to..."*, who chose the expression, there were 10 respondents, the expression inviting, the expression that was rarely used, namely *"we would be delighted if you..."*, there was one respondent who chose the expression and for the expression a prohibition is an expression that is rarely used, namely *"be prohibited"* who chose this expression, there was 1 respondent. Therefore, the most selected expressions are inviting and prohibition expressions, while expressions that are less used are asking permission and command expressions.

### ➤ **The Influence of English Pragmatic Competence in Directive Act to Col Language Speakers**

The Influence of English pragmatic competence occurs when the students were influenced by their native language and culture, oftentimes, a negative pragmatic transfer occurred, which would lead to pragmatic failure both at pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic level in a cross-culture communication (Hamdani, 2019). In this research there were negative pragmatic transfer expressions that occurred, the following expressions were found;

In asking permission, there were several respondents who chose negative diversions L1 and L2 into English productions, as in situations 1 and 2 there were only

20 respondents who chose negative transfer, with a frequency of 25%. This is evidenced from the results of interviews that have been conducted such as:

- **Researcher:** "How to say asking permission in Col language"
- **Respondent:** "*Mak, ku nak kelekho dai dengan wat ku, minta izin dai boleh dak?*" (Mother, I want to go with my friend, may I permission to go)

From the results of the interviews that have been conducted, the *Col* language speakers speak politely and appropriately and the *Col* language speakers look at the other person he is talking to. This shows that there is no negative transfer influence from the *Col* language speakers to English production.

In giving suggestion, there were several respondents who chose negative diversions L1 and L2 into English productions, as in situations 1 and 2 there were only 24 answered who chose negative transfer, with a frequency of 30%. This is evidenced from the results of interviews that have been conducted such as:

- **Researcher:** "How to say giving suggestion in Col language"
- **Respondent:** "*men saran ku ni, dak usah gin gah get u oi, dak baek*" (My suggestion, don't do it again, because it's not good)

From the results of the interviews that have been conducted, the *Col* language speakers speak politely and appropriately. This shows that there is no negative transfer influence from the *Col* language speakers to English production.

In command, there were respondents who chose negative diversions L1 and L2 into English productions, as in situations 1 and 2 there were 46 answered who chose negative transfer, with a frequency of 57,5%. This is evidenced from the results of interviews that have been conducted such as:

- **Researcher:** "How to say command in Col language"
- **Respondent:** "*cube nga pegi dai, ku nak ngomong dengan kawan ku kak*" (Go first, I want to talk to my friend)

From the results of the interviews that have been conducted, this shows that there is a slight transfer of negative influence from *Col* language speakers to English production because *Col* language speakers when giving command are more to the point and a little impolite.

In inviting, there were several respondents who chose negative diversions L1 and L2 into English productions, as in situations 1 and 2 there were only 19 answered

who chose negative transfer, with a frequency of 23,75%. This is evidenced from the results of interviews that have been conducted such as:

- **Researcher:** "How to say inviting in Col language"
- **Respondent:** "*jadi gi kak, rumahku ni malam gek ade orgen nga datang umahku*" (So, tonight there will be a party at my house, come to my house)

From the results of the interviews that have been conducted, the *Col* language speakers speak politely and appropriately. This shows that there is no negative transfer influence from the *Col* language speakers to English production.

In prohibition, there were several respondents who chose negative diversions L1 and L2 into English productions, as in situations 1 and 2 there were only 23 answered who chose negative transfer, with a frequency of 28,75%. This is evidenced from the results of interviews that have been conducted such as:

- **Researcher:** "How to say prohibition in Col language"
- **Respondent:** "*dak dak dak, jengan gi, dak baek tu*"  
(No, don't do that again, it's no good)

From the results of the interviews that have been conducted, the *Col* language speakers speak politely and appropriately. This shows that there is no negative transfer influence from the *Col* language speakers to English production.

## CONCLUSION

The pragmatic competence of *Col* language speakers who use their directive acts is better understood because respondents understand the appropriate use of language in different situations. The tests that have been carried out show that many of the respondents' answers are appropriate. It can be concluded that *Col* language speakers in Lubuklinggau speak more than one language including English as a foreign language. The results of this study indicate that most of the respondents gave appropriate responses to the given situation. they understand how to use appropriate expressions in formal and informal situations even though some respondents answered less appropriate.

The interference of L1 and L2 knowledge is identified in the analysis. There are some mistakes and misunderstandings to the given situation. Errors in the use of expressions in some formal situations. However, it does not occur significantly because

pragmatic competence errors are found infrequently because almost all expressions there is no significant negative transfer from L1 and L2 production to English, because all proportions below 50% except 57,5% command expressions have little influence on production English. These errors were found in the use of expressions in several formal situations, but they were not significant because there were not many pragmatic competence errors found and also this is caused by several factors that affect the language interference of Col speakers of English pragmatic competence found in this research, such as multilingualism of speakers (speakers speak more than one language), familiarity with L1/L2 (speakers mostly use L1/L2 in public domain) and knowledge of the cultural differences between English and L1/L2.

## **SUGGESTION**

This research was expected to provide an additional teaching material for lecturer so that it can be used for teaching English pragmatic especially about directive act and the researcher suggests the students to give some information and knowledge about linguistic study, especially in English pragmatic. The result of the research can enrich students' knowledge about English pragmatic especially directive act.

## **REFERENCES**

- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: *Study design and implementation for novice researchers*. The qualitative report, 13(4), 543-559
- Della, F., & Sembiring, B. (2018). an Analysis of Directive Speech Acts By Searle Theory in "Sleeping Beauty" Movie Script. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 2(1), 22–27. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jeeet.2.1.22-27>
- Fitria, T. N. (2019). An Analysis of Directive Speech Act Found in "Koi Mil Gaya" Movie. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1(2), 89–99. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v1i2.89-99>
- Hamdani, B. (2019). *Pragmatic Competence Among Efl Learners*. 31–38.
- Iloafu, L. E. K. (2016). The Role of Effective Communication in Strategic Management of Organizations. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 6(12), 93–99. [http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol\\_6\\_No\\_12\\_December\\_2016/10.pdf](http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_6_No_12_December_2016/10.pdf)
- Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic Competence and Adult L2 Acquisition: Speech Acts in

- Interlanguage. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(3), 279–289.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1989.tb06364.x>
- Lestari, D. E. (2017). *Teaching Pragmatics to Indonesian Learners of English*. 1(2), 1–14.
- Castillo, J. (2015). The Speech Act as an Act of Knowing. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3(6), 31. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.s.2015030601.15>
- Mayanto, D. (2016). The Students' English Pragmatic Competence in Understanding Crosscultural Communication: a Study At Xi Grade Student of SMK Negeri 1 Batulayar. *Lingual: Journal of Language and Culture*, 1(1), 1–18.  
<https://doi.org/10.24843/ljlc.2016.v01.i01.p01>
- Obidovna, D. Z. (2022). *International Journal of Pedagogics The Concepts of Politeness in Modern Linguopragmatics : The Politeness Principle by J . Leech International Journal of Pedagogics*. 02(11), 15–20.
- Sari, I. F. (2020). The Speech Act of Cartoon Movie: Spongebob Squarepants' The Movie. *Linguists : Journal Of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 6(1), 126.  
<https://doi.org/10.29300/ling.v6i1.2854>
- Seli, S., Arma, L. R., & Syafitri, D. (2021). Language Choice and Attitude Among Native Lubuklinggau Community. *EDULIA: English Education, Linguistic and Art Journal*, 1(2), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.31539/edulia.v1i2.2348>
- Seli, S., & Kristi, S. (2020). Language Choice and Attitude in Sumatran-Javanese Inter-marriage Families in Relation to Language Maintenance in Lubuklinggau. *Journal of English Education Literature and Linguistics*, 3(1), 116–130. <https://ojs.stkippgri-lubuklinggau.ac.id/index.php/JEELL/article/view/897>
- Swarniti, N. W. (2023). A Pragmatic Analysis of Illocutionary Act Used in Valley of The Lanterns Movie. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling (JPDK)*, 5(1), 883-891.
- Xafizovna, R. N., & Boboqulovna, X. M. (2022). Politeness in Literary Works: An Overview. *Eurasian Research Bulletin*, 7(1973), 200–206.  
<https://www.geniusjournals.org/index.php/erb/article/view/1300>.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Hongkong; Oxford University Press.