Re-Examining the Indonesian Language Pragmatic Abilities of Students Majoring in Hospitality as a Basis for Exploring Students' Intercultural Abilities in Japanese

Devita Widyaningtyas Yogyanti[1]
Dwi Iswahyuni [2]
Angela Bayu Pertama Sari [3]

[123] Universitas Bina Sarana Informatika, Indonesia
[1]devita.ded@bsi.ac.id
[2] dwi.dhs@bsi.ac.id
[3] angela.abp@bsi.ac.id

Abstract

This research focuses on the intercultural competence of Japanese language students majoring in hospitality at three vocational schools in Yogyakarta. To be able to find out students' intercultural competence, a contrastive analysis method is used regarding politeness strategies in the context of greeting guests, asking the guest's name, asking for general information, rejecting the guest's wishes, asking for something from the guest and confirming. There are three things compared in this research, namely, politeness strategies in Indonesian sentences made by students, politeness strategies in Japanese sentences from native Japanese and the suitability of Indonesian translations into Japanese made by students. Brown and Levenson's face-threatening act (FTA) management theory was used as the theoretical basis for this research. The research results show that politeness strategies in the mother tongue do influence how students translate. In general, there are many similarities in strategies between Indonesian and Japanese regarding politeness strategies in the hospitality context. The similarity of these strategies will make it easier for students to achieve intercultural competence. It is just that a lack of linguistic ability still causes pragmalingustic failure and sociopragmatic failure. Furthermore, the difference in strategy is that the use of bald on record in Indonesian produces a bald on record translation in Japanese, which causes sociopragmatic failure.

Keywords: Hospitality, Politeness Strategy, Pragmatic failure.

Introduction

Teaching Japanese in the hospitality department, especially in Yogyakarta, has long experienced stagnation due to various obstacles such as a lack of reference books, limited class hours and inadequate teaching skills. To be able to serve guests well, hospitality graduate students are expected to communicate in a foreign language well, even in a simple way. So far, teachers have used the grammar-translation method approach in classroom teaching. However, this approach does not produce the expected

results because, in reality, the majority of students are still unable to produce utterances in Japanese, even with simple grammar. This condition is exacerbated by a lack of understanding regarding the communication norms of Japanese society, which means that even students who master grammar are still unable to use Japanese well. For this reason, a new approach is needed in teaching Japanese for hospitality majors in Yogyakarta, namely by integrating intercultural competence in teaching.

Intercultural competence refers to the ability to communicate, interact and work effectively with individuals from different cultural backgrounds. This ability includes understanding differences in values, beliefs, practices and habits in communicating in order to avoid misunderstandings and increase mutual respect (Almashhadani & Almashhadani, 2023). Lack of intercultural competence will cause failure, which is called pragmatic failure. Pragmatic failure is divided into two types, namely pragmatic failure and sociopragmatic failure. Pragmalingustic failure is a failure that occurs because an utterance does not match the way the native speaker expresses the utterance, while sociopragmatic failure is a failure that occurs because an utterance does not match the socio-cultural context of the native speaker (Yao, 2020). Therefore, understanding how Japanese people communicate is more important than mastering grammar. Because cultural misunderstandings cause more fatal consequences than grammatical mistakes (Mirkovic & Simic, 2019).

In connection with politeness strategies, Brown and Levinson came up with the idea of the Face Threatening Act, which is any action that can threaten the face of the speaker or interlocutor. So, it could be said that all forms of impoliteness are a form of face-threatening act. For this reason, Brown and Levinson created four basic strategies, which they claim are universal strategies for overcoming FTAs. These strategies are (1) bald-on-record, (2) positive politeness, (3) negative politeness, and (4) off-record. Bald on record refers to communication efficiency that prioritizes the effectiveness of conveying information, positive politeness refers to an FTA management strategy that is carried out by fulfilling the interlocutor's desire to feel appreciated or liked, negative politeness refers to an FTA management strategy that is carried out to minimize imposition by maintaining social distance between interlocutor so as not to cross territorial boundaries, and off record is an FTA management strategy carried out by conveying intentions in a very implicit way in order to minimize FTA (Brown and Levinson as cited in Koper 2015). However, the complexity of hierarchical Japanese society gave rise to a variety of polite language known as Keigo. Keigo is a variety of language that must be used to fulfil the social norms that apply in Japanese society and is a very complex language system (Dewi & Robihim, 2019).

In relation to Keigo (Matsumoto, 1988) believes that Brown and Levinson's politeness strategy cannot be applied in Japanese linguistics. He claims that negative politeness is a foreign concept to Japanese people because Japanese people actually do not consider maintaining territorial boundaries to be important. What Japanese people care about is their position in social relations and how they can be accepted in the social environment. Therefore, Keigo, as a type of language, is used to maintain a person's position in relation to other people.

It has been said before that grammar translation in Japanese language teaching in the hospitality department has reached a dead end. Therefore, considering that the hotel industry is an industry that places great emphasis on politeness in communication, intercultural material related to the communication norms of Japanese society, which is full of politeness, should receive a large portion in the teaching process. However, this is not easy considering that politeness in Japanese is closely related to polite language (Keigo), which is advanced Japanese language material. Of course, this material has yet to be given to students majoring in hospitality, the majority of whom are elementary-level students who do not even know Japanese at all. So, how can someone understand politeness strategies if they do not have sufficient linguistic skills?

For this reason, we need to return to the most basic things, namely the pragmatic ability of the mother tongue, because this will determine success in the foreign language acquisition process. The similarities and differences in politeness strategies between the mother tongue and the target language need to be analyzed as a basis for understanding communication culture. All similarities will facilitate the acquisition of intercultural competence, and all differences will become challenges that must be overcome. However, apart from comparing strategies, the thing that needs to be emphasized in this research is that, as stated in (Ide, 1989) Keigo will not be considered a form of strategy because strategy and Keigo as a formal variety are two different things, and in Japanese society, Keigo as an effort to fulfil social norms. Therefore, students' inability to make Keigo will not be discussed in this research. The strategy referred to in this research is primarily about diversity in ways of conveying meaning, for example, through modifying sentence forms, modifying words or the content of the speech itself. In this case, the types of strategies will still be divided according to the politeness strategy of Brown and Levinson. In the case of translation errors, the error will not be discussed from the absence of Keigo in the student's translated sentence but rather from what might have caused the translation error to occur, namely whether the error arose because there was an error in the politeness strategy in the Indonesian language they used or was it just a general error. Beginners regarding grammar are relatively easier to improve as their linguistic abilities improve.

Regarding students' Japanese language skills, there is previous research that highlights the mistakes students make when doing role plays with the theme of serving guests in a restaurant. Students are given several different scenario texts to practice. In this research, it was discovered that students often made mistakes in intonation and gestures which were caused by different cultural factors (Wijayanti et al., 2022). Another study used 30 student essays as research samples to analyze student errors at the lexical level. From this research, it is known that the lexical errors made by students are spread across all lexical classes. The causes of these errors are mother tongue interference, lack of diction, lack of understanding regarding the use of personal pronouns and the large number of Japanese vocabulary words that have similar sounds making them difficult to memorize. Audio-visual vocabulary teaching is recommended to overcome these errors (Harisal et al., 2022). Another research is research regarding the mistakes that students often make in explaining words related to tourism using

Japanese. In explaining a word concept in Japanese, students generally make many grammatical errors. In this case, the self-explain method is recommended as a way to overcome these errors (Keeratinanwattana, 2022). These studies tend to only focus on the grammatical level but have not penetrated to the pragmatic level.

Therefore, by using students majoring in hospitality, this research is likely to expand the study of elementary level learners' Japanese language skills. This research will focus on the scope of pragmatics to explore the potential for intercultural competence of elementary level Japanese language learners. The Indonesian sentences written by the students on the test sheet will be used to determine the pragmatic abilities of their mother tongue, namely in terms of communication strategies related to language politeness. Next, these strategies will be compared with Japanese communication strategies used by native Japanese as the target language to see the similarities and differences between the two different cultures. In the next stage, Japanese sentences from native Japanese will be compared again with the results of the students' Japanese translations to see the location of pragmatic failure, which can have fatal consequences if the errr is in the form of socio-pragmatic failure and errors which are relatively easier to overcome by increasing linguistic skills if This error is in the form of pragmalingustic failure (Stukan, 2018). In this way, a more appropriate Japanese language learning evaluation strategy will be found for elementary-level Japanese language learners.

Method

This research was a qualitative descriptive study (Adlini et al., 2022) which aimed to portray a unique phenomenon that occurs in the field of Japanese language teaching for students majoring in Hospitality. The respondents of this research were 30 students who were a combination of students majoring in Hospitality at Diploma III level at Bina Sarana Informatika University and class XI students at Ambarrukmo Vocational School. In this case, the level of education was not an issue because both students and students were elementary level Japanese language learners. The primary data source for this research was the results of tests carried out by respondents in writing. This research was carried out through the following procedures:

1. Respondents were asked to fill in the conversation text with a hospitality context. Namely filling the conversation with the role of hotel staff using Japanese and Indonesian. They were expected to be able to translate Indonesian expressions into Japanese according to the material they had studied. Students were allowed not to translate everything and only what they could. Students were also allowed to leave the translation section blank if they did not know the Japanese translation at all.
2. The same conversation text was sent to 3 Japanese natives. The test was then filled in with appropriate answers by Japanese natives (answers from natives were verified using Japanese for Hotel Staff and Japanese for Hotel Staff lessons from YouTube because the three natives were not hotel practitioners).

3. Indonesian sentences, translations from students and sentences from native Japanese were then codified and categorized according to the communication strategies they used.
4. Communication strategies in Indonesian contained in Indonesian sentences compared to communication strategies in Japanese
5. Translations from students and natives were then compared
6. The student's Japanese translation was verified as a native to find out the impression of Japanese people if a hotel staff answers with an answer as written by the student. This step was carried out to be able to determine the type of pragmatic failure in student translations.

Result

Based on 303 Indonesian utterances produced by students, it was discovered that 300 utterances (99.01%) used appropriate communication strategies in terms of politeness. However, there were three utterances (0.99%) that used the wrong communication strategy. The following are incorrect communication strategies in Indonesian:

a. *Jam sarapan tepat jam 7 pagi. Apabila Anda butuh bantuan silakan panggil saya* *Apakah kamu tidak mengerti?* (data 21.10)

b. *Jika tidak ada lagi saya tinggal ya, selamat sore* (data 22.12)

c. *Selamat tinggal kawan* (data 22.18)

The three statements above are answers written by students in the context of a conversation serving hotel guests. The underlined part is an impolite expression used towards guests in Indonesian communication culture. Errors like this should also be given special attention because they can have an impact on students' translation results.

Furthermore, regarding translation, it is known that the majority of students have yet to be able to translate the Indonesian sentences they make into Japanese. Of the 30 students with 303 utterances produced, only 30 utterances (9.9%) were indicated to have been done without translation aids. A total of 92 utterances (30.3%) were not translated. The remaining 182 utterances (60.06%) indicated that they were done using Google Translate. Speech that is indicated to be self-translated is known from the simplicity of the sentences using sentence patterns that have been taught, while translations that are indicated to be the result of Google Translate are known from the complexity of Japanese sentences, sentence patterns that have not been taught, and translation oddities.

Initially, the researchers hoped that students could translate sentences using the basic grammar they had learned because all the test questions could basically be translated using basic Japanese sentence patterns. However, in reality, students actually write Indonesian sentences that are quite complex, so they have difficulty translating them into simple Japanese sentences. In the end, even though they had been given instructions not to use tools, the students still entered their sentences into Google Translate and produced Japanese sentences that were unnatural and even unacceptable. Students who complied with the instructions ultimately chose to leave the translation section blank.

The following (example a) is an example of a student translation using Google Translate, and (example b) is a translation without Google Translate that several students successfully wrote. For the translation of Google Translate results, the researcher entered translations that were deemed strange and re-entered the Indonesian language written by the students into Google Translate for validation. Here is an example:

a. *Selamat siang, ada yang bisa saya bantu? Atas nama dengan siapa?* (data 13.4)
   '*Konnichiwa, nanika otetsudai dekimasu ka. Dare no kawari ni?*'

Gambar 1. Validasi Google Translate

b. *Baik, atas nama siapa?* (data 1.8)
   Hai, namae wa dare desu ka.

The Japanese translation sentences selected to be used as data samples in the discussion section are, as far as possible, taken from the results of independent translations. Sample translations from Google Translate used in the discussion section are only included if there is no independent translation data in a test section.

Discussion
Comparison of Native Indonesian and Native Japanese Politeness Strategies in the Hospitality Context

Before going into the discussion part, it is necessary to understand that Keigo as a formal form is always closely related to socio-pragmatic conformity. Accuracy in the use of honorifics is a socio-pragmatic obligation and a grammatical obligation (Ide, 1989). Therefore, if we look at the students' inability to produce Keigo, the students' main failure in translation is socio-pragmatic. However, because, as previously stated, Keigo is not the main focus of this research, pragmatic failure will be seen more from the choice of words, use of hedges, sentence form and the content of the sentence itself. Following is the discussion.

In the following discussion, the researchers described seven speech acts, which are a summary of the test questions, which include greeting guests, asking for names, asking for other information, asking for something from guests, conveying information and confirming.

Greeting guests

In the context of greeting guests, the politeness strategies used are the same. Both native Indonesians and native Japanese use positive strategies, namely by greeting, introducing themselves and offering help to guests. Giving a welcome greeting is used to make guests feel welcomed and accepted at the hotel. Introducing yourself is done as an effort to build intimacy with guests while offering help shows your readiness to accept guests as part of the hotel. The following are examples of utterances and translations written by students:

a. *Selamat pagi, Diamond hotel dengan Biwi. Ada yang bisa saya bantu?* (data 1.4)
   'Ohayou gozaimasu, Diamond hoteru, watashi wa Biwi desu.'
   (good morning, Diamond hotel, I'm Biwi).

b. *Selamat siang, dengan Affri ada yang bisa dibantu?* (data 1,8)
   'Konnichiwa, nan desu ka.'
   (Good afternoon, what's up?)

Berikut adalah contoh tuturan dari *native* Jepang:

c. *Odenwa arigatou gozaimasu. Kochira Okinawa hoteru de gozaimasu.* (data a.3)
   'Terimakasih sudah menelepon. Ini adalah hotel Okinawa'.

d. *Konnichiwa, goyouken wo oukagai itashimasu.* (data a.1)
   ' Selamat siang, (saya) akan menanyakan keperluan (Anda)?'

Translation contains pragmalinguistic failure, which occurs due to the use of sentence expressions that could be more natural in the context of serving guests. A sentence like this will only sound strange to Japanese people because the meaning is not very understandable, but it is not a meaningful FTA because the sentence uses the appropriate honorific form. On the other hand, translation b contains sociopragmatic failure due to the sentence *"nan desu ka"*, which would sound rude in a hospitality context. Sentences like this will cause guests to be reluctant to stay at the hotel.

Asking Guests' Name

In asking guests' names, differences in communication strategies were found, which could cause friction in communication. About 50% of students use the Bald on record strategy to ask for names. In other words, bald on record means speech that is spoken without using politeness strategies (Musyafa'ah et al., 2022). With this strategy, students ask the guest's name directly and explicitly. This method is correct in terms of communication norms in Indonesia (Dwijayanti et al., 2021). In communication norms in Indonesia, the use of this strategy starts from the idea that asking a guest's name is done based on the guest's interests because the name is important information in the reservation process. These considerations make students feel that there is no need to make FTA management efforts. Examples of speech and translations written by students include:

a. *Baik, untuk reservasi atas nama siapa?* (data 2.1)
   'Hai, yoyaku dare?'
   (OK, whose reservation?)

b. *Baik, atas nama siapa saya berbicara?* (data 2.4)

    '*Hai, watashi wa dare ni mukatte hanashite iru no desu ka.*'

    (OK, who am I talking to?)

Then, compare it with examples of speech from native Japanese:

  c. *Onamae o <u>oukagaiitashimasu.</u>* (data b.1)

    '(Saya) akan menanyakan nama (Anda)'.

  d. *Goyoyakusha sama no namae wo <u>okikase itadakemasu, deshou ka</u>*. (data b.2)

    '(Saya) akan menerima perintah tuan yang melakukan reservasi (Anda) untuk menanyakan   namanya (bisakah demikian)?

      When asking for names, Japanese natives seem very careful. For this reason, native Japanese use an off record strategy by changing interrogative sentences into declarative sentences so that their speech becomes very indirect. Apart from that, to make it more polite, deshouka hedges are also added to give the impression of uncertainty so that input from the guest is required.

      It can be seen that the use of bald on record in Indonesian causes students to use direct interrogative sentence forms in their translation. This difference in communication strategy will cause sociopragmatic failure because questions that are too direct are considered impolite in Japanese communication norms (Scroope, 2021). Furthermore, the word urgency to include the object (you) in the Indonesian sense causes the use of the word "dare" as the only word known by students to translate the word "you". In fact, "dare" used in the two sentences above is also unacceptable in this context because it would sound impolite. Therefore, teachers must explain the word "dare" from a cultural perspective, not just as a direct translation of the word who. Translation b, which is a translation from Google Translate, also cannot be understood by native Japanese, causing pragmalinguistic failure.

    However, the other 50% of students have the same politeness strategy as Japanese natives, namely using negative strategies. Japanese students and natives use negative strategies by changing imperative sentences into requests or permission and also using hedges in the form of an apology at the beginning of the sentence. The following is an example of a student's speech:

  a. *Baik, <u>tolong</u> sebutkan nama Anda* (data 2.5)

    '*Hai, oname <u>onegaishimasu.</u>*'

    (OK, please mention your name)

  b. *Baik, <u>mohon maaf bolehkah</u> saya tahu nama Anda?*

    '*Hai, <u>sumimasen</u>, o namae o choodai <u>shitemo yoroshii deshou ka</u>.*'

    (OK, sorry, would you mind if I asked your name?)

    Below are the examples of native Japanese speech:

  c. *<u>Osoreirimasu</u>. Onamae wo <u>onegaiitashimasu</u>*. (data b.4)

   <u>Maaf</u> (saya takut Anda kurang berkenan). <u>Tolong </u>sebutkan namanya'

      Students' understanding of the use of the request form makes students include *"onegaishimasu"* and *"yoroshii deshou ka"* in their translation. It is just that students have not been able to convey it in a form that sounds natural to Japanese people, giving rise to pragmalingustic failure in the translation.

Suppose there are variations of this kind of strategy. In that case, the teacher should clearly explain the urgency of using negative strategies in asking for names and explain why the bald on record strategy, which is usually used in Indonesia, cannot be applied in Japanese, especially in a hotel context. The use of an off record strategy type like the example above must also be introduced, considering that this strategy is not a common strategy used in Indonesia.

Asking for other information (length of stay, number of guests, room type)

There are similarities and differences in politeness strategies in asking for other information such as duration of stay, number of guests and room type. Bald on record strategies, positive strategies and negative strategies are used by students, while Japanese natives only use positive strategies and negative strategies. In this context, the use of bald on record by the majority of students (50%) can be understood because it departs from communication norms in Indonesia, which prioritize effectiveness and clarity in communication (Meiratnasari et al., 2019). Important questions, for example, asking for information that is important for a reservation, must be asked clearly to avoid misunderstandings that are detrimental to guests. The following are examples of student speech and translation:

a. *Baik, untuk berapa malam?* (data 3.3)
  'Hai, nanpaku desu ka.'
  (well, how many nights?)
b. *Baik, rencana menginap ada berapa orang?(*data 4.2)
  Hai, otomaritai kata wa nanmei desu ka.
  (OK, how many people who will stay?)

As the previous discussion, the use of the bald on record strategy in Indonesian causes students to make Japanese sentences in interrogative form. Although in other contexts, translations made by students are acceptable, in the hospitality context, such overly direct forms of interrogative sentences can be seen as impolite, giving rise to sociopragmatic failure.

Something is interesting about the politeness strategy in Indonesian, namely always mentioning the guest's name or including a nickname in every sentence, which is a negative strategy. Mentioning names or adding nicknames in the Indonesian sense is used to respect the person you are talking to by adding intimacy. Repetition of a name will give the impression that the speaker is interested in the person he is talking to because he can remember their name. One of these strategies appears in the context of asking for other information. As many as 31.25% of students added names or nicknames such as "Bapak." at the end of sentences to show respect for guests. As in the example below:

a. *Baik <u>Bapak Kimura</u>, untuk hari apa Anda akan check in?*
  Hai, <u>Kimura san</u>, nan nichi taizai shimasu ka.

It can be seen that this habit was carried over into Japanese translation. Students add "Kimura san" to their sentences. Habits like this are also common in other contexts, such as the following:

Examples in other contexts:

 b. *Mohon maaf <u>Bapak</u>* (data 3.3)

  Sumimasen <u>san</u>,

  (Maaf, -)

 c. *Selamat pagi, Apakah dengan <u>Kakak</u> Sunandar?* (data 18.8)

  Ohayou gozaimasu, <u>onisan</u>

  (Good morning, Mister)

   In these two examples, it can also be seen that there is an urgency in the students' minds to add a call to the sentence with the appearance of the word "*san*" and the word "*onisan*". Meanwhile, Japanese natives often omit or deliberately do not mention the second person in sentences, which can be categorized as a negative strategy (Brown and Levinson as cited in Yogyanti 2015), like the statements below:

 d. *<u>Gotaizai</u> kikan wa <u>ikaga</u> <u>itashimasu</u>ka* (data c.1)

  'Durasi menginapnya (berkenan) bagaimana?'

 e. *<u>Oheya</u> no taipu wa <u>ikaga</u> <u>nasaimasu</u> ka?* (data e.2)

 'Tipe kamarnya (berkenan) bagaimana?'

 In general, this kind of error will only cause pragmalingustic failure because it sounds unnatural and different from the habits of native speakers. However, as in example c, using the word *"onisan"* as a sense of urgency to translate the word *"Kakak"* can cause sociopragmatic failure. In Japanese, the word onisan itself can be used in several different contexts, but in relation to guest service, this word is the word that night entertainment workers will use to address customers. Of course, this kind of error will have fatal consequences if it is used to serve guests at the hotel.

 The similarity between Japanese students and natives in the context of asking for other information is in the use of negative strategies. In this case, both students and native Japanese use hedges and more indirect sentences to refine their speech. Unfortunately, this strategy is only used by 18.75% of students, the least among the other two strategies. The following is an example of a student's speech:

 a. *Baik, untuk berapa orang <u>kalau boleh saya tahu</u>* (data 4.7)

  'Hai, kata wa nanmei desu ka'

  (OK, how many people?)

 For example, a, the lack of a collection of Japanese expressions causes students to refrain from using hedges in their translations, which results in translations using interrogative forms that are too direct. If we look at the Indonesian language, students have understood the concept of using hedges as a politeness strategy, but their lack of linguistic ability causes pragmalingustic failure to appear by using ordinary interrogative sentences in the translation. Below is the correct use of hedges in Japanese:

 b. *Goshukuhaku wa nanmei sama <u>deshou ka</u>* (data d.3)

  '(Yang) menginap berapa orang, <u>ya? (saya ingin tahu)</u>'

 c. *Itsu gokibou <u>deshouka</u>.* (data c.4)

  ' Kapan <u>kah</u> harapan (Anda) untuk menginap? <u>(saya ingin tahu)</u>'

Furthermore, students attempt to apply negative strategies by making sentences more indirect, which makes it seem as if an activity is more focused on themselves, not on the person they are talking to, for example, as follows:

d. *Baik, <u>boleh dibantu</u> untuk pemesanan selama berapa malam?* (data 3. 6)

(The student did not translate this sentence)

In example d, "*boleh dibantu*" is a strategy used by students to make the sentence indirect. This phrase makes it seem like he is the one who needs help as a form of respect for the guest. Unfortunately, students have not been able to translate sentences like this. Native Japanese also apply the same strategy in this context. Here is an example:

e. Nanmeisama de <u>goyoyaku itashimasuka</u> (data d.1)

' *Berapa orang yang akan (saya) reservasikan?*'

In example e, the Japanese native makes a sentence that seems to focus more on himself and not on the guest by using "goyoyaku itashimasu" (I will make a reservation).

Rejecting guests' wishes

To reject guests' wishes, in this case, rejecting the request for a room they want to reserve because the room is not available, 100% of Japanese students and natives have the same strategy, namely using a combination of negative and positive strategies. Rejecting a guest's wishes begins with an apology, which is a negative strategy, and then continues with giving reasons. As many as 50% of students added offers. The following are statements from students:

a. *Mohon maaf.* (negative strategy: apologizing)

'*Sumimasen*',

(Sorry)

Untuk tipe kamar deluxe kami saat ini sedang penuh (positive strategy: giving reason)

'*derakusu no heya ga ja arimasen*'

(It is not a deluxe room)

Apakah Anda berkenan di tipe single? (positive strategy: offering)

'*dou desu ka.*'

(How?)

(data 6.1)

b. *Maaf,* (negative strategy: apologizing)

'*Sumimasen*'

(Sorry)

Untuk hari kamis sampai minggu tipe deluxe tidak tersedia (positive strategy: giving reason)

'*Mokuyoubi kara nichi youbi made derakusu no heya ga arimasen.*'

(from Thursday to Sunday there are no deluxe rooms)

(data 6.4)

In examples a and b, students use the word *"sumimasen",* which is not appropriate to the hotel context. This word does not show a deep sense of regret, so it is still considered impolite in a hospitality context. It causes sociopragmatic failure. Furthermore, when conveying

reasons, students' translations will be less comprehensible to Japanese natives and sound unnatural, giving rise to pragmalingustic failure. Then, in example a, to make an offer in an Indonesian sentence, the student is in accordance with the politeness strategy in Indonesian by using the diction *"berkenan"*, but the student cannot translate it into Japanese in an appropriate way. Students only use "dou desu ka" as a basic expression they have learned to ask for the opinion of a lecturer. This expression will sound impolite to Japanese natives because, in this context, it will give the impression of laziness or anger. It will give rise to sociopragmatic failure. The following is a statement from a Japanese native.

c. *Moushiwake gozaimasen*, (negative strategy: apologizing)
   'mohon maaf'
   genzai derakkusu no oheya ga manshitsu to natte orimashite, (positive strategy: giving
   reason)
   'untuk saast ini kamar deluxe penuh,'
   shinguru ruumu desu to   goyoyaku kanou de gozaimasu, ikaga nasaimasu ka.
(positive strategy: offering)
   'Kalau single room memungkinkan untuk direservasi. Apakah Anda berkenan?'
   (data f.2)
d. *Moushiwake gozaimasen.* (negative strategy: apologizing)
   'Mohon maaf'
   Toukan wa derakkusu wa ainiku gozaimasen.
   ' (di) penginapan kami sayang sekali (yang deluxe) tidak ada (positive strategy: giving
    reason)

In this context, in order to show great respect for guests, what Japanese natives do is express as much as possible their deep regret for not being able to fulfil the guests' wishes. This feeling is shown by the word *"moushiwake gozaimasen", which* shows more regret or the word *"ainiku"* (unfortunately), which is also an expression of regret (Lambe, 2019). In this case, none of the students added the words "*sayangnya"* or *"sayang sekali"* in their Indonesian sentences. It is understandable because even though this word exists in the Indonesian vocabulary, it is rarely used in daily conversation.

Requesting something from guests
To ask for something from a guest, such as a passport, 100% of students use negative strategies. In using negative strategies, students use permission sentences and indirect sentences. Here is an example:
a. *Bolehkah saya pinjam paspor Anda?* (data 7.6)
   'Kurejitto kaado no pasupooto desu ka.'
   (Is it a passport or a credit card?
b. *Bolehkah saya pinjam identitas Anda?* (data 7.3)
   'Watashi wa anata no mibunshoumishou wo karite mo ii desu ka.'
   (Can I borrow your ID card?)
c. *Boleh saya cek passport Anda?*
   (not translated)

d. *Bisa dibantu paspornya Pak?*
  'Hai, tetsudai no pasupooto desu.'
  (Okay, passport help)

In example a, although students use permission as a negative strategy, in the translation, the students do not use a form of permission and instead make a translation whose meaning cannot be understood. So, the lack of students' linguistic abilities causes pragmalinguistic failure. Furthermore, in example b, students also use permission, and students can also make sentences in the form of permission in Japanese, but the student's translation will sound unnatural and not in accordance with the expressions usually used by native Japanese. It gives rise to pragmalinguistic failure. In example c, the student also uses permissions but cannot translate it. Furthermore, the indirect sentence in example d appears to be translated word for word by the student by using the word *"tetsudai"* (bantuan) in the sentence and directly connecting it with the word *"pasupooto"* (passport). Such errors occur because students cannot find the correct Japanese expressions. Such word-for-word translations result in translations that cannot be understood and cause pragmalingustic failure. Now compare it with the speech from a native Japanese:

e. <u>*Osoreirimasu*</u>. *Pasupooto wo* <u>*onegaiitashimasu*</u> (data i.4)
  '(Saya) takut (Anda tidak berkenan). Mohon paspornya'.

The negative strategy used by Japanese natives in the sentence above is by using hedges *"osoreirimasu"* at the beginning of the sentence as an apology and expressing reluctance or fear of asking. It is done because asking for something from guests is considered to have a high level of imposition, so it must be done very carefully.

For the record, the speech act of asking for permission has not been taught to respondents, but students are expected to be able to make request sentences using the word "*onegaishimasu".* However, this did not happen because 100% of students made Indonesian sentences containing permission. It is understandable, considering that using *"bolehkah"* in permits sounds more indirect and more polite than the word *"tolong"* in Indonesian. Therefore, the form of a request for help was not found in the Indonesian language data from students.

Furthermore, native Japanese caution in asking for things is also demonstrated by the off record strategy below:

a. *Dewa, mazu pasupooto wo* <u>*haiken*</u> *itashimasu*. (data i.1)
  ' Kalau begitu, pertama-tama saya akan <u>*melihat*</u> *paspor (Anda).*

b. *Mibunshomeisho wo* <u>*omachi*</u>*, deshou ka*. (data i.2)
  ' Apakah gerangan (Anda) <u>*membawa*</u> *kartu identitas?*

c. *Pasupooto wo* <u>*oazukari* </u>*shitemo yoroshii desu ka.* (data i.3)
  ' Apakah (Anda) berkenan <u>*menitipkan*</u> *paspor (Anda) (kepada saya)?*

Native Japanese uses other words to replace *"meminjam"* or *"meminta",* which produces a very indirect effect. In the example above, the words *haiken 'melihat', machi 'membawa'* and *azukari 'menitipkan'* are used to replace the words "*meminta"* or "meminjam". These words do not seem to be directly related to *"meminta"* or *"meminjam"*, so these words act as hints for guests. It is where the difficulty lies. If we

pay attention to the Indonesian sentences (a-c), students use the words *"meminjam"* or *"cek".* When compared with the choice of native Japanese words, these words seem more direct. Actually, the words *"melihat"* and *"membawa"* can also be used in Indonesian, for example in the sentence *"Apakah Anda membawa paspor"?.* or *"Apakah Anda membawa paspor"?.* However, this sentence can have an ambiguous and confusing meaning for Indonesians, so students prefer to use the words "*meminjam"* or "*cek"* to avoid misunderstandings. The word "*menitipkan"* also clearly would not be used in Indonesian in this context.

So, students' choice of diction, which is based on mother tongue habits, will make it difficult for students to make sentences in the context of asking for something from a guest if they are not directed clearly. It means that with Google Translate, no translation will appear with the words "*haiken", "omachi", or "azukari"* because students will not enter sentences into Google Translate using the words "*melihat", "membawa",* let alone *"menitipkan".* Mistakes in choosing diction like this cause **pragmatic linguistic failure** to occur. So, at this point, the teacher must convey the differences in vocabulary and provide sentence expressions that can be used as templates.

Confirmation

The similarity between Japanese students and natives in terms of confirmation is the use of positive strategies. In this case, methods are used to seek agreement or avoid conflict with guests. About 85% of students use this method to confirm. Here is an example:

a. *Pemesanan untuk 1 orang di tipe kamar single non smoking room, <u>apakah benar?</u>* (data 8.1)

   (not translated)

b. *Untuk tipe kamar yang dipesan, tipe single room yang non smoking <u>ya pak?</u>* (data 11.8)

   (not translated)

c. *Baik, dengan Kimura Hanada?*

   Hai, Kimura Hanada san desu ka.

   (OK, are you Mr. Kimura Hanada?)

d. *Baik, dengan Bapak Kimura Hanada?*

   Hai, san Kimura Hanada?

   (OK, Kimura Hanada?)

   (data 8.4)

Like examples a, b, c and d above, other data shows that 100% of students try to agree with the person they are talking to, and their sentences are acceptable in terms of Indonesian politeness. However, the data shows that all students who use confirmation expressions, as in examples a and b, cannot translate the sentences, while students who do not use confirmation expressions (c and d) can translate the sentences even though they could be better. Example c is a basic interrogative sentence form that is taught to students. For example, c, the Indonesian sentence used, is a regular interrogative sentence, and in Indonesian, this sentence can be understood as a form of confirmation, so students translate it into a regular interrogative form. However, interrogative

sentences marked with '*ka'* at the end of the sentence cannot be used to confirm. For confirmation, the sentence must end with the word '*ne',* so the simplest appropriate confirmation expression is "*Hi, Kimura Hanada san desu ne".* In this case, habits in the mother tongue make students forget the ending 'ne', which has actually been taught to students, causing pragmalingustic failure. Furthermore, in example d, the student again tries to translate the word 'Mr' literally, which results in an inverted word order. Now compare it with the speech from a native Japanese:

e. *Gotaizaikikan wa sanpaku de <u>omachigai nai</u> deshouka?* (data k.2)

  '*Menginap (nya) tiga malam, apakah tidak ada kesalahan?'*

f. *Kinen no shinguru ruumu de <u>omachigai nai</u> deshouka?*(data l.2)

  '*Kamar single non-smoking, apakah tidak ada kesalahan?'*

Even though Japanese students and natives use the same strategy, there are fundamental differences in the confirmation method used by native Indonesians and Japanese. Look again at examples a and b from students' Indonesian sentences. In Indonesian sentences, students use "*apakah benar"* or "*ya pak?"* to confirm. These two expressions are expressions that Indonesians often use to confirm. What needs to be noted is that both expressions use positive sentence forms, whereas if you pay attention, native Japanese more often use negative forms (for example, e and f), which are marked with "*nai desu ka/ nai deshou ka*" to confirm. The use of positive and negative forms is a fundamental difference in culture in Indonesia and Japan. By using positive forms, Indonesian people appear more confident. They seem confident that what they are doing is right, so they seek validation of that truth with the expression *"apakah benar?"* or *"ya, Pak?".* Confidence here is not in a bad way. In this case, a sense of self-confidence is needed to provide a sense of security to the person you are talking to.

On the other hand, native Japanese have a different perspective. The negative form creates a more indirect and humbler impression than the positive form. With this form, the speaker's intentions become more subtle because the speaker gives the impression that he is not confident, so he directs the question more to himself (Zain, 2017). Therefore, questions are more focused on "*machigai*" (mistakes) to minimize possible errors by asking, *"apakah tidak ada yang salah*?".* Suppose students have mastered the vocabulary "*tadashii",* which means "benar", with the habit of positive sentences in their mother tongue. In that case, it is very likely that "is it true" will be translated as "*tadashii desu ka",* which actually sounds unnatural. If the positive form is to be used, the word used is not "*tadashii" (benar) but "yoroshii" (berkenan),* so the expression will be *"yoroshii desu ka*". The problem is that in the Indonesian sense, the word 'berkenan' has a slightly different meaning to the word *'benar',* so there is a big tendency for Indonesians not to use this word to confirm.

Furthermore, the difference between students and native Japanese lies in the use of Bald on record strategies and negative strategies. To confirm, 15% of students use a very direct Bald on record strategy, while Japanese natives use a negative strategy by adding hedges. The following is an example of a student's speech:

a. *Baik, reservasi atas nama Kimura Hanada, untuk satu orang dengan tipe kamar single non smoking.* (data 8.4)

'*Hai, yoyaku Kimura Hanada san, hitori dake desu. Heya no kinen singuru.*'

(OK, Mr. Kimura Hanada's reservation, only one person. Non smoking room, single).

b. *Baik, tunggu sebentar, dengan Bapak Kimura Hanada, untuk satu orang dari hari Kamis-Minggu. Tipe kamar single non smoking room. Terimakasih*. (data 8.6)

'*Sosho omachi kudasai, Hai*, (tidak diterjemahkan)'

(Please wait a moment)

The use of bald on record in this context is acceptable in Indonesian on the basis of maximum communication effectiveness, and both interlocutors already understand the urgency. The use of bald on record by students can be understood as a communication norm in Indonesian, which prioritizes effectiveness and clarity in speech (Dwijayanti et al., 2021). Sentences that are convoluted and too long are considered to distort the content of the message, which will be detrimental to the guest, so direct confirmation is done by repeating the information obtained. For example, the use of bald on record in Indonesian results in a translation without any honorific markers, which could be considered inadequate polite. On the other hand, Japanese natives will still add the hedges "*deshou ka*" at the end of sentences to produce a humbler impression. The following is an example of the speech.

a. *505 shitsu no Yamada sama, <u>deshou ka.</u>* (data o.2)

'*Apakah benar (mungkin saya salah) (Anda adalah) Tuan Yamada (yang reservasi di) kamar 505?*'

Using bald on record as above will seem too direct and therefore impolite in Japanese communication norms, so Japanese natives add the hedges *'deshou ka'* to soften the speech. Differences in cultural values like this will cause ***sociopragmatic failure.***

Most of the politeness strategies used by native Indonesians and native Japanese are not much different; only the methods used to realize the strategies are slightly different. This strategy equation is actually good for learning because it facilitates the positive transfer process (Rahayu et al., 2023). Apart from the pragmatic failure that occurs, the similarity of politeness strategies in Indonesian and Japanese is the main asset for students to understand how communication works in Japan. Pragmalinguistic failure can be overcome by increasing linguistic skills and exposure to natural expressions in Japanese, while sociopragmatic failure can be overcome using a cultural approach by explaining to students why such sentences are unacceptable (considered rude) in Japanese culture. Furthermore, different communication strategies will become an obstacle to the formation of intercultural competence. Differences in communication strategies have the potential to produce sociopragmatic failure, which, of course, must be overcome with a cultural approach.

Conclusion

In general, students' inability to make Japanese sentences using the Keigo variety causes sociopragmatic failure because Keigo is an obligation that must be fulfilled at a grammatical and social level in order to maintain one's position in society. However, apart from that, Indonesian and Japanese actually have similarities in terms of

politeness strategies used in guest service. This equality will actually make it easier for students to achieve intercultural competence. In terms of strategy similarities, mixed results in translation are shown. Here, some students have been able to produce translations with the same strategy even though they are not perfect; some students have not been able to produce the same strategy because of their lack of Japanese linguistic skills. At this stage, students as beginner learners are not yet able to produce natural and grammatically correct translations, which often results in pragmalingustic failure or sociopragmatic failure. Apart from these things, this is actually easier to handle if, from the start, students are always exposed to natural expressions, not just grammar. Furthermore, the differences regarding strategy mainly lie in the use of bald on record, which is common in Indonesian but not found in Japanese. The use of bald on record in Indonesian results in a bald on record translation also in Japanese, which gives rise to sociopragmatic failure. Basically, both pragmalingustic failure and sociopragmatic failure can be overcome if intercultural learning is implemented from the start of learning. Students must be given an understanding of intangible culture, such as communication norms and social systems in Japanese society.

The hospitality context includes more than just the six contexts discussed in this paper. Other contexts, such as prohibiting, giving warnings, offering help and so on, still need to be reviewed further. Specifically regarding Keigo, it seems necessary to carry out another study regarding how to teach Keigo to students with large language skills gaps, considering that Keigo is the core of politeness in Japanese but is quite difficult for beginner learners to master.

Acknowledgement

References

Adlini, M. N., Dinda, A. H., Yulinda, S., Chotimah, O., & Merliyana, S. J. (2022). Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Studi Pustaka. *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *6*(1), 974–980. https://doi.org/10.33487/edumaspul.v6i1.3394

Almashhadani, M., & Almashhadani, H. A. (2023). English Translations in Project Management: Enhancing Cross-Cultural Communication and Project Success. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI) ISSN*, *12*(June), 291–297. https://doi.org/10.35629/8028-1206291297

Dewi, D. S., & Robihim, R. (2019). Penggunaan Ragam Bahasa Hormat Keigo Oleh Tokoh Sebastian Michaelis Pada Situasi Informal Saat Pertikaian Dalam Anime "Kuroshitsuji" Season 1 karya Toboso Yana. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Budaya Jepang*, *2*(1), 74–81.

Dwijayanti, D., Nababan, M., & Wiratno, T. (2021). Analisis Terjemahan Tuturan Asertif yang Merepresentasikan Strategi Kesantunan Bald on Record pada Novel Rich People Problems Karya Kevin Kwan. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Linguistik Dan Sastra (SEMANTIKS)*, 577–583.

Harisal, H., Darlina, L., Kanah, K., & Dyah, W. (2022). Kesalahan Leksikal dalam Karangan Bahasa Jepang Mahasiswa Jurusan Pariwisata pada Politeknik Negeri Bali. *Humanika*, *29*(1), 1–12.

Ide, S. (1989). *Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness.*

Keeratinanwattana, K. (2022). Errors of explaining the tourism vocabulary in Japanese through the Self-Explain method : A case study of universities in the lower northeastern region. *Thammasat Journal of Japanese Studies*, *39*(November), 71–92.

Koper, L. (2015). *Politeness and Honorification in the Discourse of Japanese TV dorama University of Warsaw Faculty of Applied Linguistics Laura Koper Album number : 333936 Politeness and Honorification in the Discourse of Japanese TV dorama B . A . Thesis Field of study : June*. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.2625.1362

Lambe, M. (2019). *Business Japanese: Answering the Phone – Part 2*. https://workinjapan.today/study/business-japanese-answering-the-phone-part-2/

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *12*(4), 403–426. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(88)90003-3

Meiratnasari, A., Wijayanto, A., & Suparno, S. (2019). An analysis of Politeness Strategies in Indonesian English Textbooks. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, *2*(4), 529–540. https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v2i4.8393

Mirkovic, D., & Simic, M. (2019). Language Barriers Complexity and Their Implications With Fatal Consequences in Aviation. *KNOWLEDGE-International Journal*, *30*(5), 1131–1135.

Musyafa'ah, L., Yuliasri, I., & Pratama, H. (2022). Politeness Strategies of the Main Characters of Pride and Prejudice Movie. *English Education Journal*, *12*(3), 310–418. https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v12i3.58194

Rahayu, E. T., Riyadi, S., Hartati, H., Stovia, A., Roiyasa, N., & Asriyama, W. F. (2023). Language Politeness Education through Language Behaviour Habits: Concerning the Indonesian and Japanese Viewpoints. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, *15*(2), 2173–2181. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i2.3267

Scroope, C. (2021). *Japanese Culture*. https://culturalatlas.sbs.com.au/japanese-culture/japanese-culture-communication%0D

Stukan, D. (2018). Sociopragmatic Failure: Struggling with Cross-Cultural Differences in Communication. *Open Journal for Anthropological Studies*, *2*(1), 27–36. https://doi.org/10.32591/coas.ojas.0201.03027s

Wijayanti, A. A. R., Poetranto, I. W. D., & Saharjo, S. A. J. (2022). Pembelajaran Bahasa Jepang Perhotelan Bidang Tata Hidangan Berbasis Role Playing Pada Program Studi Diploma Iv Perhotelan Universitas Triatma Mulya. *Jounal of Tourism and Interdisciplinary Studies (JoTIS)*, *2*(1), 34–40.

Yao, Z. (2020). Study on Pragmatic Failure in Intercultural Communication. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 490*, 680–684. https://doi.org/10.2991/icemaess-15.2016.229

Yogyanti, D. W. (2015). *Stretegi Kesopanan Dalam Wacana Iklan Majalah Remaja Putri Indonesia dan Jepang. Kajian Pragmatik Kontrastif*. Universitas Gadjah Mada.

Zain, N. M. W. (2017). *Prinsip Kesopanan Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Dalam Drama Koukousei Resutoran (Kajian Pragmatik)* ドラマ *[高校生レストラン] における表出的発話行為のポライトネス原則*. UNIVERSITAS DIPONEGORO.