English learning motivation and pragmatic competence: Correlational study of non-English major postgraduate students in java

Muhammad Syahied Hidayatullah[*], Nur Hidayanto
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This research aims to investigate the significant relationship between English learning motivation and pragmatic competence of non-English major postgraduate students and their current pragmatic competence. 350 non-English major postgraduate students from Javanese provinces (West, Central, and East Java) participated in this study. This study was quantitative research in the form of a correlational study by using one adapted questionnaire (Attitude and Motivation Test Battery (AMTB)) for English learning motivation and two kinds of adapted pragmatic competence tests (Multiple-choice Discourse Completion Test (MDCT) and Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT)). The data were analyzed by using Normality Test, Linearity Test, Bivariate Pearson Product Moment, and Descriptive statistical analysis by IBM SPSS 26. The finding indicated English learning motivation correlated with English pragmatic competence. Although the correlation degree was 0.563 which had a moderate degree of correlation, they have a positive correlation which means the English learning motivation has contributed to the pragmatic competence. The current level of the non-English major postgraduate students' pragmatic competence in Javanese provinces was categorized as still developing because the students hardly understand responses in the pragmatic competence test, especially in pragmatic awareness.

Keywords: *English learning motivation; Pragmatic competence; Correlational study*

---

[*]*Corresponding Author:*

Muhammad Syahied Hidayatullah
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
Jl. Colombo Yogyakarta No.1, Karang Malang, Depok, Kabupaten Sleman, DIY, 55281, Indonesia
Email: syahiedsahed@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Some linguists defined pragmatics as a study of contextual meaning related to spoken utterance in specific speech situations (Leech, 1989). Language learners can understand the contextual meaning in speech situations if they have self-ability to recognize and comprehend the context in a certain communication, particularly in speech acts (requests, offers, apologies, etc.) (Yule, 2017). The self-ability refers to language learners' assumptions, expectations, and purposes or goals in their communicative activities like speech acts. Therefore, language learners' self-ability to understand the context in various speech acts is developed by linguists to reduce incorrect interpretations of a context in communicative activity (Lavinson, 1983; Leech, 1989; Yule, 2017). The linguists called self-ability pragmatic competence.

Canale and Swain (1980) proposed pragmatics competence as an important component of communicative competence. If there is a pragmatic error between locutors and interlocutors, a serious misinterpretation of spoken utterance will occur in their communicative activities. Pragmatics competence is comprised of two easily understandable components: pragmatics knowledge and pragmatics processing (Ziashahabi, Jabbari, & Razmi, 2020). Pragmatics knowledge is the ability to comprehend and produce speech acts. Meanwhile, pragmatics processing refers to the ability to apply pragmatic knowledge in various daily communicative situations (Farashaiyan & Tan, 2012). Farashaiyan and Tan (2012) asserted that pragmatic knowledge contributes to grasping and producing language learners' assumptions and perspectives.

A factor that influenced language learners' assumptions and perspectives in the acquisition of their second language (henceforth L2) is the learning environment (Farashaiyan & Tan, 2012). Tajeddin et al., (2014) proposed that the L2 learning environment has an important role to create L2 learners' comprehension of social contextual meaning, especially in spoken utterances as part of pragmatic competence. As a result, the social-learning environment contexts influence the L2 learner's assumptions and perspectives, and then the assumptions and perspectives enable them to provide interactive opportunities in the L2 communicative activities easily and to enhance the acquisition and production of Interlanguage pragmatic (henceforth ILP) in L2 learning.

The Interlanguage pragmatic (ILP) research focuses on examining how non-native speakers comprehend and carry out linguistic action (speaking and comprehending or writing and reading) in their language target, as well as how they acquire pragmatics knowledge during the second language acquisition process (Astia, 2020; Tajeddin & Moghadam, 2012). Tajeddin and Moghadam (2012) claimed that L2 acquisition is not only influenced by the social environment but also by L2 learners' individual differences themselves. Individual differences refer to personal characteristics applying to everybody and on which people differ by degrees (Dornyei, 2015). Dornyei (2015) mentioned personal characteristics as individual differences which consist of some attributes like anxiety, self-efficacy, self-confidence, self-control, and motivation.

Nowadays, motivation as one of the individual differences attributes has received much attention in response by some researchers (Khorshidi & Nimchahi, 2013; Tajeddin & Moghadam, 2012), especially for the L2 learning environments. Some motivation factors like enthusiasm and attitude believe to play an important role in creating L2 learners' comprehension in their L2 learning acquisition like L2 pragmatic competence (Tajeddin & Moghadam, 2012). Tajeddin and Moghadam (2012) named the enthusiasm and attitude for acquiring the L2 pragmatic competence *"Pragmatic Motivation"* because pragmatic motivation as individual differences can be influenced by the L2 learning environment then determine learners' active involvement in the L2 learning process to get certain information (Khorshidi & Nimchahi, 2013).

Some researchers (Badrkoohi, 2018; Mirzaei & Forouzandeh, 2013) analyzed the contribution of L2 learning motivation in communicative situations. Badrkoohi (2018), Mirzaei and Forouzandeh (2013) examined the relationship between L2 motivation (factors causing an increase in motivational level), L2 demotivation (factors causing a decrease in motivational level), and L2 intercultural communicative competence (ICC) (the ability to communicate effectively in various cultural context). Their research tried to find out not only the relationship between these variables but also the influence of these variables on a successful interaction in the L2 communicative competence. In conclusion, there was a strong relationship between L2 intercultural communicative competence and L2 motivation but negatively related to L2 demotivation, so L2 motivation influences successful communicative competence. Tajeddin and Moghadam (2012) supported this by claiming that pragmatic competence is part of communicative competence. On other hand, Tajeddin, Moghadam (2012) and Zarrinabadi et al., (2021) examined the relationship between pragmatic aspects such as ILP motivation, pragmatic production, pragmatics mindset, and pragmatics behaviors. They found that the pragmatic aspects can help L2 learners to recognize, predict, evaluate, and confirm conformity to the norms of polite speech acts when they interact by using their second or foreign language.

Based on the previous studies (Badrkoohi, 2018; Mirzaei & Forouzandeh, 2013; Tajeddin & Moghadam, 2012; Zarrinabadi et al., 2021), some gaps like the correlation among intercultural communicative competence (ICC), pragmatic competence, affective variables in individual differences (e.g., motivation, anxiety, self-efficacy, self-confidence), L2 learning, gender role, and differences are unexplored previously. Badrkoohi (2018), Zand-Moghadam, and Adeh (2020) replenished that L2 learning motivation is an important aspect of pragmatic competence, and also pragmatic competence has a significant role in building communicative competence. Therefore, this current study aims to fill some of the gaps by analyzing the relationship between L2 learning motivation and L2 Pragmatic competence. Non-English major postgraduate students in the selected universities of Javanese provinces (west, central, and east Java) are chosen as the subject. The non-English major postgraduate students were chosen for this study because English in Indonesia especially for postgraduate students in Java is required as an important subject for university entrance tests and graduation requirements.

The research questions constructed in this research are: (1) Is there any significant relationship between L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence of non-English major postgraduate students in Javanese provinces?, (2) What is the current level of non-English major postgraduate students' pragmatic competence in terms of pragmatic awareness and pragmatic production in Javanese provinces?. The contribution of this study is to provide L2 learners' learning motivation to the L2 pragmatic competence awareness and production and then to improve their comprehension of contextual meaning in L2 communicative situations, especially for non-English major postgraduate students.

2. Literature review

2.1. Concept of L2 learning motivation

Gardner and Lambert (1959) were the first researchers who investigated and associated the first concept of L2 learning motivation, which is called a socio-educational theory. The socio-educational theory indicated attitude and motivation in the implication of learning a second or foreign language. The socio-educational theory model consisted of four components, namely: (1) the social milieu, (2) individual differences (3) second language acquisition (SLA) context, and (4) outcomes (Gardner & Lalonde, 1985). These components concern intelligence, language aptitude, situational anxiety, language acquisition contexts, and language learning outcomes all of them are believed to have a significant role in determining achievement in second language learning (Gardner & Lambert, 1959). Although this theory model seems applicable to individuals irrespective of the status of the ethnic groups in the L2 learners' community, this theoretical model is concerned with minority group members as an ethnic identity solely for second language acquisition. This theory inspired other researchers later like Krashen (1982) with his Monitor model theory.

The other theory, the monitor model theory (Krashen, 1982) in the principle and practice of second language acquisition, is similar to the socio-educational theory model that also focused on attitude and motivation and the implication of second language learning. The component in this model theory focused on consciousness in learning, especially second language learning. Krashen (1982) proposed that conscious L2 learning composes of a self-correction process in correcting errors or perceiving them to be errors. The process happens before the sentence is spoken by the speakers. The monitor model for L2 acquisition needs some conditions to be equipped, namely need time to improve, memorize patterns and routines, and use social awareness in the utilizing of the first language. Then, the motivation facilitates those conditions as instigators to act or learn. In conclusion, both socio-educational and monitor model theories are concerned with L2 learners' efforts to learn how L2 learners acquire and utilize a second language and to use their second language in the L2 speech community.

The learners' effort is realized as a relative variable, so every learner has a different degree of effort to learn a second language. Ryan (1985) named it in his self-

determination theory as individual differences. The individual differences in Ryan's (1985) Self-Determination Theory (SDT) emphasized the role of motivation and personality in self-regulation, such as self-confidence, anxiety, emotion, and attitude. Self-regulation impressed the importance of motivation for a given activity. The Self-Determination Theory divided motivation into two kinds of motivation, namely Extrinsic Motivation and Intrinsic Motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000). The self-determination theory is utilized as a psychological instrument by L2 learners to grow internal motivation or intrinsic motivation because it has an important role in creating learners' perceptions.

Intrinsic motivation means to do some activities because of inherently interesting or enjoyable, not for external reinforcements or rewards but extrinsic motivation refers to activities for obvious reinforcements or rewards (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In other words, intrinsic motivation comes from personal factors like engaging in learning second language activities because of enjoyment and get personal satisfaction from learning second language activities. Extrinsic motivation of learning second language activities may come up from a certain purpose on the outcomes to gain an external reward for the return such as money, grade, and praise.

Therefore, both socio-educational and monitor model theories of motivation are the social psychological theory of L2 motivation. Then, the monitor model theory by Krashen (1982) mentioned some factors in the awareness of motivation in the second or foreign language learning, namely self-image, self-expression, self-analysis, self-correction, and self-confidence which have similarity with self-determination theory that the progress and outcome of language learning are determined by the L2 learners' individuality. For instance, their attitude and motivation to achieve a goal in their language target.

In final conclusion, the theories explained above create a schematic abstract about how motivation relates to L2 learners' characteristics like the sociological concept (Ethnic identity) and individual differences (Intelligence, language aptitude, anxiety, and language acquisition contexts) that influence second language acquisition outcomes. Moreover, these motivational theories concern L2 learners' effort in learning and using a second language in the second language speech community. The contribution of these models is to find out how L2 learners acquire and utilize a second or foreign language. The self-determination theory framework has a role in creating L2 learners' perceptions to increase their motivation including internal motivation or intrinsic motivation.

As explained previously, those motivation theories such as socio-educational theory (Gardner, 1985, 2006), monitor model (Krashen, 1982), and self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) are categorized as affective factors in individual differences. Ryan (1985) has similar perceptions like the sociological concept and individual differences in the motivation concept of foreign and second language acquisition. Consequently, the implementation of similar assessments for L2 learners' motivation assured to get same purposes and goals. However, the self-determination theory expects language learners to get extrinsic motivation firstly until they get their motivation-awareness like self-image,

self-expression, self-analysis, self-correction, and self-confidence because of their competence. The process to evoke intrinsic motivation occurs continuously.

2.2. Concept of L2 pragmatic competence

Some linguists (Lavinson, 1983; Leech, 1989; Yule, 2017) defined pragmatics as a study of meaning relate to speech-situation context. The utterance in the speech-situation meaning context referred to a place and situation where the utterance happens, especially for the particular local condition (Leech, 1989). The local condition consisted of some aspects, such as different cultures, language communities, social situations, and different social classes which aspects influence language users' self-ability like assumptions, expectations, and purposes or goals in various speech acts (like requests, offers, apologies, etc.) (Lavinson, 1983; Yule, 2017). Alfghe and Mohammadzadeh (2021) asserted that language users' self-ability significantly affects their understanding to spoken-utterance meaning context in their various speech acts. Afterward, self-ability like assumptions and expectations help language users to create their language skill and language style in daily usage, including how they speak, pronounce, and understand the context of utterances. The way people understand utterance context to create the way to speak and pronounce is called pragmatic competence.

Pragmatic competence is a knowledge and a basic competence required to comprehend and produce discourse (e.g. speech acts) to reduce pragmatic errors or misunderstandings between locutors and interlocutors (Bachman, 1990; Canale & Swain, 1980). The knowledge is affected by language users' communicative competence and their first-language cultures for creating basic pragmatic competence. Then, it enables language users to correlate signals from linguistic actions and references of spoken utterances to their interpretation for understanding relevant contexts. Moreover, there are two kinds of knowledge known as pragmatic components, namely pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic knowledge (Ajabshir, 2019; Bardovi–Harlig & Su, 2018; Farashaiyan & Tan, 2012; Leech, 1989). Pragmalinguistic knowledge refers to the knowledge for realizing speech intention and linguistic forms (e.g. grammar, phonology, syntax, and so on) to express the intention of a specific meaning. Then, the sociopragmatic refers to knowledge of social conditions (for example, the environment, cultures, communities, social classes, and behaviors) that comprise language use in society (Farashaiyan & Tan, 2012; Leech, 1989).

The use of pragmalinguistics helps language users to understand their sociopragmatic and awareness of "when and what" to use appropriate speech acts in appropriate situations based on social conditions. According to Ajabshir (2019), sociopragmatic aims to improve language learners' recognition for addressing communicative activities courteously, whereas pragmalinguistic leads to an allocation of language users to address terms, strategies, and formulating expressions in courteous communicative activities. Therefore, pragmalinguistics plays a significant role in L2 users' awareness of specific linguistic resources as basic knowledge that provides an

ability to convey specific illocutions. The role of sociopragmatic as a social ideology creates politeness aspects in various social conditions like environments, cultures, and communities that make L2 learners have different assumptions and perspectives in the interpretations, such as in Indonesia, England, or American society.

3. Method

3.1. Research design

This study was quantitative research that focused on a survey by implementing correlational technique analysis to examine the link between English (as a second language) learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence of non-English major postgraduate students in Javanese Provinces.

3.2. Participants

The participants in this study were 350 (188 females and 162 males) non-English major postgraduate students at 15 of 85 public universities in the 3 provinces of Java (West Java, Central Java, and East Java) – Indonesia. The universities are selected as a sample of the population in this research by using *Probability sampling* as a sampling method and *Simple random sampling* as a sampling technique because this research has a homogenous population who are non-English major postgraduate students (Creswell, 2012; Sugiyono, 2015). Moreover, The selected universities are based on the importance of English for postgraduate students as a university entrance test and graduation requirements (Journal submission and Pro TEFL test) by the students in the universities, So they have basic competence, same quality, and characteristics in English to participate in this research. Their ages ranged from 21-42 years old (mean= 28).

3.3. Data collection

Intending to measure non-English major postgraduate students' L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence, a questionnaire and tests are used as instruments to collect the data. The first instrument is a multiple-choice L2 learning motivation, which was adapted from Gardner's (2004) attitude/motivation test battery (AMTB) to assess participants' L2 learning motivation. The questionnaire contents have been restored for making it compatible to be distributed to non-English major postgraduate students. There were 20-modified items including 4 categories about L2 learners' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, namely (1) Self-Esteem and attitudes toward learning English, (2) Interest and realization of the importance of learning English, (3) Parents' support in learning English, and (4) Teacher's support in learning English. This questionnaire is measured by using five points Likert scales (1=strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= moderate, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree). The obtained data from this instrument was interval data.

The second instrument is the L2 pragmatic competence test, which consisted of two kinds of pragmatic competence tests namely the Multiple-choice Discourse Completion

Test (MDCT) and the Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT). The MDCT was adapted from Chen (2017) containing 25 multiple-choice modified items that were divided into some speech act contexts, such as apologizing, asking for help, invitation, congratulation, etc. In addition, the WDCT was adapted from Qadi (2021) and Aufa (2011) establishing 5-modified written items about the university environment and daily office activities. The collected data from these tests were Ratio Data.

Two kinds of data-validating analysis (content validity and construct validity) were used to get the best validity for the instruments used in this research. Content validity and construct validity are utilized for double-checking the validity of the items to make sure that the two instruments are relevant to the purpose of this research.

3.4. Data analysis

As the data analysis procedure, the constructed MDCT and WDCT were first administered to measure the participants' L2 pragmatic competence. Then, the multiple-choice L2 learning motivation questionnaire was administered to examine the participants' learning motivation toward English as a second language. Finally, an adjunct questionnaire was used to collect the participants' demographic necessary like gender and age group. Furthermore, data normality testing and data linearity testing was used firstly as requirement tests before analyzing by Bivariate Pearson Product Moment.

Descriptive statistical data analysis was used to answer the second research question which is about the current level of Javanese non-English major postgraduate students' L2 pragmatic competence in terms of pragmatic awareness and pragmatic production. The analysis obtained data on the mean (M), standard deviation (SD), maximum and minimum value, the total score (Sum), and frequency score. This research used IBM SPSS 26 for analyzing data.

4. Findings and discussion

Some requirement test like data normality testing and data linearity testing was run before analyzing the correlational analysis by bivariate pearson product moment to find out the correlation between L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence.

Table 1 below showed about the data normality testing output by using the one-sample Kolmogorov Smirnov method. The output focused on the N which means the total of respondents was 350 respondents and the output of the significant value (Asymp Sig) got 0.200. Because the significant value is greater than 0.05, so it concluded that the data is normally distributed.

Then, the linearity testing of the data (L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence) by anova formula in IBM SPSS 26 got a value of 0.000. The output of the significance of linearity the value is 0.000. Because the significance of linearity is lower than 0.05. Furthermore, it can be concluded that the two variables have a linear relationship (Purnomo, 2016).

Table 1

Data normality testing and linearity testing output.

Normality testing by one-sample Kolmogorov Smirnov method		Linearity testing by Anova	
N	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Group of Linearity testing	Sig.
350	.200	L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence	.000

Afterward, table 2 below showed a pearson product-moment output about the correlation between L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence. The correlational analysis value was 0.563. This value is categorized as a moderate correlational degree and has a positive correlation.

Table 2

Correlational analysis output of L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence.

Correlations		Motivation	Pragmatic
Motivation and Pragmatic	Pearson Correlation	1	,563**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,000
	N	350	350

Finally, the descriptive statistical analysis was computed to find out the current level of non-English major postgraduate students' pragmatic competence in Javanese provinces. Based on table 3 below, the total of respondents was 350 and the missing data is 0. The non-English language graduate program students' minimum score is 17 and the maximum score is 100 the pragmatic competence score. Afterward, the mean score is 75.05 by the standard deviation is 14.22.

Specifically, the descriptive statistical analysis about pragmatic competence in terms of pragmatic awareness and pragmatic production for non-English major postgraduate students' pragmatic competence in Javanese provinces got the same *minimum* score which is 0 and the maximum score is 100. The mean of pragmatic production was higher (88.86) than pragmatic awareness (68.88). Then the standard deviation (SD) for pragmatic awareness is lower (16.31) than for pragmatic production (18.59).

Table 3

Descriptive statistical analysis of L2 pragmatic competence.

Descriptive Statistics				
Pragmatic Competence N	Max	Min	Mean	SD

N		Max	Min	Mean	SD
Valid	Missing				
350	0	100	17	75.05	14.22
Pragmatic Awareness					
N		Max	Min	Mean	SD
Valid	Missing				
350	0	100	0	68.88	16.31
Pragmatic Production					
N		Max	Min	Mean	SD
Valid	Missing				
350	0	100	0	88.86	18.59

Table 4

Frequency table of pragmatic competence output.

		Pragmatic Competence	
		Frequency	Percent
Valid	17	2	,6
	23	3	,9
	29	2	,6
	34	2	,6
	37	3	,9
	40	5	1,4
	49	5	1,4
	51	1	,3
	54	4	1,1
	57	8	2,3
	60	9	2,6
	63	7	2,0
	66	17	4,9
	69	29	8,3
	71	29	8,3
	74	32	9,1
	77	30	8,6
	80	39	11,1
	83	32	9,1
	86	35	10,0

89	19	5,4
91	21	6,0
94	10	2,9
97	3	,9
100	3	,9
Total	350	100,0

The specific frequency score of pragmatic competence results can be figured out in table 4 above. There are 2 of 350 students who got a minimum score of 17 and 3 of 350 students who got a maximum score of 100. So to sum up, there are 1% of all respondents got the maximum score. Subsequently, there are 192 out of 350 (55%) students got scores above the average of 75.

This research analyzed the correlation between L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence of non-English language program students. The analysis data found a correlation between L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatics which was 0.563. The results indicate the correlational degree of both variables is a moderate positive correlation. In summary, the L2 learning motivation contributed to the successful L2 pragmatic competence. Afterward, the correlational output (0.563) was categorized as a positive correlation which means if the L2 learning motivation improves, The L2 pragmatic competence will also improve. These findings are in line with the previous research (Badrkoohi, 2018; Mirzaei & Forouzandeh, 2013). Badrkoohi (2018) investigated similar variables, namely L2 demotivation and intercultural communicative competence, and then he found the motivation on L2 culture can influence students' L2 communicative competence. However, pragmatic competence is an important part of communicative competence, so successful L2 communicative competence also depended on successful L2 pragmatic competence.

Mirzaei and Forouzandeh (2013) did a similar research area on the correlation between L2 learning motivation and intercultural communicative competence. Based on the result, the L2 learning motivation is the notable supporting subset in the successful intercultural communicative competence which the pragmatic is part of it. Furthermore, the categories used in his research were social, cultural, and psychological categories are similar to some L2 learning motivation categories in this current research, namely parents' and teachers' support in learning English are similar to social and cultural then the self-esteem, attitudes, interest, and realization towards learning English are similar as psychological dimensions.

Another research was by Zhang and Papi (2021) who investigated learners' motivational character which influenced their L2 pragmatic competence in various situations. Afterward, they found that learners with certain types of motivational characteristics influenced their focus, were concerned with advancement, growth, and

accomplishment, and positively predicted pragmatic production. However, pragmatic production is part of pragmatic competence. So that is why the Written Discourse Completion Test (WDCT) was used as one of the questionnaires to measure L2 pragmatic production as part of L2 pragmatic competence.

In conclusion, the L2 learning motivation correlates with L2 pragmatic competence. Although the correlational degree in this current research was moderate and is different from previous research studies (Badrkoohi, 2018; Mirzaei & Forouzandeh, 2013; Zhang & Papi, 2021) which have strong correlation degree in their research, the important thing needs to be realized that this current research has a positive correlation between L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence. So, the L2 learning motivation contributes to the successful L2 pragmatic competence, especially for the postgraduate program both English major and non-English major students. The implications are the L2 teaching program, L2 activities, and L2 learning environment which is designed to stimulate L2 learners' awareness of their L2 pragmatics competence issues in classroom communicative tasks and activities then the L2 learners' awareness has them reflect upon various speech acts. It can be achieved by familiarizing them with their language target environment.

The descriptive statistical analysis from the two pragmatic competence tests, namely MDCT (Multiple-choice Discourse Competence Test) to measure pragmatics awareness and WDCT (Written Discourse Competence Test) for pragmatics production of non-English major postgraduate students, concluded that the 350 respondents' maximum and a minimum score of MDCT and WDCT are same, which the highest score is 100 and 0 as the lowest score. Then the mean of pragmatics awareness was 68.88 and the mean of pragmatics production was 88.86. Therefore, pragmatic awareness is significantly correlated with pragmatic production. The non-English major postgraduate students' pragmatic production was higher than their pragmatic awareness. They are good for giving appropriate responses in the pragmatics production test (WDCT) but less than good to understand and to choose the appropriate responses in pragmatics awareness (MDCT). The students' pragmatics competence mean score (75.05) is lower than the researcher's expectation for this research. Because it is 0.05 % higher than the average score (75.00) and there were 55% (192 out of 350) students who got a higher score.

5. Conclusion

The result of this study provides some information about the second language (L2) learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence of non-English major postgraduate students, especially in some well-known universities in Java Provinces. The empirical findings to answer the first research question showed the correlation or relationships between L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence. Although the degree of correlation between both of them was moderate they have a positive correlation. It meant if the students' L2 learning motivation improved, their L2 pragmatic competence would also improve. The last empirical statistical finding to prove the second research question

is that the non-English major postgraduate students' L2 pragmatic competence was categorized as still developing. This development was because 55% (192 out of 350) students got higher scores, but 45% (158 out of 350) students got a failure to understand responses in the pragmatic awareness test.

This current research offers new and considerable information on the importance of L2 learning motivation which consisted of some matters stated before to improve L2 English competence, such as L2 pragmatic competence. Therefore, grounded on this research, postgraduate program students such as English majors or non-English majors need to realize the importance of these variables (L2 learning motivation and L2 pragmatic competence) for their achievement of L2 communicative competence in their language target. This research also gives some notable information about some ways to be realized that was important to improve L2 learning motivation, both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation which contributed to almost aspects of English competence. Moreover, the high degree of L2 learning motivation does not assure a high level of L2 pragmatic competence. Other factors influence the full success of L2 pragmatic competence, such as the local condition like different cultures, language communities, social situations, and different social classes.

References

Ajabshir, Z. F. (2019). The effect of synchronous and asynchronous computer-mediated communication (CMC) on EFL learners' pragmatic competence. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *92*(Cmc), 169–177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.11.015

Alfghe, A., & Mohammadzadeh, B. (2021). Realisation of the speech act of request, suggestion and apology by Libyan EFL learners. *SAGE Open*, *11*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211050378

Astia, I. (2020). Politeness strategy in interlanguage pragmatics of complaints by international students. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, *4*(2), 14. https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v4i2.528

Aufa, F. (2011). The use of discourse completion task (DCT) as explicit instruction on Indonesian Efl learners' production of suggestion acts. *Journal of English and Education*, *5*(2), 21–43. https://doi.org/10.20885/jee.vol5.iss2.art2

Bachman, L. F. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. In *Oxford University Press* (Firstpubli). New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350093560.ch-003

Badrkoohi, A. (2018). The relationship between demotivation and intercultural communicative competence. *Cogent Education*, *5*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1531741

Bardovi–Harlig, K., & Su, Y. (2018). The acquisition of conventional expressions as a pragmalinguistic resource in Chinese as a foreign language. *Modern Language Journal*, *102*(4), 732–757. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12517

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 1–47. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1

Chen, C. (2017). A case study on the relationship between individual differences and English pragmatic competence of non-English-major Chinese postgraduates. *English Linguistics Research*, *6*(1), 58. https://doi.org/10.5430/elr.v6n1p58

Creswell, J. (2012). Educational research (Planning, Conducting and Evaluating, Quantitative and Qualitative Research. In K. Mason (Ed.), *AORN Journal* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-2092(06)63677-6

Deci, Edward. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and Self-determination in human behavior* (Springer S). New York: Plenum Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Dornyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). The psychology of the language learner revisited over. In the Bristol Medico-Chirurgical Journa,l 87. Retrieved from Routledge

Farashaiyan, A., & Tan, K. H. (2012). On the relationship between pragmatic knowledge and language proficiency among Iranian male and female undergraduate EFL learners. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*, *18*(1), 33–46.

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitude and motivation* (H. Giles, Ed.). London: Edward Awrnold.

Gardner, R. C. (2004). Attitude / Motivation test battery : International AMTB research project. In *The University of Western Ontario*. Ontario.

Gardner, R. C. (2006). The socio-educational model of second language acquisition- A Research paradigm. In *EUROSLA Yearbook* (Vol. 6, pp. 237–260). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-28380-3_2

Gardner, R. C., & Lalonde, R. N. (1985). Second language acquisition: A social psychological perspective. *The annual convention of the American Psychological Association (93rd, Los Angeles, CA, August 23-27, 1985)*, 1–23. Los Angeles. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195384253.013.0014

Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1959). Motivational variables in second-language acquisition 1 Robert c. Gardner and Wallace e. lambert. *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, *13*(4), 266–272.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition* (1st ed., Vol. 33). Alemany Pr. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543033001038

Lavinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatic* (first). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Leech, G. N. (1989). Principles of pragmatics. *Computation of Language*, p. 134. New York: Longman Linguistic Library. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-74564-5_12

Mirzaei, A., & Forouzandeh, F. (2013). Relationship between intercultural communicative competence and L2-learning motivation of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *42*(3), 300–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2013.816867

Purnomo, R. A. (2016). Analisis statistik ekonomi dan bisnis dengan SPSS. In *Cv. Wade Group*. Retrieved from CV. Wade Group

Qadi, A. H. (2021). Use of refusal strategies among Saudi EFL Students: An investigative study. *English Language Teaching*, *14*(7), 27. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v14n7p27

Rasouli, K. H., & Bagherzadeh, N. A. (2013). Motivation and interlanguage pragmatics in Iranian English language learners. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(6), 86–96. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n6p86

Ryan, E. L. D. R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and Self-determination in human behavior* (Alliot Aro). New York: Springer Science+Business Media. LLC. https://doi.org/DOI 10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7

Sugiyono, P. D. (2015). *Metode penelitian pendidikan: Pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D* (22nd ed.). Bandung: Alfabeta.

Tajeddin, Z., Alemi, M., & Razzaghi, S. (2014). Cross-cultural perceptions of impoliteness by native English speakers and EFL learners: The case of apology speech cct. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *43*(4), 304–326. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2014.967279

Tajeddin, Z., & Moghadam, A. Z. (2012). Interlanguage pragmatic motivation: Its construct and impact on speech act production. *RELC Journal*, *43*(3), 353–372. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688212468481

Yule, G. (2017). The study of language sixth edition. In *Cambridge University Press* (6th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108582889

Zand-Moghadam, A., & Adeh, A. (2020). Investigating pragmatic competence, metapragmatic awareness and speech act strategies among Turkmen-Persian bilingual and Persian monolingual EFL learners: A Cross-cultural perspective. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *49*(1), 22–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2019.1705876

Zarrinabadi, N., Rezazadeh, M., & Shirinbakhsh, S. (2021). "I can learn how to communicate appropriately in this language" Examining the links between language mindsets and understanding L2 pragmatic behaviours. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2021.1938173

Zhang, Y., & Papi, M. (2021). Motivation and second language pragmatics: A regulatory focus perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*(October), 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.753605

Ziashahabi, S., Jabbari, A. A., & Razmi, M. H. (2020). The effect of interventionist instructions of English conversational implicatures on Iranian EFL intermediate level learners' pragmatic competence development. *Cogent Education*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1840008