

Study of Chinese Junior High School Students' English Pragmatic Failure from the Perspective of Cultural Transfer

Jiazhen Rao *

College of Foreign Languages, Ocean University of China, Qingdao, China

* Corresponding author Email: rjzelliot@163.com

Abstract: In the context of English as an international lingua franca, people's cross-cultural communication is obviously enhanced. In the process of cross-cultural communication, people with different cultural backgrounds ways of thinking, and cultural language habits use their own native culture to guess the behavioral habits of people who are different from their own culture. When negative cultural transfer occurs, it will cause the interlocutor to make a linguistic error in the communication. This affects the smoothness of intercultural communication. The rational use of English in cross-cultural communication situations has always been a major challenge for Chinese English learners. There are many domestic studies on the analysis of English language use from the perspective of negative cultural transfer based on second language acquisition, but not enough attention has been paid to the study of junior high school students English language use errors from the perspective of cultural transfer. The emphasis on pragmatic failure from the time students have the appropriate cultural awareness will help them improve their linguistic skills, reduce the phenomenon of Pragmatic failures, and improve their communication skills in intercultural. Therefore, this paper investigates the reasons for the emergence of junior high school students' pragmatic failures from the perspective of cultural transfer and draws teachers' attention to the development of students' pragmatic competence so that students can effectively avoid pragmatic failure in cross-cultural communication.

Keywords: Pragmatic Failure; Cultural Transfer; Pragmatic Competence; Junior High School Student.

1. Introduction

The study of pragmatic failure is an important part of the study of intercultural communication pragmatics. After the famous English linguist Jenny Thomas introduced the concept of pragmatic failure and divided it into two categories, namely pragmatic language errors and social pragmatic failure, many scholars at home and abroad have paid extensive attention to and studied the phenomenon of pragmatic failure. He Ziran (1997) generally believes that pragmatic failure is not errors in the form of linguistic expressions, but rather when the speaker uses the correct expressions in terms of symbolic relations in verbal communication, but the speech does not fit the context, does not fit the other party's pragmatic habits or cannot be understood by the listener. Specifically, the speaker violates the communicative habits and specific cultural values of the target language due to the cultural habits and ways of thinking of the native language, as well as the lack of understanding of the cultural differences between the two parties, social status, and the occasion. This can lead to interruptions or failures in communicative behavior, which can lead to obstacles in communicating, failing to achieve the desired effect or to achieve a complete communicative effect.

However, in recent years, the research related to pragmatic failure is not significant, but the phenomenon of pragmatic failure still exists. Especially in foreign language teaching, the teaching focuses on students' language expressions, language structures, grammar rules, and other aspects of education, but does not pay special attention to the development of students' pragmatic competence. As a result, students still make a lot of pragmatic failure in intercultural communication, because they cannot understand the linguistic habits of different

cultures and analyze the corresponding situations well. This seriously affects the expected or desired effect of intercultural communication and sometimes causes some misunderstandings. The study of pragmatic failure is of great value for teaching foreign language pragmatic competence. Cultural transfer is divided into positive cultural transfer and negative cultural transfer. Positive cultural transfer means that the rules of both the native language and the foreign language learned have similarities, and this time the native culture will have a positive influence on the learning of the second foreign language, which is conducive to promoting the acquisition of the second language. On the contrary, negative cultural transfer means that the cultural background and cultural habits of the native language are different from those of the learned foreign language, which will have a negative impact on the acquisition of the second language and will be influenced by the culture of the native language thinking, which is not conducive to the acquisition of the second language. There have been many previous studies in China on the integration of pragmatic failure and foreign language teaching, but they have mostly stayed in the study of English learners in colleges and universities. Few studies have been conducted specifically on pragmatic failure in secondary school classrooms. In this paper, we analyze the causes of English language learners' classroom pragmatic failure, the types of pragmatic failure, and the corresponding teaching methods to avoid pragmatic failure and improve students' pragmatic competence.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Conception of Pragmatic Failure

The concept of pragmatic failure was first formally

introduced by the British linguist Jenny Thomas, who established a theoretical framework that has far-reaching significance for cross-cultural pragmatics research. Pragmatic failure refers to the misunderstanding of the linguistic context and the inability of the communicators to understand the meaning of the two parties, specifically, the understanding of a word or structure in the learned language in the native language. Social pragmatic failure refers to pragmatic failure that occurs when the cultural conventions of the native language are applied without understanding or ignoring the differences in the social and cultural backgrounds of the two parties in the conversation.

2.2. Previous Studies on Pragmatic Failure Abroad

Kasper (1996) studied cross-cultural pragmatic failure from the perspective of interlingual pragmatics, and in his article on mediated pragmatics, he pointed out that negative language transfer can cause communicative errors. Megumi K.M (2003) pointed out that linguistic pragmatic failure is relatively easy to overcome in her study, so she focused on analyzing the causes of students' social pragmatic failure in the context of her language teaching focus her study. In his study, Peter Dash (2004) analyzed the semantic and pragmatic aspects of English as a second language acquisition language and the importance of both for learning and understanding pragmatics. In his study, analyzes the role of semantic and pragmatic knowledge and the importance of both for the learning and understanding of pragmatics in the second language acquisition classroom and shows that teaching pragmatics in the second language acquisition classroom can help students avoid the problem of pragmatic failure in cross-cultural communication. In overcoming Pragmatic failure in the classroom, Jeong, E.S. (2006), a researcher on teaching pragmatic failure in the English as a Foreign Language classroom, uses Thomas' dichotomous pragmatic failure to investigate the pragmatic failure of Korean English learners and suggests strategies for overcoming pragmatic failure in intercultural communication. For example, second language teachers should collect a large number of cross-cultural situations from English movies and corresponding English books, newspapers, and websites so that students can understand the pragmatic situations, understand different cultural language situations, and improve learners' pragmatic awareness and pragmatic competence.

Italian scholar Chiara Zamborlin (2007), in "Beyond Discourse Failure: Dissonance in Intercultural Communication," suggests that he prefers the term dissonance to failure. He studies discordance from the perspective of harmony management and points out that dissonance in intercultural communication is caused by the superposition of different causes and impositions, and the effect of this dissonance can extend from unpleasant emotions to humor, so this dynamic view of intercultural dissonance can better provide answers to the possible causes and potential outcomes of miscommunication.

By understanding the foreign studies on discourse dissonance, it can be found that the field of discourse dissonance research has emerged from social sciences to natural fields, and the study of discourse dissonance is very extensive and interdisciplinary, cross-cultural communication. At the same time, we can also see that the research on language errors abroad is relatively general, and the specific empirical research on the causes and countermeasures of

cross-cultural language errors is relatively small.

2.3. Previous Studies on Pragmatic Failure at Home

Cross-cultural pragmatics has received a lot of attention from Chinese scholars. Scholars have noticed that in cross-cultural communication, Chinese learners of English are vulnerable to cultural differences and language transfer and do not understand the context and the habits of English, which leads to the phenomenon of pragmatic failure, and their pragmatic awareness and pragmatic competence are not strong. Most domestic studies have called for the problem of pragmatic failure to be brought to the attention of foreign language teachers who should not only focus on students' fluency in phonetics, grammar, and sentence expressions but also on the development of students' pragmatic competence, focus on pragmatic teaching and improve students' meta-pragmatic knowledge and awareness as well as related pragmatic competence. The teaching policy should be adjusted to better and effectively avoid intercultural communication errors and successfully achieve intercultural communication. Domestic research on pragmatic failure focuses on the causes of pragmatic failure and how to help learners solve them, and scholars have studied the causes of pragmatic failure from the perspectives of second language acquisition and foreign language teaching, as well as from the perspectives of conformity theory and cognition.

Domestic research shows that the main causes of pragmatic failure are, firstly, the misuse of native language rules and the influence of negative native language transfer, and secondly, the violation of the principle of cooperation in communication, which makes the interlocutor unable to understand the meaning of both sides. There is also the inability to understand the context of a specific communication, which leads to the phenomenon of pragmatic failure.

The research of domestic scholars is mostly confined to cross-cultural communication failure or interlingual pragmatic failure, naturally, the primary cause of pragmatic failure is attributed to cultural differences. In cross-cultural communication, as a result of one party (or both) to the other party's lack of understanding of traditional social culture, communication between different cultures involved, from the perspective of their culture to ascertain people of other cultures, the results of two kinds of cultural concepts is not mutual confluence, found and their expectations are different, can produce cultural conflicts, appear inappropriate words and deeds. In a paper published by He Ziran and Yan Zhuang (1986), Chinese students' pragmatic failure in English communication investigation of the differences in Chinese and English pragmatic use used a quantitative research approach to conduct a case study. They found that students' social pragmatic failure in cross-cultural communication was due to different Chinese-English cultural differences. They believe that foreign language teaching should focus on the education of pragmatic knowledge and the development of students' pragmatic competence.

Wang Dexing (1990) summarized the types of pragmatic failure that people tend to make in intercultural communication and used pragmatic tests to test students' pragmatic abilities. The types of pragmatic failure are mainly addressing, greeting, introduction, greeting, apology, request, and so on. He also pointed out that cultural differences are an important reason for pragmatic failure.

Lv Wenhua and Lu Jianji (1993) believed that "the

pragmatic rules and cultural factors of students' mother tongue are acquired from childhood, and have become their mode of thinking and code of conduct", which interferes with the learning and use of foreign languages. It also explains the reasons for pragmatic failures from the perspective of teaching." Our teaching has not fully reflected Chinese pragmatic rules and culture consciously, in a planned way, and this gap in teaching makes it possible for students to interfere with their mother tongue. The content of language teaching in the primary stage (meaning and cultural connotation expressed by language) is often very simple and broad. However, adult ideas are complex and nuanced. These two form a pair of contradictions, which is a source of pragmatic failures." Dai Weidong and Zhang Hongling (2000) analyzed the influence of surface culture transfer and deep culture transfer on foreign language communication and cross-cultural communication and pointed out that deep culture transfer has not received much attention from many scholars, and it is more difficult to overcome the deep culture transfer than the surface culture transfer. This paper uses specific examples to distinguish between surface cultural transfer and deep cultural transfer and finds that most Chinese communicators will be affected by cultural transfer and have obstacles in communication. Especially deep cultural transfer. In cross-cultural communication, foreign language learners have good basic language skills, but there are always some problems in communication, because they do not understand the deep cultural background of the other party, or even if they have some understanding, it is difficult to get rid of the influence of mother tongue cultural habits on their language communication. This finding has important implications for foreign language teaching and intercultural communication.

From the perspective of the relationship between cognition and language, language is a cognitive activity, and cognition precedes language. As far as cognitive objects are concerned, "the mental representations left by the objective world in the human brain are reflected in the form of images, concepts, and scripts. The different highlights of images, the generalization of concepts, the wrong choice of scripts, or the different cultural and psychological representations of scripts may all lead to the intra - or interlingual pragmatic failures"(Sun Ya,2001). As far as cognitive subjects are concerned, although people's cognitive experience is universal, it also varies from person to person. As far as cognitive tools are concerned, categorization is the most automatic way for human beings to perceive the world. People tend to classify to have a clear understanding of the world. However, different people may classify the same thing differently, and even the same person may classify the same thing differently on different occasions, not to mention people with different cultural backgrounds. Other cognitive abilities of human beings, such as metaphor, metaphor, generalization, and concretization, also have different cognitive patterns. In short, discoveries will be made when pragmatic failures are examined from a cognitive perspective. Long, Xiang, and Li, Zheng (2002) point out that pragmatic failure does not only exist at the level of verbal communication but also the level of non-verbal communication, such as body gestures and facial expressions. In the study, verbal and nonverbal communication errors are compared and some typical examples of verbal and nonverbal communication errors are analyzed in detail, and students are urged to pay attention not only to the improvement of verbal communication skills but also to nonverbal communication errors. They also cited the need to learn more about pragmatic

aspects rather than just focusing on linguistic rules because of cultural differences and differences in values, which are expressed in different gestures between countries. This will help to promote smooth intercultural communication.

Cui Yiping (2004) analyzes negative pragmatic transfer as the main reason for the emergence of pragmatic failure. He analyzes examples of pragmatic failure in some situations and finds that due to the influence of native language cultural awareness, communicators tend to apply the expression habits of their native language to the second language, thus having a hindering effect on intercultural communication and not conforming to cultural pragmatic habits.

Other scholars have also studied the study of pragmatic failure in English teaching and conjunction with English teaching materials, and less attention has been paid to the study of static pragmatic failure, mainly focusing on how teaching materials should be written and the study of countermeasures for pragmatic failure. Hao Qin Hai (2000) pointed out in his research that advertising language has become an application language with its unique features. However, due to the huge differences between Chinese and English cultural forms, customs, and cognitive patterns, cross-cultural pragmatic errors often occur, which become a major obstacle for Chinese products to enter the international market. Based on the analysis of some Chinese-English advertisements, this paper finds that the main causes of language pragmatic failures and social pragmatic failures are: the transfer and generalization of pragmatic rules and meanings, difference of associative meanings, misuse of taboos, and neglect of different values between the two cultures. Tang Liping (2007) points out that teachers should pay attention to the development of students' pragmatic competence in secondary school English teaching classrooms. He conducted a questionnaire survey on teachers in five secondary schools and found that there is a close relationship between intercultural communication pragmatic failure and foreign language teaching. Teachers should promote the interaction between grammar teaching and pragmatic teaching, cultivate students' meta-pragmatic awareness and ability in teaching activities, create situations and let students practice communicatively give them timely feedback on pragmatic aspects, and give them timely correction after pragmatic failure.

According to Zuo Yanhong and Jiang Zhanhao (2012), the lack of pragmatic and cultural knowledge can lead to pragmatic failure, and the lack of pragmatic knowledge in textbooks is not conducive to the development of students' pragmatic competence. The textbooks should be written with pragmatic knowledge of different backgrounds and cultures to improve students' pragmatic awareness. Chen, Xinren, and Li, Min (2015) have made a new definition of pragmatic failure in the context of English as an international lingua franca, so the pragmatic teaching of pragmatic failure should also be adjusted accordingly. Teachers should focus on students' sensitivity to communicative contexts as well as comprehension, enhance students' empathy awareness, and expression ability, and improve students' awareness of meta-linguistic cultural information. Focus on the development of students' ability to improvise and observe adaptations.

The study of pragmatic failure in China shows that many scholars have focused on the causes of pragmatic failure and how teachers should respond to them, emphasizing the development of students' pragmatic competence. However, the empirical studies on pragmatic failure are still insufficient,

and the empirical studies can draw teachers' and students' attention to pragmatic failure and cultivate pragmatic awareness of pragmatic competence.

2.4. The Conception of Cultural Transfer

The cultural transfer is caused by cultural differences is manifested by the fact that people subconsciously use their cultural norms and values to guide their own words, actions, and thoughts during intercultural communication or foreign language learning, and use them as a standard to judge the words, actions and thoughts of others.

Wei Dong Dai and Hong Ling Zhang (2000) analyze the influence of superficial and deep cultural transfer in foreign language communication and intercultural communication and point out that deep cultural transfer has not received much attention from scholars, and deep cultural transfer culture is more difficult to overcome than superficial cultural transfer culture. In this paper, specific examples are used to distinguish between superficial and deep cultural transfer, and it is found that most Chinese communicators are affected by cultural transfer and have obstacles in communication. This is especially true for deep cultural transfer. In cross-cultural communication, foreign language learners have good basic language skills, but they always have problems in communication because they do not understand each other's deep cultural background, or even if they do understand it, it is difficult to change the influence of their native cultural habits on their communicative expressions. This finding has important implications for foreign language teaching and intercultural communication.

2.5. Studies on Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatic competence refers to the communicator's ability to use and understand speech appropriately in specific communicative situations. Pragmatic competence has always been a concern by many scholars. Many scholars have subdivided and defined pragmatic competence and pointed out that learners should pay attention to the cultivation of pragmatic competence. Many pragmatic failures and misunderstandings in language communication are due to the deficiency of pragmatic competence. At present, most teaching focuses on cultivating students' correct language expression and language form, while ignoring the importance of language competence and pragmatic competence. Students' pragmatic competence should also be emphasized after learning a second language. Chen xinren (2009) defined pragmatic competence as the ability to use discourse to conduct appropriate communication in a specific context so as to achieve communicative goals, and proposed four dimensions of pragmatic competence : (1) pragmatic linguistic competence refers to all the language resources (such as vocabulary and grammar knowledge) a speaker has mastered to implement or understand a speech act; (2) Social pragmatic competence refers to the ability to communicate appropriately based on socio-cultural factors, mainly including the consideration of the need for face, the expression of politeness, the communication and recognition of attitude or emotion, and the grasp of formality of style, etc. (3) Pragma-cognitive mind refers to the ability to provide or capture the best possible relevance in discourse and understanding, mainly in the reasoning of conversational implications, the use of presuppositions and markers; (4) Discourse organization ability refers to the ability to construct semantically coherent and standardized monologue discourse

and participate in natural conversation organization, which can be further divided into discourse organization ability and conversation organization ability. The former mainly includes the use of cohesive devices to enhance coherence, and the construction of macro discourse structure; The latter mainly includes turn-taking control (e.g., initiation, conversion, maintenance, handover, end), conversation adjustment (e.g., correction, restatement, use of increments, etc.), and topic control (e.g., topic selection, maintenance, conversion, etc.). Li Min and Chen Xinren (2018) Pragmatic Competence research methods. Generally speaking, the pragmatic competence research institute in China has adopted a relatively complete range of research methods, including experimental method, questionnaire method, corpus method, and so on. However, the study of pragmatic competence is a study of the interface between pragmatics and second language acquisition, which requires researchers not only to have certain pragmatic knowledge but also to have a good grasp of the research methods of second language acquisition, which is a great challenge for researchers of pragmatic competence. In addition to rational thinking, pragmatic competence research in China needs to be further improved in the aspects of scientific experimental design, validity of questionnaire, representativeness of corpus selection, and scale of the corpus. In addition, although the case method has the characteristics of long duration and difficult data collection, it can reveal the characteristics that are difficult to find in quantitative research, and the data mining is deeper, more comprehensive, and more detailed, which is also worth the attention of pragmatic competence researchers.

3. Research Design

3.1. Research Questions

This paper is based on the questionnaire survey data of 60 Chinese junior high school students' English language proficiency tests and the analysis of students' pragmatic failure in the tests, and four main questions to explore the pragmatic teaching of students are as follows.

- (1) what are the main types of pragmatic failure that are more common among Chinese junior high school students?
- (2) What are the causes of middle school students' pragmatic failure from the perspective of cultural transfer theory?
- (3) what kind of pragmatic teaching strategies can improve students' pragmatic awareness and pragmatic competence?

3.2. Research Participants

In this paper, 60 junior high school students from a middle school in Qingdao, Shandong Province, were selected, all of whom had comparable English proficiency and were at the middle to high-level stage. They are divided into two groups A and B. Their English proficiency was judged by first giving the subjects an English proficiency test that contained relevant pragmatic ability test questions. The results of these 60 students' scores were analyzed by SPSS data and found to be not significantly different, indicating that all 60 junior high school students in this middle school were at a comparable stage of English proficiency and did not differ greatly enough to be used as subjects for the experiment. Secondly, none of the subjects had received systematic theoretical teaching of pragmatics and the development of pragmatic competence.

These subjects were all from the second year of junior high school and had some communicative skills at a level that was representative of the middle of the first and third-year students. Thirty of the students were male and the other 30 were female. Equal numbers of males and females were maintained and the experiment was not influenced by gender.

3.3. Research Materials

The experimental material is a questionnaire about a verbal ability test, i.e. a test of various types of verbal ability in some common situations in interpersonal communication such as invitation, request, apology, thanks, praise, refusal, congratulations, etc. This questionnaire consists of 30 multiple-choice questions containing three options A, B, and C. The options for each multiple-choice question are the same, keeping equal options, and students are not disturbed by other factors. The student's ability for linguistic variation is tested. Eight subjective multiple-choice questions examine whether students have been trained in pragmatic knowledge or whether they have relevant pragmatic awareness. The questions were based on a questionnaire designed by He Ziran's (1986) study on pragmatic failure of secondary school students, in which students were given a specific social situation, such as a request for help from a classmate, and were given a specific context for how to respond. Students are asked to make a choice and are not allowed to discuss it with their classmates, but are required to answer the questionnaire independently. Each type of language proficiency test question is randomly assigned, not an equal number of questions. The specific contexts provided were prompted in Chinese, while the options and questions were in English. This prevented students from choosing the wrong answer because they could not read the questions, as they were still junior high school students and did not have a high level of English, which might have an impact on this, so the questionnaire was designed with this aspect in mind. The questionnaire was pre-tested on junior high school students from other schools to examine whether the questionnaire was feasible before testing the students. Some of the specific contents of the questionnaire are as follows

1. Lucy's grandmother is sick, and she talked to Ming about it, what should Ming say at this time?

Lucy: My grandmother is ill, I'm so sad.

A. It doesn't matter B. I'm sorry to hear that C. It will be ok

2. Li Hua worked in a foreign trade company, and one day his boss asked him to work overtime, and then her boss said to him: Thanks a lot, you doing me a great favor.

A. No problem B. It's my pleasure C. Never mind, it's my job

3. Xiao Li and Tom are roommates in the same dormitory. One day Tom asked Xiao Li to help him get the delivery because he had something outside and couldn't come back in time and needed someone to sign for the delivery.

4. Can you help me to take a delivery?

A. Yes, my honor B. No problem C. OK, It's a small thing

5 Wang Ming has something to say to his boss Brown, what should he say?

A. Have a time B. I'm sorry to trouble you, sir C. Can I have a word with you

6. When you wear a beautiful dress and your good friend Jane compliments you on it, how should you respond?

A. It's so cheap B. Would you like to have it C. Thanks

7. Xiao Hong met her foreign teacher Lily on her way to the library.

A. Hello B. Good morning, dear teacher C. Hi, have you eaten breakfast already?

8. Your good friend Frank asks you to go to the coffee shop for coffee, but you can't go.

A. Thank you so much, I'm busy B. No, I don't have any time C. Thank you, I can't go with you

9. You accidentally broke something that your good friend had, how should you apologize at this time?

A. I did it accidentally B. It's not my intention C. Sorry, I will buy you the same one

10. When your classmate has won the first prize, you want to give him/her congratulations, what will you plan to say?

A. You are so wonderful B. Congratulations to you C. You are so lucky

The second experiment was conducted after the first questionnaire survey, and it was found that students made a lot of linguistic errors in specific situations. The second experimental material is a test designed after the implementation of pragmatic teaching, after summarizing the types of pragmatic failure of students, which mainly includes the pragmatic test questions of the common types of pragmatic failure of students. The test consisted of 20 questions, including 10 single-choice questions and 10 judgment questions, to test whether strengthening pragmatic teaching could help students improve their pragmatic competence and reduce the occurrence of students' pragmatic failure.

3.4. Research Procedures

The experimental procedure consisted of having students complete a questionnaire containing various types of pragmatic situations without training or instruction. The students were given a time limit of 45 minutes to complete the test, and then they had to complete the questionnaire independently without any discussion during the process of answering the questionnaire. The questionnaires are collected and corrected by the questionnaire senders, and the data on students' pragmatic failures are compiled and summarized. The data will be analyzed to determine the types of linguistic errors that students commonly make and to discuss the causes of these errors. Once the data analysis was completed, it was organized into a table that showed the students' error-prone questions and related problems. The second step was to group the students into control and experimental groups, with no pragmatic instruction for the control group and three days of pragmatic instruction and training for the experimental group. The control group and the experimental group were 30 students each, and the students were first taught about cultural awareness the importance of not applying the cultural habits of their native language to English expressions, and the importance of developing their pragmatic awareness. During this process, the student's pragmatic competence was reinforced with concrete examples and exercises. After the three days of teaching, the students were tested on the fifth day, the day after the end of teaching. The control group and the experimental group were tested separately on their pragmatic competence, and the scores of the two groups were compared. The SPSS data analysis software was used to analyze the results of both groups to see if timely pragmatic instruction would improve the students' pragmatic competence and reduce the phenomenon of pragmatic failure. Finally, a subjective interview was conducted with the experimental and control groups, in which several students were selected and asked questions about whether or not they

felt that pragmatic instruction had had an impact on them. Do you usually pay attention to the development of pragmatic competence? Do you know about the problems related to pragmatic failure and do you think the reason for your pragmatic failure is due to the influence of negative cultural transfer?

4. Results

By analyzing the results of the pragmatic competence test, it was found that the pragmatic failures of the two groups are different, and there are also differences in the pragmatic failures of different types of speech acts. The errors in Group B were significantly higher than those in Group A. The results were that strengthening the pragmatic competence teaching of Group B was beneficial to improving the pragmatic awareness and competence of Group A. Analyze the general data, and then analyze the students' correct rate of each type of example, such as greeting, suggestion, praise, and so on. Thus carry on the corresponding comparative analysis. Based on the analysis of the obtained data, the specific reasons for the pragmatic failures of students in this speech act communication are speculated. The reason for the experiment presupposition is the influence of the negative transfer of mother tongue culture. As junior high school students just learn English, the cultural thinking and expression habits of their mother tongue are deeply rooted in the early stage, and the daily English teaching received by learners is also expressed from the perspective of mother tongue thinking. Teachers pay little attention to the cultivation of learners' pragmatic ability. Therefore, influenced by the cultural thinking of their mother tongue, junior high school students will habitually use the expressions of their mother tongue to express the words they want to express in English. Moreover, the lack of understanding of foreign pragmatic habits and cultures also has a certain impact on learners. Learners may have different types of pragmatic failures, which are also influenced by cultural transfer. The data of the results is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The percentage of correct answers from Group A and Group B on different types of speech act

Types of speech act	The percentage of correct answers from Group A	The percentage of correct answers from Group B
Greeting	80%	50%
Compliment	78%	60%
Advising	72%	45%
Apology	70%	42%
Thanks	89%	60%
Request	64%	40%
Farewell	65%	46%

5. Conclusion

The above study has made a detailed discussion on the phenomenon of pragmatic failure in junior high school students, mainly through the common language situations in life to make students communicate with the tendency to show the answer. There are mainly invitations, apologies, thanks, congratulations, and other situations. The data collected from the test can be used to observe whether students have pragmatic failures. Then the pragmatic failure of students is summarized. Through experimental design and other investigations, whether the cultivation of students' pragmatic ability in teaching can improve students' pragmatic ability and

awareness, and reduce students' pragmatic errors. By summarizing, the following questions are answered: First, what are the most common types of pragmatic failures of Chinese junior high school students? Secondly, from the perspective of culture, it analyzes that the causes of each type of pragmatic failure are influenced by the negative transfer of the mother tongue. Thirdly, the correlation between English language competence and English pragmatic competence is investigated. Finally, this paper emphasizes the importance of cultivating students' pragmatic awareness and awareness of cross-cultural differences, and puts forward some innovative teaching suggestions based on the current situation of English teaching in China, aiming to reduce the pragmatic failure of English learners in cross-cultural communication. In common communications, there are still many pragmatic failures, which disturb the interaction with students. Pragmatic competence is necessary to be attached to great importance, for with pragmatic competence, communication with foreigners can be easier. The study of pragmatic failure is an interdisciplinary subject involving pragmatics, intercultural communication, second language acquisition, and foreign language teaching. However, there are some limitations to this paper, the participants are only junior high school students, and the type of materials is simple. In the future study, the participants can be extended to college students, and the type of materials can be enlarged.

References

- [1] D. Peter, "Cross-cultural pragmatic failure: a definitional analysis with implications for classroom teaching" *Asian EFL Journal*, vol.6, no. 3, 2004.
- [2] M. Economidou-Kogetsidis, "please answer me as soon as possible": pragmatic failure in non-native speakers' e-mail requests to faculty. *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 43, no. 13, pp. 319-321, 2011.
- [3] Gabriele, Kasper, Richard, and Schmidt. Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 149-169, 1996.
- [4] E. S. Jeong, *Overcoming Pragmatic Failure*. Modern English Education, 2006.
- [5] S. Liu, M. K. Kang. *The Causes of Pragmatic Failure from the Perspective of Bilingualism and its Implications for Foreign Language Teaching*, 2021.
- [6] K. M. Megumi, "What is the relevance of socio-pragmatic failure to language teaching?", 2003.
- [7] G. Pohl, *Cross-cultural pragmatic failure and implications for language teaching*. *Second Language Learning & Teaching*, 2004.
- [8] K. Samovar and A. Larry, *Communication between cultures* 5th ed. Peking University Press, 2004.
- [9] J. A. Thomas, *Cross-cultural pragmatic failure*. *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 91-112. 1983.
- [10] W. Zamborlin and G. Chiara, *Going beyond pragmatic failures: dissonance in intercultural communication*. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2007.
- [11] Dai Weidong, Zhang Hongling, *Cultural Migration in Foreign Language Communication and Its Implications for Foreign Language Reform*. *Foreign language world*, vol. 2, pp.2-8, 2000.
- [12] Cui Yiping, *Pragmatic errors from the perspective of negative pragmatic transfer*. *Shandong foreign language teaching*, 2004, pp. 67-69.

- [13] Chen Xinren and Li Min, A new solution to pragmatic errors in the context of English as an international lingua franca. *Foreign languages and foreign language teaching*, 2015, pp. 7-12.
- [14] Chen Xinren, Critical Pragmatics: Objectives, Objects, and Methods. *Foreign languages and foreign language teaching* 2009, pp. 10-12.
- [15] He Ziran and Yan Zhuang, Pragmatic Errors of Chinese Students in English Communication: A Survey of Differences in Chinese-English Communication. *Foreign language teaching and research*, 1986, pp. 52-57.
- [16] He Ziran, What is Interlingual pragmatics. *Foreign linguistics*, 1996, pp. 1-6.
- [17] Hao Qin Hai, A Brief analysis of cross-cultural pragmatic Failures in advertising language in Chinese-English translation of advertising language. *Foreign language teaching*, 2002, pp. 26-32.
- [18] Li Min and Chen Xinren., An analysis of international hotspots in the study of corpus pragmatics. *Modern foreign language*, vol. 42, no. 1, pp.122-133, 2019.
- [19] Long Xiang, Li Zheng, A comparative study of pragmatic failures in Verbal Communication and non-verbal communication. *Journal of Guangxi Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, vol. 3, pp. 70-78, 2002
- [20] Lu Wenhua and Lu Jianji, Pragmatic failures of foreigners in learning Chinese. *Chinese Language Learning*, vol.1, pp.41-44, 1993.
- [21] Sun Ya, Pragmatic Failure from a Cognitive Perspective. *Journal of Sichuan Foreign Languages University*, vol. 6, pp. 59-61, 2002.
- [22] Sun Ya and Dai Ling, Studies on pragmatic failure in China. *Foreign languages and foreign language teaching*, vol. 3, pp.19-21, 2002.
- [23] Tang Liping, A study on cross-cultural Pragmatic Failure and English Teaching in Middle School. (Doctoral dissertation, Central China Normal University), 2007.
- [24] Wang Dexing, Pragmatic Issues in cross-cultural communication. *Foreign language teaching and research*, vol. 4, pp. 7-11, 1990.
- [25] Yuan Caihong and Lang Hongqin. Negative transfer of mother tongue culture and English teaching. *Foreign languages and foreign language teaching*, vol. 8, pp. 46-47, 2000.
- [26] Zuo Yan-Hong and Jiang Zhanhao.). A study on cross-cultural pragmatic failures and strategies for compiling English textbooks. *Journal of Shandong University of Technology: Social Science Edition*, vol. 1, pp. 4-6, 2012.