

Cross Cultural Pragmatic Failure in Anna and the King Film

Nelita Permata Sari, Albert, Afdaleni, Nofrika Sari, Haris Syukri,

ARTICLE INFORMATION

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: 2025-12-01

Review: 2026-01-11

Accepted: 2026-01-15

Published: 2026-01-20

KEYWORDS

CROSS-CULTURAL PRAGMATIC FAILURE, ANNA AND THE KING FILM

KATA KUNCI

KEGAGALAN PRAGMATIK LINTAS BUDAYA, FILM ANNA DAN RAJA

AUTHOR CORRESPONDING

Nelita permatasari
nelitapermatasari@gmail.com
STAB HAS Bukittinggi

Afdaleni
afdaleni@yahoo.com
Universitas Mohammad Natsir
Bukittinggi

Nofrika Sari
nofrikasari81@gmail.com
AKBAR Paramitha Bukittinggi

Albert
albertnatsir@gmail.com
Universitas Deztron

Haris Syukri
harissyukri@gmail.com
Universitas Negeri Padang

ABSTRACT

This research discussed on *Cross Cultural Pragmatic Failure in Anna and the King Film*. It is aimed to find out the types and causes of cross cultural pragmatic failure in Anna and the King film. The data are taken from an American film entitled *Anna and the King* by Andy Tennant. Theory of Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure proposed by Thomas is applied in this research. This research is categorized into qualitative research by applying *non-participant observational method (Simak Bebas Libat Cakap)* and supported by *noting technique (Teknik Catat)* proposed by Sudaryanto. The result showed that the types and causes of cross cultural pragmatic failure are found in the data source. The types are divided into 2; pragma-linguistic failure and socio-pragmatic failure. Continually, the types occur because there are some causes. Pragma-linguistic failure occurs as the result of pragma-linguistic transfer while socio-pragmatic failure occurs because of taboo, cross-culturally different assessments of relative power or social distance, socio-pragmatic failure and value judgements. Generally, in communication both speaker and hearer who have different background and knowledge will lead cross cultural pragmatic failure. It's because each cultures are unique which they have their own way in linguistic patterns, politeness, norms, customs, rules of communication and social habit where one culture have and the others not and otherwise. Therefore, both speaker and hearer carry out their own way in communication through the language as the result cultural differences.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini membahas tentang Kegagalan Pragmatik Lintas Budaya dalam Film Anna and the King. Tujuannya adalah untuk mengetahui jenis dan penyebab kegagalan pragmatik lintas budaya dalam film Anna and the King. Data diambil dari film Amerika berjudul Anna and the King karya Andy Tennant. Teori Kegagalan Pragmatik Lintas Budaya yang dikemukakan oleh Thomas diterapkan dalam penelitian ini. Penelitian ini dikategorikan sebagai penelitian kualitatif dengan menerapkan metode observasi non-partisipan (Simak Gratis Libat Cakap) dan didukung oleh teknik pencatatan (Technique Note) yang dikemukakan oleh Sudaryanto. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa jenis dan penyebab kegagalan pragmatik lintas budaya ditemukan dalam sumber data. Jenis-jenis tersebut dibagi menjadi 2; kegagalan pragma-linguistik dan kegagalan sosio-pragmatik. Selanjutnya, jenis-jenis tersebut terjadi karena ada beberapa penyebab. Kegagalan pragma-linguistik terjadi sebagai akibat dari transfer pragma-linguistik sedangkan kegagalan sosio-pragmatik terjadi karena tabu, penilaian kekuatan relatif atau jarak sosial yang berbeda antarbudaya, kegagalan sosio-pragmatik, dan penilaian nilai. Secara umum, dalam komunikasi, baik pembicara maupun pendengar yang memiliki latar belakang dan pengetahuan berbeda akan menyebabkan kegagalan pragmatik lintas budaya. Hal ini karena setiap budaya unik, memiliki cara tersendiri dalam pola linguistik, kesopanan, norma, kebiasaan, aturan komunikasi, dan kebiasaan sosial di mana satu budaya memilikinya dan budaya lain tidak, dan sebaliknya. Oleh karena itu, baik pembicara maupun pendengar menjalankan cara mereka sendiri dalam berkomunikasi melalui bahasa sebagai akibat dari perbedaan budaya.

INTRODUCTION

People and language are related to each other as language becomes tool in communication among people which means they share things in communication through language. Language has variation in functions including discussing, giving opinion, announcing, debating, and so on. Communication occurs as speaker and listener build conversation, where speaker communicates through language and the hearer will interpret what the speaker means. Yule (1996: 3) stated that being good in communication is when listener or reader understands what the speaker says, it depends on the way of a person communicate each other. This study does not only tell about what the speaker means but it also contains context of the conversation which relates to who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances.

As social being human can't stay at the same place and situation, as human need to mobile, meet another people in the different place, culture, race, and religion. Communication helps to understand other people regarding where they are from as well as personal background and knowledge. As the speakers communicate with other people with different culture, they must consider the several aspects that follow the communications to avoid misunderstanding. For instance, the speaker considers their politeness base on their custom and considers the aspects which may be associated with failure in communication.

There is condition when pragmatic fails as the result of cultural differences. Thomas (1983) stated that the speaker's meant has not same with what the listener meant in common linguistic and cultural background. It means there are possibilities of failure that can be occurred

intercultural. People from different cultural have their own perception in talking with the other who shares different value.

Cross cultural pragmatics failure can be occurred in our daily life, drama, movie, theatre, and film so on. An American film that was nominated on 2 Oscars and 12 other nominations with the title *Anna and the King* is chosen as the object of this research by the writer. In this film is presented a lot of cross cultural pragmatic failures. The writer has interested in explaining cross-cultural pragmatic failure in the *Anna and the King* film. As it is exposed the reality of West and Thai culture where the characters are said utterances which have many interpretations for the other parties from the different culture during in communication. For example, one of the characters in the film Kralahome asks the personal question to Anna which is part of type socio-pragmatic failure "*How long are you in possession of dead husband?*" this failure occurs because as well as taboo information for West culture that is not for public information. It shows failure in socio-pragmatic where social factors of in the communication which cause miss interpretation.

Pragmatics

Pragmatics is explained how language is used in communication since meaning can be understood beyond utterances, and there is context to make meaning obvious (Leech, 1983). Next, Thomas (1995: 1) stated that pragmatics is "meaning in use or meaning context" Which means that utterance of the speaker depends on pertinence of what the

speaker said and the context, in order to make hearer understand about what speaker means. Furthermore, Yule (1996: 3) stated that pragmatics points out the utterance's meaning that communicated by speaker or writer and interpreted by hearer or listener which is related with who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances (context).

During communication, the social environment influences our speech and its meaning. As Mey stated (2001: 6) that pragmatics studies the use of language in human communication as determined by condition of society. This statement is declared that as a social being the way of human use their language on society can determines how they affect, and effectualize. The explanation about meaning in utterances Thomas (1983: 2) stated there are levels of meaning which explain different understanding; first, abstract meaning which is attention in a word, phrase and sentence meaning. It is not only applied to a singular word but also to whole of sentence. Second, Contextual meaning is a situation that proposed meaning, but it never comes to our mind so it will need more interpretation alternative.

Cross cultural pragmatic failure

The term pragmatic failure is often occurs in communication, usually among people who don't share same language. Everybody may have experience pragmatic failure when they are talking and sharing different culture. People who come from non-native speaker frequently misinterpret about what the speaker means. Based on Thomas (1983: 91) "*pragmatic failure to the inability to understand what is meant by what is said*" which means that either the speaker or the listener will misinterpret as long as they can't express their idea through language in use. For example when

speaker talk, their utterances may contains ambiguity which can be hardly understood by the hearer / listener. It is assumed that there is pragmatic failure that occurs in the utterances, less of context can also cause pragmatic failure.

Continually, pragmatic failures that occur in cross-cultural are divided by Thomas into 2 types including pragma-linguistic failure and socio-pragmatic failure. Pragma-linguistic failure occurs when a failure of speaker communication incomprehensible in receptor language which is in the utterance speaker can't realization their utterance in a good speech act. Socio-pragmatic failure occurs when the utterances are not accepted with in social conditions. It needs to distinguish both of the types before assuming whether the utterance is pragma-linguistic failure or socio-pragmatic failure.

In analyzing the utterances, the major intention is context where the hearer grabs the intention of the sentence. In addition, the linguistic form also has important role in explaining the intention of the utterance. The use of language in pragmatic is usually about how the speaker expresses their knowledge by using grammar to realize the world. The knowledge depends on the belief in language as well as the world. Thus, speaker expected to clarify their ability in language in use and their ability to see the reality.

Types of Cross-cultural pragmatic failure

Thomas stated there are 2 types of cross-cultural pragmatic failure. They are:

a. Pragma-linguistic Failure

Formerly, pragma-linguistic was explained by Leech (1983:11) as "*where we consider the particular resources which a given*

language provides for conveying particular illocutions” shows language specific that in an utterance, the meaning of speech is considered based on the knowledge about language and it’s perform into utterance whether it’s accepted in a condition. Thomas (1983: 101) stated that during in communication considered pragma-linguistics points out first the pragma-linguistic failure occurs when speaker communication is incomprehensible in receptor language or when the speaker can’t realize the utterance within speech act. It’s usually occurs to most of the people who come from different culture and language. In any case, as Beniak and Mougeon (1981) in Thomas (1983: 103) have pointed out, it is difficult to attribute error to any one particular source; the same writers have shown that where errors reflect first language interference and second language overgeneralization, they reinforce one another and are more difficult to overcome.

b. Socio-pragmatic failure

The term socio-pragmatic discusses a lot of detailed cultures specific which is every culture may have their rules to set up many things including communication. Leech (1983: 11) stated that *“the cooperative principle and the politeness principle operate variably in different cultures or social communities, in different social situation, among different social classes, etc”* it explained wherever each culture in this world have been set their social life. The speakers must understand not only the language but also the culture their interlocutors, as the speakers remind that language is culture’s product which are every part of cultures can’t be separated in the social life. In other words, the pragmatics relates with sociology.

A condition which the speaker less concern toward value, norm, moral that related to socio-

pragmatic will lead socio-pragmatic failure. As Thomas (1983: 103) stated that socio-pragmatic failure occurs when the utterances are not accepted in social conditions factor. The ability to make judgments according to the social scales of value is part of the speaker’s ‘social competence’, which is ability to apply these judgments to linguistic utterances—knowing how, when, and why to speak—comes within the field of pragmatics. It is cross-cultural mismatches in the assessment of social distance, of what constitutes an imposition, of when an attempt at a face threatening act’ should be abandoned, and in evaluating relative power, rights, and obligations, etc., which cause socio-pragmatic failure. Continually, Socio-pragmatic judgment is about size imposition, cost/benefit, social distance, and relative rights and obligations. These aspects are included in social factor, especially when the speaker talk with the person who has a different culture that has limited to asking something which is caused by rules in social condition. Hence, if the speaker is asking the question that related to failure of socio-pragmatic so linguistic takes the second part attention while social condition as central part of this failure during communication with our interlocutor. The assessment cross-cultural often leads to the failure in communication.

Causes of Cross cultural pragmatic failure

There are causes that cause a cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Thomas stated based on types are:

a. Pragma-linguistic Failure

1. Pragma-linguistic Transfer or ‘teaching-induced errors’

Thomas (1983) stated that Pragma-linguistic failure occurs because of pragma-linguistic transfer or ‘teaching-induced errors’ as word realization into grammar contains ambiguity in the utterances or speech act strategies of speaker that leads to different assumption. For example: In British English the politeness form when asking to do something is “Can you do X?” this utterance is not asking someone about their ability to do X. but in French and Russian, that question above is to ask about the ability to do X. In Russian when use an elaborate sentence to ask something its means not productive in our speech.

b. Socio-pragmatic Failure

In this types, Thomas classifies there are 4 causes of Socio-pragmatic Failure. There are:

1. Size of Imposition

Sometimes there is a condition that makes people unaware of ‘free good’ and ‘non-free good’ which cause socio-pragmatic failure. Goffman in Thomas (1995: 130) stated that 'free' and 'non-free' goods provides a useful framework within which to discuss the concept of 'size of imposition'. 'Free goods' are those which, in a given situation, anyone can use without seeking permission” The thing that gets free in a culture may be not free in other ones. Both of ‘free good’ and ‘non-free good’ could find in daily life. Generally, an example when guests need more salt in the restaurant it’s possible for us to ask the waiter or it may not permit to ask for salt. Another example, in our own home such as; food, drink, and bath are to use and consume, while in the stranger’s home they are not. Next, in Russian, as a stranger may ask cigarette because its ‘free good’ and it doesn’t

need a politeness strategies to ask a cigarette, they depend on a culture where the person live.

2. Taboo

There are several aspects which makes stranger impossible to ask about taboo topics. For example, sexual and religious are typically ‘non-free’ information, since they are not for public information.

3. Cross-culturally different assessments of relative power or social distance

In the situations, there are a lot of differences during communication. One of them is social distance that exists between speaker and their interlocutor. Failure in socio-pragmatic occurs because non-native speaker is judging relative power or social distance differently from a native speaker and otherwise.

4. Socio-pragmatic failure and value judgments

Base on socio-pragmatic failure, there are several aspects that considered a cause mismatch cross-culturally. The ‘values’ is not only about ‘truth’ or ‘justice’, but no one can enacts a notion that a culture is better than others. People can’t judge the culture base on their perspective, because the judgment of the other culture is not considered polite. Thomas stated that there are 2 basic conflicts of values that relate to socio-pragmatic failure. They are:

a. Cross Culturally Different ‘Pragmatic Ground Rules’

In conversation, there are words and utterances which are constituted of pragmatic ground rules and it usually based on the situation, context and culture or social condition.

b. Cross-culturally different assessments of the relative importance of pragmatic principles

The use of pragmatic principles differs from a culture to other because each culture has their own pragmatic principle that no one can force it in another culture.

Context

The particular of role in the study of pragmatics is context. Based on Mey (2001: 39) context is extra-linguistics terms for finding a way to get the meaning based on grammar and shape of situation. It helps to understand the literal meaning which the speaker said within their utterances. The meaning could get based on the situation that related to when, where, who, and what the conversation about. Both the speaker and hearer can't get what the meaning in utterances without a role of context which it makes a meaning deal with the portions.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is categorized into qualitative research since the writer is collected the data based on observation and its describing and explaining by words. *Anna and The King* Film is used as the source of the data. This research focused on the utterances which are stated by characters in the film that have misunderstood each other as the result of cultural differences.

A. Pragma-linguistic Failure

Kralahome (Prime Minister of Siam) :
have you any friends in Bangkok, Sir?
Anna Leonowens : no,
I know no one here.

The utterances above consist of pragma-linguistic failure. The setting describes when Anna Leonowens came for the first time to the King Mongkut's Palace. The rules of the palace, the

Data are collected by using non-participant observational method which is supported by *Teknik Catat* (noting technique) proposed by Sudaryanto. The researcher downloaded *Anna and The King* film and watched the film. Then, the researcher took note the utterances that contain cross-cultural pragmatic failures. Next, the data are analyzed by applied *Metode Padan Pragmatics* (Correlation Method since the language is not determined in this research but the context and situation in the object took apart in the process analysis the data. Then, the informal method is used in presenting the result of analysis since the analysis in form of words rather than using symbol.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents findings and discussions which are analysed of the data described by discussion of the research finding that related to research questions which guided in this study. The data was taken from a film entitled "*Anna and the King*" directed by Andy Tennant. The writer analyses the types and causes of each types of cross cultural pragmatic failure in *Anna and the King* film are described as follows:

foreigner must be interrogated by Chao Phya Kralahome (The Prime Minister of Siam) with a number of questions. Kralahome first asked "*have you any friends in Bangkok, Sir?*" and Anna answered with flat face that she knows no one in Thailand. According to Thomas (1983) Kralahome's utterance belongs as a type of pragma-linguistic failure. Pragma-linguistic failure occurs when the pragmatic force

mapped on to linguistic structure is systematically different from native speaker normally. The speaker (Kralahome) was mapped pragmatic force to a linguistic structure which is systematically different from the hearer (Anna Leonowens) normally in her communication. The cause of this type occurs as the result of *pragma-linguistic transfer* is inappropriate transfer of speech act semantically or syntactically equivalent structure. In this situation, Kralahome's utterance is inappropriate transfer as his utterance syntactically different than Anna. In this utterance, Kralahome asked Anna according to cultural customs in Thailand by asking has any foreigner a friend. On the other hand, Anna has interpreted this question for a person who has been stay for a long time in a place whereas Anna just arrived in Thailand for the first time and how could she has a friend in a new place. As a foreigner who came for the first time to a new place certainly didn't know anyone and Anna answered she knows no one in Thailand with flat face. In the other side, Kralahome doesn't mean to irritate Anna with that question, as Cooper (2008) in Thailand this question is a part of custom to ask foreigner about it. Therefore, Kralahome's utterance classified to type *pragma-linguistic failure*.

Kralahome : **Sir** is married?

Anna Leonowens : a widow. **Can you explain to me why you call me "Sir"?**

A : women do not stand in the presence of his Excellency.

The utterances above consist of *pragma-linguistic failure*. The situation set when Kralahome asked Anna Leonowens "*Sir is married?*" Anna replied "*a widow. Can you explain to me why you call me sir*". According to Thomas (1983) Kralahome's utterance belongs to type *pragma-linguistic failure*. *Pragma-linguistic*

failure occurs when the pragmatic force mapped on to linguistic structure is systematically different from native speaker normally. The speaker (Kralahome) was mapped a form of word "*Sir*" in his utterance which is normally different from the hearer's side (Anna Leonowens) in her communication. The cause of this type occurs as the result of *pragma-linguistic transfer* is inappropriate semantically or syntactically which is equivalent to 'interpretive bias', as the utterance tend to convey a different pragmatic force in the target language. In Kralahome's utterance, he used 'Sir' to Anna which semantically means man while Anna is a woman which makes her irritated when Kralahome calls her 'Sir'. Beside of that, Kralahome pragmatically used 'Sir' to adapt his custom and also to make Anna realized that standing up presence of His Excellency not consider polite. Anna who failed to understand the situation feels irritated and asked why he called 'Sir' to her. It is occurs because there is pragmatic force which is seemed in the situation on the film to make Anna realized that woman shouldn't stand up presence of Prime Minister of Siam. In the situation, all of the men sat while Anna confidently decided to standing up among of men. Pragmatically, Anna has failed to understand as the result of this condition Kralahome calls her 'Sir' rather than Mam or Mrs.

Anna Leonowens : **can you please convey to His Excellency that my purpose here is as tutor to King's eldest son that is not necessary to ask any more personal question, please.**

Kralahome : in Siam Sir, it is custom to first ask questions of personal nature to be polite.

Anna Leonowens : Mr Prime Minister, I meant no disrespect, however getting here was something of a challenge

Kralahome : Sir will be shown to palace quarters

The utterances above consist of pragma-linguistic failure. From the utterances above, the situation set when Anna feels angry and uncomfortable with personal question by Kralahome. She said that “can you please convey to His Excellency that my purpose here is as tutor to King’s eldest son that is not necessary to ask any more personal question, please.” and Kralahome said “in Siam Sir, it is custom to first ask questions of personal nature to be polite.” According to Thomas (1983) Anna’s utterance belongs to type pragma-linguistic failure. Pragma-linguistic failure occurs when the pragmatic force mapped on to linguistic structure is systematically different from native speaker normally. In this situation, Anna’s utterance was irritated Kralahome because she was direct spoken while in Thailand not allow to say in that way. The cause of this type of pragma-linguistic failure occurs because *pragma-linguistic transfer* is inappropriate speech act strategies from first language to second language which is different pragmatic force in target language. Pragmatically, Anna and Kralahome have different pragmatic force to convey their utterances. She considers to direct speak by said her purpose in Thailand as a tutor for King’s eldest son which is the meaning of this utterance downright feeling with talk directly by Thailand’s culture. According to Cooper (2008) in Thailand this utterance intend that a person convey a criticism the act of an openly criticism

means a bad manners while for West culture talk to the point constitute a productive speech. Anna that realized Kralahome’s intention became an awkward moment and said be in Thailand was something of a challenge. Therefore, failure between Anna and Kralahome belong to the type of pragma-linguistic.

B. Socio-pragmatic Failure

Kralahome : **how long are you in possession of dead husband?**

Anna Leonowens : 23 months.

A : **how did he die?**

Anna Leonowens : can you please convey to his Excellency that my purpose here is as tutor to King’s eldest son **that is not necessary to ask any more personal question, please.**

The utterances above consist of socio-pragmatic failure. The setting describes when Kralahome continued to ask Anna “how long are you in possession of dead husband” it makes Anna feel more irritated with that question but then there is more questions “how did he die?” that makes Anna uncomfortable with personal question. According to Thomas (1983) both of the utterances belong to the type socio-pragmatic failure. Socio-pragmatic failure occurs when the utterances are not acceptable in social conditions factor. Anna considers the information is not for public consumption. Both utterances belong to *taboo topic* as a person can’t ask private information based on interlocutor’s culture. Kralahome was asking taboo topic to Anna as the result Kralahome failed to understand about West culture which is this failure belong to socio-

pragmatic. The situation set that he ignores Anna who was angry and uncomfortable with these questions. Kralahome failed in understanding Anna's pragmatically gesture that makes her declines in answering personal question that is not related to her purpose coming to Thailand. In the other side, Anna has failed to understand about custom in Thailand as it is her first time coming to this place. Kralahome's questions are part of Thailand's custom Cooper (2008) as asking personal status is considered normal while for West culture they are not.

Kralahome : when presented to his Majesty, **you and son will remember to touch forehead to floor.**

Anna Leonowens : **Your Excellency, although we have become better acquired with your customs, we have certainly not forgotten our own.**

Kralahome : then how will you great him?

Anna Leonowens : with the utmost respect.

The utterances above consist of socio-pragmatic failure. The setting describes when Anna came to the King Kralahome tried to explain how Anna should behave to King. Kralahome said "when presented to his Majesty, you and son will remember to touch forehead to floor" and Anna answered confidently "Your Excellency, although we have become better acquired with your customs, we have certainly not forgotten our own." Kralahome's utterance is intended that people that come to the King must be greet him by touch forehead to the floor. On contrary, Anna confidently said that she wants great King with her own. According Thomas (1983) both of

utterances occurs failure belongs to the type socio-pragmatic failure. Socio-pragmatic failure occurs when the utterances are not accepted in social conditions factor. In her utterance, Anna was failed to understand norms and value in Thailand by ignoring how should behave towards King. The cause of this socio-pragmatic failure in both utterances belongs to *cross-culturally different assessments of relative power or social distance* is a situation where there is social distance between speaker and their interlocutor. However in Thailand, King has same level to the God. Therefore, people must be touched forehead to the floor in order to great King even though they are not Thailand's people. Continually, in the conversation Anna has failed to understand about degree of King such as Kralahome's explanations. Pragmatically, she ignored Kralahome's advice by said that she has own way to greet the King. Therefore, both of the utterances belong to socio-pragmatic failure.

Mr Kincaid : all due respect Your Majesty it is a little far-fetched to think that commerce alone will bring progress to your people, **especially when they are awash with, uh, superstition and fear, like your lovely concubines here with their talismans worn, no doubt to protect them from us foreign devils.**

King : a friend once said, Mr Kincaid English also have fantastical beliefs or am I mistaking your

country for being land of Merlin and Camelot?

The utterances above consist of socio-pragmatic failure. The setting describes when King has an anniversary dinner and invited important English nobles and diplomat. A noble man name Mr. Kincaid said toward King and guests “all due respect Your Majesty it is a little far-fetched to think that commerce alone will bring progress to your people, especially when they are awash with, uh, superstition and fear, like your lovely concubines here with their talismans worn, no doubt to protect them from us foreign devils” According to Thomas (1983) this utterance belongs to type socio-pragmatic failure. Socio-pragmatic failure occurs when a situation cannot accept in social condition factor. In this setting, Mr. Kincaid less concerned toward value in Thailand’s culture because he comments on talismans worn that used by King’s concubine. The cause of this type occurs belongs to socio-pragmatic failure and value judgment occurs when a judgement to the other cultures based on each perspective. In this situation, Mr. Kincaid stated that Thailand’s women used talismans to protect themselves. This utterance means Mr. Kincaid judging the value in Thailand based on his own perspective. Cross-culturally Mr. Kincaid failed to understand about Thailand’s culture which is underestimated the other culture. King embarrassed about it then he replied that Mr. Kincaid’s country is land of Merlin and Camelot.

King : **on table Mam, is small gift of appreciation for your many efforts at anniversary party. Mam’s hand has been lonely without such**

Anna leonowens : it is most kind, Your Majesty it’s very beautiful

and though I’m terribly grateful

King : it is custom to bestow favours for those who please King and Mam has done so

Anna Leonowens : I’m sorry, I cannot accept such generosity

The utterances above consist of socio-pragmatic failure. The setting describes when King gave Anna a gift because her aids at anniversary. King said “on table Mam is small gift of appreciation for your many efforts at anniversary party. Mam’s hand has been lonely without such” and Anna can’t accept and said “I’m sorry, I cannot accept such generosity” According to Thomas (1983) this utterance belongs to type socio-pragmatic failure. Socio-pragmatic failure occurs when a situation cannot accept in social condition factor. In this situation, Anna can’t accept a gift from King and it makes King feels upset because she rejected where no one to do it toward King. The cause of this failure is cross-culturally different assessments of the relative importance of pragmatic principles is situation a culture may have different about relative value in pragmatic principle which is this failure also a part of socio-pragmatic failure and value judgements. The situation Anna rejected King’s gift that means disobedient toward King. Pragmatically, this situation the value of ‘gratefulness’ may be systematically valued above ‘appreciations’ for King but Anna valued his ‘appreciations’ above ‘generosity’. Thus, Anna cannot accept that gift because she helps was sincerity. Anna rejects that gift because she has different relative value about ‘gratefulness’. Therefore, this differences King felt insulted of Anna’s rejection.

Kralahome : Sir, you of all are most aware there are certain boundaries I cannot cross one being to contradict King

Anna Leonowens : yes and God help him.

Excuse me

Kralahome : there is no white elephant Sir, King invented sighting at Prachin Buri so he could escort royal family to greet **imaginary beast** as in tradition

Anna Leonowens : I don't understand

The utterances above consist of socio-pragmatic failure. The setting describes the situation when Kralahome tried to dismiss Anna who ready to back to Newcastle. Kralahome said there is treason in the palace by using white elephant as a metaphor. He said "there is no white elephant Sir, King invented sighting at Prachin Buri so he could escort royal family to greet imaginary beast as in

CONCLUSION

Based on the finding and discussion above, the writer can conclude that there are 2 types of cross-cultural pragmatic failure in Anna and the King film. They are pragma-linguistic failure and socio-pragmatic failure. Based on these types in this research, the most of the type that appears is socio-pragmatic failure as the result Anna who comes from West culture doesn't understand about Thai culture and otherwise. It indicates a lot of differences about custom, value, norm lead failures in socio-pragmatic. Then, each of the types has their own causes. It indicates that the cause of pragma-linguistic failure is pragma-linguistic transfer has found in 8 datum in this research while causes of socio-pragmatic failure are; taboo has found in 1 datum, cross-culturally

tradition" Anna didn't understand said "I don't understand" According to Thomas (1983) Kralahome's utterance belongs to type socio-pragmatic failure. Socio-pragmatic failure occurs when a situation cannot accept in social condition factor. In this situation, Kralahome's utterance can't accept by Anna because he was using pragmatic ground rule. The cause of this failure occurs as the result of cross-culturally different 'pragmatic ground rules' is a situation each culture has different 'pragmatic ground rules' in interpret the utterances which is this failure also a part of socio-pragmatic failure and value judgements. Pragmatically, Anna failed to interpret Kralahome's utterance by using 'imaginary beast' to describe a traitor so she can't get what Kralahome intends. In the other side, Kralahome was failed that during in Thailand Anna tend to speech directly. Therefore, this failure belongs to type socio-pragmatic.

different assessments of related power or social distance has found in 9 datum, and the last socio-pragmatic failure and value judgement has found in 4 datum. The most causes that appear of cross-cultural pragmatic failure is *cross-culturally different assessment of related power or social distances* as the result Anna has failed to understand about social distance that exist in Thailand. Cultural differences between native and non-native speaker in communication are unavoidable, and it tends to cross cultural pragmatic lead to failure.

These aspects can be occurred in the communication that described in this thesis as Anna Leonowens an English speaker has faced various differences in social habit, views of value, background knowledge, norms, customs in Thailand which these aspects cross cultural

pragmatic failure sources. Furthermore, each cultures has uniqueness as they have their own way in linguistic patterns, politeness, norms,

customs, rules of communication and social habit where one culture has and the others not, and otherwise.

Nouichi, Fahima. 2015. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure*. University of Constantine One English Department, 95-101 Journal

REFERENCES

Charlebois, J. (2003). *Cross-cultural pragmatic failure and language teaching*. JALT Hokkaido Journal, 7, 35-43.

Cooper, Robert. 2008. *CultureShock! A Survival Guide to Custom and Etiquette Thailand*. Tarrytown, New York : Marshall Cavendish Corporation

Hornby, A S. 2000. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. New York: Oxford University Press

IMDb. 1999. *Anna and the King*. Accessed January 1st 2018 at 02.00 pm. Archived at <http://m.imdb.com/title/tt0166485>

Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principle of Pragmatics*. United States of America: Longman Inc. New York

Mey, Jacob L. 2001. *Pragmatics second edition*. Malden: Blackwell Published

Miles, B Matthew, A Michael Huberman, Johnny Saldana. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. California: Sage Publication, Inc

Mulyanah, Ade. 2013. *A Pragmatic Failure in Interculture: The Yes and No Done by Indonesian*. International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW) vol 4, 74-79

Norbury, Paul. 2015. *Culture Smart ! BRITAIN*. Great Britain: Kuperard, an imprint of Bravo Ltd

Oatey, Helen Spencer and Wenying Jiang. 2003. *Explaining cross-cultural pragmatic findings: moving from politeness maxims to socio-pragmatic interactional principles*. Journal Pragmatics [http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/S0378-2166\(03\)00025-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(03)00025-0)

Samovar, Larry A, Richard E. Porter, Edwin R. McDaniel. 2007. *Communication between Culture Sixth Edition*. USA: Thomson Learning, Inc

SHOWTIMES. 1999. *Anna and the King*. Accessed May 20th 2018 at 09.30 pm. Archived at <https://www.showtimes.com/movie/s/anna-and-the-king-1198/>

Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press

Thomas, J. (1983). *Cross-cultural pragmatic failure*. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 91-112.