

PRAGMATIC FAILURE IN *THE GODS MUST BE CRAZY*: CROSS-CULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Lintang Widjanarko

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Art, State University of Surabaya

Lintangwidjanarko@gmail.com

Dian Rivia Himmawati, S.S., M.Hum

English Department, Faculty of Languages and Art, State University of Surabaya

Dianrivia@yahoo.com

Abstrak

Komunikasi sangat penting untuk masyarakat dalam menyampaikan pesan dari pembicara ke pendengar. Hal ini diupayakan agar pesan dapat tersampaikan sesuai maksud dari pembicara. Bagaimanapun juga, salah penafsiran, miskomunikasi, kesalahpahaman dan salah pengertian terkadang bisa terjadi karena disebabkan oleh beberapa aspek. Fenomena ini sering terjadi terutama dalam komunikasi lintas-budaya, dimana orang-orang yang mempunyai latar belakang budaya yang berbeda bertemu dan berinteraksi. Jadi, pada kasus ini, "*The Gods Must be Crazy*" yang diyakini sebagai contoh yang tepat untuk menggambarkan sesuatu yang kita sebut dengan kegagalan pragmatik. Penelitian ini telah menemukan pertanyaan pertanyaan dalam masalah yang muncul. Apa faktor-faktor yang menyebabkan kegagalan pragmatis terjadi dan bagaimana kegagalan pragmatis terjadi. Untuk mengidentifikasi proses dan elemen yang dapat menyebabkan masalahnya, penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan pragmatik lintas-budaya dalam metode deskriptif kualitatif. Bentuk data yang dianalisis adalah percakapan di setiap adegan yang mengandung kesalahpahaman lintas-budaya. Selain itu, pendekatan pragmatik lintas budaya juga membantu untuk mengetahui unsur-unsur utama dari gangguan komunikasi seperti latar belakang pengetahuan yang berbeda, keyakinan budaya yang berbeda, dimensi sosial yang berbeda, ketidakpekaan dan presuposisi yang salah. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini dapat digunakan sebagai indikator untuk mengurangi kemungkinan dalam salah penafsiran saat berkomunikasi pada budaya lain. Hal ini juga memungkinkan untuk menghapus hambatan bahasa dan meningkatkan kemampuan komunikasi. Meskipun demikian, itu juga berarti mempertahankan fleksibilitas untuk mengabaikan kesalahan yang tidak disengaja selama komunikasi.

Kata Kunci: Komunikasi lintas-budaya, kegagalan pragmatis, budaya

Abstract

Communication is very important for the society to deliver the message from the speakers to the hearers. It attempts the message to successfully deliver as what the speakers mean to say. However, misinterpret, miscommunication, misconception and misbelief sometimes occur due to certain aspects. These phenomena are pretty common to happen mainly in cross-cultural communication, where people who shares different cultural background meet and interact. Thus, in this case, "*The Gods Must be Crazy*" which is believed as an appropriate example to portray thing what we called as pragmatic failures. This research have found the problem of the questions which are appeared. What factors that are causing pragmatic failures occur and how do the pragmatic failures occur. To identify both process and elements that may cause such problems, this study is using cross-cultural pragmatics approach in descriptive qualitative method. The data are in conversational form which appears in each scenes which are containing cross-culture miscommunication. Moreover, the approach of cross-cultural pragmatics helps to figure out the prime elements of communication breakdown such as different background knowledge, different cultural beliefs, different social dimension, insensitivity and false presupposition. Therefore, this research can be used as an indicator to reduce the probability of misinterpreting while communicating across culture. It also enables to remove language barrier and improve the communication skills. Nonetheless, it also means maintaining the flexibility to ignore unintentional mistakes during communication.

Keywords: Cross-cultural communication, pragmatic failure, culture

INTRODUCTION

Generally, people use the language to know other people, as a signal in particular community or society to learn other culture, to know other people's background not only in individual but also in cluster. In community, language also has roles to identify someone either in social status or other characteristics in personal or some particular group, because language can be a reference or recognition where the particular group belongs to and also what culture they possess. Considering the language as a media to communicate, there are some aspects that reasonable to be considered from its social dimension, social status, or social background when people try to deliver their message in conversation. The miscommunications while speaking from each person was being the main issue in this research because the consequence of such phenomena will lead into misinterpret and mislead information. Furthermore, the situation become odd and the message will not deliver to the target successfully. Those aspects have a function to control the occasion that may occur. Basically, language concerns from its contextual meaning and as a media to gain knowledge from others by using pragmatic competency.

Dealing with the differences, cross-cultural communication commonly involves face-to-face communication between people from different cultures; they cannot allow the easy assumption of similarity. From its definition, cultures are different in their languages, behaviour patterns, and values. Bennet (1998) said that cultures embody such variety in patterns of perception and behaviour, approaches to communication in cross-cultural conditions guard against inappropriate assumption of similarity and encourage the consideration of difference. Many researchers identified that language has a function whether for communicating or giving information from the speaker to addressee. It was given since childhood that the parents have been explicitly taught and culturally delivered. People are demanded to communicate each other in proposing situation, thus these functions must be the reasons for the people when having conversation by considering the culture in a certain region.

The theory of cross-cultural communication misunderstanding had already delivered by Gudykunst. He assumed that if members of the two cultures do not understand how communication is similar and different, they will not be able to accurately interpret each other's communication (Gudykunst, 2003). The term of this occasion is sometimes recognised as socio-pragmatics failures. Socio-pragmatics is "the

sociological interface of pragmatics" involving speakers' and hearers' beliefs built on relevant social and cultural values (Leech, 1983) however, the sociological interface is inaccurate and misbelief from each other.

The inability to understand the speaker's intention had explicitly pointed out by Miller which was believed that most of the misunderstanding of other people are not due to any inability to hear them or to parse their sentences or to understand their words, a far more important source of difficulty in communication is that people so often fail to understand the speaker's intention (Miller, 1974) however the main and significant point in this research is communication failure in cross-culture phenomena. It is believed that this phenomena appeared in *The Gods Must be Crazy*. The communication failure which appear in the movie are identified cross-culture because it involves native and non-native speaker and also involves several tribe which possess different culture one another.

This is the South African comedy movie written and directed by Jamie Uys that originally released in 1998 and set in Botswana. The content of the movie largely involved the misunderstanding of other culture which turn these phenomena into comedy. It is interesting issue to analyse the cross-culture interaction regardless the comedy element. The cross-cultural communication or socio-pragmatic failures applied in some scene of this movie and the analysis uncovers the cross-cultural communication failures process when they convey what they mean through verbal and non-verbal language to the addressee, and the response or their body language might appears in some occasion in the movie as an interlocutor, how they could interpret their purpose. So these phenomena hopefully help some sociolinguists to discuss about cross-cultural pragmatic failures more specific in the future in order to make a good conversation in many cultures throughout the world and break the language barrier which had been divided by culture differences.

Related to the description above, this research will analyse how do the pragmatic failure occur and then the further inquiry appear. What factor which influence the communication failure regarding the cross-culture interaction.

METHOD

This article used descriptive qualitative method. The data source was taken from *The Gods Must be Crazy* movie. The data of this research were the characters' utterances which considered

as cross-cultural and caused misunderstanding in the movie. The basic instrument when conducting the research was the human itself as the researcher (Sugiyono, 2010). Internet access, media player, and taking were necessarily needed to conduct this research. The data analysis technique was done in three levels; 1.Data Reduction; 2.Data Display; 3.Conclusion drawing or verification (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Cross-Cultural Non-Verbal Communication and Pragmatic Approach in *The Gods Must be Crazy*

The communication failure identified through the non-verbal communication approach. Largely, the data were found involving non-verbal language. However, it only described how the way both speakers experienced the communication failure due to different perspective of non-verbal language.

*Bushman :This is a funny stick.
Did it grow on a tree?
(Showing a shotgun). *in Bushman language*
Hunter :(Shocked and Hands up)
Bushman :(speaking in bushmen language)
Hunter :(Screaming and running away)
Bushman :(confuse and looking at the bottle of coke which he was carrying)

The understanding of performing expressive act via utterances from the interlocutor were influenced by non-verbal language how the way someone conveyed the expressive speech act like the Bushmen did in his first sequence of conversation. A particular speech act was produced in order to receive good response from the hunter. However, the hunter wrongly interpreted that the expressive act of the Bushman did as a serious joke of threatening because of his body language reflected differently and made the conversation totally failed. These cultural differences of non-verbal communication really affected the conversation and causing failures.

The background knowledge of the Bushman was different with hunter. The Bushmen had never seen anything like gun or any other items which were alike. Bushmen found a gun; he assumed that the gun as a stick which had unique

shape. This cultural schema had its own frame, the occasion enforced that stuff to make sense in Bushman pre-existing knowledge. He asked to the hunter with pointing a gun in front of him. Then the hunter assumed that the Bushmen threatened him by pointing a weapon and naturally the hunter raised his hands in the air, because the culture of modern people that someone who were mugged or pointed by a gun will automatically raise their hands in the air which mean surrender and avoid direct shot and Bushmen did not know this culture. He kept talking with the same gestures; it made the hunter afraid and ran away as fast as possible.

Mrs Thompson :Do you work here in Botswana?
Mr Steyn :Yes, I- Yes. Yes.
Mrs Thompson :And what do you do?
Mr Steyn :I—I collect manure. GET AWAY FROM! GET AWAY FROM! (Mr Steyn notices a rhino is coming behind her and grab Mrs Thompson and lay her down to the ground to save her)
Mrs Thompson : No! Leave me alone!
(The rhino stamps the fire out and leaving. But there a small fire still burn and Mr Steyn comes out and starts to stamp the fire out to prevent the rhino comes back. Then, Mrs Thompson sees Mr Steyn stamps the fire out by himself)
Mr Steyn : Mrs Thompson?
Mrs Thompson : (Suspicious and keep hiding)
Mr Steyn : Mrs Thompson! (Noticing Mrs Thompson is hiding) Oh, it's all right, he's gone
Mrs Thompson : Who's gone?
Mr Steyn : The Rhinoceros.
Mrs Thompson : What bloody Rhinoceros!?
Mr Steyn : Didn't you see him? He stamped out the fire.
Mrs Thompson : You stamped out the fire. I saw you.
Mr Steyn : No. he did it first. I didn't want he to come back, so... but didn't you see?
Mrs Thompson : Keep away!
Mr Steyn : Miss. Thompson, if you make a fire, and a rhinoceros sees it, he comes and stamps it out Rhinos do that. It's a most interesting phenomenon.
Mrs Thompson : You get sudden urges, and come up with warthogs and rhinoceroses
Mr Steyn : All right, I'll show you. I'll make another fire. Think I'm lying. I'll show you. You see how I'm making another fire?You'll see he'll come back.

Think I'm a liar (But the rhino did not come up) Maybe it's too far away. Maybe it's upwind.

Mrs Thompson : Mr Steyn

(Suddenly, Mrs Thompson meet two Tswanas. They greet Mr Steyn and Mrs Thompson with a small clap and speaking in Tswanas language)

Mr Steyn : Ask them. They'll tell you rhinoceroses always stamp out fires

Mrs Thompson : I don't speak the language

Mr Steyn : Okay, I'll ask them.

(Mr Steyn speaking in Tswanas language, but the response of Tswanas only shake their heads)

Mr Steyn : See?

Mrs Thompson : I noticed (shake her head)

Mr Steyn : They're Tswanas. They always shake their heads when they mean to say yes!

There were two Tswanas tribe appear in front of them, Mr Steyn tried to ask them that the rhino had such interesting phenomenon and the Tswanas tribe will say yes and shake their heads left and right. This is the main reason why cross-culture non-verbal communication failure appeared. Mrs Thompson did not know the culture of Tswanas and she misbelieved that Tswanas said no because of their unique non-verbal language which was extremely different with modern culture. Consequently, the communication failure occurred. In modern culture, nodding head means yes. The body language of saying yes in Tswanas tribe was obviously different with civilised men because in their culture, shaking heads mean "yes". Mrs Thompson thought that there is no such phenomenon like a rhino stamped the fire out.

The communication failure occurred come from the background knowledge of each speaker which become septum in their conversation. The phenomenon was occurred due to lack of animal behaviour knowledge. Mr Steyn was a biologist who analysed manure samples for his PhD dissertation, he stayed in Africa and knew the behaviour of rhinoceros; furthermore he told that he collected manure of animals to Mrs Thompson directly without further explanation why he did that, clearly it made Mrs Thompson re-thought "who is this guy, actually" but as a biologist, at least Mr Steyn noticed the behaviour of any animals in Africa.

This scene depicted that the way Mr Steyn intended to rescue Mrs Thompson from

rhinoceros behind her and instinctively grabbed Mrs Thompson and laid her body to the ground and evaded the rhinoceros. In all conscience, the animal intended to stamp out the bonfire and leave. In this case, Mrs Thompson did not notice a rhino was coming from behind. She was laid down by Mr Steyn directly without warning, moreover she recently just knew Mr Steyn in the afternoon and then they were sitting together in the deep of Kalahari with a small conversation which became their first conversation after first met. She assumed that Mr Steyn intended to rape her but actually it was not true.

There was still a small fire in the bonfire since the rhino's gone. Mr Steyn decided to stamp the fire out to prevent the rhino back, and explained to Mrs Thompson that the rhino's gone, but she did not believe him, she only believed what she saw. Mr Steyn kept trying to explain why the rhino came and stamped the fire out but still she did not believe at all.

Xi : (Smiling towards Mrs Thompson)

Mrs Thompson : (Shocked and close her body with his clothes) go away (arrange her clothes in and close the suitcase and leave)

Mr Steyn : (Smoke with his cigar and notice a bushman following Mrs Thompson) that's a bushman. How'd he get here?

Mrs Thompson : I don't know. He's rude.

Xi : (Said politely in Bushmen language) It was kind of you to send us this thing, but it made my family unhappy, please take it.

Mr Steyn : (couldn't understand what the bushman said) Sorry, no sir

The conversation above had communication failure though the emergence was still vague. The form is non-verbal which indicated the Bushman did not know the meaning and interpret differently; in addition both of them did not know others language. Consequently, the failure will occur both in verbal and non-verbal way. In Bushman culture, smiling is a good impression when they greet the strangers and thought that the hearer will feel comfortable if they do that. Sometimes the moment alike will cause misunderstanding. Civilised men had their own perspective, if the strangers stare at someone and smiling, they assume that they were crazy and

created an odd assumption. In this case, the Bushmen had a unique wearing which is almost naked, only the vital parts were covered. Then he met Mrs Thompson was changing her clothes behind the bushes. Normally, civilised men will turn around if they meet someone who is changing his or her clothes when naked and try not to see them. In fact, the Bushman only stares at her and smiling before Mrs Thompson leaved him. It was obvious that the failure occur at greeting moment and different perspective of appearance. The behaviour differences of greeting someone which combine with the different perspective about clothes made the misunderstanding gone worse. The non-verbal greeting like the Bushmen did was frangible because the moment is inappropriate.

He thought that he saw the ugliest person he had ever come across. He saw that Mrs Thompson was as pale as something that had crawling out of a rotting log. The hair was quite gruesome, long and stringy and white, as if she was very old. Although it was a hot day, the Bushman assumed that she was covering her body with skins that looked as if they were made from cobwebs (Uys, 1980). Unverbalised information from the Bushmen's assumption about Mrs Thompson on the first sight was becoming frame of cross-culture miscommunication and the failure will influence the conversation sequences when he tried to communicate with civilised men.

The Bushman spoke in his language and tried to converse with her, but his words were ignored by Mrs Thompson and he was avoided. He assumed that Mrs Thompson was very rude because she was ignoring the conversation; the main reason why Mrs Thompson leaving was because she afraid of the Bushman and also his behaviour.

The next speech sequences showed a failure. Mrs Thompson assessed the Bushmen was rude. The Bushman did not have any background knowledge about cigars. When he noticed Mr Steyn smoking cigar, he assumed that he was one of the god who gave him a bottle, because in Bushmen tribe there was no cigars, and they never seen anything like that. This instant assumption of the Bushman had no reason, he only saw strange people who had different appearance and behaviour with him as a god. That was why the Bushman said politely with Mr Steyn and intended to show what he meant. Because of their language is different, accordingly they failed to convey their meanings.

The Bushmen's perspectives about Mrs Thompson were in different dimension

(an old man with blue hat and red clothes approaching and driving his tractor)
 Mpudi : *What the hell happened? Where have you been? and the little bushman? What's he doing in these parts?*
 Mr Steyn : *I don't know. He was trying to tell me something.*
 Mpudi : *(Speak in Bushmen language)*
 Mr Steyn : *You speak Bushman?*
 Mpudi : *Yeah.*
 Bushman : *(speak in Bushman language)*
 Mpudi : *(interpret the Bushman language into English) He says, "Thanks for the bottle, but you can have it back"*
 Mr Steyn : *I didn't give it to him.*
 Mpudi : *Well, he don't want the bottle*
 Mr Steyn : *Then he'd better throw it away.*
 Mpudi : *(Speak Bushman language)*

Many boundaries were found in communications regarding the culture, perspective, behaviour, assumption, and background knowledge. But, the miscommunications boundary was possible to break through by whom understand both cultures and appeared in their conversation. The misunderstanding which gone unnoticed by both speakers will be uncovered and the significant information they received become make sense in mind; additionally they will appreciate the varieties. The evidence of this case was depicted in the conversation above.

Mpudi as a local resident knew the language but he did not know the background knowledge of the Bushman. Mpudi also lived around Sahara desert and he was Botswanian, at first glance, his background knowledge fulfilled the criteria of interethnic conversation between Botswanian and Bushman, nonetheless they lived in the same region which refers to inferential mechanisms instances of Mpudi's background knowledge. The main factor why Mpudi became a mediator in this cross-cultural conversation was because he knew or understood the Bushman language and the culture. Previous experience encountered also became influential factor in determining someone became a mediator in cross-culture communication like Mpudi. In this case, Mpudi experiencing lived with the Bushman for a few days. At least, he knew usual culture they possessed and behaviour of the Bushman. Even Mpudi knew the language but he did not know

what Bushman intended to say. It made the Bushman frustrating and felt disappointed. Bushman also thought that they were gods. The conversation was failed even though the phenomenon involving Mpudi as a mediator which had role as foundation to make the flow of the conversation straight and easy to understand yet the failure still occurred.

The communication was totally failed and it made the Bushmen very disappointed. The Bushman had his own perspectives which were come from his background knowledge. He thought that it was unfair of the gods to make him throw it (a bottle) off the earth. In fact, he began to doubt whether they really were gods. Such thoughts were influenced by his experience lifetime which he never met someone who had different physical appearances.

(the indigenous people in Botswana give a welcoming ceremony to Mrs Thompson by waved their hand up rhythmically and singing in the valley)

Mrs Thompson :Don't I wave or take a bow or something? (confuse)

Jack Hind :No

This is the cultural concept within people behaviour which had been inherited through people's lifetime as a reflection in a certain ethnicity. Cultural phenomena above also represents the identity of ethnicity and confirm the uniqueness. The foreigners who did not have any existing knowledge in facing such culture will accept a consequence which was rather obvious to identify. However, the result above depicted that Mrs Thompson rather to choose silence in her cross-culture communication to avoid bad impression from indigenous people in Botswana. This culture could be categorised as expressive speech function and the contextual constraints (the size of imposition; formality of situation) were also considered in this case. The function also has role to identify the reason and recognise the social dimension with concerning cultural aspects.

The way people thinking, feeling, and acting also part of culture definition. The way indigenous people in Botswana give a welcoming ceremony to Mrs Thompson can be defined as culture. They have a unique culture by waving their hand up rhythmically and singing. They possessed this tradition in cluster by means only certain group was possessing, thus other community which did not have any knowledge

about this culture will feel uncertainty if the culture both they possessed was inversely proportional each other.

Every tradition had so many values on it. The clue was not found in this research, what does the meaning of the tradition; however, the story indicated that those symbols seemingly as a greeting honourably. It can be seen that Mrs Thompson had been honoured in the land of Botswana. The movie did not give specific information about the place. As a matter of fact, it was part of Botswana, a specific region of Botswana. The conversation above is most likely showed the impact of communication failure which caused by nescience about the existing culture or tradition. The scene described that Mrs Thompson rather confused how to react the Botswanian welcoming ceremony. Fortunately, Mrs Thompson also accompanied by men who seemingly understand what foreigner should do in a certain situation. The communication failure was not quite visible, yet the process was significantly important in the research; however, it fulfilled the criteria of cross-cultural communication that people from different cultural background communicate. The situation was feasible to be analysed even though the form is different with communication failure, but the result also became cantilever in cross-culture study in the future and also enrich the understanding of other cultures.

Xi : (make a tranquilizer to the goat with arrow)

Young boy : (notice the goat is going to be hunted

by stranger and make a chattering noises at Xi)

Xi : (speak in Bushman language) I shot one of those animals. It'll going to sleep soon, and then we can eat it. (The boy ran away)

<a few minutes later>

(the young boy and police arrived driving a jeep)
Xi : (speak in Bushman language) Come, sit down. There's enough meat for all of us.

Policeman : (Speak African language angrily and pick up the sleeping goat to the car)

Xi : (Speak Bushman language) you have very bad manners, if you eat the whole thing, I'll have to shoot another for myself.

Policeman : (shoot the gun up to warn the bushman)

Policeman : (Shouted and warn the Bushman to stop but the bushman run after the goats and shoot the Bushman's leg) Do you speak English? You are free to remain silent until you have seen your lawyer. If you speak now, whatever you say will be taken down as evidence against you.

There was communication failure in conversation above which caused by misunderstanding of directive speech act. This kind of speech act used to get someone to do something, in other words, it had a function as a command system. In other regions, directive speech acts were influenced by culture. There are thousands of culture had different perspective, meanings and understandings. Some of them were inversely proportional and somewhat contradictory. Thus, the politeness also had role in cross-culture phenomena. Politeness and culture cannot be separated. It depicted that communication failure occurred due to different interpretation of speech act especially in directive function. In line (08), The bushman invited the young boy to joined him and showed non-verbal interaction which indicating a friendship like waving hand down to join at his lunch, even though he could speak but the language differences made them feel difficult to understand one another, the range of speaker and hearer was quite farther than usual conversation. So, this factor also needed to be reconsidered. Afterwards, the policeman arrived and warned the Bushman that he was doing wrong and against the law. The communication failure was really getting worse that the police and the Bushman cannot understand the background of each. In fact, the Bushman had no laws in their lives, so, it also became another factor which must be considered any further.

The way policeman warned the Bushman was unconsciously considered as directive speech act. The policeman warned the Bushman by shot the gun up in the sky to give a warning shot, which was common procedure in the world, this kind of law was not accepted by the Bushman because Bushman had no such official laws to govern them. When the policeman gave a final warning, the Bushman thought that it was a thunder clap instead. He kept chasing the goats which do not belonged to him, however, according

to the official law in Botswana. It considered as thievery and he got shoot in his leg. This situation was one of the impacts in failing someone's meaning. Understanding others is very necessary to avoid conflict and any other extreme impact of miscommunication as in scene (06).

This case began with the Bushman hunted the animal; actually the animal belonged to herd. In Bushman culture there was no sense of ownership at all and there was nothing someone can own. He hunted the goats because he thought that they were wild animals and did not belong to anyone, so it was nice that the animal was going to be hunted. Consequently, the herd gave bad response after he saw his goats were going to be hunted by stranger and his response was natural. It was natural too that the Bushman hunted the animal.

The Bushman was really hungry and he looked a ridiculous animal, it seems good to eat. This line sequence showed that the Bushmen intended to hunt the live stocks. It was very obvious that the cross-cultural communication occurred in this scene, because in Bushman tribe's perspective, there is nothing someone can own, only trees and grass and animals. So, it was nothing wrong that the Bushman hunted the animal and tried to eat one of them. And it was also true that the young boy angry and called the police to arrest the Bushman due to stealing the livestock. Both of them were stood in different cultural schemata and different frame of background. The Bushman lived in the middle of Kalahari Desert and no laws which confined their activities. And the young boy as a shepherd lived in civilisation. The frame structures of both speakers were totally different, this factor probably causing communication failure.

All in all, the data which had been identified are considered as failure due to some reasons including the different background knowledge and cultural schemata. This research only identified the factors by using pragmatics approach and it is analysed through their historical perspective which considering their culture. Thus, these article will become essential in further analysis

CONCLUSION

After the analysis of communication failure in *The Gods Must be Crazy*, it comes into the conclusion. As a prime object of this study,

communication failure can be defined as the severe interruption of speaker's intended meaning. But in this case it has been limited to the smaller scale, associated with cross-cultural communication. As it has mentioned before, this study used pragmatic approach and the implementation of these ties depict into depth review of particular scenes. Furthermore, it reveals the main problems of the study which appear.

This study largely identify the physical context due to the characters in the movie who perform different language. Consequently, the receivers could not easily interpret what the speakers mean to say. Meanwhile, other aspects of communication also determine the level of success while communicating mainly the interaction across culture. Cultural diversity is inevitable, furthermore it creates high degree of misinterpret, miscommunication, misconception and misbelief during interaction. To avoid these things, it is very necessary to possess pragmatic competency as an insightful tool in cross-cultural communication including the speech act, presupposition, background knowledge, coherence, cultural schemata and cross-cultural pragmatic. The analysis have figure out that speech act could resembles the cultural specific that depicts the explicit meaning of language. Presupposition also part of culture due to it shows how the way the speakers construct his/her thoughts as frame in pre-existing knowledge structure. Coherence, cultural schemata and cross-cultural pragmatics also uncover the cultural background and show how the cultural value influence the communication goal either verbal and non-verbal way

REFERENCES

- Bennet, M. J. (1998). *Basic concepts of intercultural communication*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural press.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (2003). *Cross-cultural and intercultural communication*. California: Sage publications.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. California: Sage Publication Inc.
- Miller, G. A. (1974). Psychology, Language and Levels of Communication. In A. Silverstein, *Human Communication*. New York: John Wiley.
- Sugiyono. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Uys, J. (Director). (1980). *The Gods must be crazy* [Motion Picture].