

The Asian EFL Journal

April 2020

Volume 27, Issue 2.2



**Senior Editor:
Paul Robertson**



Published by the English Language Education Publishing

Asian EFL Journal
A Division of TESOL Asia Group
Part of SITE Ltd Australia

<http://www.asian-efl-journal.com>

©Asian EFL Journal 2020

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of the Asian EFL Journal Press.

No unauthorized photocopying

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the Asian EFL Journal.

editor@asian-efl-journal.com

Publisher: English Language Education (ELE) Publishing

Chief Editor: Dr. Paul Robertson

Associate Production Editor: Ramon Medriano Jr.

Assistant Copy Editor: Eva Guzman

ISSN 1738-1460



Table of Contents

Ni Wayan Surya Mahayanti and Suwarsih Madya	5
<i>The Development of Language Policy and Language Education in Indonesia: Pre-Colonialism to Industrial Revolution 4.0</i>	
Naimah Ahmad Alghamdi	31
<i>Gender Representation in MBC Advertisements: A Linguistic Associative Account</i>	
Alif Mudiono, Ratna Trieka Agustina and Sutansi	56
<i>The Effectiveness of Integrated Thematic Learning Model Using Project Based Learning in Elementary School</i>	
Mujazin, M.R. Nababan, Riyadi Santosa and Agus Hari Wibowo	71
<i>Translation Analysis: The Religiosity of Islamic Text</i>	
Maricel L. Dayag-Tungpalan	103
<i>Lived-Experiences of ESL Teachers: Basis for the Development and Validation of Self-assessment Tool in Teaching English as a Second Language (SAT-TESL)</i>	
Imroatus Solikhah and Denik Wirawati	120
<i>Mobile Assisted Language Learning and Its Insights in Teaching Academic Writing: A Literature Review</i>	
Susanto, Mohamad Jazeri, Nur Hidayat and Yudhi Arifani	137
<i>Does Interactive Whiteboard Affect Students' Writing Proficiency?</i>	
Suhartono	161
<i>On Spoken Implicature of Daily Conversation: How Social Values Form Utterances</i>	
Annie Mae C. Berowa	186
<i>When Ethnic Affiliation Matters: Looking into the Compliment and Compliment Response Strategies of the Maranao ESL Learners</i>	
Mohammad Alshehab and Lugman Rababah	211
<i>Lexical Legal Problems Committed by Translation Students When Translating English Legal Sentences into Arabic at Jadara University in Jordan</i>	
Analyn D. Saavedra	235
<i>Teachers' Preference on the Local Policy Implementation of the Mother Tongue Based-Multilingual Education: An Assessment</i>	
Lisetyo Ariyanti and Slamet Setiawan	257
<i>Referential Expressions in Indonesian Dangdut Songs: What the lyrics imply for social values and language teaching</i>	
Joel M. Torres and Ramon Medriano, Jr.	279
<i>Rhetorical Organization of Ilocano and Tagalog Pre-Service Teachers in their Argumentative Essays</i>	

Ahmad Ibrahim Mugableh and Mohammad N. Khreisat	305
<i>Longitudinal Examination of the Temporal Variables of Saudi ESL Speakers' Reading Fluency</i>	
Saraka	330
<i>Exploring Intercultural Competence in the Non-formal English Setting Environment of the Students in Kampung Inggris, Kediri, Indonesia</i>	



On Spoken Implicature of Daily Conversation: How Social Values Form Utterances

Suhartono

Surabaya State University, Lidah Wetan Street, Surabaya, Indonesia

suhartono@unesa.ac.id

Bio-profile:

Suhartono is an Associate Professor in Indonesian Language and Literature Department of Surabaya State University, Lidah Wetan Street, Surabaya, Indonesia. His research interest is pragmatic studies that puts emphasis on implicature topics. He teaches research methodology in language teaching, language curriculum and pragmatics. He can be reached at suhartono@unesa.ac.id.

Abstract

The aim of this study is to analyze the forms of utterance implicated conversation in the former center of the capital city of Majapahit in East Java-Indonesia. This is an ethnographic communication-related study which involved 47 participants consisting of 32 men and 15 women selected on the basis of normal physical and psychological criteria, adults, non-migrants, educated at least high school, and productive in communication. The data were collected using the recording and note-taking devices. Then the collected data were analyzed with an explanatory comparative technique with Miles and Huberman's flow analysis techniques. The results show that the forms of utterance implied conversational consist of (1) hedge utterances, (2) performative deletion utterances, (3) expanded performative utterances, (4) oratioobliqua utterances, (5) hybrid utterances, (6) reference utterance and attributes, (7) indexical utterances, (8) preference utterances, (9) conditional illocutionary utterances, and (10) negated utterances. Each form of utterance has a characteristic which is unique. The uniqueness of these forms of

utterance is a reflection of differences in communication performance between speakers with one another. The difference in performance is influenced by differences in the context and purpose of communication. It shows that each form of utterance is the chosen form used by speakers in accordance with the demands of the context and purpose of communication.

Keywords: *forms of utterance, implicated conversation, Majapahit*

Background

In pragmatic studies, the main goal of communication is not only dependent on the mastery of form but also objectives and social setting (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). The way the speaker delivers his utterance should be understood by the hearer so that she/he can interpret and recognize the speaker intention. Holtgraves & Kraus (2018) say that implicature enables us to interpret what is being said by utilizing context. Additionally, this interpretation requires critical thinking skills.

This study explores how implicature is developed in social conversation by the residence in a social cluster that highly appreciate their historical background. The exploration emphasized how values of the culture are appreciated. Nowadays, studies on the use of conversational implicature in the former capital of the Majapahit kingdom, especially those focused on speech forms, are very limited. Therefore, additional studies are needed as described in this article.

Based on the findings of important sites of the Majapahit kingdom, it is believed that Trowulan and its surroundings, an area in East Java, Indonesia, were the capital of the Majapahit kingdom (Kisyani, 1996:188-203, Lombart, 2000:34, Ali, 2014:1). The people in Trowulan and its surroundings have a specificity, which is proud of their true identity and will connect themselves to the greatness of Majapahit when asked about their ancestors (Kisyani, 2000:82). Other peculiarities appear in their habit of conveying their intentions indirectly in the form of conversational implicature (Suhartono, 2005:7). When associated with the opinion of Poesponegoro and Notosusanto (1984:451) that the Majapahit kingdom's governmental system is authoritarian with a centralized bureaucratic structure which ultimately leads to superior and subordinated groups,

subordinate group adherence to the uploading system (honorific) causes it must often convey its intentions indirectly.

For the Trowulan community, in line with the thinking of Magnis-Suseno (1993:39), the use of conversational implicature to convey intentions is motivated by the desire to obey the principles of harmony and respect. The principle of harmony is the principle of life that conditions the creation of a harmonious social climate, while the principle of respect is the principle of life that governs the procedures for communication and self-defense in order to show respect for others in accordance with their degrees and position. The speaker who implies conversation basically regulates the procedures for communicating and carrying himself so that his relationship with the hearer is harmonious. Harmony is preferred over clarity of communication content.

Review of Related Literature

Implicature, as stated by Horn (2006:3), is component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said. These implicature consists of three types, namely the conversational implicature which is usually distinguished from conventional implicature and metainplicature. The conversational implicature is an indirect intention which is bound by the principles and context of the conversation (Kecskes, 2009:107), whereas the conventional implicature is an indirect purpose whose interpretation must be based on convention (Jaszczolt, 2009:115). Unlike the conversational implicature and the conventional implicature where the use is related to the indirect meaning of the speaker, the metainplicature is used only for small talk (Suhartono, 2020). In other words, the use of metainplicature is only intended for the interests of fatigue (*polite on record*), namely the interest to maintain social relations and speakers do not have a specific purpose or special purpose (Leech, 1996:24). Among the three types of implicature, the most developed one is conversational implicature because this type of implicature is related to many things, including context, principles of conversation, and politeness (Taghizadeh, 2020).

Conversational implicature can be delivered in various forms of utterances, such as hedgeutterances, performative deletion utterances, extended performative utterances, *oratioobliqua* utterances, hybrid utterances, reference and attribute utterances, dejected

utterances, structured utterance choices, conditional illocutionary utterances, and negation utterances. Hedge utterances are utterances that the speaker is not sure that the proposition that he conveys is true (Leech 1996:9). Disappeared performative utterance is frivolous utterance that the speaker *melokillok* verbs (Leech, 1996:189). The expanded performative utterance is the utterance whose performance verb is derived from the context of the speech (Leech, 1996:194). *Oratioobliqua* utterances are utterances that contain two speech situations, namely the situation of primary speech and the situation of secondary speech (Leech, 1996:184-188). Hybrid utterance is utterance which requires the presence of at least two sentence constructions with different grammatical characteristics (Leech, 1996:194). Reference utterance and attribute are utterance that concentrates on the noun reference nature contained in the speech (Yule, 1998:19). Dextral utterances are those whose constituent references change (Yule, 1998:9). Optional structured utterance is utterance that concentrates on the nature of the relationship between the speaker's speech with verbal and nonverbal responses (especially "silent") of the speaker (Yule, 1998:78). Conditional illocutionary utterance is utterance that shows that the speaker asks something with a specific purpose (Leech, 1996:98). Negative utterance is utterance that concentrates on the existence of negation markers in an utterance (Leech, 1996:100).

Methods

This ethnographic communication-related study involved 47 participants consisting of 32 men and 15 women selected on the basis of normal physical and psychological criteria, adults, non-migrants, educated at least high school, and productive in communication. In line with the thinking of Hymes (1974:3-4), Spradley (1980:53-58), and Saville-Troike (1986:2-3), using the recording and note-taking devices, in applying the approach the researcher made participant observations with how to communicate naturally with participants, observe their activities and communication in detail, and ask questions that are deemed necessary to be explored. These activities are sometimes carried out when visiting, working together, together on trips to other cities, and so on. It is not uncommon for researchers to use elicitation techniques to explore data deemed potential in producing utterance implicated conversation.

The collected data were analyzed with an explanatory comparative technique with Miles and Huberman's flow analysis techniques, namely data reduction, data presentation, and the conclusion/verification of Miles and Huberman (1984:16-23). At the data reduction stage, the data is organized according to the research problem and is coded until the presentation is organized. Furthermore, for the sake of presentation, the data are selected from a simulative-distinctive perspective, then presented according to the needs of *explanatory adequacy*.

Results

1. Hedge Utterances

In line with Leech's (1996:9) thinking stated that speaker basically tries to adhere to quality maxims, IP utterance can be divided into two types, namely (a) utterance which implies that speaker is not convinced that the proposition in its utterance is true even though it has been try to state what he thinks is right and (b) utterance suggests that speaker believes that the proposition in utterance is true. The first type of communication is in a communication situation based on his knowledge of the nature of the person he is talking about, speaker judges that the nature of the person he is talking about is in his judgment (Taghizadeh, 2020). However, he realized that his judgment might be wrong because in situations outside of what he knew it turned out that the person he was talking about had other facts that were far from what he had known so far. Under such conditions, as shown in Jk utterance in the conversation unit (1), speaker chooses to use *hedges* utterance or what Yule (1998:38) called *as cautious notes* utterance, in conveying intent.

(1) Jk: **Anu. Mertua sampean itu orangnya *mendel* (“pendiam”). Jadi, *gini* ini mungkin *nggak* tahu.**

Sh: Nanti biar saya beri tahu, Pak.

Jk: **Anu. Your mother-in-laws is a person who *mendel* (“silent person”). So, she possibly didn't know this.**

Sh: Let me tell her later, Sir.

Context: The communication takes place in a parking lot in a hospital. Sh was invited by Jk to visit a patient. Jk knows that both Sh and the patient are not familiar. However, the patient who was originally in the same village as JK was Sh's mother-in-law's friend.

With the context control, Jk utterance is Jk asking Sh to tell his mother-in-law that her mother-in-law's friend is sick. The use of *possibly* adverbial utterance is in Jk utterance which is a hedge that indicates that his assessment of Sh's mother-in-law who does not know that his friend is ill can be wrong even though based on his Tt it is implied that he knows the true nature of Sh's in-laws. By using *possibly* adverbial utterance, it is *possible* that Jk anticipates the possibility of an *over-generalization*, namely that the nature of *mendel* is directly proportional to the condition of not easily knowing something.

Based on the context, Haya's utterance is that Haya does not have any people from the Ministry of Religion. The use of *possibly* adverbial utterance is possible in Haya's utterance as a hedge to protect the untruthfulness of the substance of utterance.

Another adverbial used by speaker to indicate the lack of confidence that what is said is true, as in (2), is *usual*.

(2) Sh: Agak bingung *mikir* rumah, saya.

Tn: **Orang tua biasanya memikirkan anak perempuannya.**

Sh: Rather confused to *think* about house, I am.

Tn: **Parents are usually thinking about their daughter.**

Context: Sh has been married for about two years, but doesn't have a house yet.

Unlike *possibly, usually* utterance is used to express the prevalence that parents generally provide financial support to their daughters when the person concerned is trying to make or buy home. However, providing such support is not an obligation. As indicated

in Tn utterance, there are a few parents who do not "think" about their daughter when the child will make or buy a house. Because there are a small number of people who are, maybe because they are not really thinking or thinking but not capable, Tn is aware that this is something that might happen. Therefore, so that what he pointed out is not wrong, he fences it by using the adverbial element utterance normally. Meanwhile, in line with the context, Tn's utterance is that Sh doesn't need to worry about the house because his parents-in-law will help him.

However, adverbial elemental *usually* utterance is not always identify as a hedge utterance if the utterance implies speaker's belief that the utterance substance, as shown in Tn utterance (3) in (4), is correct.

(3) Saha(1): Ke Tuban Minggu sore gitu gimana, Pak?

Tn(1): Minggu di Kalikatur ada pengajian. Saya jadi panitianya, Pak.

Saha(2): Senin pagi?

Tn(2): *Nggak* apa-apa kalau Minggu Pak Saha *nggak* bisa.

Saha(3): Jam berapa?

Tn(3): ***Kayak biasanya.***

Saha (1): How about going to Tuban this Sunday evening, Sir?

Tn (1): There is recitation on today's Sunday evening in Kalikatur. I am the committee, Sir.

Saha (2): Monday morning?

Tn (2): It's okay if Sunday Mr. Saha can't go.

Saha (3): What time?

Tn (3): *As usual.*

Context: Saha plans to go to Tuban and Tn will join.

(4) Tn: **Pak Saha saya kira lebih tepat di perumahan. Jadi *nggak* usah *mikir* tetangga.**

Saha: Tapi saya justru ingin *gaul*, Pak.

Tn: **Mr. Saha, I think it's more appropriate for residencing. So don't think about neighbors.**

Saha: But I just want to get along, Sir.

Tn: Lho iya. Itu pasti. Tapi lingkungannya *nggak* heterogen. Paling *ndak* itu pegawai.

Tn: Yeah. Certainly. But the environment is not heterogeneous. At least it's an employee.

Context: Saha told that someone had offered him land in a village. Because the village is outside the city, Tn considered that the land was not suitable for Saha.

Tn in (4) gives an assessment that according to his knowledge of Saha's work, Saha is not suitable to live outside the city which he thinks does not support self-development. By living in housing, according to him, access to self-development is more open because there is not much preoccupation with traditional social affairs. Thus, based on the context he had an conversational implicature that Saha should buy a house in residence.

Besides using utterance which elemental adverbial and verbal phases, speaker can also use other constructions to enclose the untruths of the proposition spoken, that is, to use nominal phases of utterance in its *simple analysis*, as shown in Tn hearer (5) below.

(5) Sh(1): Kira-kira untuk apa Bu Nina uang sebanyak itu?

Tn(1): **Analisis sederhananya ya diberikan orang lain, Pak.**

Sh(2): Bukan untuk keluarga, Pak, ya?

Tn(2) : Bukan.

Sh (1): What do you have for Nina for that much money?

Tn. (1): **Simple analysis, yes, it is given by someone else, Sir.**

Sh (2): Not for family, Sir?

Tn. (2): No.

Context: Ms. Nina is an elementary school teacher. He does not invest in other business sectors. In addition, he also showed a simple lifestyle. Her husband is also an elementary school teacher as well. However, Mrs. Nina has debts here and there around Rp 100,000,000. Some of his friends, including Mr., have heard that he has another ideal man. The man had a lower formal income, but had just bought a car and his life seemed well off.

The use of utterance which has verbal phases of *analysis simply* suggests that even though they have been thought analytically, statements from the results of these thoughts can be wrong because they are only done simply. Simple analysis gives the possibility of the existence of factors that are detached from thought and that can lead to the birth of mistakes. Thus, utterance that has a verbal *simply analytical* analysis in Tn utterance suggests that as far as the analysis, what he stated is true; but the possibility of the reverse can occur if he should conduct complex analysis. In (5), based on context, Tn's utterance is that Ms. Nina had an affair.

2. Performative Deletion Utterance

In performative deletion utterance, the speaker believes that the proposition in his/her utterance is true. For example speaker is aware that he is no longer trusted by hearer because he often breaks his promises. In such conditions speaker can explicate his intention by stating, for example, "I promise that ...". According to Leech (1996:189), utterance which is "*self-naming*" or explicit performative is rarely used except in certain situations where speaker intent exemplification is considered important. Utterance with this characteristic is not possible to be spoken by speaker which conveys its meaning implicitly, for example when having conversational implicature (Jazeri, Sukarsono & Susanto, 2020). When using conversational implicature speaker changes its explicit performative utterance, it becomes a *performative deletion*, as seen in Jk's utterance in (6).

(6) Sh: Ke Bupati Senin, Pak, ya?

Jk: **Senin ada pemberangkatan haji.**

Sh: To the Regent on Monday, Sir?

Jk: **There is a pilgrimage departure on Monday.**

Context: Sh and Jk will both face the Regent. Sh wanted it Monday, but that day there was a pilgrimage departure. With the event, the Regent could not receive guests because they had to provide various provisions for prospective pilgrims.

In line with Ross's performative hypothesis (in Leech, 1996:192) that the inner structure of each sentence has a higher clause and has performative qualities, Jk utterance is basically analogous to Jk's utterance. In other words, Jk utterance is explicitly performative is the same as the analogy, namely Jk utterance is nonperformative.

3. Extended Performative Utterance

If the performative deletion utterance has a resemblance to the utterance that derives it because there is basically only the performance of the performative verb, the expanded performative hearer does not have to be so even if it is equally derivative. The performative verb in the expanded hearer performative must be derived from the utterance context, and not from the derivative utterance. This concept differs from Sadock's concept (in Leech, 1996:194) that the performative verb utterance derivative is derived from syntactic rules.

In line with the *extended performative hypothesis* that the performative inner structure also applies to utterance whose speaker is not directly circulated, Jk utterance in (7) below is utterance derived from the performative inner structure. However, new problems arise if they are related to utterance like Jk utterance.

(7) Jk: **Sini sejuk, Pak.**

Sh: (Mengarahkan sepeda motornya menuju tempat yang ditunjukkan Jk).

Jk: It is cool here, Sir.

Sh: (Directing his motorcycle towards the place indicated by Jk).

Context: Jk and Sh both will park their motorbikes respectively. Jk is under a mango tree, while Sh is in a hot place.

(8) Jk: Saya mengajak Bapak ke sini.

Jk: I ask you here.

Context: Jk at a college (PT) where Saha works. Saha has just been accepted as a civil servant at the PT. At that time, Jk needed Saha's help, but Saha had to teach first.

Before the expanded performative utterance is explained, it is important to make explicit the model of the expanded performative utterance model Sadock. Using the example of utterance "*Can you close the window?*", Sadock (in Leech, 1996:194) explains that the utterance has a performative inner structure "*I request that you close the window.*" with the argument that syntactically, the utterance derivative can contain *please* - which according to him is a syntactic marker for the action of demand - as shown in utterance "*Can you please close the window?*". By departing from this explanation, Jk utterance in (7) has a performative inner structure as seen in (8) because syntactically the derivative utterance can contain adverb *let* - which is a marker of invitation.

For those example, Sadock's argument can be accepted. However, a new problem arises if the argument is related to Jk utterance which does not have a syntactic marker that marks the purpose of the illocutionary Jk. A similar problem will arise for each utterance that is difficult to find syntactic markers that mark the purpose of the illocution speaker.

The researcher agrees with Leech's (1996) opinion that the power of illocution is not derived from syntactic rules, but from the context of utterance. Based on the context it

can be explained that Jk intends to invite Sh to park his motorcycle near the Jk motorcycle. In the form of an expanded performative utterance, the intention can be constructed.

4. *Oratio Obliqua* Utterance

Oratio obliqua utterance has three characteristics. First, *oratio obliqua* utterance contains two utterance situations: primary utterance situation and the secondary utterance situation. The primary utterance situation is the situation when utterance is spoken, while the secondary utterance situation is the situation described in utterance. Second, the contents of the secondary utterance are contained in the complementary clauses *that* or "represent" them, for example pauses. Third, in the secondary utterance, speaker has no obligation to provide verbatim reports (Leech, 1996:184-188). These three characteristics can be observed in (9).

(9) Sh: Puskopad kena kemarin?

EW: **Setengah sepuluh mas saya sebenarnya sudah *nelpon* bahwa air sudah masuk. Tapi saya pikir ya nggak mungkin *wong* selama ini tidak pernah.**

Sh: Pak Jaka juga kena?

EW: *Malah* segini (telapak tangan kanan tengkurap di dekat pusar).

Sh: Puskopad was hit yesterday?

EW: **Half past ten, my brother actually called that the water was already in. But I don't think it's possible for a long time.**

Sh: Mr. Jaka also hit?

EW: In fact this much (right palm on his stomach near the navel).

Context: Some of the Puskopad residences complexes were flooded. EW is a resident of Puskopad residence that was hit by a flood. His sister lives west of the Puskopad resident estate and was flooded first because water came from the west.

The situation when (9) was said to be a primary situation, whereas the situation when EW's brother called EW that the water had entered and when JS told Mada that he did not want to go along was a secondary situation. In relation to the two characteristics of *oratio*

obliqua utterance, these two types of situations must exist, while the complementary clause that is not mandatory exists. As shown in JS utterance (1), *that* can be substituted with pauses. Meanwhile, the secondary utterance, at (9) does not have to be verbatim. Therefore, the editor can be processed by speaker.

5. Hybrid Utterance

In certain utterance situations speaker can say that its utterance consists of only one sentence or two or more sentences that have similar grammatical characteristics, for example both declarative sentences. In other situations, speaker can also do different things, using utterance which in Leech's terms (1996:194) is a hybrid utterance. In (10), an utterance can be identified as a hybrid utterance because two or more sentences with different grammatical characteristics become constituents.

(10) Jk(1): **Kita makan siang di Simpang. Nggak ada acara, kan?**

Sh: Ada acara apa?

Jk(2): Kawan-kawan pariwisata seminar.

Jk (1): **We have lunch at Simpang. There's no program, right?**

Sh: What's the show?

Jk (2): Seminar tourism comrades.

Context: If you visit Sh's house. That day, at Simpang Hotel, Jk friends who worked in the tourism sector held a seminar. Jk invited Sh to attend the seminar.

In responding to utterance as told by Jk (1), Leech (1996:195) maintains that utterance is not a mere fact of language, but rather two meanings that come together and give meaning to one another. Therefore, according to him, from a pragmatic point of view, hybrid utterance can be explained in terms of general principles of human behavior that are purposive and rational.

It implies that Jk has a specific purpose when combined construction *We have lunch at Simpang* and *there is no event, right?* In line with the context, Jk's intention was to

invite Sh to attend a seminar at the Simpang Hotel. However, that intention can not be realized, and it is rational, if the reality is Jk's prediction that Sh does not have a wrong event. Thus, in the declarative plus interrogative construction, interrogative utterance is a requirement (*condition*) and is therefore no less important than the declarative utterance status which is the *main statement*.

6. Reference Utterance and Attributes

This type of utterance needs to be distinguished from the five types of utterance in advance because the utterance concentration is referenced and the attribute is the reference noun characteristic contained in utterance. The five types of utterance ahead, as can be observed in their characteristics, "ignore" the reference issue.

Reference utterance and attributes regard to *referring expressions*. Nouns in utterance are referenced and attributes consist of *exist* and *not exist*. For the second category, Yule (1998:18) uses the example of "*We'd love to find a nine-foot-tall basketball player*", an utterance with an unusual proposition substance in communication that speaker puts forward obedience to quality maxims.

The first category can be broken down into two parts, those that are clearly there and the references are clear and those that are not clear, but the references can be identified. For the second choice, Yule (1998:19) uses the term *atributif (attributeive use)*, whereas for the first choice Yule uses the term *referential use*. *Attributive use*, as the examples appear in (11), refers to "what use or anyone whose description is suitable", while *referential use* refers to "the use of references that are clear or at least clearly reflected in hearer's mind" .

(11) Jk: **Ada koran di sana.**

Sh: (Mengangguk)

Jk: **There is a newspaper there.**

Sh: (nodding)

Context: Jk and Sh both look after students who are currently in UTS, but each is in a different class. At that time, JK passed in the class where Sh was.

In (11), the *newspaper* reference referred to by Jk is not clear so that it can refer to anything that has a newspaper status. This is different from the utterance of the same type whose reference is clear, for example *there is Jawa Pos there*.

7. Deixis Utterance

Like reference utterance, deixis utterance is also related to clear references. The difference lies in the nature of the reference. In utterance, the reference for reference to the constituents of utterance is fixed, whereas in utterance, the deixis is nomadic (Yule, 1998:9).

Deixis utterance is characterized by deictic or indexical expressions (*indexical*). The in-deixical type depends on the type of deixis. The "I" indexical, for example, as the example shown in Jm(3)utterance in (12) is part of the person deixis (*person deixis*).

(12) Sh(1): Pak Kada masih di Radar?

Jm(1): Sekarang dekat, Pak. Dekat rumah saya.

Sh(2): Mana itu?

Jm(2): Wates.

Sh(3): Dekat Pak Ara?

Jm(3): **Pak Ara sebelah timur, saya barat.**

Sh (1): Mr. Kada is still on Radar?

Jm (1): Now it is close, Sir. Near my house.

Sh (2): Where is that?

Jm (2): Wates.

Sh (3): Near Mr. Ara?

Jm (3): **Mr. Ara to the east, I am in west.**

Context: Mr. Kada, Jm's husband, works in Radar Mojokerto. Before being moved to Wates, Radar's office was in the center of town. Ara, like Jm, also lives in Wates residence.

"I" in Jm(3)utterance refers to Jm. In line with the nature of deixis, which is an indexical reference can move, "I" at Jk utterance in (12) follows another reference, namely Jk. Thus, "I" in the two examples presented have different references.

8. Preference Utterance

Preference Utterance involves the nature of the relationship between speakerutterance with hearer's verbal and nonverbal responses (especially "silence"). In line with Yule's view (1998:78), a series of adjacent pairs, namely between speaker utterance and hearer utterance, basically it is not simple because in addition to representing social actions, not all social actions get the expected response. Adjacent pairs can be grouped into two parts. The first part contains requests or offers or similar acts that are typically made in the hope that the second part will be an acceptance. This is logical because, as stated by Yule (1998:79), a structural acceptance is more likely to be realized than rejection. Such a structure, that is, which gives an alternative response, is called a *preference structure*. As such, the two adjacent pairs are responses to a preference utterance.

Responses to preference utterance consist of responses that reflect social actions that are selected (*preffered social acts*) and those that are not selected (*dispreferred social acts*). The selected social actions are the future actions that are structurally expected by hearer and the social actions that are not selected are the future actions that are structurally not expected by hearer. The use of the choice of structured utterance in conversational implicature utterance can be given the following example.

(13) Tt: Sudah berapa putranya?

Jk: **Dua. Satu kelas 5, adiknya kelas 4. Maunya, yang satu SMP 1, adiknya SMP 2 sini.**

Tt: Lha ya itu, kasihan Bu Puji, Pak. Sekarang ini aturannya banyak sekali. *Nggak kayak dulu.*

Tt: How many sons are there?

Jk: Two. One class 5, younger brother grade 4. Wants, the one Junior High School 1, his brother in Junior High School 2 here.

Tt: Yes, that's a pity Mrs. Puji, Sir. Now there are so many rules. Not like the previous one.

Context: Tt is Jk's old friend, while Mrs. Puji is Jk's brother who knows Tt. Tt works as a teacher in SMP 2 who was once "entrusted" by Mrs. Puji to put her child in SMP 2. However, Tt's attempt failed.

9. Conditional Illocution Utterance

In line with Leech's (1996:98) thinking, utterance which has conditional illocutions (1) is only found in utterance which explicitly shows that speaker asks something and (2) speaker has two objectives, i.e., the anticipation goal and the final destination. The purpose of anticipation is an explicit goal, namely the purpose of finding information as it appears in the structure of the question speaker utterance, while the final goal is an implicit goal, that is, an indirect objective that is implicit which can be identified by connecting speaker utterance with the context of utterance.

In (14), the purpose of anticipating speaker is to ask whether or not a brochure is available, while the final goal is to request a brochure. The purpose of this anticipation appears from the structure of the question which is not a rhetorical question. Therefore, speaker question is an aretrical question or ordinary question. The usual question sequence is that speaker requires certain information. The information needs are met by hearer, as shown in utterance *there is, there is*.

In addition to fulfilling the anticipation goal of speaker, hearer in (14) also fulfills the final goal speaker. It is evident that he then gives a number of brochures to speaker. This also implies that the catch of hearer for the implicit purpose of speaker is correct. If it is wrong, speaker of course makes a negative feedback, for example reject.

(14) Ss: **Brosur yang dulu masih, Pak?**

Sl: Ada, ada. (Mengambil brosur di tas dan kemudian memberikannya)

Ss: **The brochure used to be still, Sir?**

SL: There is, there is. (Take the brochure in the bag and then give it)

Context: SL is the administrative staff who handles the distribution of brochures for a program managed by the PTS where Ss studies. For brochure distributors who successfully recruit program participants, incentives are provided. Many old program participants, including Ss, who wish to distribute the brochure.

In contrast to speaker utterance in (14) which gets a positive response from hearer, in (15) following, hearer's response to both types of goal speaker is negative. The purpose of anticipating speaker is to request information about whether or not Sek can deal with other regions. hearer response via utterance *Just wait. It will be arrived really.* shows that hearer answered "no" to the arorical speaker question. Another reality that hearer did not or did not promise to do an action to mutate Sek shows that the final goal of speaker, namely asking hearer to "mutate" Sek, also received a negative response.

(15) Tn(1): Kok lama, Bah?

Bah(1): Bupati dan Sek-nya sibuk urusannya sendiri-sendiri.

Tn(2): **Sek-nya *ndak* bisa ngurusi daerah lain saja?**

Bah(2): Tunggu saja. *Nyampek* kok.

Mr (1): How long is it, Bah?

Bah (1): The Regent and his Sek are busy with their own affairs.

Mr (2): **Can you just not deal with other areas?**

Bah (2): Just wait. It will be arrived really.

Context: Tn is a model teacher who was promised to be appointed as a school principal. Tn know that it is difficult to realize quickly because the Regional Secretary has other candidates. The new possibility was appointed after the other candidates. Bah is a psychic who in his view had no difficulty in realizing Tn wishes.

10. Negation Utterance

Negation utterance "take care" of utterance which contains negative markers. In relation to speaker utterance, Leech (1996:100) argues that in communicating activities speaker prefers a positive utterance than a negated utterance. According to him, this is based on the reality that, as indicated in Tn(1)utterance in the conversation unit, utterance is not as informative as positive utterance which is its "partner", for example Tn(1)utterance (1) in (17). In (17) X refers to only one person; whereas in the conversation unit (16), *it is no longer like Basir* to refer to anyone who is different from Basir.

(16) Tn(1): **Tidak lagi seperti Basir. (sambil melihat By yang lewat di dekatnya)**

Sh: Diet?

Tn(2): Kegiatannya banyak, Pak. Hampir tiap hari pulang sampai sore.

Tn (1): **It's no longer like Basir.(while looking at the passing by nearby)**

Sh: Diet?

Mr. (2): There are a lot of activities, Sir. Almost every day go home until evening.

Context: Tn utterance is addressed to By, his son. Basir is an auxiliary figure in the soap opera *Misteri Gunung Merapi* that is famous for its fat physical condition.

(17) Tn(1): Seperti X. (X adalah inisial orang yang kurus)

Sh: Diet?

Tn(2): Kegiatannya banyak, Pak. Hampir tiap hari pulang sampai sore.

Mr (1): Like X. (X is the initials of a thin person)

Sh: Diet?

Mr. (2): There are a lot of activities, Sir. Almost every day go home until evening.

Because negation utterance is less informative than positive utterance, negation utterance will be avoided if positive utterance can be used. Thus, Tn utterance (1) in (39) arises because Tn has the view that there is no soap opera figure who is considered representative to be considered the same as By.

Discussions

This study found that the form of utterance used by participants is chosen on certain considerations. Hedge utterance, for example, is a product of balance that speaker is not convinced that the utterance proposition is true. If it is related to Grice's (1975:45-46) thought that speaker should avoid its utterance which he does not believe to be true because it can violate the quality maxim, by using a hedge utterance with speaker violates the quality maxim. According to Grice, the violation should be avoided so that cooperation between speaker and hearer continues to be established. With the establishment of cooperation, communication can run efficiently and effectively.

As a product of particular consideration, utterance forms have unique characteristics. That characteristic implies that each form has specific characteristics. The characteristic of the hedge utterance, for example, is different from the performance of the performative utterance. utterance with hedge characteristics (1) speaker shows a cooperative attitude by concentrating on complying with quality maxims, but he is not sure that what he is saying is correct and (2) speaker uses categories of words or phrases that indicate predictability; whereas performative utterance is characterized by fade (1) speaker believes that what is spoken is correct and (2) speaker implements illocutionary verbs.

However, the difference in characteristics between forms does not mean that

certain forms of utterance are absolutely different from other forms. The results showed that in addition to having differences, between forms can also have similar characteristics. For example, reference utterance and attributes have the same characteristics as ethics utterance, namely that they are related to certain references. The difference is that the references in reference utterance and attributes, both existing and non-existent, are fixed; while references dehis utterance move around.

Another peculiarity is that IP utterance cannot be in the form of explicit performative. This is in line with the view of Leech (1996:189) that utterance which "calls oneself" is rarely used except in certain situations where speaker's explicit purpose is considered important, for example when speaker baptized. Outside this situation speaker will use other analogous forms, for example the performative utterance is worn out and the expanded performative utterance.

Aside from being unique, the IP utterance also has its uniqueness especially when associated with its status as "another world" which shifts the role of selected words and their construction. The words that were originally chosen because speaker requires their meaning and are constructed in such a way as to be grammatical meaning, so that they are able to facilitate speaker's needs in conveying the meaning, ultimately have to lose their role because the journey between purpose and context is more important to put forward. The loss of that role causes hearer to ignore the substance of construction utterance because with context control he is "ordered" by speaker to look for other meanings, namely implicit innate meanings. That complicates three things. First, the performance of speaker from doing word selection activities to constructing it grammatically is ultimately "wasteful". Second, the construction of speaker utterance only functions as a "container" and not a representation of intent speaker. Third, the emergence of "other worlds" is not due to the use of a functional approach, but because of the need that new labels must be raised in line with the demands of the communication context and the emergence of implicit innate meaning.

Conclusion

The objective of this study is to analyze the form of utterance in social

conversation. Results show that hedge utterance the speaker (1) shows cooperative attitude by concentrating on complying with the quality maxim, but he is not sure that his/her proposition is correct and (2) uses a category of words/phrases that indicate predictability. In contrast to hedge utterance, performative utterance is characterized by (1) the speaker is convinced that his/her proposition is true and (2) the nutter blurs the illocutionary verb.

The expanded performative utterance is almost the same as the slow performative utterance. The difference is that the performance performative utterance is similar to the utterance that derives it because basically there is only a diminution of the performative verb, while the expanded performative utterance is not so because the performance verb is derived from the context of the utterance, not from the derivation. Different from the three types of utterances, the *oratio obliqua* utterances have the following characteristics: (1) contains two utterance situations, namely the primary utterance situation and the secondary utterance situation, (2) the contents of the secondary utterances are contained in the complementary clause that or " who represent it ", and (3) in the secondary utterance the speaker has no obligation to report verbally or in *letterlijk*. Hybrid utterance has another characteristic because this type of speech requires the presence of at least two sentence constructions with different grammatical characteristics.

Referenced utterance and attribute concentrates on the noun reference nature contained in the utterance. Deixis utterances are almost the same as reference and attribute utterances. The difference is that the reference constituents referenced speech and attributes are fixed, while the reference constituents deixis are moving. The following types of utterances, namely the choice of structured speech, concerns the nature of the relationship between the speaker's speech with verbal and nonverbal responses (especially "silent") of the speaker. Furthermore, the conditional illocutionary speech is characterized by (1) only in speech which explicitly shows that the speaker asks something and (2) the speaker has two goals, namely the anticipation goal and the final goal. The last type of utterance, namely negation utterance, concentrates on the existence of negation markers in an

utterance.

Pedagogical Implication

The results of this study can be utilized for pragmatics learning, especially to explain about the authentic variants of utterance form which implicated conversation in informal oral situations. Thus, authentic examples of utterance forms implied conversational which have been used both in lectures and in class explanations become abundant and varied. On the other hand, the examples of forms of utterance that are not authentic are better replaced by these authentic examples. So that in the other side of learning became more natural and more interesting. In addition, it is more convincing to students that the theory of utterance forms is not an imaginative theory, but rather than empirical theories which are supported by real examples in daily life in many areas. Students have more easily understand the utterance form theory, the use of authentic examples also inspires students to produce similar utterance or its variants in conversational implication activities. In the future, the variant forms of utterance implied by the conversation produced by students will be more and more and it enriches authentic linguistic data that can be used to sharpen the theory in lectures and explanations in class.

References

- Ali, Akbar. (2014). "Cultural Resource Management for Majapahit Kingdom Site in Trowulan, East Jawa, Indonesia" in *Conservation & Management of Archaeological Sites*, Nov 2014, Vol. 16 Issue 4, p297—307.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How To Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holtgraves, T., & Kraus, B. (2018). Processing scalar implicatures in conversational contexts: An ERP study. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 46, 93–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2017.12.008>
- Horn, Laurence R. (2006). "Implicature" in *the Handbook of Pragmatics*. (Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward, Eds.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics an Ethnographic Approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Jaszczolt, K. (2009). "Constraint, Pragmatic" in *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. (Jacob L, Mey, Ed.). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Jazeri, M; Sukarsono & Susanto. (2020). Interlanguage pragmatic: Politeness strategy of apology by Thai learners in Indonesian learning program of foreign learners. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 16(1.2), 234-249.
- Keeskes, I. (2009). "Communicative Principle and Communication" in *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics*. (Jacob L, Mey, Ed.). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Kisyani. (1996). Bahasa Jawa Dialek Jawa Timur di Mojokerto: Evidensi Pewarisan Bahasa Jawa Kuno dan Batas Dialeknya. *Prasasti*, VI(24).
- Kisyani. (2000). *Bahasa Jawa di Jawa Timur Bagian Utara dan Blambangan Kajian Dialektologis*. Disertasi tidak diterbitkan. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Leech, G. 1996. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Magnis-Suseno, F. (1993). *Etika Jawa: Sebuah Analisa Falsafi tentang Kebijakanaan Hidup Jawa*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M.(1984). *Qualitative Data Analysis A Sourcebook of New Methods*. London: Sage Publications.
- Nordquist, R. (2017). Speech Acts in Linguistics and What Intended to Say by Speakers. *English Teaching Forum*, 23(4), 124–135.
- Nordquist, R. (2019). *Phatic communication Definition and examples*. Available at: <https://www.thoughtco.com/phatic-communication-1691619>. Retrieved on July 12, 2019.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1986). *The Ethnography of Communication an Introduction* (Cet. Ke-3) New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). *Speech act: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Suhartono. (2005). *ImplikaturPercakapandalam Bahasa Indonesia Lisan Informal Warga Masyarakat Tutar Mojokerto*. Disertasitidakditerbitkan. Malang: Malang State University.

Suhartono. (2020). Implication of academic interaction in the graduate thesis exam context in Indonesian university. *Asian ESP Journal*, 16(1.2), 247-287.

Taghizadeh, R. (2020). Pragmatic competence in the target language: A study of Iranian learners of English. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 24(1), 1-28.

Yule, G. (1998). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

