CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE AMONG BREBESNESE FRIENDS (PRAGMATICS STUDY)

Ekfindar Diliana

Fakultas Ilmu Budaya Universitas Diponegoro

Absract

This descriptive qualitative study aims at investigating the tendency of particularized and generalized conversational implicature used by Brebesnese friends in the work place, and it aims at figuring out why they use certain particularized implicature. The theories employed are conversational implicature theory by Grice (1975) and face wants theory by Brown and Levinson (1987). The conversation among Brebesnese friends in writer's work place was taken purposively as sample. By using observation method with transcription technique, the writer found that they tended to use particularized implicature (72.2%) more often than generalized implicature (27.7%). People used particularized implicature mostly because they wanted to save and to threaten their own face or the hearer's face. Meanwhile, generalized implicature was used to imply 'not all', to imply the opposite, and to imply the contradiction to the factual condition.

Abstrak

Penelitian deskriptif kualitatif ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui kecenderungan pengguanaan implikatur percakapan umum dan implikatur percakapan umum antar teman pengguna dialek Brebes di lingkungan kerja dan juga untuk mengetahui mengapa mereka menggunakan implikatur percakapan khusus tertentu. Teori-teori yang digunakan adalah teori implikatur percakapan oleh Grice (1975) dan teori muka olej Brown dan Levinson (1978). Data yang digunakan adalah percakapan antar teman di tempat kerja si penulis. Dengan menggunakan metode observasi dan teknik pencatatan, penulis menemukan bahwa mereka cenderung menggunakan implikatur percakapan khusus (72.2%) dari pada implikatur percakapan khusus (27.7%). Mereka menggunakan implikatur percakapan khusus karena mereka ingin menyelamatkan atau mengancam muka mereka sendiri atau mitra tutur. Sedangkan, mereka menggunakan implikatur percakapan umum untuk menyiratkan 'tidak semua', menyiratkan lawan kata, dan menyiratkan kebalikan dari kondisi yang sebenarnya.

Key words: Conversational Implicature, Inference, Face Wants

Introduction

Pragmatics is one of interesting studies to conduct. It provides us a broad study between utterance and its meaning. Yule (1996:3) states that pragmatics investigates what kind of utterance that someone usually uses in given situation and it also gives the speaker clues of the function of each utterance. Furthermore, it investigates why people cannot maintain the flows of the conversation. In other words, it investigates why people violate the cooperative principle. For instance, when people say "Will you have some coffee?" we may expect that the second speaker answers with

"Yes, I would love too" or "No, I won't". However, the second speaker may say "I had three glasses this morning" which may infer that he refuses the first speaker offer. This is one of the cases in pragmatics study which is commonly called as 'implicature'.

Among the terms discussed in pragmatics, implicature is the most challenging matter to discuss, because this term is used to analyze the "hidden meaning" that is in someone's utterance. The term 'implicature' was first introduced by Grice. The difference of *what is said* by a speaker and *what he means or implicates* is what Grice called as implicature (Moeschler 2006:5).

This paper focuses on the analysis of conversational implicature, especially generalized and particularized implicature. There are two questions addressed in this paper: (1) How is the tendency of the use of generalized and particularized conversational implicature among Brebesnese friends, and (2) Why they use certain particularized conversational implicature.

There are several studies on implicature. It is reported that implicature is mostly used in humor. Alvaro (2011) used the term implicature and presupposition to analyze how the humor in the film is guaranted. In working on his dissertation, he analyzed more on the flouting of Grice's maxim, especially Quality maxim. He tried to compare the result between the use of the two terms; implicature and presupposition. He finally went to his findings that the use of implicature and the conversational maxims was much more abundant than the use of presupposition. However, in his study, Alvaro did not clearly distinguish two kinds of conversational implicature; particularized and generalized implicature. He focused only on the flouting of the maxims that leads to implicature. Hamid and Behija (2009) who worked on the violation in response to some western political, tried to investigate the application of four maxims in politician talks. They drew on their last conclusions that if the maxim quality was violated, then other maxims were difficult to

achieve. Again, in their research, the two different conversational implicatures were not taken into account.

Another study on implicature was also conducted by Nanda, Sukyadi and Sudarsono (2012). They aim to investigate conversational implicature used by the presenter of Take Me Out Indonesia. In this study, they tried to differentiate the use of generalized and particularized conversational implicature. The result showed that the presenter of Take me Out Indonesia tended to use more generalized implicature than particularized implicature. However, they did not involve directly in such TV program. They have lack knowledge of context. As a consequence their assumptions of some implicature might be false. From the three studies described above, the writer decides to work on investigating conversational implicature—generalized and particularized conversational implicature— in the conversation among Brebesnese friends.

The theory used in this study is Grice's theory of conversational implicature. Grice logical conversation begins with the Cooperation Principles (Cp). He believes that whenever people have conversation, they must have an assumption in their minds about the way to keep their conversation in track. Cooperative Principles proposed by Grice (1975) in Yule (1996:37) states "make your conversational contribution such as required…' Then he classified Cooperation Principles into four maxims; they are as follows; (a) Maxim of Quantity, (b) Maxim of Quality, (c) Maxim of Relevance, and (d) Maxim of Manner. However, the failure of fulfilling the maxim mostly occurs in conversation. There are several types of failure such as flouting, violating, opting-out, and infringing, but in this paper the writer only focuses on flouting the maxims which generates to an implicature.

Grice distinguished the concept of implicature into two; conventional and conversational implicature. However, in this paper, I only focus on the conversational implicature. Conversational

implicature shows Grice's attempts to illustrate how a person understands the meaning from what has said systematically, or understand the implied meaning from the expressed meaning, (Thomas, 1995 in Alduais 2012:377). Conversational implicature is an implicature occurs in special case of situations in which the perceived meaning extends beyond the literal meaning (Wang 2011:1162).

There are two kinds of conversational implicature: generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. Generalized conversational implicature occurs without reference to any particular features of the context (Levinson 1983:126). In other words, when there is not any special knowledge in the context to indicate the additional implied meaning is called a generalized conversation. Grice in Nana, Sukyadi and Sudarsono (2012:124) distinguishes generalized implicature into three types;

Q-Implicature (based on the first sub maxim of Quantity—Make your contribution as informative as required for the purpose of communication), I-Implicature (based on the second sub maxim of quantity—do not make your contribut ion more informative than what is required), and M-Implicature (based on the third sub maxim of manner—avoid obscurity of expression and avoid proxility).

Among the three types of implicatures, Q-implicature is highly noticed. It is classified into causal and scalar implicature. Causal and scalar implicature are distinct one another. Causal implicature is the truth possibility of proposition that is inferred by addressee. If Sandy, for instance, believes that tomorrow is sunny, then it is also possible that tomorrow is rainy. Scalar implicature, on the other hand, is the decision of using certain word of a scale of value to communicate certain information (Yule, 1996:41). The example of scalar implicature is the use of some attributes such as some, all, almost, few, always, three, two, and one. The further understanding may be explained as follows;

A: Is everyone here?
B: Only some

By saying 'only some', B tries to imply that not all people

come in. This is one of generalized implicature. The word 'some' indicates an implied meaning that not all people come.

Meanwhile, when special knowledge needed in the context to indicate the implied meaning is called particularized conversational implicature (Yule, 1996: 42). As shown in this example;

A: Is the noodle tasty?
B: Noodle is noodle

In the chunk above, there is none of explicit clue that can be used to indicate an implicature. This case is what is called as particularized implicature in which we need particular context to find out the hidden meaning of B.

Implicature foregrounds the indirectness, which then generates to the concept of face management. Face management was first introduced by Goffman (1967:5); it is as 'an image of self, delineated in terms of approved social attributes'. Brown and Levinson (1987:62) further classified the concept of face management into two; they are positive face—'the want of every 'competent adult member that his

action be unimpeded by others' and negative face—the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others. Our face is sometimes are threatened, for instance; refusal threatens the listener's positive face. This is called face threatening act (FTA). Meanwhile, 'given the possibility that some action might be interpreted as a threat to another's face, the speaker can say something to lessen the possible threat is called a face saving act' (Yule, 1996:61)

Research Method

This is a qualitative descriptive research using two types of data—primary and secondary data. Conversation among Brebesnese friends is the primary data. Meanwhile, the reference supporting the theory and other information supporting the data analysis are the secondary data. According to Moleong in Zares (2013:294) descriptive qualitative is a research procedure that produces descriptive data in the form of words or writing about people behavior. The method used in this study is the observation

with transcription technique. After the writer read the transcript carefully, the conversation was analyzed based on conversational implicature framework proposed by Grice (1978) and Face Wants by Brown and Levinson (1987). To see the tendency of whether the participants use more generalized or particularized implicature, the writer used simple statistics of percentage.

Finding And Discussion

The Frequency of Conversational Implicature

Findings show that implicature appears 18 times in the conversation between Brebesnese friends taken from three days observation in the writer's work place, Global Lingua. The implicature is classified into two; they are particularized and generalized conversational implicature. According to Nanda, Sukyadi and Sudarsono (2012:126), the inferences underline the two

categories to find the conveyed meaning, in which the Gricean maxims match them. Particularized conversational implicature appears more often than generalized implicature. Particularized implicature occurs 13 out of 18 times or 72.22 %; meanwhile, generalized implicature occurs 5 out of 18 times or 27.7 %.

Particularized implicature is categorized into two: specific knowledge based category and general knowledge based category. The two categories are underlined by the inference the hearer may have, to recognize the intention of the speaker. Generalized implicature is catergorized into three points; they are *to imply 'not all', to imply the opposite, and to imply contradiction to the present condition.*

Nanda, Sukyadi and Sudarsono (2012) propose different category to classify implicature; they use functional, inferential and

Particularized Conversational-I		Generalized Conversational-I	
Category	Frequency	Category	Frequency
Specific knowledge	61%	To imply 'not all'	11%
General knowledge	11%	To imply the opposite	11%
		To imply contradiction to factual condition	5.5%

politeness category. The writer adopts two categories from three categories proposed by them; they are functional and inferential categories. The frequency of particularized and generalized implicature can be seen in the following table.

Particularized Conversational-I		Generalized Conversational-I	
Category	Frequency	Category	Frequency
Specific knowledge	61%	To imply 'not all'	11%
General knowledge	11%	To imply the opposite	11%
		To imply contradiction to factual condition	5.5%

Particularized Conversational Implicature

The occurrence of particularized conversational implicature is 13 times out of 18, or it is about 72%. Particularized implicature is an implicature which needs specific knowledge of the context to interpret the conveyed meaning of a conversation. In this session, the writer did not only analyze and categorize the data into particularized conversational implicature, but the writer also tried to figure out the motivation of the speaker to choose certain particularized implicature; the motivation is based on the concept of face want.

Specific Knowledge based category

(1)   DD: Heh, meneng bae sih? Lagi sariawan apa?
        Why are you so silent? You get sore throat?
AG: Lagi ana masalah nyong
        I've got a problem.
DD: Masalah apa?
        What's your problem?
AG: **Musim udan, kowen ngerti lah pimen**
        It is rainy season, you must know it.
DD: Nang apa karo musim udan? Bawang?
        Is there something wrong with rainy season? Like Onion?
AG: Bapane nyong rugi akeh Di, wingi ben motor Vixione d idol ka.
        My dad is now broke Di. Our vixion was sold.
DD: Haha, sing sabar bae ya.
        Haha, take it easy!

The first chunk was between two best friends who worked in Global Lingua course. DD asked AG why he kept silent all day. It was expected that AG gave clue to DD about his problem. However, AG flouted the

maxim of manner. He obscured his answer by saying *'Musim udan kowen ngarti lah pimen'* (or it is rainy season, you must know it). To understand the meaning of AG's utterance we need specific knowledge. In Brebes, the town which becomes the central onion production, it is commonly known that onion will not grow well if the soil contains too much water. In this case, AG owned onion fields, but it was raining heavily all day. Therefore, by saying so, AG wants to show his problem of his onion field. In addition, DD recognized what AG meant, thus; he asked AG for confirmation whether he talked about onion or not.

(2)   LL: Miss.Fina bisa ngajar ora dina Sabtu kiye? Soale ana sing panles TOEFL, si Ryan CS.
         Can you teach this Saturday? There will be students who want to have TOEFL private. They are Ryan Cs.
FN: **Duh pimen ya mba, soale tugase akeh nemen kyeh yakin**
                    sing dosene nyong.
                    I am confused either; I've got a lot of assignments from my teachers.

LL: Si sapa maning yah? Mr.Didi bisa?
         So, who's anyone else? Mr.Didi. Can you?
DD:**Duh nyong ben dikongkon bapane maring kuburan mba matang puluhan padene nyong**
         Sorry, but my dad asked me to go the grieve, to pray patangpuluhan for my uncle

LL was the front officer who was responsible for teaching schedule. He asked FN and DD who were the instructors to teach on Saturday. In Grice's cooperative principle, FN and DD should give the respond as informative as possible. The answer of 'yes' or 'no' may simply indicate their willingness. Yet, they provide too much information. It means that they flouted the quantity maxim. Nonetheless, to make FN and DD's response relevant, LL should assume that FN and DD expected another to have. FN said 'Duh pimen ya mba, soale tugase akeh nemen kyeh yakin sing dosene nyong' (or I am confused either; I've got a lot of assignments from my teacher). FN would do her assignment; doing

assignment would last for days. Consequently, FN would not be available on Saturday to teach. It means that FN objected to teach on Saturday. DD's response echoes the same thing. DD said 'Duh nyong ben dikongkon bapane maring kuburan mba matang puluhan padene nyong' (or Sorry but my dad asked me to go to grieve, to pray patangpuluhan for my uncle). DD would go to grieve on Saturday, and his father insisted him. It indicates that he could not teach on that day.

Apart from flouting quantity maxim, FN and DD had their own reason of choosing the utterance that implied a refusal. They did not directly refuse the request from LL, but they seemed to use implicit utterance. FN and DD wanted to be free to choose to teach or not to teach. However, they did not want to seem sarcastic by saying 'No, I can't'. They wanted to save LL positive face. Yule (1996: 62) states that a positive face saving act is 'a face saving act which is concerned with the person's positive face will tend to show solidarity, emphasizes

that speakers want the same thing, and that they have common goal.'

> **(3)** FN: **Jah, pimen si endah nglampingi buku bisa rapih kaya sing nang global?**
> *How to cover this book neatly like you do in Global?*
> DJ: **Belajare karo mba Lili Miss, njajal gen takon karo mba Lili.**
> *You should learn from mba Lili. Please you ask her!*

The case in utterance (3) is similar to (2). FN asked DJ about how to cover the book neatly. FN's expression implies that FN's did not only intend to ask DJ to tell her the way; she indirectly request DJ to teach her. FN choice to use implicature is as the attempt to lessen the threat from a request; FN wanted to save DJ's negative face want. DJ knew what FN intention. DJ was flouting the maxim quantity since she did not give exact information that FN wanted. From her respond: 'Belajare karo mba Lili Miss, njajal gen takon karo mba Lili' (or you should learn from mba Lili, please ask her), it can be assumed that DJ

may not be confident to teach FN or she might be busy doing another task. Therefore, she indirectly refused to teach FN. Her choice of using such implicature leads to an assumption that she wanted to respect FN as a senior. She did not want to directly say 'Sorry, I am busy', but she preferred to say above utterance that implies her in confidence. In short, her chosen utterance indicates that she wants to save FN positive act.

> (4) FN: Mau udan ora wel?
> > *Did it rain?*
> DS: **Belih weruh dalane teles miki?**
> > *Don't you see the wet road?*

FN was just arrived from Tegal, the city next to Brebes. She wondered whether it was raining or not. She asked DS for confirmation. However, it seems like DS did not want to cooperate. DS tended to flout the maxim of relevance. DS said 'Belih weruh dalane miki teles?' (or don't you see the wet road?). However, DS respond is still relevant when FN was able to recognize the intention of DS. Logically, when it is raining the road must be wet. DS,

here, wanted to emphasizes that it did rained. DS intonation showed that she was inconvenient while FN asked her. It can be inferred that FN should not have asked the question as it was clearly seen that the road was wet. Considering DS intonation, it is assumed that DS threatens the FN negative face. According to Brown and Levinson (1978:66), 'the expression of strong (negative emotion) towards H...' belongs to an act that threatens the H negative face.

> (5) AG: **Kayane ana sing anyar kyeh. Yuh makan-makan yuh,**
> > **angkringan mboran**.
> > *It seems like there is something new. Let's we have dinner together*
> DD: **Hahaha, nyong lagi langka duit Jhon. Wingi kas nggo**
> > **setor motor.**
> > *Hahaha, I don't have much money dude. I spent the money for my bike*
> > AG: Aja kesuwen lah di, yuh dangkati baen. Kowen ngelih o ya fin?
> > *Come on, don't take it so long. Fin, you're hungry. Aren't you?*
> FN: Nyong pan nggledah dompete ndisit Guz temenan langka ora.
> > *Let me check his wallet to make sure that he does not have any money left*

The fifth chunk provides us some implicature. The first is from AG. AG saw DD with his new motorbike. It is a custom for Brebesnese that anytime we buy something new, we must treat our fellowship some meal. DD recognized AG intention since he had this shared-knowledge. Yet, DD responded with another implicature. He knew that AG wanted him to treat AG and other friends. It meant that he had to spent money. DD implicitly refused AG's request by saying 'Hahaha, nyong lagi langka duit Jhon. Wingi kas go setor motor' (or Hahaha, I don't have much money. I spent the money for my bike). AG, DD, and FN are really close friends; thus, DD felt free to express his feeling although it might embarrass him. In this case, DD threatens his own positive face. Many Brebesnese often do this when they talk to other friends; by embarrassing themselves or by threatening their own face, they make jokes. According to Brown and Levinson (1978:68) 'self-humiliation, shuffling or cowering, acting stupid, self contradicting'

belongs to an act that damage the S positive face.

(6) FN: Mba ibu kue katone ka centil nemen sih, wis duwe bojo durung?

> *Mba She seems so centil, has she got any husband?*

RN: **Malah wis cerai ping loro jare**
She got divorced twice

FN was sitting on the front office desk when she saw a middle-aged-woman were in a red short pants. In Brebes, the eastern culture was still a concern. It was hardly found a middle-aged woman dressed in short pants. FN wondered if the woman was single; therefore, she asked for confirmation to the front officer. The response was short but it met the relevance. The front officer said 'Malah wis cerai ping loro' (or she got divorce twice). If a woman divorces with someone it means she has married before. RN expresses more than FN needs; the word 'twice' indicates that the woman has married more than one. The woman failed in her first and her second marriage. There is social value in Brebes; that is, being a widow is considered to be negative. Failure in maintaining her first and second

marriage will support the negative impression of the woman. It was actually the topic that shouldn't have discussed in the work environment. This was done to threaten FN's positive face. According to Muryanti (2009:24) the example of FTA is to insult, to suspect, to complaint, to challenge, to disagree, to interrupt, and to mention taboo topics.

(7)   DJ: **Mas Adi, kyeh lemarine kotor nemen kyeh**
Mas Adi, the cupboard is so dirty
AD: **Iya mengko langi nganuki computer**
Just wait, I am repairing the computer
In Global Lingua Course, the hygienist of the place was the main concern. Usually, in the morning before the class starts, the front officer and the janitor work to clean up the classroom and the office. If the book and the cupboard are messy and dirty, the janitor will soon clean them up. From DJ said 'Mas Adi, kyeh lemarine kotor nemen kyeh' (or Mas Adi the cupboard is so dirty), DJ did not only tell Adi that the cupboard was dirty but DJ also asked Adi to clean up the cupboard. This implicature is as an act of saving AD's negative face. AD recognized

what DJ intended, hence; he was busy fixing the broken computer. Therefore, he could not do what DJ wanted directly. He might finish his work first then clean up the cupboard. AD's response also indicates an implicature; he understood what DJ wanted and he would like to do it after he was done fixing the computer.

DJ is the new front officer; in the hierarchy of Global Lingua Course, janitor is in the bottom. DJ tended to use the implicature because she wanted to tease the janitor by insinuation. She wanted to criticize the janitor for not doing his job well. The cupboard's cleanliness was the responsibility of the janitor.

General knowledge based category

(1)   FN: weh kowen ngko pan nyoblos nomer pira? Siji apa loro?
Which number will you vote? Number one or number two?
DD: Sing pasti nomer 2 lah, salam dua jari
I am positive to vote number 2, peace!

FN: Bisane?
Why?
DD: **Nomer siji mengko langka ibu negarane.**
Number one has no state-mother

After teaching FN and DD were about to go home, but because of the rain they sat on the desk and talked about some topics; one of the topics is presidential election. FN asked DD about whom he would vote in presidential election. DD would surely vote number 2; however, DD gave ridiculous answer when FN asked why he would vote number 2. He said 'Nomer siji mengko langka ibu negarane' (or number one has no state-mother). To understand DD's response, FN should interpret that DD was talking about the number 1-candidate president. Everyone knows that he does not have wife; commonly a president must have wife to accompany him to do his task as a leader of the state. Then if number 1-candidate president does not have wife, who will accompany him to handle some crucial tasks relates to woman and children right. In this case, the general knowledge about presidential election should be employed to understand what DD's mean.

DD's response was as the ice-breaking, since FN seemed so serious in asking the question. It was also one of the strategies that he used to avoid impose from FN. To vote should be private, but FN kept asking the reason of why he would vote for number 2.

(2)   DD: kowen pacare ganti gus?
You have a new girl friend, do you?
AG: Iya di, hehehehehe
I do, hehehehehe
DD: Ayu ndi karo sing ndisit?
Which one is prettier? Your ex or your new girl friend?
AG: kaya **Nikita Willy** pokoke
She is as pretty as Nikita Willy

DD knew that AG had a new girl friend, he wanted to know who is prettier his new girl friend or his ex girl friend. AG seemed to flout the maxim of relevance; however, if DD was able to catch the AG's intention, the AG's answer would be relevant. Nikita Willy is a famous artist in Indonesia. She is one of beautiful Indonesian artists. It can be inferred that his new girl friend is much more beautiful than his ex girl friend. However, AG might flout the maxim of quality if he did not tell DD the truth. He tried to manipulate his description of his girl friend, and he

used Nikita Willy as metaphor. From the two assumptions, the second assumption more makes sense, for AG's paralinguistic showed that AG did not serious with his words.

Generalized Conversational Implicature

The occurrence of generalized conversational implicature is only 8 out of 18 times, or it is about 27.7 %. Generalized implicature is in the contrary of particularized implicature. It is an implicature which does not need specific knowledge of the context to understand its meaning.

To imply 'not all'

(1) RN   : Om, surate wis dingekna tangga-tanggane durung?
Om, have you sent the letter?
BKR : **Nembe seket**. Wingi lagi sibuk natani nggo nikahane Aditya.
Just 50. I was so busy in Adit's marriage.
RN   : Cepetan loh Om, telung dina maning acarane loh ya
You'd better to be hurry, the ceremony will be three more days
BKR : Bar ngaterna kunci sing Global wes ngko sore.
After I bring the Global key, this afternoon
The owner of Global Lingua's brother would marry. One of the janitors of Global Lingua,

BKR, was the one who distributed the invitation letter. There were hundreds of letters that had to be distributed as soon as possible. The expression 'nembe seket…' (or just 50) means that only some letters had been delivered, or not all letter had been delivered. This belongs to scalar implicature. Yule (1996:41) states that 'scalar implicature is that, when any form in a scale asserted, the negative of all forms higher on the scale is implicated.'

(2)   FN: Wis pada kumpul?
Have everyone attended the meeting?
DD: **Nembe mas Adi, mba Lili, Dijah, mba Mela, nyong, toli Agus**
There were just mas Adi, mba Lili, Dijah, mba Mela, Agus, and I
FN: Yaw is berarti aku monone mengko limalas menitan maning bae?
Okay, I may be there in 15 more minutes?
DD: Ya ati-ati bae ya
Take care
There was a regular meeting at the end of the month in Global Lingua. The meeting invitation letter was at 5 pm; however, FN was not in Global Lingua yet. Thus, she called DD to check whether everyone had come. The expression of 'Nembe

mas Adi, mba Lili, Dijah, mba Mela, nyong, toli Agus' (or there were just mas Adi…) means that there were just six people came. Actually, Global Lingua consists of 21 employees; it means that the rest 15 people had not come to the meeting, or not all people had come to the meeting. From DD's response FN assumed that the meeting had not started yet; therefore, she did not need to be hurry to be at the meeting.

To imply the opposite

(1) RN   : Om, surate wis dingekna tangga-tanggane durung?
     Om, have you sent the letter?
BKR   : Nembe seket. Wingi lagi sibuk natani nggo nikahane Aditya
     Just 50. I was so busy in Adit's marriage.
RN   : **Cepetan** loh Om, telung dina maning acarane loh ya
     You'd better to be hurry, the ceremony will be three more days
BKR   : Bar ngaterna kunci sing Global wes ngko sore.
     After I bring the Global key,

     this afternoon

The expression 'Cepetan loh Om…' (or You'd better be fast) implies that RN would not say 'please be fast' if BKR did not work slowly. It can be said that the phrase 'cepetan' or be fast is the opposite of

the word 'lemotan' or be slow. Be slow here implies the way BKR distributed the letter invitation.

(2) MLA : Mbak aku dong ngango bando ndean apik yah
     Mbak, what if I put on a scarf?
LL   : Wes **tua** owh
     You're old already
     In expression of 'Wes tua' (or you're old already), the word 'tua' or old is the opposite of 'muda' or young. Young here refers to the kids who will fit to put on a scarf. MLA is no longer young, so she does not fit on a scarf.

To imply contradiction to factual condition

(1)   FN: Di, kowen nggawa duite?
     Di, do you bring the money?
DD: **Duh, donge kowen sms disit miki**, nyong ora nggawa duit owh mung limangewu tok
     I wish you texted me. I don't bring much money, only five thousands.
     In the expression of 'Duh donge kowen sms disit miki' (or I wish you texted me), the phrase 'donge kowen…' or 'I wish…' indicates the action that contradicts to the present. FN asked DD her money he owed, but he did not bring the money. If only FN texted DD to bring the money, DD would not

forget to bring the money. The fact was FN did not text DD; thus, he forgot to bring the money.

Conclusion and Suggestion

From the discussion above, it can be concluded that people tended to use particularized conversational implicature more often than generalized implicature. It can be shown from the findings that of 18 implicature occurred in the data; particularized conversational impicature appears 13 times, or it is about 72.2%. However, generalized implicature occured 5 times, or it is about 27.7%.

Particularized implicature mostly occurs as a face saving act. Meanwhile, generalized implicature is used to imply 'not all', to imply the opposite, and to imply contradiction to factual condition.

However, the writer believes that the data in this study does not cover all sample of the conversation. It needs more data to get more valid result. Therefore, further research is worth conducting to support the result of this paper. In addition, it is to dig up other findings that are not presented in this study.

Reference

Alduais, Ahmed M.S, 2012, 'Conversational Implicature (Flouting the Maxim): Applying Conversational Maxims on Examples Taken from Non-Standard Arabic Language, Yemeni Dialect, an Idiolect, spoken at IBB City'. *Journal of Sociological Research*. 2, (3), 376-387

Al-Mahadi, Hamid (Ph.D.) and Muhammed, Behija J (M.A). 2009. 'Pragmatics: Grice's Conversational Maxims Violation in the Response of Some Western Politicians'. *Journal of the College of Arts University of Basra*. 50, 1-23

Alvaro, Ramiro Nieto. 2011. 'The Role of Conversational Maxims, Implicature and Presupposition in the Creation of Humor (An Analysis of Woody Allen's Anything Else)'. *Unpublished Dissertation*. UCM: Dept. of English Philology

Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen. 1978. *Politeness*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Haugh, Mitchele. 2002. 'Theoretic Implicitness Versus Gricerian Implying'. *International Pragmatics Association*. 12, (2), 117-134

Levinson, Stephen.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Melia, Zares. Darmayanti, Nani. and Riyanto, Sugeng. 2013. "Various Speech Acts in Disclosing Conversational Implicatures among UKM KSR PMI Unit Unila Members". *Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL)*. 1, (4), 293-297

Moeschler, Jackques. 2006. Convensional and Conversational Implicature. (pdf),Website: http://www.unige.ch/lettres/linguistique/moeschler/publication_pdf/implicature-moeschler-def.pdf", retrieved at 8.59 p.m on July 4 2014

Muryantina, Rina. 2009. 'Dialog Alex dan Jonathan dalam Film *Everything is Illuminated*: Analisis Tindak Tutur dan Implikatur dalam Perbedaan Budaya'. *Unpublished Thesis*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia

Nanda, Sheila; Sukyadi, Didi; M.I, Sudarsono. 2012. 'Conversational Implicature of The Presenter of Take Me Out Indonesia'. *Conaplin Journal.*2, (1), 120-138

Wang, Haiyan. 2011. 'Conversational Implicature in English Listening comprehension'. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 5, (2), 1162-1167

Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press