TYPES OF IMPLICATURE IN INFORMAL CONVERSATIONS USED BY THE ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM STUDENTS

Endry Sri Rahayu

Prof.Safnil M.A,Ph.D.

University of Bengkulu

W.R. Supratman, Kd. Limun 38371A. Bengkulu, Indonesia

Email : srendry@gmail.com

Email : safnilarsyad@gmail.com

Abstract: *Implicature was refers to implied meaning in utterance that can be understood by indirectly expression. In informal conversation was occurred the hidden meaning of what actually said by the speakers. This study was investigated the types of implicature in informal conversations used by the English education study program students. The study was aimed to analyze the types of implicature and how the implicature is carried out in the informal conversations. The method of study was a descriptive qualitative method. The subjects of this study were 25 students of English study program who have informal conversation. The students' conversation was transcribed and analyzed by using checklist instrument. The results was shown that 1) there were three types of implicature found in the informal conversations; conventional implicature, generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature, and 2) the implicature is carried out in the informal conversations by the used of generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. Moreover, a conclusion is students in the informal conversation have potentially implicature that indicates that their utterance has implied meaning. The suggestions, the study about implicature should be conducted in different area such as movie, drama or others, to give enrichment information in the Pragmatics study.*

Keywords: Implicature Types, Informal Conversations, English Education Study Program Students.

Abstrak: *Implikatur mengacu pada makna tersirat pada suatu ujaran yang dapat dipahami dari ekspresi tidak langsung. Pada percakapan informal terjadi makna tersembunyi dari apa yang telah di sampaikan oleh pembicara. Studi ini mengivestigasi tipe implikatur pada percakapan informal oleh mahasswa program bahasa Inggris. Studi ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis tipe implikatur dan bagaimana implikatur terjadi di dalam percakapan informal. Metode study ini adalah deskripsi kualitatif. Peserta dalam studi ini adalah 25 mahasiswa program bahasa Inggris yang melakukan percakapan informal. Percakapan peserta telah ditranskrip dan dianalisis menggunakan instrumen ceklis. Hasil menunjukan bahwa: 1) terdapat tiga tipe implikatur yang telah ditemukan pada percakapan informal; yaitu konvensional implikatur, percakapan implikatur general dan percakapan implikatur khusus, dan 2) implikatur yang terjadi pada percakapan informal dengan menggunakan percakapan implikatur general dan percakapan implikatur khusus. Maka sebagai kesimpulannya mahasiswa yang melakukan percakapan informal memiliki kemungkinan terjadinya implikatur yang mengindikasikan bahawa ujarannya mengandung makna tersirat. Sebagai saran, tudi tentang implikatur*

sebaiknya dilaksanakan pada area yang berbeda seperti pada film, dram atau yang lainnya untuk memperkaya informasi pada ilmu Pragmatik.

Kata Kunci: Tipe Implikatur, Percakapan Informal, Mahasiswa Program Bahasa Inggris.

INTRODUCTION

Language as a tool for communication intends to make the interaction easier. The term interaction could actually apply to a very large number of different social encounters. For example, a teacher talks to students in a classroom, and groups of friends discuss their planning are called as kinds of interactions.

There are so many languages in the world that used by people in their own countries. Everyone uses language to talk each other and makes conversation in both formal and informal situation. Exactly, the most important is language has a function as the conversation tool in communication.

A communication is desired to exchange the informations. The information will be easy to understand when the speaker says clearly and informatively, not more or less. Most of the time, conversation consists of two, or more, participants. Human always produces language to express the ideas in many ways. The languages are produced with pause or silence in the spoken act is called utterances (Johnson, 2003).

The situation of utterance is produced in both formal and informal situation. Sometimes, people make conversation informally.

The informal conversation occurs in context of situation informally. The informal situation of conversation may take place like in a shop, market library, movie etc.

The formal conversation takes in formal situation such as in the classroom, seminar, speech contest, etc.

Pragmatics is the study of the aspects meaning and language that are depend on the speaker and the hearer and other features of the context utterances.

Levinson (1983) said that pragmatics is the study of the relation between language and its context appropriatelly. In addition, pragmatics is concern into discussion about what the speaker saying is not same with the addressee meaning.

The addresse has own interpretation or schemata in an utterance. Thus, different people may interpret the same utterance differently according to the information they possess. Understanding the context consider with all situation happen when the language is occur.

Context is the responsibility of the hearer who accesses the information in order to process an utterance, on the assumption that has made by the speaker (Black, 2006).

Understanding language context means understanding about the situation of the language is taking includes who, what, where, when and how the speaker produced the language.

Context is the physical environment in which a word is used (Yule, 1996). Understanding the context of the language situation avoid the hearers to prejudice the wrong perception of information that uttered by the speaker.

The understanding of language context help the hearers or reader to understand the information as much as required based on their behaviour, knowledge, experience and the intellectual capacity (Victory, 2010). Therefore, by consider about the context the hearer will be easy to understand the speaker's message.

Implicit meaning of utterances is investigated into pragmatics concept. Pragmatics is the study of the language usage based on the context (Levinson, 1983). Conversation that occurs between speakers and hearers contains certain purpose that is different from the structure of the language used.

In this conditions, the use of language often has the hidden purpose or indirect ways (Grice, 1975). Someone usually use many ways in express something. The implicit meaning of utterances is expressed indirectly. It means that when people produce implicit meaning it can be defined as Implicature.

Implicature is indirect or implicit meaning of an utterance that is produced by the speaker. Implicature happens when the speaker wants to express something in an implicit or indirect way in a conversation.

There are numbers of implicature types introduced by Grice. An implicature's type is also has characteristics. One type of

Implicature is conventional implicature. Conventional Implicature is implications based on the conventional meanings of the words occurring in an utterance.

Conventional implicature does not depend on the special contex, but deals with the specific word such as but, yet, therefore, however and even. These conjunctions are use in conventional implicature to explain the implicit meaning from particular lexical items or expression.

A speaker using the word"but" between coordinate clauses thinks that some contrast or concession (Levinson, 1983). The conventional has the different criteria to test whether the implicature was mentioned in the utterance or not.

Conventional Implicature is non cancelable, non calculable, detachable, conventional, carried by what is said and determinate (Grice as cited in Rosidi, 2009).

Another type of implicature is conversational implicature. Conversational Implicature is implications derived on the conversational principles and assumptions, relying on more than linguistic meaning words in an utterance.

In conversation people make communication. In true condition, the speakers use different ways to express their meant. The characteristic of conversational implicature is well defined. Types of implicature can be identified by the characteristics of each type.

Different with conventional implicature that expressed agreed meaning from lexical item, the conversational implicature is not intrinsically associated with any expression

(Grundy as cited in Victory: 2010). Conversational implicature is inferred from the use of some utterance in context.

One types of conversational implicature is generalized conversational implicature. The implicature arises when utterances produced by the speaker give implied meaning based on context.

Types of conversational implicature regarding to its context is generalized conversational implicature. Generalized conversational implicature does not concern with special context. The general knowledge means that not need specific knowledge to identify the implicature when the conversation occurs. As part of conversational implicature, the general conversational implicature also has the characteristics.

When discuss about genealized conversational implicature, the thing that also needed to be discussed was scale implicature. A number of other generalized conversational Implicature discussed on the scale of values and known as scalar implicature.

Scalar Implicature is the special type of generalized Implicature. Scalar implicature is expressed the quantity such as; all, most, some, few, always, often and sometimes (Yule, 1996). When producing an utterance, a speaker selects the word from the scale, which is the most informative.

Kind of implicature generally could be tested by cancelability, detachability, calculability, and conventionally (Cummings, as cited in Victory, 2010).

One of the ways to identify conversational implicature in an utterance is by cancellable (Grice, 1975). Implicature can be cancelled when the speaker gives additional information on his or her utterance. It means that when the speaker produces an implicature in the utterances, then he or she gives information of the first utterance, the implicature is cancelled.

Detachability Implicature can be described as the capacity of an implicature to be detached or separated from an utterance following a change in the linguistics form of an utterance. It means that the Implicature is attached to the semantics content of what is said, not the linguisics form.

In other words, Implicature is depend on the said of content not based on the particular ways of saying it. The third element of the implicature is calculability. Calculability can be described as implicature only be arriving at though a process of reasoning or calculation. It means that the truth of implicature content did not depend on what is literally said, it can be calculated from how the words were uttered.

Several studies have been done on this topic. The study was done by Victory (2010) entitle implicature Used in Humors of Yes Man Movie. Victory took analyzed the conversation in which conversationl implicature by the main characters as the main topic discussion. Victory found that the main character of the movie is actually used generalized implicature in the conversation.

However, research on Implicature was rarely done, especially in conversation, like as Sobur cited in Victory (2010) said that an understanding of implicature in conversation is more difficult rather than in written speech, especially in the discourse that contains of variety of the figurative language.

Therefore, to analyze the meaning of implicit meaning in conversation, someone must rely on implicature study. Even the utterance contains of implicature, the types of the implicature is not easy to define.

There are four types of implicature; conventional implicature, conversational implicature, generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. Each types has characteristics such as cancellable, calculable, detachable, conventionally, and determinate (Grice, 1975).

The informal conversation between the students of English Education study program in informal conversation raises the Implicature. In informal conversation, the students always use languages freely.

The students use some ways to express the idea that does not easy to understand by their partners. Sometimes the meaning of their utterance is expressed from what they said (conventionally) or by the act of saying (conversationally). Based on the problem above, this research is conducted to investigate the type of Implicature and how the Implicature is carried out in informal conversations. Finally, this study was aimed to investigate the types of implicature in informal conversations used by the English Education Study Program Students at The Teacher Training and Education Faculty of The University of Bengkulu.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A descriptive qualitative method is used to give comprehensive descriptions and discover the use of Implicature in the conversation. Because of the research design of this study was qualitative and the result of the study also described the phenomena of language, especially the type of implicature in informal conversations used by the English Education Study Program Students.

The subjects of this study were 25 students of English Education Study Program at the Teacher Training and Education Faculty of The University of Bengkulu. The participants were mutual friends who always study together in Reading Room. They have closeness and togetherness in personaly with the researcher.

Because of the similar background knowledge among participants, it raised Implicature in the conversations. As the data sources, the data was obtained from the recording of the students' informal conversation of English Study Program Students at Faculty Teacher Training and Education University of Bengkulu.

Implicature checklist was used to reduce the data and classify it according to the problem. The additional instruments used were handphone for recording and the field note for notes the context while the conversation is occur.

After the data was collected, the researcher was analyzed the data by some techniques:

Transcribing of recording, reducing the types of Implicature use Implicature checklist, classifying the types; conventional implicature and conversational implicatures, discussing (showing the frequency of Implicature types), concluding.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
Types of Implicature
According to Grice (1975), Implicature is divided into two major categories; conventional Implicature and non-conventional Implicature as called conversational Implicature. Table 1 below shows the results of conventional and conversational Implicature used in the conversations.

Table 1: Types of Implicature Found in Informal Conversations

No	Types of Implicature	Frequency	Percentage %
1.	Conventional Implicature	2	9.5 %
2.	Conversational Implicature	19	90.5 %
	Total	21	100 %

As presented in the table above the types of implicature by informal conversation was conventional implicature and conversational implicature. The conversational implicature was more dominant Implicature (90.5%). The conventional implicature is less type (9.5%). The example of conventional implicature from the data conversation is given below:

In Reading Room, they were English students enrolled 2008-2009 were discussed in English language about the graduation. (Kreeekkkk....the door opened, other students came).

RI   : Hei bro, what time now (73)
     (Hi guys, what time is it?)

RA   : Five pass one (74)

(RA looked at a thesis on his hand not look at his watch)

TI   : How about this December guys? (75)

RI   : December? Apo? What about December? (76)

(December? What do you mean? What about December?)

HE **: I think December will be so complicated but this (77) month is the horrible month for us. All of the (78) skripsi must finish this months. So…,,(79)**

(I think December will be so complicated but this month is the horrible month for us. All of the thesis must be finished this months. So…,,)

The example above is categorized as conventional Implicature because the use of conjunction 'yet' in line 77-78 *(I think December will be so complicated "but" this month is the horrible month for us…)*. This explains what is implied. HEL said that

December is the complicated month so December is also the horrible month for her and others to finish their thesis. The next example of conventional Implicature is given below:

RI, HEL, TR, RA talked about Rejang language. Rejang is the RI's language because he came from kepahyang. RA from Manna, they talked about the kaganga word used as a part of a curriculum.

HEL : It is hard to read the kaganga word (419)

TR : Oh (420)

HEL : I have learnt it three years when I senior high school (421)
(I have learnt it for three years when I was in senior high school)

RI : Is the curriculum in Lebong, Rejang lebong, Kepahyang (422)
(Kaganga was completed as a part of Curriculum in Lebong, Rejang Lebong and Kepahiang)

RI : How about in Manna? (423)

RA : Apo? (424)
(What is it?)

RI : In school as the model of curriculum manna? (425)
(Does Manna's school use the kaganga in curriculum?)

RA : Extrakurikulerny? (426)
(Extracurricular?)

RI : Not extracurricular, curriculum (427)
(Not extracurricular but curriculum)

RA : Nggak, not yet (no, not yet) (428)

The example above is categorized as a conventional Implicature because the use of conjunction *(yet)* in line 428 *(no, not yet)* was implicated of what is RA says conventionally. In line 428 RA says '*nggak, Not yet' (not, not yet)'* means that RA did not know whether Kaganga is taught or not in Manna as the curriculum.

Conversational Implicature

The data is taken from the conversation, so the more dominant type found is generalized conversational implicature rather than particularized conversational implicature. The type conversational implicature was shown in table 4 below:

Table 2: Types of Conversational Implicature

No	Types of Implicature	Frequency	Percentage %
1.	Generalized Conversational Implicature	10	52.6 %
2.	Particularized Conversational Implicature	9	47.4 %
	TOTAL	**19**	**100 %**

It can be seen in the table above the generalized conversational implicature is more dominant used by the students in the conversation than particularized conversational implicature. The generalized conversational does not concern with special context, the context is independent and uses the scalar implicature. The particularized conversational implicature is the second type found from the students conversations. The example of generalized conversational implicature is given below:

(Gusran looked so busy. He will do the examination. He prepared the administration. He entered and out to the Reading Room. In Reading Room were TR and friends who talked about graduation in English. They were students of English study program of The University of Bengkulu.

      TR : Gusran is busy. He will….(188)

      RA : Always (189)

      RI   : Ujian (190)

          (Examination)

      TR : Yes, he will ujian (191)

          (Yes, he will do the examination)

      TI   : Final (192)

      TR : Yes final examination (193)

(For a while, the participants looked at Gusran's activity)

The example above is categorized as a generalized conversational Implicature because by the use of scalar Implicature (*always)* in utterances (line 189). The generalized Implicature did not use special background knowledge of the context. Gusran was looked so busy because he prepares everything for his final examination shows the independent context from the conversations. It means that Gusran was not always busy for everything in that moment, but he just prepares for final examination. The next example of generalized conversational Implicature is as follows:

In one moment, TR asked about football score tonight because she did not watch the match to RA and RI.

TR : Ehh…. what about the football match last night? Who is the winner? Real Madrid or Barcelona? (110)

RI : No (111)

TR : 0-0? (112)

RA : 2-2 (113)

TR : 2-2? Wow great. I think Messi is not great any more (114)

RA : Messi two goals, Ronaldo is two goals (115)
(Both of Messi and Ronaldo has two goals)

RI : I don't like the two but no what what (116) *(RI was smiled)*

TI : He don't like the two, I don't like football (117)

RI : No what what (118)
(It does not matter)

TR : hi.. hi… hi… *(TR is laughing and smile to TI)*
I like football I like very like (119)

The example above was categorized into generalized conversational Implicature because the general context of the Implicature does not explain. The utterances mean that RI really did not like the football or just does not like both of the team (Real Madrid and Barcelona).

RI may have his own favorite football team so he did not like Real Madrid or Barcelona. The next implied was he did not like football at all. The general context was shown by utterance *(no what- what / it does not matter)* in line 118 that he does not explain why he doesn't like both of the team.

The Implicature is characterized by calculable implicature, in which the hearers may assume that RI does not like football or did not like the two teams of Real Madrid and Barcelona.

Particularized conversational implicature depends on knowing certain context in which conversation occurs. The example was given below:

RI came to the Reading Room and joined his friends there. He looked so bored by his face because he just waited the supervisor for checking his thesis in hours. The time for checking was limited for registering the graduation.

RI : I think today so complicated for meet our supervisor (7)

TR : No meet your supervisor? (8)
(Does not meet your supervisor?)

RA : We have been waiting for hours (9)

TI : More (10)

RI : Two hours (11)

TR : Two hours! (12)

RA : Very interesting (13)

As shown in the example above, the Implicature was called particularized conversational Implicature because specific context is explained.

The specific context is shown by the time for waiting the supervisor. The time for waiting the supervisor has been two hours that is why RI and RA look so bored *(line 9: We have been waiting for hours).*

The Implicature is calculable because RA's utterance in line 13 *(very interesting)* gives meaning they are bored.

The calculability is shown by the fact that they did not meet the supervisor at that day. The next example of particularized conversational Implicature was given below:

The students talked about their scary graduation on December, because no one of them has yet got the final examination as the guarantee to be graduation at December.

RI   : Do you think all of us here will be graduated at December? (22)

Amiin....Yes (all answered) (23)

HEL   : I think no (24)

TI   : I am really scared for the December. I think its hard (25)

TR   : December is hard for walk away (26)

RI   : Don't say hard because you have to optimistic (27)

HEL   : Examination is two weeks again (28)

RI   : We just have… (29)

RA   : Easy to say but hard to (30)

In the example above, the Implicature is categorized as particularized conversational Implicature because HEL tries to explain the specific conditions about their limited time for thesis deadline and their graduation in December (*examination is two weeks again: line 28).*

The context of this Implicature is explained specifically. To graduate at December they just have two weeks left to complete all the requirements.

The thing that they are scared was not about the December as the scare month, but the thesis deadline was scary for regulation in very limited time *(line 25: I am really scared for the December. I think it's hard).*

Thus, the types of Implicature found in informal conversations by the English Education Study Program Students at the Teacher Training and Education Faculty of The University of Bengkulu are conventional implicature, generalized conversational implicature, and particularized conversational implicature.

The table shows the generalized conversational Implicature more dominant used than particularized conversational Implicature. Moreover, the last type found is conventional Implicature.

The Way of Implicature is Carried Out

The example of the implement of conventional Implicature in utterance was given below.

In Reading Room, they were English students enrolled 2008-2009 discussed in English language about the graduation. They have a moment did not see each other. (Kreeekkkk….the door opened, the others students came).

(73) RI : Hei bro, what time now
(Hi guys, what time is it?)

(74) RA : Five pass one *(RA looked a skripsi on his hand not look his watch)*

(75) TI : How about this December guys?

(76) RI : December? Apo? What about December?
(December? What? What about December?)

(77) HEL : I think December will be so complicated but this

(78)   month is the horrible month for us. All of the skripsi

(79)   must finish this months. So…,,
(I think December will be so complicated but this month is the horrible month for us. All of the thesis must be finished this months. So…,,)

The presented example above was explained the use of conventional Implicature characteristics by used conjunction 'but' in line 77-78, *(I think December will be so complicated but this month is the horrible month for us…)***.**

The conjunction was explained conventionally of what is said. HEL is says that December is the complicated month so December also the horrible month for her and others to finish their thesis. The use of conjunction is determined of what is said. Another characteristic for this Implicature was detachable.

The detachable of this Implicature was shown by the capacity of the Implicature to be detached or separated from a changed a linguistics form of utterance. Furthermore, the changed conjunction 'but' become 'and' rise that the Implicature in this utterance was detached. The next example was given below.

RI, HEL, TR, RA talked about Rejang language. Rejang is the RI's language because he comes from kepahyang. RA from Manna, they talked about the kaganga word used as a part of a curriculum.

HEL : It is hard to read the kaganga word (419)

TR : Oh (420)

HEL : I have learnt it three years when I senior high school (421)
(I have learnt it three years when I was senior high school)

75

RI   : Is the curriculum in Lebong, Rejang lebong, Kepahyang (422)

      (Kaganga was complete as a part of Curriculum in Lebong, Rejang Lebong and Kepahiang)

RI   : How about in Manna? (423)

RA   : Apo? (424)

      (What?)

RI   : In school as the model of curriculum manna? (425)

      (Does Manna's school use the kaganga in curriculum?)

RA   : Extrakurikulerny? (426)

      (Extracurricular?)

RI   : Not extracurricular, curriculum (427)

      (Not extracurricular but curriculum)

RA   : Nggak, not yet (no, not yet) (428)

The example above was used the characteristics signals to produce a conventional Implicature because the used of conjunction 'yet' *(no, not yet: line 428)* implicates of what is RA says conventionally.

In line, RA says *(not, not yet)* means that RA does not know whether Kaganga is taught in Manna or not as the curriculum

The characteristics of conversational Implicature is indicate how the use of Implicature in the conversation conversationally.

The characteristics of generalized conversational Implicature that was used by the students in their conversations indicate the implementation of Implicature in the utterance. The independent context is dominant characteristic use in Implicature.

In other words, the students implement all the characteristics of features of the generalized conversational Implicature in the informal conversations. In addition, the most characteristics used was context independent, scalar Implicature and calculable. The example of how generalized conversational Implicature was carried out in the utterance of conversation is given below:

Suddenly, Erina came to the Reading Room. She is an English Study Program student of 7th semester. All the students of English Study program students were members of EDSA (English Department Students Associations). NA, TR, RA, RI, were Edsa member enrolled 2008-2009. NA asked to TI about the dedication for her thesis.

Er   : mam gita ado? (263)

      (Is there mam Gita?)

RA   : ado. Ado mam gita (264)

      (Yes, there is, mam gita is there)

TI   : For dedication? (265)
NA   : eh TI what about your dedication? (266)
TI   : First is for myself hehe (267)
RA   : For parents and most Edsa (268)

The example above was meatn that RA tries to explain the utterance in independent context *(For parents and most EDSA: line 268).* The context means that there was no specific context explains about what EDSA was.   EDSA was the organizations of English student, there is no specific context explains what EDSA was because the speaker has knowledge that he as speaker and the all the listeners are EDSA members.

The use of word "most" *(For parents and most EDSA: line 268)* EDSA was the

scalar Implicature as the second indicate of Implicature is implemented in the utterance. RA does not mention in what enrolled of EDSA will be dedicated by him, but from the context is means that the dedication is refers to EDSA enrolled 2008-2009, because they are the members of EDSA 2008.

The next example of how generalized conversational Implicature carried out was given below:

TR and RI were seriously talked about their future after graduated from the university. One day TR looked seriously for motivate herself and his friends.

TR   : But I think graduation is not the end of our journey but yes…(275)
RI   : Yes. But beginning (276)
TR   : but The journey that we have to work out, is not (277) the end..
                but you know, The adventure just begun (278)
RI   : **I think you are like pujangga today** (279)
TR   : What is pujangga? oh… hehe (280)
RI   : **You able to produce some words that meaningful that cannot
                easy to say. (281)**
                (You are able to produce some words that are meaningful that
                cannot easy to say)
TR   : oh no. I think I read lots (282)

The example above was shown the use of scalar Implicature as the characteristics of Implicature is carried out in the conversations. The use of word 'some' in line 281 (*You able to produce some words that meaningful that cannot easy to say)* indicates scalar Implicature. The utterance

means that not all people who produce the meaningful words called as pujangga. In Indonesian, Pujangga refers to specialist someone who in produce a poem.

The following example also shows how the characteristics of implicature were carried out as the generalized conversational implicature in the conversations.

RA, TR and RI were a classmate of English Department. Along of years being a friend, TR was praised has good pronunciation of English British. RA and RI said what amaze them to TR.

RA : she is good, I serious, not bad, I say better in…(308)
    (She is good, I am serious, not bad, I say better in.)
    RA and RI seriously like to TR's pronunciations

TR : pronunciations? (309)

RA : yes pronunciations. (310)

RI : She is keturunan (311)
    (She is not native)

TR : No (312)

RI : Blasteran (mixed blonde child) (313)

TR : No. Look at my skin I'm black hahaha (314)

The example above was shown the calculable Implicature. It does not need special context for understanding about who TR is. TR is Indonesian. This explanation does not explain specifically. Indonesian people mostly have black skin but not all foreign people are white skin. TR has good pronunciations' like English British; it did not mean she was a foreign people. The independent context was shown she was Indonesian because she was RA and RI's classmates from the first semester in English department.

The characteristic of particularized conversational Implicature is identified by the use of special context of background knowledge in the utterance. The dominant characteristics uses are special context of background knowledge, context dependent and calculable. The example of how particularized conversational Implicature was implemented in the utterance of conversation is given below:

They silence for a moment. RI and RA said that they waited their supervisor but they did not meet. They also haven't yet made the appointment with their supervisor.

RI : I feel kecewa today (162)
    (I am disappointed today)

TR : Why? (163)

HE : So today is unlucky day for you? (164)

RI : I… yess, unlucky day. But I have friend today if you see about today (165)
    (RI felt happy by met his friends in Reading Room)

HE   : Don't you make a…. (166)

      (Have you makes)

EN   : Appointment? (167)

RI   : I have revised my thesis but is about waiting from this morning (168)

      (I have revised my thesis but my problem is about waited him since this morning)

RA   : Nyo baru hari ko, ambo dari hari jumat (169)

      (He just waited supervisor for today, but I have waited from last Friday)

HE   : Why don't you make a call before? (170)

RA   : Oh that's good idea but (171)

RI   : I think for the last is never meeting five men with the lecture (172)

TR   : he is not standby (173)

RI   : none (174)

RA   : The reason is not we do not have the number. But we afraid to call (175)

      (The reason is not about we do not have his number. Nevertheless, we afraid to call him)

The example above was explained the particular or specific context use in conversations. The specifics context was shown by why they (RI and RA) do not meet the supervisor *(he just waited supervisor for today, but I have waited from last Friday: line 169).* The calculable was shows that RI did not meet the supervisor. The next example was given below:

RA and RI talked about TR's voice were seemed with the English stranger. Ra asked TR to talk everything and he was seriously to hear her pronunciations.

RA   : I cannot differentiate between England and Tri (295)

      Puspita Andini……..hmmm England stranger (296)

      Brian, our new lecturer, when he said to me everything and I heard you (297)

TR   : Say it? (298)

RA   : Everything. I think the same voice, same sound (299)

TR   : ohhh you make me shy. Ha ha aa.. (300)

      (TR's face was reddish)

      ah ha ha ha ………(all laughing) (301)

RI   : No what what (302)

      (it does not matter)

TR   : I feel shy. Don't you lie that (303)

The example above was shown the cancellable implicature. The cancellable indicates utterance (*line 295-297: I cannot differentiate between England and Tri Puspita Andini……..hmmm England stranger Brian, our new lecturer, when he said to me everything and I heard you*) is canceled by additional information. The cancelable implicature is become strong by the specific information about what the differences of RA's means *(Everything. I think the same voice, same sound: 299)* is only about the pronunciations not at all. The following example given was about the carried out of Implicature as the particularized conversational Implicature:

RA, RI, and TR were students of English Department. They came from different district area of Bengkulu. Today they met in Reading Room and discussed everything in English.

RA   : I was born in Manna, live in Manna (326)

RI   : and died in Manna (327)
            ah ha ha ha ………(328)
            (All laughing and Gusran is coming to them)

Gusran   : Minta tissue woe (329)
            (Give me tissue please)

RI   **: What do you say, we don't understand (330)**
            (What did you say?)
            Ah ha ha ha ………(331)
            (All laughing)

TR   : Say in English (332)

RI   : Ado ado bae haha (333)
            (Just a joke)

TR   : He is my old friend. We are in the same Senior High school (334)
            (We came from the same of senior high school)

RI   : Oh (335)

TR   : That's my old friend (336)

The example above was shown the particular context as the characteristic of particularized conversational Implicature was carried out in conversations. In line 330 (*what did you say?*) explains that RI does not really not understand about Gusran's saying, the specifics context is shown by RI's group discuss in English in the conversation. In other words, Gusran comes to them while RI and friend discuss use English.

DISCUSSIONS

As presented result above it is concludes that the students of English Study Program of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of The University of Bengkulu use the

Implicature in the informal conversation. The result findings were shown the generalized conversational Implicature is more dominant type use in the conversations. The second type is particularized conversational Implicature. Moreover, the last type is conventional Implicature.

Conventional Implicature did not usually occur in the conversation that is why this type is the less type found. Like as Grice said in Levinson (1975) that the implicit meaning of utterances is expressing indirectly. It means that when people produce implicit meaning it can be defined as Implicature.

Implicature is indirect or implicit meaning of an utterance that is produced by the speaker. Implicature happens when the speaker wants to express something in an implicit or indirect way in a conversation.

The result was shown that the generalized conversational Implicature is more dominant type found in the conversations, the second type is particularized conversational Implicature.

In addition, for the third findings is conventional Implicature which has the less percentage of findings. The findings were shown the students well in produce Implicature in the informal conversations.

The use of characteristics of Implicature in the conversations shows how the Implicature is carried out in the conversation. The test use is categorized the utterance of what is say is different with what is imply based on context.

The features of conventional Implicature show how conventional Implicature is carried out in the conversations. The features are indicates by the use of conjunction word; "yet and but".

The features of generalized conversational Implicature show how generalized conversational Implicature is carried out in the conversations; they are cancellable, calculable, context independent, no special background knowledge of the context, and use scalar implicature; identify with word all, many, some, and always.

The process of reasoning or calculation of implicit meaning of the utterances shows the calculable. The context independent shows the general context is carried out in conversations. The scalar Implicature is use to imply the meaning in more general context. The process of reasoning or calculation of implicit meaning of the utterances is shown the calculable. The context independent shows the general context of Implicature. The scalar Implicature use to imply the meaning in more general context.

The features of particularized conversational implicature showed how particularized conversational implicature was carried out in the conversations; they are cancellable, context dependent and use special context of background knowledge.

The dominant characteristics of particularized conversational implicature are the implementation of special context of background knowledge, calculable and context dependent.

The special context is the detail information or particular context that

expresses the implicit meaning of the utterance. The calculable means that the Implicature is calculated from reasoning of the specific context in the utterance. Moreover, as a conclusion of how implicature carried out in the conversations is the use of generalized and particularized conversational implicature.

Finally, the analysis of types of implicature use by the students was based on the characteristics of implicature and the context of situation of the conversation is occurred. As Levinson (1983) said that implicature is the study of the language based on context, the context is refers to the physical environments that influence the meaning of the language was occur (Yule, 1996). In the conversational information have greatly potential rises the implicature.

CONCLUSION

As a conclusion the type of implicature and how implicature implemented were concludes as follows:

1. There are three types of implicature found in the informal conversations, they are conventional implicature, generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.

2. The implicature is carried out by the use of generalized and particularized conversational implicature in the conversation.

Finally, the conclusion of this study is in the informal conversations the implicature types are used by the students. As the suggestions, for the next researcher, it is expected to analyze of implicature in others subject such as movie, humors or others. The result of this study is also expected to give additional information for Pragmatics study and the other studies, which has analysis in conversation such as speaking class.

REFERENCES

Black, Elizabeth. 2006. *Pragmatics Stylistics: Edinburgh Textbooks in Applied Linguistics.* Great Britain: Edinburgh University Press. Retrieved on July 12 2009. From http://faculty. ksu.edu.sa/ 76518 / Linguistics / books/ pragmatic %20%20stylistics.pdf

Bottyan, Gergely. *The operationality of Grice's tests for Implicature.* Retrieved on December 12 2011. From http://www.nytud.hu / cescl / proceedings /Gergely_Bottyan_CESCL.pdf

Brown, Gilian and George Yule.1998. *Discourse Analysis.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grice, H. Paul.1975. *Logic and Conversation.* In *Syntax and Semantics* (vol.3), ed. P. Cole and J.L. Morgan. New York: Academic Press. Reprinted in *Studies in the Way of Words*, ed. H.P. Grice, pp 22-40. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press (1989).

Hornby, AS.2000. *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English.* London: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, Lee. 2003. *What Is an Utterance.* Retrieved on November 31 2011. From http://www. wisegeek. com / what – is – an -utterance.html

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

Liddicoat, A J. 2007. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis.* London: Athenaeum Press.

Moeschler, Jacques. *Conversational and conventional Implicatures.* Swiss*:* University of Geneva,

retrieved on January 12 2012. from http://www.unige.ch/lettres/linguistique/moeschler/publication_pdf/implicatu e-moeschler-def.pdf

Parker, Frank.2005. *Linguistics For Non Linguistics.* London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.

Rosidi, Imron. 2009. *Bentuk Implikatur Dalam Kegiatan Transaksi Di Koperasi Siswa SMKN Kota Pasuruan. .retrieved on February, 12 2012.* From: http://www.scribd.com/doc/51371192/ *TUTURAN – SISWA – DALAM – SOSIOLINGUISTIK – BU - ID.*

Sbisà, Marina.2003. *The Rationality of Conversational Implicature.* Italy: University of Trieste.

Sidnell. Jack. 2009. *Conversation Analysis, Comparative Perspective.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Victory, Widya RP.2010. *Implicature Used in Humors of Yes Man Movie.* Unpublished thesis. Semarang: UMS. Retrieved 12 October 2011. from: http://lib.uin-malang.ac.id/ thesis / full chapter/06320107 - widya - rabiah - praja - victory.pdf.

Widyawati, Anis. 2010. *Implicature Used In the Main Characters on the Movie Transcript of Memories of Geisha.* Research paper. Malang: Universitas Islam Negeri Malik Ibrahim. Retrieved 12 October 2011. From http://lib.uin-malang.ac.id /thesis / fullchapter/06320060-anis-widyawati.ps

Wooffitt, Robin.2005.*Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A comparative and Critical Introduction.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

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