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Abstract
This research refers to pragmatic competence of English Study Program students of UNIMOR in English dialogs. Pragmatic competence is important in the context of language use from the view points of the language users. This research is aimed at describing the students’ pragmatic competence in using English inside and/or outside the classroom from the perspective of pragmatic competence. It means how pragmatic competence is realized in English dialogs. The problems of this research are as follows: (1) How is pragmatic competence realized in English dialogs?, (2) How does context in English dialogs influence the speaker’s intention in negotiating meaning? The theoretical background of this research is based on concepts and/or ideas introduced by some experts in pragmatics, such as George Yule, Jenny Thomas, Levinson, Leech, and others. This research applies qualitative method to analyze and describe how language is used based on the contexts found in the dialogs. Besides, it is also important to know what kind of meaning is negotiated in language use, since contexts can influence what is said. This research is focused on pragmatic contexts in dialogs. The data of this research are obtained from the fifth semester students of English Study Program in the academic year 2016/2017. The data is by collected asking the students in pairs to demonstrate their speaking ability in a dialog freely about any topic, then the dialog is recorded and transcribed based on the recording for further analysis. The recorded dialog is the primary data of data analysis. In order to support the main research data, the researcher also uses observation technique as secondary data to support the main data by observing how the students interact inside and/or outside the classroom by using English. The result of the research showed that pragmatic competence was realized in the dialog and the contexts could influence the speaker’s intention in negotiating meaning, since the utterance meaning does not reflect the intended meanings in the speaker’s mind.
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INTRODUCTION

It is undeniable that language plays an important role in social interaction since it is used as a tool of communication. To communicate with others, people need knowledge and skill to interact. The process of interaction involves the speakers. Through communication the speakers negotiate meaning. The meaning of a particular utterance cannot be analyzed on the basis of linguistic evidence, since linguistic evidence cannot be interpreted on the basis of utterance meaning. The utterance meaning cannot fully reflect the speaker’s intention in communication. Through communication, the speakers can communicate ideas, feelings, emotions, desires, and intention. From pragmatic perspective, when two speakers exchange ideas in a dialog, the listener can make inference about what is said in order to achieve. This article is related to pragmatics as a branch of linguistics which is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and a listener.

The meaning of words cannot be viewed as word in isolation in terms of lexical meaning. There are some other factors that should be considered to determine the meaning of any utterances. One of those factors is context, since language makes meaning in which it is used. To determine the intended meaning of a speaker then the listener should make any adjustment to figure out what the speaker means by the utterance than words or phrases in the utterance might mean by the speaker. This involves an interpretation of what the speaker means in a particular context. The context may influence what is said than what is stated in the utterance. In order to do this, the listener should make inference about what is said to come to an interpretation of the speaker’s intended meaning. This perspective in pragmatics is known as speaker’s intended meaning. Through pragmatics one can talk about people’s intended meaning, their assumptions, their purposes or goals. To do this it is difficult to adjust human concepts in an objective way.

The problems of this research are as follows: (1) How is pragmatic competence realized in English dialogs?, (2) How does context in English dialogs influence the speakers’ intention in negotiating meaning? On the basis of the research problems, then the objectives of this research would describe how pragmatic competence is realized in English dialogs, and how contexts in dialogs influence the speaker’s intended meaning. This research has some significances, such as: (1) Theoretically, this research will enrich
the theoretical background of pragmatic competence since it is necessary to match actional intent with linguistic form based on the knowledge of the speaker. (2) Pedagogically, this research will assist the teacher or lecturer to develop the learners’ communicative competence in the classroom by applying methods and/or approaches to improve the students’ pragmatic competence. So, this article deals with pragmatic competence focussing on the user of language and the context of communication. This research is significant since the result of the research will give a major contribution to the improvement of the students’ pragmatic competence. Besides, there are not so many researches which have been conducted before that deals with pragmatic competence, among others, Siegel Joseph (2016) conducted a research about ‘Pragmatic Activities for Speaking Classroom’. He suggested a number of classroom activities that can be incorporated into speaking lessons to target pragmatic development within contextual factors. Meanwhile, Rui Li (2015) conducted a research about ‘An Investigation into Chinese EFL Learner’s Pragmatic Competence’. The result of the research showed that Chinese EFL learner’s pragmatic competence is still influenced by Chinese language and culture.

Based on my observation, it is hard for English Study Program students of UNIMOR to interact by using English whether inside or outside the classroom. It has not been proved yet that the students do not have an adequate pragmatic competence in using English. So, this research would try to bridge the gap between the students’ ability in using English and and their pragmatic competence that should be developed in the classroom during teaching and learning process. This needs an ability to use knowledge of language rules in order to understand and produce an appropriate language in communication. So, the result of this research will contribute to the improvement of developing the students’ language performance in terms of their pragmatic competence in communication. Then, this research is important and necessary to be conducted at the university level.

LITERATURE REVIEW

It is important to review some concepts or ideas stated by linguists as theoretical bases to support this writing. Based on the title of this article, then the focus is on pragmatic competence. It is to say that pragmatics is a sub-field of linguistics which studies the ways in which context contributes to meaning in terms of the meaning of a spoken utterance. Pragmatics encompasses speech act theory, conversational implicature, conversational structure, deixis, and other approaches that should be interpreted from its context. Pragmatics studies how the transmission of meaning depends not only on the linguistic knowledge of the speaker and listener, but also on the context of the utterance, knowledge about the status of those involved, the inferred intent of the speaker, and so on. In this respect, pragmatics explains how language users are able to overcome apparent ambiguity, since meaning of any utterances cannot be interpreted from utterances only but also on speaker’s intended meaning.

Historically, the term pragmatics was firstly known when Morris (1938) in Levinson (1983:1), a philosopher, who introduced a science of signs known as semiotics. Through semiotics Morris distinguished three different branches of the science of language into syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Since the introduction of the branches as syntax, semantics and pragmatics by Morris, the latter term has become to be in use for many years and has expanded in recent years. Meanwhile, (Levinson, 1983: 9) defined pragmatics as the study of the relationships between forms of linguistics and the user of it. Besides, Yul (1996: 4) emphasized similar definition of pragmatic as Levinson did. From this definition, pragmatics is the study of the relationship between language and...
context that deals with language use. It is clear that those definitions of pragmatics share similar ideas that pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies meaning. It means the meaning of a linguistic form should not be predicted by linguistic form that concerned with knowledge only but the speaker of the language also should take any concerns about the knowledge of social world. This social world refers to the context in which language is used. Language operates within context. Jenny (1996: 1) defined pragmatics as the meaning in use or meaning in context. Furthermore, Parker (1986: 11) defined pragmatics as the study of how language is used to communicate. The same idea was also expressed by Yule (1996: 5) that pragmatics is the study about the relationship between linguistic forms and the use of the linguistic terms. Those definitions of pragmatics share some similar ideas beside the differences in concepts and perceptions about pragmatics.

A critical review should be made that there are some similarities of those concepts introduced by the linguists or pragmatists. Those theoretical aspects of pragmatics have strengths and also weaknesses. The strengths of such definition are as follows: it recognizes that pragmatics is essentially concerned with inference (Thomason, 1977) who emphasizes that a linguistic form is uttered in a context, while another difficulty facing this definition or scope for pragmatics, is that it calls for some explicit characterization of the notion of context. From the earlier definitions, pragmatics was restricted to encoded aspects of context. One could claim that the relevant aspects of context should be specified. It means that one needs to distinguish between actual situations of the spoken utterance, and the selection of those features that are culturally and linguistically relevant to the interpretation of an utterance (Van Dijk, 1976: 29). The main point that makes pragmatics different from syntax or semantics is the use and user of the linguistic forms. Again, talking about the concept of pragmatics, Mey (1993: 5) states that pragmatics starts out from the conception of language as being used.

The above statements certainly lead to an understanding that pragmatics is essentially the science of language seen in accordance with its uses and users. Pragmatics is not the science in its own right, or the science of language as seen and studied by the linguists, or the science of language as used by real, live people, for their own purposes and within their limitations and affordances (Mey, 1993: 5). On the basis of the concept of pragmatics as introduced by Mey above, many definitions of pragmatics are offered in this article, such as follows: (1) The study of speaker meaning, (2) The study of contextual meaning, (3) The study of how idea is communicated than is said, and (4) The study of the expression of relative distance. The idea of pragmatics as stated by Mey (1993:5) also has similar ideas as stated by Levinson (1983: 9-27), and pragmatics could have some basic concepts such as: (1) The study of those relations between language and context that are grammatical, or encoded in the structure of a language; (2) The study of those all aspects of meaning not captured in a semantic theory; (3) The study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding; (4) The study of the ability of language users to pair sentences with the context in which they would be appropriate; and (5) The study of deixis (at least in parts), implicature, presuppositions, speech acts, and aspects of discourse structure.

At a glance, the definitions of pragmatics offered by Yule and Levinson are rather different. However, they have the same view on defining pragmatics if they are in detail taken into account. On one hand, the first two by Yule and the first three by Levinson are at the more linguistic end of pragmatics. On the other hand, the last two by Yule and the last two by Levinson are in relation to more social aspects of pragmatics. There are some areas of pragmatics, namely: (1) the study of the speaker’s meaning, not focusing on the phonetic or grammatical form of an utterance, but on what the speaker’s intentions and beliefs are. (2) The study of meaning in context, and the
influence that a given context can have on the message. It requires knowledge of the speaker’s identities, and the place and time of the utterance. (3) The study of relative distance, both social and physical, between speakers in order to understand what determines the choice of what is said and what is not said. (4) The study of what is not meant, as opposed to intended meaning, which is unsaid and unintended, or unintentional. The effort to integrate pragmatics in the theory of grammar starts from philosophical and rhetorical works. Leech (1983:2) identifies that the influences of modern pragmatics have been those of philosophers such as Austin (1962), Searle (1969), and Grice (1975). From definitions offered by linguists, there are some similar ideas about pragmatics.

As discussed previously, pragmatics is substantially the study of language in use both linguistically and socially, (see Yule, 1996 and Levinson, 1983). The definition of pragmatics reminds us that the proper domain of pragmatics would be what Chomsky has called performance, the way the individual user uses his or her language in everyday life (Mey 1993:36). On the other hand, pragmatics has become the interest of linguists as the reaction to Chomskyan syntactic well-formed (Mey, 1993:25) or the anti-syntax (Leech, 1983:2). From the point of views above, it is important to say that syntax and pragmatics certainly have different concepts in taking account of language. Syntax deals with a description of language structure whereas pragmatics deals with a description of the language use. Concerning with this difference then it is clearly described by Mey (1993:38) as mentioned that, the difference between a grammatical and a user oriented point of view is precisely in the context: on the former view, we consider linguistic elements in isolation, as syntactic structures or parts of grammatical paradigm, such as case, tense, and so on; whereas how these linguistic elements used in a concrete setting, e.g. a context. To use a language for communication, it is important to consider the relation between the user of the language and the context in which the communication takes place. There is a relation between the utterances someone produces and the functions that speaker intends to perform through the utterances, and which can be called illocutionary force of utterances. The context will determine the appropriateness of the utterances. Pragmatic competence includes illocutionary competence, the knowledge of the pragmatic conventions to perform acceptable language functions.

In short, this research mainly deals with pragmatic competence although most theoretical concepts are based on pragmatic point of views. Bachman (1990) states that pragmatic competence is independent from grammatical and discourse organization, and it is concerned with the functional aspects of language that coordinates with the formal aspects of language use. Besides, Barron (2003:10) regards pragmatic competence as the knowledge of the linguistic resources available in a given language for realizing particular illocations, knowledge of the sequential aspects of speech acts. Furthermore, Rose (1999) defines pragmatic competence as the ability to use available linguistic resources in a contextually appropriate fashion. Similar ideas came from Thomas (1983) who defines pragmatic competence as the ability to use language effectively in order to achieve a specific purpose and to understand language in context. Whatever the differences are in the theoretical perspectives but those theories share some common features of pragmatic competence.

RESEARCH METHOD

To do a research it is important to design the research before collecting the data. This is important because it is based on the goals of the research. Some experts in research like Cohen et all (2007:87) stated that planning a research should refer to the research design and methodology, data analysis, presenting and reporting the results of
the research. On the basis of that idea, this research is classified as a qualitative research since it describes the facts as it is. Meanwhile, Best (1981:106-107), and Nunan (1992:4) stated that a descriptive research is a way of describing the fact in a qualitative research which is nonexperimental since it deals with a natural, rather than an artificial setting. The research was conducted in Timor University. The research data was obtained from the fifth semester students of English Study Program in the academic year 2017/2018. The sample of the research was obtained randomly, then twenty students were chosen. The students were asked to perform a free dialog in pairs about any topic without any preparation. This is important in doing a descriptive research in order to get the natural data from the students. The students should perform an English dialog freely. The dialog was recorded by using a handycam and the recorded dialog would be transcribed carefully as natural as it was for further analysis and interpretation. The recorded dialogs would be selected to be analyzed; then five recorded data were chosen to be the primary data. Beside the recorded data in terms of dialogs, then the observation technique was also applied in order to observe the students’ interaction when they were using English inside and/or outside the classroom. Any information about the observation were collected by taking notes. The data from the observation were treated as secondary data. Both data later on were analyzed by following the procedures of data analysis as suggested by Cohen, et al (2007:470), namely, (1) Generating natural unit of meaning, (2) Classifying and categorizing units of meaning, (3) Describing the content, and (4) Interpreting the data.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

It has been stated before that this research will try to find out the answers of the previous research questions. After the original data were recorded and analyzed, then in this part the data would be presented and followed by interpretation. The research data would be analyzed and interpreted on the basis of pragmatic competence. So, in this part, the data are presented in forms of the transcription of the original dialog, neglecting any grammatical mistakes found in the transcription, including vocabularies. Then the discussion, analysis, and interpretation in the dialogs would refer to pragmatic competence of the speakers who involve in the dialog. As a researcher, it is important to look at any utterance meaning or speaker’s intended meaning in the dialogs. The researcher also would like to look at how the speakers have an adequate knowledge of pragmatic competence. The analysis and interpretation are as follows:

Dialog 1 (where M = Mikhael, T = Tilda)
1. M: Good afternoon
2. T: Hello, good afternoon, nice to meet you
3. M: Nice to meet you too. How are you?
4. T: I’m fine thanks. How about you?

In dialog (1) the first speaker (Mikhael) starts the dialog with an opening by using a greeting, ‘good afternoon’, and gets the response in the same way with agreeing, ‘hello, good afternoon’ in line (2). The second part of the greeting is the pseudo health inquiry ‘how are you?’ that receives the second pair of response with ‘I am fine thanks’ and the utterance is then followed by asking the pseudo health inquiry ‘How about you?’ in line (4). It is common in all languages, that the speakers who involve in a dialog generally start a dialog by greeting one another as to open a dialog. It does not mean that both speakers (Mikhael and Tilda) do not know the time of the day when the conversation is taking place. The utterance meaning is clear as lexical meaning which is found in the dictionary of the expression of greeting. The speaker’s intended meaning is to start the dialog by greeting one another that both speakers want to maintain a social relationship.
through conversation as a way to respect one another. This is related to how to open a conversation. Both speakers have already had in mind that they want to manage the dialog in such a way by greeting one another so that the dialog can run smoothly as expected. The utterance ‘how about you?’ can be interpreted as the speaker’s expectation that the opponent speaker is in a good health condition like him. The speaker has known before that his listener as the opponent speaker would feel the same way as he is at the time of speaking. There is a hope of the speaker about the health condition of another speaker (Tilda).

5. M: [Oh] I’m very well. By the way, what are you doing here?
6. T: I’m going to looking for Christmas tree because we will celebrate
7. T: our christmas here, how about you?
8. M: I want to buy some clothes to wear for christmas day

In line (4) above it is asking about health condition of another speaker by saying ‘and how about you?’ and gets the response in line (5) ‘[oh], I am very well’. The dialog continues by using a question ‘what are you doing here?’ then the topic moves on to the plan for Christmas celebration. The speaker in line (5) uses a place deixis ‘here’ as place or space deixis that concerns the specification of location when the dialog takes place. The utterance meaning of place deixis ‘here’ is clear, but the interpretation is what the speaker (Mikhael) has in mind when he utters the place deixis. It is clear from the linguistic fact that both speakers are in a common place when they are communicating with one another. From line (6) the speaker tells the reason why she is there at the time of speaking by saying ‘I am going to look for Christmas tree’. The utterance meaning is related to the reason why she is there. The speaker uses place deixis ‘here’ to refer to place where they are speaking, and this shows that both speakers in a shop nearby, or a supermarket or a mall where they can buy things that they need. Again, in line (7), the speaker uses the same utterance by saying ‘how about you?’ like in line (4). The speaker’s intended meaning is to show that both speakers have the same assumption or hope or goal. This means there is a hope or an expectation of the response that both speakers share the same goal of being there without mentioning the exact location. The response of the utterance in line (7) is in line (8) ‘I want to buy some clothes to wear on christmas day’. The responses in lines (6) and (8) are the shared goal of both speakers. There are two main ideas of this part of dialog, namely it is not stated clearly about the place or exact location when the dialog takes place, and secondly there is another interpretation is that the time when the dialog takes place is in Desember as the month of Christmas celebration.

9. T: [wow], I think Christmas is about wish time so you have to prepare the new
10. T: clothes. I think it’s very nice; [by the way] we have been never long time not
11. T: see each other, so where were you?
12. M: [Oh], so long I have time busy and I think the students in SMAN 3 and
13. M: [By the way] where will you celebrate the christmas day?

Meanwhile, line (8) of the dialog gets a long response in line (9). In order to interpret the utterance meaning and/or the speaker’s intended meaning then the response ‘[wow]... I think christmas is about wish time’. The use of non-linguistic utterance such as ‘wow’ has an idea of expressing surprise of the speaker. The utterance ‘about wish time’ could mean the expected time to come. This idea is in line with what the speakers should do to celebrate Christmas. The goals of the two speakers are clearly stated in line (6) and (8). Besides, another utterance in line (9) ‘you have to prepare the new clothes’. Another utterance is ‘I think it is very nice’ can be interpreted as the speaker (Tilda) expresses a feeling of pleasure to meet one another since the speaker goes on uttering by saying ‘[by the way] we have never been long time not see each other’. The speaker in line (10) uses
to utterance ‘by the way’, has a meaning that the speaker wants to change the topic of discussion from talking about Christmas celebration to another topic. Line (12) gives an impression of short response to the previous utterance in line (11). Both speakers donot maintain the topic of discussion since in line (13) the speaker’s response leads to the same topic of discussion namely christmas celebration.

14. T: I will celebrate christmas day in Kefa town because we are in our complex,

15. T: we have to make competence by bought christmas tree in front of our house

16. T: I think this is a nice motivation so I looking for nice christmas tree, [by the

17. T: way] how about you, where will you celebrate your christmas day?

18. M: [oh]... I want to celebrate my christmas day with my family

19. M: in my village Tunbaba

Dialog 1 in line (14) is the response of the utterance in line (13) which is asking about the place to celebrate Christmas. Lines (15 – 17) are the responses of the question in line (13). The speaker (Tilda) is explaining in detail about Kefa town as the place to celebrate Christmas. From the original data in line (15) causes ambiguity of the speaker’s intended meaning as well as the utterance meaning. This is because the utterance is unclear as a matter of sentence construction is also unclear. The interpretation of the speaker’s meaning in lines (14 – 17) is related to giving information about the place to celebrate Christmas. The speaker wants to tell her opponent speaker in a short description. The intended meaning of buying Christmas tree since to decorate the surrounding of the speaker’s house before the celebration such as in lines (15-16). Here, the speaker wants to tell her opponent speaker the tradition of the speaker’s family when celebrating Christmas as the unsaid message of the utterance. What the speaker has in mind is to give information. At the end of line (17), the speaker wants to get the same response by asking ‘[by the way], how about you, where will you celebrate your christmas day?’ The speaker gets the same response in lines (18-19) that the speaker also wants to celebrate christmas day in his village; Tunbaba. The response of the question in line (17) is a confirmation of the message being communicated by asking about the place to celebrate christmast.

20. T: I was hear about Tunbaba but so long time ago, I never get there, so if you

21. T: don’t mind would you like to let me join with you a christmas with your

22. T: family?

23. M: [oh]... of course, I will waiting you go to my village sowe will celebrate

24. M: together

The dialog still continues with lines (20 – 24) describing about the speaker’s idea about her friend’s village where he will celebrate christmast there. The speaker wants to go there since she has never been there before so she wants to go there in line (21) by saying ‘would like to let me join you a christmas with your family?’ This utterance has a meaning of request. It means the speaker is willing to go to her friend’s village in Tunbaba (line 20). The interpretation is that the speaker has no intention to go there but she has to say so, or the speaker really wants to go there if her opponent speaker accepts the request. The linguistic evidence shows that the speaker wants to get a positive response from another speaker, whether she will go there or not it depends on her intention. The question in line (21) gets a response in line (23) ‘[oh] of course. I will be waiting for you to go to my village to celebrate Christmas’. The response starts with a non-linguistic utterance ‘[oh]’ and the interpretation is that the speaker gives a positive response to his friend’s request to show certainty of the utterance. This can also mean that the speaker has in mind is that she really wants to go there on christmas celebration or it is an expression of her request without expecting a positive response from her opponent speaker. Line (23) gives an impression that both speakers have the same goal of
celebrating Christmas; and the place that they are talking about will give an idea of both speakers have in mind during the dialog.

25. T: yes, I don't promise but I will decide when I will visit your family,
26. T: I think that we have to looking for what we are find sowe have now to go
27. M: and I hope that you will went to my village so that we will celebrate
28. M: Christmast day together.

The dialog continues with line (25) that gives an interpretation that the speaker (Tilda) is doubtful about the response since she has not decided yet to go to her friend’s village. There is a promise in line (25) and the utterance is related to the reason that line (25) gives an idea that the speaker may go or may not go to her friend’s village. Here, the topic of the dialog changes as in line (26) that both speakers want to look for and buy what they need for Christmas celebration, while lines (27 -28) refers to the speaker’s intention to invite his friend to go to his village to celebrate Christmas together.

29. T: I promise I will go there if I have time. I think it’s enough of our
30. T: conversation, nice to meet you. Bye-bye
31. M: okay, bye

Dialog 1 ends with an idea that in line (29) the interpretation of the speaker’s intended meaning is that there is a possibility for the speaker (Tilda) to go to her friend’s village. This also means line (29) refers to uncertainty since the speaker is doubtful to go there. There is a promise but whether she will go or not is still a possibility. In line (30) the speaker feels satisfied with the meeting by saying ‘nice to meet you’. In a casual dialog, it is common to open the dialog with greeting one another and then followed the utterance ‘Nice to meet you’ such as in lines (2 -3) above. Here, the speaker repeats the same thing. This could mean the speaker expresses her satisfaction about the meeting and having a nice dialog in a friendly atmosphere. Finally, both speakers close the dialog by using leave-taking expression ‘bye bye’ (line 30) and gets the same response in line (31) by saying ‘oke, bye’.

Dialog 2 (where M = Meni, L = Lia)

1. M: Hi, good morning Lia. How are you this morning?
2. L: Hi, good morning too. I’m pretty well, thanks. And you?
3. M: So far so good, thanks.
4. L: That’s great. Have you done your homework?

Dialog 2 is similar with the analysis and interpretation in dialog 1 that generally a dialog starts with how to open the dialog by greeting one another. Here Meni greets her opponent speaker in line (1) and get the response in line (2). At the end of the response, the speaker asks about the condition of another speaker. Again, the question is related to pseudo health inquiry in line (3) by saying ‘so far so good, thanks’. The first speaker (Meni) is expressing a feeling of pleasure with the health condition. It happens nearly in all languages that the speakers start the dialog beginning with greetings, then followed by the question asking about health condition of another speaker. In line (4) of dialog 2, the speaker (Lia) wants to change the topic of the dialog by saying ‘Have you done your homework?’

5. M: I have and how about you?
6. L: I leave three numbers. Those are so difficult numbers for me.
7. M: [Oh]…what number so difficult for you?
8. L: If I don’t forget number followed seven and nine.
9. M: [Oh]… those are like a piece of cake for me.

The response in line (5) is the right utterance asking about the activity that the speaker has done her homework and continues the utterance by saying ‘How about you?’ This means the speaker also wants to know about the same homework they got before.
Meanwhile, in line (6) tells about how the speaker thinks about the homework. The speaker expresses her feeling about what is in her mind. The sympathy comes from the opponent speaker in line (7) by starting the dialog with a non-linguistic expression, ‘[oh]...what number so difficult for you?’ and gets response in line (8) about the difficult items or numbers of the homework. From pragmatic perspective that utterance can be interpreted as the speaker wants to tell another speaker about her difficulty, and it is hoped that her opponent speaker could help her to finish the homework. There is something interesting to interpret about the speaker’s intended meaning in line (9) by saying ‘[oh]... those are like a piece of cake for me’. This utterance could mean that number seven and nine are easy for the speaker. This is an expression showing a feeling of pleasure, or it is an expression of showing satisfaction.

10. L: [Wow]... would you like explain for me?.
11. M: You list my homework number 4 about personal pronoun, number 7 about descriptive poem, number 9 about simple present tense.
12. L: [Oh]... thank you. By the way, where are the another friends?
13. M: Maybe they are outside.

Line (9) of dialog 2 gets a response in line (10) that refers to asking for help, since the speaker does not know the answers of number seven and nine of the homework then she needs a help by saying ‘[wow]... would you like explain for me?’. Meanwhile, lines (11–12) are any helps provided by the speaker as asking another speaker to find out the answers of the homework by mentioning the numbers of the homework. Line (13) is the direct response of the speaker because of the help given by another speaker. This expression of thanks is in line (13) ‘[oh]... thank you’. Another utterance in line (13) is about changing the topic of the dialog, ‘where are the another friends?’ and gets the response in line (14) ‘maybe they are outside’. The speaker uses the word ‘outside’ to denote the place which is not close to both speakers. It is hard to define which friends are outside since the speaker does not mention in specific about the friends.

15. L: Would you like the accompany to the library?
16. M: Well, but for what?
17. L: I’m going to finish my homework test.
18. M: [Oh]... you can finish your homework at here.
19. M: And you may borrow my notebook.
20. L: [Oh]... you are my best friend. Thank you.
21. M: Here you are.

Line (15) is about asking for help since from the previous utterances, such as in line (6) and (8), and it is clear that the speaker gets some difficulties to finish the homework, so she needs a help from another speaker. There should be an interpretation of the speaker meaning in line (16) by saying ‘well, but what for?’. This means that the speaker wants to know the reason why she invites her to go to the library. The reason is in line (17) that she wants to finish her homework test in the library. The response in line (18) with a non-linguistic utterance ‘[oh]... you can finish your homework at there’. This utterance means that the speaker is sure that the opponent speaker is able to finish the homework since she will provide any help by lending her notebook and it is line (19) which has a response by expressing thanks for her help in line (20) by saying ‘[oh]... you are my best friend, thank you’; and line (21) means the speaker gives her notebook to another speaker since she is borrowing the notebook to finish the homework.

22. L: What time our class to start?
23. M: At nine o’clock.
24. L: [Oh]... it leaves 40 minutes.
25. M: Yes, I’m going to buy bread for breakfast.
26. L: Ok, you will.
27. M: See you.
28. L: See you too.

The final part of the dialog starts with the utterance of changing the topic of dialog as in line (22) ‘what time our class to start?’ and gets the right response in line (23) ‘at nine o’clock. It is interesting to note that line (24) gives other possible interpretation of the speaker’s intended meaning by saying ‘[oh]...it leaves 40 minutes’. One possible interpretation is that the class will start in 40 minutes times, or the class has been started for about 40 minutes since there is no specific time unit as mention in line (24). The meaning in line (25) is hard to interpret that is going to buy some bread for breakfast. Suppose that both speakers are in the library at the time of speaking, and another speaker (Meni) will buy bread for breakfast. This may also mean that the speaker will have her breakfast then. The assumption is that the speaker is sure to go and have breakfast before the class begins. The dialog comes to the end as closing the dialog by using leave taking expressions in line (27) ‘see you’ and (28) ‘see you, too’.

CONCLUSION

Based on data presentation, analysis and interpretation above, it is important to conclude some ideas about this research, namely (1) pragmatic competence of the students is realized in dialog that in a language use, there is a relation between the users of the language and the context in which the language is being used. The data shows that the students do not have an adequate knowledge of pragmatic competence when they involve themselves in an English dialog. The students find some difficulties to choose an appropriate utterance to express what they have in mind; since the relation between speech utterances and the acts or functions could determine the appropriateness of the choice of language utterance. Any language utterances in the dialogs cannot be interpreted on the basis of lexical meaning only but also the speaker’s intended meaning. This intended meaning depends on the context, (2) the context in English dialog could influence the speaker’s intention to negotiate meaning, since what the speakers mean in a particular context would influence what is said in the dialog. The speaker’s intended meaning which is realized in a dialog could influence the speaker’s intention. So, this needs an interpretation of what the speaker has in mind, that what is said does not necessarily reflect the speaker’s intended meaning. Language utterance could make sense in its context since it is hard to analyze human concepts in a consistent and objective way.
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