



*International Journal of Humanity Studies*  
<http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/IJHS>  
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

**EXTRALINGUISTIC CONTEXT ROLES IN DETERMINING  
MEANINGS OF JAVANESE PHATIC EXPRESSION ‘*MBOTEN*’:  
A SOCIOPRAGMATIC PERSPECTIVE**

**R. Kunjana Rahardi**

Sanata Dharma University  
kunjana.rahardi@gmail.com

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.2019.030103>

Received 27 May 2019; revised 1 July 2019; accepted 20 August 2019

**Abstract**

The indirect expression of intention in the Javanese culture-based speech community requires the speaker and the hearer to understand the importance of contexts in communication. Failure to understand the context of interaction will definitely impede communication and interaction, or even worse it may cause misunderstanding in the communication and interaction process. In the Javanese speech community, people may say ‘*mboten*’ or ‘no’ without intending to negate or to express falsity. On the contrary, people may say ‘*inggih*’ or ‘yes’ which does not necessarily mean to affirm or to express an assertion. Therefore, it is clear that in the Javanese speech community, the extralinguistic contexts in the communication is very important and defines the purpose of utterances. Based on the research background, the research on extralinguistic contexts to determine the meaning of ‘*mboten*’ was carried out. The objective of the research was to elaborate the extralinguistic contexts which determine the meaning of ‘*mboten*.’ The data consists of excerpts containing Javanese phatic ‘*mboten*’. The technique of collecting data was recording and note-taking. Besides, interview or speaking method was employed to gather the data. The data analysis was done using the distributional and content analysis methods. This research results in five functions of extralinguistic contexts to determine the meaning of the utterance. The five functions are: (1) the extralinguistic contexts to affirm the intention of negation; (2) the extralinguistic context as the background of negation; (3) the extralinguistic contexts to confirm the meaning of negation; (4) the extralinguistic contexts to affirm the intention of negation; (5) the extralinguistic contexts to affirm the phatic function. The result of the research is very important and contributes significantly to the development of linguistics, especially the development of pragmatics embedded in culture-specific concepts.

Keywords: extralinguistic contexts, pragmatic meaning, culture-based phatic

**Introduction**

The linguistic phenomenon found in the Javanese speech community rich of culture-specific phenomena is interesting to describe. For centuries, the largest

speech community in Indonesia has attracted linguists to describe its linguistic aspects, especially the culturally embedded language (Sukarno, 2015). In the Javanese speech community, indirectness or insinuation in expressing the meaning of utterances is prevalent in almost every utterance. People will speak directly only in certain situations, for example when the intentions conveyed through indirectness and insinuation have failed to take effect (Subandi, 2011; Irawanto et al., 2011).

In the Javanese speech community, being silent or keeping quiet or '*anteng*' and restraining oneself from speaking or '*meneng*' can also be used to convey one's disagreement with something. Thus, instead of wasting too much energy to speak, or to argue, and to insist on something with too many words, the Javanese people usually resort to refusing to talk altogether in order to express one's disagreement. In a particular situation, the act of clamming up or refusing to talk can also be used to convey one's culminating anger and resentment (Anderson, 1972; Sukarno, 2015). The indirect delivery of intention in the Javanese culture-based speech community requires the speaker and the hearer to understand the importance of context in communicating and interacting with others. Failure to understand the context of interaction will definitely impede the communication and interaction, or even worse it may cause misunderstanding in the communication and interaction process (Rahardi, 2017; Chen, 2017).

For this purpose, the research on the extralinguistic contexts to determine the meaning of '*mboten*' in the Javanese speech community was carried out. In the Javanese community, people often say '*mboten*' although they do not always mean to negate something. On the contrary, they would say '*inggih*' or '*nggih*' although they do not always intend to affirm something or to express agreement. It is clear, therefore, that in the Javanese speech community, extralinguistic contexts (Recanati, 2008; Allan, 2007; Rahardi, 2016) to determine the linguistic meaning play a fundamental role.

## Literature Review

There are two theories underlying the research in the culture-specific pragmatic perspective or known as sociopragmatics. They are the culture-specific pragmatics theory or sociopragmatics, and the theory of culture-specific contexts, involving social, societal, and situational dimensions (Clyne, 2006). The first theory refers to the sociopragmatics which was first proposed by Leech as the counterpart of the term 'pragmalinguistics' (Chen, 2017; Leech, 2007). The second theory refers to the theory of social, cultural, and situational contexts proposed by several theorists. Pragmatics is commonly understood as the branch of linguistics that studies the speaker's meaning (Rahardi, 2017b; Culpeper, 2010; Streeck, 1984).

Therefore, pragmatics is commonly understood as the study of the extralinguistic factors because the object of the study is the factors which are outside of the language being studied (Blackledge & Pavlenko, 2001; Verschueren, 1997). The study of the speaker's meaning cannot be carried out without relating it with contexts. It means that the existence of context is fundamental and absolute to be taken into account in the pragmatics study (Gretsch, 2009; Rahardi, 2018a; Lee, 2001). Thus, it can be confirmed that the

study of the speaker's meaning cannot be carried out by stripping and excluding the contexts of utterances.

Thus, pragmatics is also referred to as the context-dependent study, while the linguistic study is commonly known as the context-independent study (Waugh et al, 2016; Lee, 2001). Pragmatics in the general sense can be defined by basing the data and facts on the Western perspective. It can be seen from the fact that most of the concepts in the Western pragmatics is based on the data and facts from Anglo-cultural languages (Rahardi, 2018a).

Pragmatics whose principles are formulated in the generalized perspective cannot be applicable for culture-specific communities. In the Javanese community, for instance, Grice's cooperative principles and Leech's politeness cannot fully be applied (Rahardi, 2017b). The maxims in the pragmatic principles may lead to different results when they are applied in the Javanese culture-based data and facts. For this purpose, Leech proposed the idea of sociopragmatic concepts. Sociopragmatics is actually pragmatics, which is based on the culture-specific data and facts (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). The sociopragmatic perspectives do not focus on the social dimension, but on the pragmatic dimension or the speaker's meaning.

Similarly, the counterpart of the sociopragmatics is pragmalinguistics (Dippold, 2012; Chen, 2017). Pragmatics focuses on the linguistic dimensions, other than merely linguistic. The linguistic dimension in pragmalinguistics focuses on the linguistic meaning in pragmatics (Rahardi, 2010). Furthermore, the theory of contexts is employed as the analytical tool in this research. Thus, the pragmatic meaning or intention of '*mboten*' as the object of this research employed the theory of context as the analytical tool. The social contexts initiated by Hymes become the starting point of the sociopragmatic study (Gumperz, 2008; Rahardi, 2018b).

Likewise, the theory of societal contexts by Mey was also used as the starting point in this research. Social contexts are different from societal contexts in that the former focuses on the horizontal communal dimensions, while the latter focuses on the vertical communal dimensions (Mey, 2006). In other words, the horizontally-dimensional contexts are interconnected with social distance, while the vertically-dimensional contexts are related with social status and ranks (Mey, 2017; Rahardi, 2018a).

In addition to the social and societal contexts, this research also employed the concepts of cultural contexts. Contexts are related to the social contexts despite their different perspectives. Social contexts have highly dominant social perspectives, while cultural contexts have observable cultural perspectives (Chen & Yang, 2010; Hassall, 2012). For example, the notion shared among the Javanese people that it is taboo to trample on the ancestors' tombs, to shout loudly, and to curse in the cemetery ground is related to cultural contexts.

However, the fact that it is impolite for Javanese people to speak to someone older than them using the '*Ngoko*' language, or the lowest variety of Javanese, is a matter of social context. In a nutshell, social, societal, and cultural contexts are not the same, and therefore they cannot be generalized (Limberg, 2009; Scollon & Scollon, 2001).

Careful examination of each similarity and difference among the three aspects is important in sociopragmatics. Further, pragmatics cannot be separated from the

situational contexts as proposed earlier by Leech. The pragmatic meaning of the same linguistic entity may be different because the contexts are different (Yu, 2011; Gretsche, 2009). The form 'kurang ajar temenan' or 'you little rascal' expressed by a father to his son when he is angry has a different pragmatic meaning from the same statement expressed when they enjoy a father-and-son playtime.

It is clear that situational contexts are very important to understand the speaker's meaning of a certain utterance (Mey et al., 2006; Van Dijk, 1977). In terms of phatic function, it is important to note that in the discussion of word categories, Kridalaksana states that this linguistic form does not have a category. In his view, linguistic forms such as 'ah', 'ih', 'lho' and so on are classified as phatic fillers. Leech asserts that the phatic functions are merely used as fillers to break the silence between interlocutors (Leech, 2007).

By employing fillers to break the silence between the speaker and the hearer, the conversation may run smoothly (Spencer-Oatey & Jiang, 2003; Leech, 2007). In other words, phatic functions are actually said to initiate conversations, start communication and interaction (Kulkarni, 2014). Leech's view is different from the notion of phatic communion which was firstly proposed by Malinowski based on his research in Trobriand islands in the Pacific Ocean (Kulkarni, 2014; Robbins, 2008).

In his view, phatic functions are 'a mere exchange of words.' Therefore, in his view, no actual meaning is carried in the linguistic phatic functions (Senft, 2014). The research by Rahardi found that culture-specific phatic communion is different from the findings from previous research. He states that phatic functions can be used to express the speaker's meaning, be it informative, or any other functions (Rahardi, 2017b). The theories of pragmatics and sociopragmatics, the theory of contexts, and the theory of phatic functions are employed in this research as both the frame of reference and as the analytical tool.

## Method

Research on the role of extralinguistic contexts to determine the pragmatic meaning of 'mboten' is a descriptive qualitative research. The type of research was chosen because the purpose of this research was to describe contexts and to analyze data using analysis and interpretation, instead of using numerical computations. The substantive data source of this sociopragmatic study was excerpts of recorded utterances containing phatic 'mboten' spoken by the Javanese speech community members. Thus, the research data was the excerpts of utterances from the substantive data source mentioned previously (Yusuf et al., 2014; Mahsun, 2005).

Furthermore, the research data was collected using the observation method commonly employed in a linguistic study. The basic and advanced techniques are recording and note-taking (Sudaryanto, 2016; Chen, 2017). After the data was gathered, it was classified and typified to be the subject of the analytical method and technique. The analytical method employed in this research was distributional and contextual methods (Mahsun, 2005).

The distributional method was used to describe the linguistic dimensions in this research, while the contextual method was used to describe the dimensions of pragmatic meaning or intent in this research. The research result was triangulated

to an expert to ensure the reliability and validity of the data and the analysis results. After the data and the analysis results were validated by the expert, the results were presented using an informal method. The informal method in the linguistic study refers to the method of presentation by elaborating and describing the analysis using an ordinary language, instead of using numerical computations, as commonly used in other disciplines (Mahsun, 2005; (Sudaryanto, 2016; Scollon & Scollon, 2001).

### **Findings and Discussion**

In this section, the various functions of extralinguistic contexts related to the use of the word '*mboten*' will be described in details. The functions of the extralinguistic contexts will be clear when they appear in the various contextual uses of the word '*mboten*.' As previously explained, the theory used to analyze the research data was the theory of contexts. How certain contexts play their role in determining the meaning of phatic '*mboten*' will be elaborated one by one in the following section.

#### ***The Extralinguistic Contexts to Affirm the Negative Intention***

The extralinguistic contexts play central role in interpreting the speaker's meaning / intent. The utterance which is interpreted by stripping the extralinguistic contexts will result in the wrong interpretation of the utterance. Thus, such meaning can only be derived from the linguistic forms. In fact, the pragmatic meaning may not always be derived from their linguistic forms, but also from the social, societal, cultural, and situational contexts encompassing it (Rahardi, 2017a; Travis, 2004). The explanatory function of the meaning of the extralinguistic contexts can be seen in the following excerpt.

#### **Excerpt of Utterance 1:**

*S: Ayo, nambah lagi siji maneh lah. Enak ya masakan iwakke! Iku rewangku prigel tenan yen masak.*

*M: Sampun, sampun. **Mbotenlah, pun cekap.** Kula sampun tuwuk saestu, Kangmas.*

*S: Halahh....nambah siji maneh. Ra popo! Ben tambah gendhut ra kerempeng.*

S: Please, have another filling. The meat is delicious, isn't it? My maid is a very good cook.

M: No more. No more, please. **I can't. It's enough.** I am full already, Kangmas.

S: Oh, come on! One more time, please. It's alright! You are just skin and bones.

Context:

The utterance took place between a host and his friend who came to visit. The utterance took place in the dining room, during the dinner. The host offered more side dish to the hearer, who was already feeling full.

In the excerpt 1 above, the form '*mboten*' in the utterance '***Mbotenlah, pun cekap***' or '**I can't. It's enough**' has a phatic function. Actually, the hearer may not necessarily have felt that he was full as stated in the following statement: '*Kula sampun tuwuk saestu, Kangmas*' or '**I am full already, Kangmas.**' In the Javanese

speech community, small talks often take place in the daily conversations (Irawanto et al., 2011; Anderson, 1972). In the family domain, saying ‘*mboten*’ or ‘no’ may not always mean that the person really means to negate a proposition or to reject something.

Likewise, when someone says ‘*sampun tuwuk saestu*’ or ‘I’m full already,’ it does not necessarily mean that the person is really full. This statement is conveyed out of politeness through indirectness. Polite conversations are commonly expressed using indirect statements (Subandi, 2011). The term ‘*jaga rasa*’ or ‘being considerate / respecting others’ feelings’ is obvious among the Javanese community members who are often indirect. Moreover, due to the dominant indirectness, people judge the Javanese people to have a ‘*samudana*’ culture. The term ‘*samudana*’ is almost the same as camouflage, or white lie and not telling the truth, whose purpose is to be considerate or respectful of others’ feelings.

The feelings being respected in the community are, first feeling towards oneself as a person, and the feeling towards others / hearers (Sukarno, 2015; Rahardi, 2018a). Pragmatically, it can be confirmed that the Javanese speech community is very rich in pragmatic values. Those who can understand the contexts during the conversations with others have a greater chance to be successful in communicating and interacting with other people.

On the contrary, those who like to ‘*antem krama*’ or to ‘go straight’ and pay no heed to situational contexts may face challenges in communicating with the Javanese speech community (Anderson, 1972). In the above utterance, the meaning of ‘*mboten*’ whose pragmatic meaning is not merely saying ‘no’ must be interpreted by connecting it to the contexts. The function of the extralinguistic contexts in interpreting utterances is to affirm the meaning. If contexts are scrutinized more closely, the pragmatic meaning of ‘*mboten*’ will be easily grasped.

### ***The Extralinguistic Contexts as the Background of the Negative Intention***

The negation of the meaning of the utterance using the form ‘*mboten*’ can really be interpreted as rejection, or it can be interpreted as fake rejection. Pretending to say no may mean that the negation refers to the action of ‘I reject’. The clear meaning of the different pragmatic meaning of the word ‘*mboten*’ may be clarified by identifying the contexts precisely. The function of the extralinguistic contexts as the background of ‘negation’ of the text’s meaning (Rahardi, 2018b; Izadi, 2016) can be seen closely in the following excerpt.

#### **Excerpt of Utterance 2:**

S: *Sudah sarapan belum tadi Pak. Ayo tak traktir ke SGPC Bu Wiryo. Anget-angetlah!*

M: *Wah....mboten Pak. Aku wis sarapan dimasakke istri e tadi.*

S: *Mboten-mboten pripun tho? Wis ayo tak sopiri pake mobilku.*

M: *Hehehe....yo ayo!*

S: Have you eaten breakfast, Sir? Let’s go to SGPC Bu Wiryo (a famous restaurant selling peanut sauce vegetable salad). My treat. Something to warm us up.

M: Well....**No**, Sir. I had my breakfast. My wife cooked it for me.

S: What do you mean by saying “**No**”? Let’s go. I’ll drive.

M: Well, what the heck? Let’s go.

Context:

The speaker and the hearer are lecturers in a university. They both had a spare time because they did not have classes or consultation. The lecturer stopped by his colleague’s office and asked him to have breakfast together outside campus. They are close friends. They treat each other breakfast or lunches.

There are two forms of ‘*mboten*’ in the Excerpt 2 above. First, the word ‘*mboten*’ in the utterance ‘*Wah....mboten Pak. Aku wis sarapan dimasakke istri e tadi*’ (Well....No, Sir. I had my breakfast. My wife cooked it for me.) and the word ‘*mboten*’ in the utterance ‘*Mboten-mboten pripun tho? Wis ayo tak sopiri pake mobilku.*’ (What do you mean by saying “No”? Let’s go. I’ll drive.) The pragmatic meaning of both statements is not the same. In the Excerpt 2, the form ‘*mboten*’ in ‘Well....No, Sir. I had my breakfast. My wife cooked it for me.’ sounds like a rejection to the offer.

When someone was asked by a colleague to have breakfast together, he refused because his wife cooked him breakfast. However, was it really a rejection? Apparently, it was not so. After being coaxed with the form ‘*Mboten-mboten pripun tho? Wis ayo tak sopiri pake mobilku*’ (What do you mean by saying “No”? Let’s go. I’ll drive.), he relented and went to have breakfast with the speaker.

Therefore, the negation is not a real rejection. The form ‘*mboten-mboten*’ which appears in the above utterance functioned as the speaker’s way to persuade the hearer. Thus, it can be affirmed that the function of the contexts in the form ‘*mboten*’ and ‘*mboten-mboten*’ in the above utterance is as the background of the negation or the rejection. The careful understanding of the extralinguistic contexts in the Excerpt above will lead someone to interpret utterances properly (Science et al., 2017; Gretsche, 2009).

#### ***The extralinguistic context as Confirmation of the Negation***

The extralinguistic context in the form of social, societal, cultural, and situational contexts play various roles. In the previous excerpts, contexts serve to confirm the intent and serve as the background of the negation, while in the following excerpt, contexts are used to confirm the negative intent or rejection.

The form ‘*mboten*’ in ‘***Mboten niku. Aku mangkat no ke Surabaya. Lha iku Scopus Je***’ or ‘**No, I did not.** I am positive that I will leave for Surabaya. It’s good for Scopus.’ confirms the negative intent. In the next utterance: ‘*Oh....mboten tho. Yo aku seneng nek ono kancane hehehe*’ or ‘Oh, **you did not cancel it.** That’s great. I’m glad I have a company to go there.’ The form ‘*oh....mboten tho*’ clearly confirms the negative intent.

The extralinguistic context presented in the excerpt functions to confirm the negation or rejection (Norricks, 2009; Eckert, 2008). Readers may read several times to prove that the function of the extralinguistic context is to confirm the negation or rejection.

**Excerpt of Utterance 3:**

S: *Penjenengan mbatalke rencana keberangkatan seminar ke Surabaya napa nggih Pak? Aku kok krungu saka Bu Yuliana pa seka sapa ya wingi kae?*

P: *Mboten niku. Aku mangkat no ke Surabaya. Lha iku Scopus Je.*

S: *Oh....mboten tho. Yo aku seneng nek ono kancane hehehe.*

P: *Eh lha....kita kan satu kamar berdua tho Pak.*

S: Did you cancel the plan to go to the seminar in Surabaya? I thought I heard it from Bu Yuliana or somebody. Did you?

P: **No, I did not.** I am positive that I will leave for Surabaya. It's a Scopus meeting.

S: Oh, **you did not cancel it.** That's great. I'm glad I have a company to go there.

P: Didn't you know? We share the same hotel room together.

**Context:**

The speaker and the hearer are lecturers at the same study program. Both are close friends and they often go to the same seminar together. The speaker was worried that the hearer canceled his plan to go to the seminar in Surabaya with him.

***The Extralinguistic Context as Affirmation of the Negation***

The Javanese language is one of the pillars buffeting the Indonesian language because the Javanese language is rich with a double entendre. Therefore, many sources mention that the Javanese community is known as the community with the 'samudana' culture. *Samudana* means camouflage or double entendre. The Javanese people are used to communicating in camouflage, indirectness, and insinuation (Rahardi, 2018a; Gu, 1998).

Someone may say 'yes' although he or she does not necessarily agree, or someone may say 'okay' although he or she may not be able to carry out the task. The same thing happens to a community member who says 'mboten', he or she may not necessarily mean to say 'no' as a real rejection. People may say 'mboten' while he actually agrees with the statement.

By saying 'mboten' when being offered to say something, the person is actually willing to say something. Then, why does the person say 'mboten' in the conversation? Perhaps, he or she wants to know how serious the other person asks him or her. Sometimes, the meaning of 'mboten' is an affirmation of the negation, as in the following utterance in Excerpt 4:

**Excerpt of Utterance 4:**

S: *Wah....wah....iku mambu opo iki?*

P: *Mambu opo tho? Aku ora mambu opo-opo je!*

S: *Penjenengan lali rung adus ya hahahaha.....kok srang-sreng ambune.*

P: *Mboten.....mboten. Wah ngisin-isini. Wong ganthenge koyo ngene je!*

S: *Hahahaha.... yo wis nek ngono!*

S: Well...well...what smell is this?

P: What smell? I don't smell anything!

S: Did you forget to take a bath hahahah.....I can smell your bad odor coming and going.

P: **No.....no way.** That would be embarrassing. A handsome man like me smells bad? No way.

S: Hahahaha.... Well, okay then!

Context:

The conversation took place in the secretariat of the study program. The employee joked with the other employee of a particularly bad smell. Actually, the intention of their conversation is to insinuate the third person who was not involved in the conversation. Both had complained of the third colleague's bad odor. Although the insinuation was expressed in a joke, the speaker and the hearer hoped that the third person could get their point.

In the utterance above, the form '*mboten*' in '*Mboten.....mboten. Wah ngisinini. Wong ganthenge koyo ngene je!*' or 'No.....no way. That would be embarrassing. A handsome man like me smells bad? No way,' conveys the meaning of strong negation. The repetition of the form '*mboten*' in the excerpt shows that the negation is very strong.

Thus, in the above excerpt, the use of '*mboten-mboten*' really serves to negate the previous statement, namely '*Penjenengan lali rung adus ya hahahaha.....kok srang-sreng ambune,*' or 'Did you forget to take a bath? hahahah.....I can smell your bad odor coming and going.' It is clear, therefore, that the form '*mboten-mboten*' in the beginning of the sentence is the negation of the previous statement (Yu, 2011; Irawanto et al., 2011). The meaning of the affirmation of the negation can also be examined in the following excerpt:

#### **Excerpt of Utterance 5:**

S: *Nyuwun sewu Kangmas, kula badhe ngresahi.*

P: *Ono opo tho Dik, kok njanur gunung, tumben banget?*

S: *Njih niki, nyuwun ngapunten njig sak derenge. Saestu badhe ngresahi. Nyusun sambetan.*

P: *Sambetan piro? Aku yo lagi wae ragat mbakyumu neng rumah sakit je.*

S: *Sambetan 15 juta kemawon Mas. Tahun ngajeng kula wangsulke.*

P: ***Wah.....mboten saged. Nyuwun ngapunten....jan mboten saged. Mboten wonten Dik.***

S. *Saestu Kamas.*

S: Excuse me, big brother. I'd like to ask you for a favor.

P: What is it, little brother? It's unusual for you to come and visit.

S: Well, yes. I'm sorry. I'd like to apologize in advance. I really want to ask for a favor. I was wondering if you could loan me some money.

P: Loan? How much? Don't you know that I also need money? My wife is hospitalized.

S: I'd like to borrow fifteen million rupiahs. I promise to pay back next year.

P: **No.....No way. I'm sorry....I really can't help you. I don't have that much money.**

S. Really?

Context:

The interlocutors in this conversation are actually brothers. They are siblings. The speaker wants to borrow fifteen million rupiahs from the hearer, but the hearer refused because an urgent situation forced him to refuse. The rejection caused the brothers to have an awkward situation.

Context:

The conversation took place in the secretariat of the study program. The employee joked with the other employee of a particularly bad smell. Actually, the intention of their conversation is to insinuate the third person who was not involved in the conversation. Both had complained of the third colleague's bad odor. Although the insinuation was expressed in a joke, the speaker and the hearer hoped that the third person could get their point.

In the above utterance, the form '*mboten*' to negate appears three times, namely in '*Wah.....mboten saged. Nyuwun ngapunten....jan mboten saged. Mboten wonten Dik,*' or 'No.....No way. I'm sorry....I really can't help you. I don't have that much money.' The repetition carries the meaning of negation which is strongly expressed (Coupland et al., 1992). It means that the person strongly rejects or negates the previous statement.

The negation is actually the rejection towards the speaker's intention to borrow money from the hearer as shown in the following statement: '*Sambetan 15 juta kemawon Mas. Tahun ngajeng kula wangsulke,*' or 'I'd like to borrow fifteen million rupiahs. I promise to pay back next year.' Even though the speaker promised to pay back the loan the following year, the hearer still refused him because he had a more urgent situation.

### ***The Extralinguistic Context to Affirm the Phatic Function***

The phatic function is stated in the Javanese negative utterance, namely '*mboten*', as in the following excerpt: '***Mboten napa-napa tho niki mboten lulus?***' or 'Is it alright not to let him pass the test?' The word '*mboten*' in the utterance is intended to affirm the phatic function, or to establish social relation, by pretending to ask whether it was alright to fail a student under the supervision of a certain lecturer in a thesis defense.

The use of the word '*mboten*' in the utterance is expressed twice. It means that the negation is expressed strongly as shown in the repetition. The two '*mboten*' in the utterance does not obviously show the meaning of negation. The second utterance, '***Mboten! Kula ya nilaine mepet kok. Wong ra iso njawab kabeh kok,***' or '**No!** I also gave him barely minimum scores. Obviously he could not answer the whole questions,' has two pragmatic meanings. The first '*mboten*' refers to 'I do not really mind', while the second '*mboten*' means 'I mind.'

The role of context accommodating the utterance is very important. The relation between the speaker and the hearer is also important to interpret the right pragmatic meaning of the word '*mboten*' as shown in the above excerpt. Therefore, it can be confirmed that the extralinguistic contexts have a significant role in determining the meaning of an utterance (Recanati, 2008; Yang et al.,

2011). The following excerpt contains utterances to be examined in detail in order to grasp the meaning of the Javanese phatic 'mboten'.

**Excerpt of Utterance 6:**

**S:** *Mboten napa-napa tho niki mboten lulus?*

**P:** *Mboten! Kula ya nilaine mepet kok. Wong ra iso njawab kabeh kok.*

**S:** *Kula ra penak karo penjenengan je. Pembinge profesor kok ra lulus.*

**P:** *Rasah ngono. Nggo kepenak wae rasah neka-neka. Ra lulus yo ra lulus!*

**S:** **Is it alright not to let him pass the test?**

**P:** **No!** I also gave him barely minimum scores. Obviously he could not answer the whole questions.

**S:** I feel uncomfortable. He is supervised by a professor. It's not right that he fails after all you have done.

**P:** You don't have to feel that way. Make it simple. He fails. That's all there is to it.

**Context:**

The speaker and the hearer are examiners of a final examination in a particular university. The speaker felt uncomfortable because he had to fail a student who was supervised by the hearer because the student did poorly in the test. The hearer who was more senior than the speaker convinced the speaker that his student should not pass the test.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the extralinguistic contexts play a significant role in determining the speaker's intent in an utterance. From the analyzed data, there are five roles of the extralinguistic contexts to determine the pragmatic meaning of the Javanese phatic 'mboten'. The five roles are presented as follows: (1) The extralinguistic contexts affirm the negative intent; (2) The extralinguistic context serves as the background of the negation; (3) the extralinguistic context confirms the negative intent; (4) the extralinguistic context affirms the negative intent; (5) the extralinguistic context affirms the phatic function. The research result is beneficial and will contribute to the development of linguistics, especially pragmatics embedded in the culture-specific forms. The research had a few limitations in terms of determining the locational data source. The Javanese speech community in Indonesia is spread in all corners of the archipelago and not limited to those residing in the Java Island. Further research is expected to reach the wider scope. With the breadth of the scope of the research area, it is expected that the results of these studies will better illustrate more tangible forms of language.

**References**

- Allan, K. (2007). The pragmatics of connotation. *Journal of Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.08.004>
- Anderson, B. (1972). The Idea of Power in Javanese Culture. *Culture and Politics in Indonesia*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>

- Blackledge, A., & Pavlenko, A. (2001). Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. *International Journal of Bilingualism*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069010050030101>
- Chen, J. (2017). Research Trends in Intercultural Pragmatics. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2016.1204903>
- Chen, R., & Yang, D. (2010). Responding to compliments in Chinese: Has it changed? *Journal of Pragmatics*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.12.006>
- Clyne, M. (2006). Some thoughts on pragmatics, sociolinguistic variation, and intercultural communication. *Intercultural Pragmatics*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/IP.2006.005>
- Coupland, J., Coupland, N., & Robinson, J. D. (1992). "How are you?": Negotiating phatic communion. *Language in Society*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500015268>
- Culpeper, J. (2010). Historical sociopragmatics. In *Historical Pragmatics*.
- Dippold, D. (2012). Pragmatics for Language Educators. *Journal of Pragmatics*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.01.011>
- Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00374.x>
- Gretsch, C. (2009). Pragmatics and integrational linguistics. *Language and Communication*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2009.02.010>
- Gu, Y. (1998). Doing pragmatics. *Journal of Pragmatics*.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(97\)82074-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(97)82074-7)
- Gumperz, J. J. (2008). Interactional Sociolinguistics: A Personal Perspective. In *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470753460.ch12>
- Hassall, T. (2012). Sociopragmatics is slower: A reply to Chang. *Language Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2011.12.001>
- Irawanto, D. W., Ramsey, P. L., & Ryan, J. C. (2011). Challenge of leading in Javanese culture. *Asian Ethnicity*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14631369.2011.571829>
- Izadi, A. (2016). Over-politeness in Persian professional interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.06.004>
- Kulkarni, D. (2014). Exploring Jakobson's "phatic function" in instant messaging interactions. *Discourse and Communication*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481313507150>
- Lee, B. P. H. (2001). Mutual knowledge, background knowledge and shared beliefs: Their roles in establishing common ground. *Journal of Pragmatics*.  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00128-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00128-9)
- Leech, G. (2007). Politeness: Is there an East-West divide? *Journal of Politeness Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/PR.2007.009>
- Limberg, H. (2009). Impoliteness and threat responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.02.003>
- Mahsun, M. (2005). Metode Penelitian Bahasa. *Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada*. <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2008.17.1991>
- Mey, J. L. (2006). Focus-on issue: Intercultural pragmatics and sociolinguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.07.002>
- Mey, J. L. (2017). The pragmatics of metaphor: An ecological view. In *The*

- Routledge Handbook of Ecolinguistics.*  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315687391>
- Mey, J. L. L., Brown, K., & Mey, J. L. L. (2006). Pragmatics: Overview. In *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1338>
- Norrick, N. R. (2009). Interjections as pragmatic markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.08.005>
- Onwuegbuzie, A., & Leech, N. (2005). On becoming a pragmatic researcher: The importance of combining quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Theory and Practice*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570500402447>
- Rahardi, R. K. (2016). Personal and Communal Assumptions to Determine Pragmatic Meanings of Phatic Functions. *Lingua Cultura*, 10(10(2)), 95–98.  
<https://doi.org/doi.org/10.21512/lc.v10i2.897>
- Rahardi, R. K. (2017a). Kefatisan Berbahasa: Kajian pragmatik tutursapa keseharian warga masyarakat. In *KOLITA 15* (pp. 7–11). Jakarta: Atmajaya Catholic University.
- Rahardi, R. K. (2017b). Linguistic Impoliteness in The Sociopragmatic Perspective. *Jurnal Humaniora*. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.v29i3.24954>
- Rahardi, R. K. (2017c). Pragmatic Phenomena Constellation in Specific Culture Dimension Language Study. *International Journal of Humanity Studies*, 1(1), 84–92. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.24071/ijhs.2017.010109>
- Rahardi, R. K. (2018a). Elemen dan Fungsi Konteks Sosial, Sosietal, dan Situasional dalam Menentukan Makna Pragmatik Kefatisan Berbahasa. In *Prosiding Seminar Tahunan Linguistik Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia (SETALI 2018)* (pp. 654–658). Bandung: Sekolah Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Bandung.
- Rahardi, R. K. (2018b). Konstelasi Kefatisan dalam Teks-teks Natural Religius dengan Latar Belakang Kultur Spesifik. In *Prosiding Kongres Internasional Masyarakat Linguistik Indonesia 2018* (pp. 274–279). Manokwari, Papua Barat: MLI.
- Recanati, F. (2008). Pragmatics and Semantics. In *The Handbook of Pragmatics*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756959.ch20>
- Robbins, J. (2008). Introduction: Cultural and Linguistic Anthropology and the Opacity of Other Minds. *Anthropological Quarterly*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1353/anq.0.0005>
- Science, L., Company, P., Long, M. H., Canagarajah, S., Peterson, R. A., Nagel, J., ... Backus, A. (2017). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method. *Journal of Pragmatics*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(88\)90022-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(88)90022-X)
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural Communication. A discourse Approach. SocioLinguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1128/EC.00123-08>
- Senft, G. (2014). *Understanding pragmatics. Understanding Pragmatics*.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203776476>
- Spencer-Oatey, H., & Jiang, W. (2003). Explaining cross-cultural pragmatic findings: Moving from politeness maxims to sociopragmatic interactional principles (SIPs). *Journal of Pragmatics*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(03\)00025-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(03)00025-0)

- Streeck, J. (1984). Embodied contexts, transcontextuals, and the timing of speech acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(84\)90067-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(84)90067-5)
- Subandi, M. A. (2011). Family Expressed Emotion in a Javanese Cultural Context. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11013-011-9220-4>
- Sudaryanto. (2016). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa* (1st ed.). Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Sukarno, S. (2015). POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN RESPONDING TO COMPLIMENTS IN JAVANESE. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v4i2.686>
- Travis, C. E. (2004). The ethnopragmatics of the diminutive in conversational Colombian Spanish. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X10000136>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). Context and cognition: Knowledge frames and speech act comprehension. *Journal of Pragmatics*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(77\)90035-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(77)90035-2)
- Verschueren, J. (1997). Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. *Pragmatics*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(97\)84203-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(97)84203-8)
- Waugh, L. R., Catalano, T., Al Masaeed, K., Do, T. H., & Renigar, P. G. (2016). Critical discourse analysis: Definition, approaches, relation to pragmatics, critique, and trends. In *Perspectives in Pragmatics, Philosophy and Psychology*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12616-6\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12616-6_4)
- Yang, Z., Cai, K., Tang, J., Zhang, L., Su, Z., & Li, J. (2011). Social context summarization. In *Proceedings of the 34th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in Information - SIGIR '11*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2009916.2009954>
- Yu, K. A. (2011). Culture-specific concepts of politeness: Indirectness and politeness in English, Hebrew, and Korean requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/IPRG.2011.018>
- Yusuf, M., Adams, C., & Dingley, K. (2014). Research philosophy and methodologies of e-Government: Update From ECEG and ICEG. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on e-Government, ECEG*.