

**METAPRAGMATIC FUNCTION OF SPEECH ACTS IN INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURSE: A CASE STUDY OF DISCUSSION INDONESIA LAWYERS CLUB**

**Malikatul Laila<sup>1</sup>; D. Edi Subroto<sup>2</sup>; Sri Samiati Tarjana<sup>3</sup>; Sumarlam<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Doctoral Student of Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta, Indonesia

<sup>2,3,4</sup>Professor in Linguistics at Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta, Indonesia  
malikatullaila@ums.ac.id

**ABSTRACT**

An institutional discourse seems intrincating and less interesting to study if viewed and compared from the ordinary social conversations. The present study aims to examine metapragmatic functions as the inherent properties within the use of speech acts in *Indonesia Lawyers Club* which support to characterising the institutional discourse. The data are utterances in an 'exchange' of the discussion *Indonesia Lawyers Club* which are gathered by using purposive sampling, while the analysis operates the *mean-and-end* technique which is supported by felicity conditions. The result shows that moderator's power, intonation, metapragmatic description (performative verbs), discourse markers (non verbal gaze, pointing, gesture), evidentials, and metasequential awareness are attached to serve the speech acts in the discussion *Indonesia Lawyers Club*.

**Key words:** institutional discourse, exchange, ILC, *mean-and-end*, evidentials.

**A. Introduction**

Any utterances might be differently interpreted; it depends on the goal or intention of the speaker to whom the addressee is required in the interaction. The meaning of utterances presented to hearers is sometimes understood not only from the speaker's stated expression but also from the hearers' inference due to the close relationship between the speaker and the addressee in an interaction. The interaction which occur by referring to verbal exchanges between two or more people where at least one speaker is a representative of a work-related institution and where the interaction and the speakers' goals are partially determined by the institution in play is so called an institutional discourse. A set of interactive properties are tacit characteristically used in the institutional discourse such as in the ILC discussion.

The ILC discussion shows an interaction between mainly a moderator and the participants of discussion in which mostly include lawyers, executives, state officials, legal representatives, experts, fictims, and tertiary students. Within the formal situation such as in the ILC discussion, the moderator's ways of speaking have sometimes been importantly interpreted as clues to lead the addressee reveal much information more than expected. The use of language in various ways which is influenced by the relation between the speaker and the addressees as in this occasion is studied under the sociopragmatics.

This paper intends to present the moderator's ways of speaking including interactive properties which are intended to get more response from his addressee and to identify the intention in attaching the inherent properties which all of these will be identified as his metapragmatic function in directing to the whole participants of the ILC discussion.

**B. Metapragmatic Function**

The term "metapragmatic function" and "metapragmatic awareness" are closely related. When any items or properties in language use will have its reflect in pragmatic awareness, this awareness of pragmatic effect is called metapragmatic function. To identify further about the pragmatic function, first we need to know the category of metapragmatic awareness. As stated by Grundy (2008:157-159), there are nine categories to refer to metapragmatic awareness, which he refers to 'weird' terms: (1) metapragmatic description, it is a category which includes both performative verbs and speech act description; (2) self-referential expressions such as *this argument, my talk, and these perspectives*; (3) discourse markers or pragmatic particles such as

anyway, *undoubtedly*, and *you know*; (4) sentence adverbs such as *frankly*, *regretably*, and *obviously*. These sentence adverbs has a higher level function, and indicate propositional attitude; (5) hedges, such as *sort of*, *in a sense*, and *so far as I know*; (6) explicit intertextual links such as *namely*, *for example*, *similarly*, and another kind of intertextual awareness which is called by Schiffrin (1987) as ‘metalinguistic referent’ such as “*the former*, *the latter*, and *the next point*”; (7) quoted and reported speech; (8) mention, an occurrence of an item with overt metalinguistic marking. In written language, this category of metalinguistic awareness is marked by quotation marks; (9) evidentials, which mark the source/reliability of an utterance make overt reference to the evidentiality of what is stated, for example the use of the words “*I suppose*, *(so far as) I recall*, *what I remember*”; and (10) contextualization cues, including control items such as *right*, *okay*, *so*, *etc.* and other overt indications of awareness of the effect of talk such as *oh*, *sorry* (= *I didn’t expect you to say that*), etc.

The metapragmatic functions as in the discussion ILC can be seen as in the following utterances within ILC discussion.

1. Moderator’s power as in:

- (a) *Bisa anda ulang lagi?* ((The moderator walked closely to (Political Expert, Hantha Yuda) and asked him to repeat the clarification)).
- (b) *Ya tapi seluruh uraian anda ini kacamatanya hitam, artinya negatif.*
- (c) *Bagaimana kalau kita positifkan, Anas benar-benar yakin dirinya tidak bersalah. Makanya dia berani menantang publik dengan mengatakan “saya siap digantung”. Orang yang yakin dirinya benar-benar bersih juga akan mengatakan hal itu.* (a,b,c are taken from Data: ASDM/13Mar12)

As in (a) implicitly the moderator has a power to hold the discussion until the expected response is sufficiently obtained from the addressee. That’s why he asks the addressee to repeat the answer, while in (b) the moderator has power to claim the addressee’s clarification; using verdictive speech act he makes judgement of value to the addressee, and as in (c) this is done by directing to inferring the negative addressee’s ideas in which such an answer is really not expected in the discussion. So utterances (a), (b), and (c) function to show the moderator’s power to offer the revision of the addressee’s statement.

2. Metapragmatic description as in:

- (a) *Saya ingin mengingatkan seorang negarawan dan politikus Yunani pada abad Yunani kuno pada tahun 495 sampai 492 BC.*
- (b) *Saya mau bertanya ke pak Hantha Yudha dulu ((“gak selesai jawabnya” kata salah satu peserta & ketawa)). ((sambil berjalan menuju Hantha Yudha)) saya tertarik dengan analisa anda atas pernyataannya Anas tadi di Kabar Petang kemarin.*

The use of performative verbs overtly as in (a) “*mengingat*” and covertly as in (b) above function differently. The first functions to lead the audience think together or to remind an event as for getting the first impression from the audience; while the latter, not spoken (*bertanya*) functions to cut the previous response from one addressee and now to continue to the current addressee being spoken. The quick and abrupt change of addressing which is usually accompanied by mentioning the name shows that the moderator has close relation to the addressee.

3. Moderator’s signalling to the addressee as discourse markers as in:

- (a) *Baik, sekarang saya ke pengacaranya Nazarudin ((sambil menunjuk ke Junimart, sedangkan peserta bicara sendiri)).*
- (b) *Pemirsa, sebenarnya tujuan saya mengadakan acara ini adalah silaturahmi antara korban dan keluarga pelaku. ... Sekarang saya panggilkan keluarga terdakwa dan saya berharap pintu maaf dari bapak-bapak dan ibu dibukakan dan semoga Allah yang membalasnya ((menunggu kehadiran keluarga pelaku)).*
- (c) *... Inilah keluarga Apriyani ((keluarga Apriyani bersalaman dengan keluarga korban, peserta tepuk tangan)).*

The underlined words (a), (b), and (c) are metapragmatic awareness which respectively use his finger to point the addressee, stare his eyes to call the man spoken to come up,

and feel cheerful to expect the men mentioned be glad. The functions respectively are to ask the addressee (Nazaruddin's Lawyer, Junimart) to clarify the fact of the case and give quick response, to enhance the coming up of the man spoken, and to lead them be wisely familiar.

4. Rising intonation as in:

(a) *Kenapa?*

A short utterance of question in higher intonation is to show moderator's search of reason from the clarification of the addressee's statement.

(b) *Supaya ada buktinya ada pertemuan tadi, dan memang saya bertemu dengan Nazarudin. Cuma saya tidak akan memberikan opini saya.*

The speaker (Nazarudin's Law Consultant, OC Kaligis) raised the intonation on the underlined words tidak akan to show his stressing opinion not to do giving opinion.

5. Evidentials as in:

(a) *Saya pikir entah nama singkat apa tidak semua orang sudah tahu itu, buat apa itu.*

(b) *"Saya kira 'tepek tangan' untuk Jawa Timur ((Audien tepuk tangan))"*

(c) *Ia ketawa-ketawa tapi dia sendiri tidak mengerti apa itu artinya pontispilatus ((peserta ketawa)). Saya kuatir setelah dia pulang, gaya solo dia tahu pontispilatus, baru dia nangis, nah gitu.*

The examples (a), (b), and (c) show that the ideas as in moderator's utterances as far as he knows are to be the truth. These kinds of evidentials function to show the moderator's firmly reliable information about the fact.

6. Metasequential awareness as explicit intertextual link as in:

(a) *Apakah dengan mengatakan kepada kalian yang saya tadi maksudkan, lalu saya harus menjadi musuh kalian.*

(b) *Apakah dengan mengatakan kepada kalian yang saya tadi maksudkan, lalu saya harus menjadi musuh kalian.*

The underlined words above are identified as metapragmatic awareness in the forms of explicit intertextual link which function to relate the previous utterances showing another case and the present utterances.

7. Mention as in:

*Ya kalau waktu itu dikatakan apel Malang, apel wasito mestinya kan penyidik tanya. Apa yang kau maksud dengan ini, apa yang kau maksud dengan nama "AU", kenapa tadi you sebut mas Anas, ini semua BAP-nya ada.*

The mentioned word marked by quotation "AU" indicating Anas Urbaningrum functions more than mentioning a name, but it implicitly means that AU also belongs to a man who is suspected to do corruption, a case related to Nazaruddin.

### C. Conclusion

From the examples of the use of metapragmatic awareness above, I can conclude that the speech acts used by the moderator in the discussion ILC have shown various metapragmatic functions. Those metapragmatic functions have supported to determine the intention of the moderator in delivering the utterances to get more information within the discussion ILC. In the discussion ILC, the emphasis is on getting the more and reliable information about the case being discussed so that the role of moderator is challenged to vary the strategy of getting the information.

### References

- Archer, Dawn, Karin Aijmer, and Anne Wichmann. 2012. *Pragmatics: An Advanced Resource Book for Students*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bublitz, Wolfram dan Norrick, R. Neal. 2011. *Foundations of Pragmatics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.
- Freed, F Alice. 2015. *Institutional Discourse*. The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All rights reserved. Published Online: 27 APR 2015. DOI: 10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi151

- Grundy, Peter. 2008. *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Hodder Education and Hachette UK Company.
- Haugh, Michael. 2009. "Intention(ality) and the Conceptualization of Communication in Pragmatics". *Australian Journal of Linguistics*. <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713404403>. (10 Juni 2009).
- Haugh, Michael. 2013. "Speaker Meaning and Accountability in Interaction". *Journal of Pragmatics* 48 (2013) 41-56 [www.elsevier.com/locate/pragma](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/pragma).
- Kasper, Gabriele. 2004. *Speech Acts in Interaction: Towards Discursive Pragmatics*. University of Hawai'i, Mānoa <http://www.hawaii.edu/sls/sls/wp-content/uploads/Speechacts.pdf>
- Kreidler, W. Charles. 1998. *Introducing English Semantics*. London: Routledge.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *The Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Sinaga, Mangatur, dkk. 2013. "Tindak Tutur dalam Dialog Indonesia Lawyers Club". *Jurnal Bahasa*, Volume 8, Nomor, 1, April 2013. [http://ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JB\\_view/1314](http://ejournal.unri.ac.id/index.php/JB_view/1314).
- Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.