

Reflections in Cartoon Animation: A Discourse Analysis Approach

Nur Hidayu Jaafar*, Sharifah Azizah S. Sahil

Centre for General Studies, Sultan Abdul Halim Mu'adzam Shah International Islamic University, Kampus Kuala Ketil, 09300 Kuala Ketil, Kedah Darul Aman, Malaysia.

Abstract

Recent development in multimedia technology has seen its relevance to children's language development. Despite numerous advantages technology has to offer, parents hold mixed opinions in allowing young children to be exposed to multimedia resources. As such, the main objectives of the study are twofold: (1) to identify children's reflections on utterances via 'Upin and Ipin' animation film and (2) to analyse the children's utterances in post viewing sessions based on their reflections of the multimedia animation tool. The study employed Brown and Yule's Discourse Analysis framework as the underpinning theory. Subjects comprised twenty one nine-year-old children from one suburban area in one state in Malaysia. The methods used were observations and interviews while Upin and Ipin animation was utilised as the study instrument. The interactions among the subjects were recorded and documented in written transcriptions. Subjects were asked to view the animation film after which they were grouped into four focus groups and reflected upon the animation. Despite the children's limited communicative skills and given the right stimulus, subjects were observed to have adequate self-confidence while producing each of their respective utterances and managed to reduce shyness and low self-esteem in speaking during post viewing sessions. The employment of animation has shown that animation viewing has its place in training children to communicate confidently and systematically. This was evident as the subjects' utterances contained diversity in meaning, and they were also able to discuss their opinions, present information, retell the story and recall their memories based on what they viewed as well as their life experience. In short, it can be concluded that the children's utterances follow specific principles in utterances as proposed by Brown and Yule.

© 2018 Penerbit Universiti Malaysia Pahang

Keywords: Cartoon animation; Children; Communication skills; Discourse analysis; Utterances

INTRODUCTION

One of the elements that govern our lives today is technology since human beings use technology in a number of aspects in their lives. The rapid development in technology has seen almost all children today are familiar with multimedia tools on TV, internet, and games - among others. At the same time, there is growing concern that children's language abilities at entry point to schools have declined (National Literacy Trust and National Association of Head Teachers, 2001). This is matched by the uncertainty among parents that there may be negative effects of increased exposure to TV and other medium among children (British Broadcasting Company News, 2003). On the contrary, presenting ideas in visual forms has been shown to be particularly important as it helps young children to improve visual communication (Bliss, Ogborn & Whitelock, 1989).

* Corresponding author: Tel.: +60134792010; +60134469938.

E-mail addresses: nurhidayu@unishams.edu.my [Jaafar, N.H.]; drsharifah@unishams.edu.my [Sahil, S.A.S.].

Subsequently, cartoons in the form of animations have been used in classrooms effectively for both children and adolescents (Ball, 1982; Sou, Wang & Tzeng, 2006). While presenting the subjects in the cartoons using simple lines, cartoons offer a combination of humour, exaggeration and symbols. Cartoons are also said to provide information via symbols efficaciously (Ball, 1982; Dalacosta, Kamariotaki-Paparrigopoulou, Palyvos & Spyrellis, 2009). According to Kania Anjani (2011), the development of animation is fast developing in any discipline, particularly in educational contexts. Perzlyo (1993) for instance, asserted that the use of multimedia in learning enhances both learning and the delivery of information significantly. Normaliza Abdul Rahim (2012) echoed these findings when she discovered that Korean students managed to improve their confidence level in speech communication after viewing a few cartoon series in Malay language. Furthermore, the use of technology in the forms of graphic and video could also facilitate a complicated process in communication (Khine & Fisher, 2003).

All the scenarios painted above necessitate understanding the implications of technology for language development in young children in this fast changing technological environment which influence home practices. Therefore, it is the interest of the authors to examine how language discourse especially spoken discourse works in tandem with technological development (specifically animation) resulting in its relevance especially to young learners. Specifically, the following research objectives are addressed:

- 1) To identify the reflections on utterances through Upin and Ipin animation.
- 2) To analyse the children's utterances (based on their reflections through Upin and Ipin animation) using Brown and Yule's (1983) discourse analysis framework.
- 3) To determine if the children's utterances contained diversity in meaning.
- 4) To examine the children's reactions after having exposed to the animation as a learning tool.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Utterances

A study on speech utterances by Zaitul Azma Zainon Hamzah (2002) utilised a combination of Relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986, 1987) and Schlobinski's (1996) speech analysis framework in describing interference in speech turn taking amongst Malay children. She concluded that children triggered intended disturbance so as to convey and add information as well as to seek turn to speak. Additionally, according to the study, interference happens as a way to display objection or spark conflict. The study also suggested that children apply disturbance strategy by interrupting when others are giving verbal opinions. From a positive point of view, speech disturbance is a way to ensure children focus on others during group interaction. Evidently, such a strategy is able to expedite communication process among children.

Relevance theory was also incorporated by Mustafa Atan (2010) when analysing the implicature in film characters. He examined the use of implicature in films by identifying the functions of implicature in delivering message about Malay culture. Findings revealed that utterances analysed contained semantically implicit meaning.

2.2 Animations

Siti Muslihah Isnain and Normaliza Abd Rahim (2012) looked into styles in utterances produced by children using multimedia as a medium. Multimedia was used as a tool in producing children's utterances during conversations. In the study, the children's conversations were recorded and subsequently Tannen's (1979) conversational style framework was used to analyse the data collected. The study concluded that given the right stimulus, children are able to produce conversational styles besides creating communication space for them. Incorporating Brown and Yule's (1983) DA Theory, Nurfarhana Shahira Rosly, Normaliza Abd Rahman, and Hazlina Abdul Halim (2016) concluded that children in their study became more focused on learning and were more active when exposed to digitalised storytelling elements. Their study examined three primary school children's utterances in relation to digital elements and

storytelling. Notwithstanding, the aforementioned studies are closely linked to Normaliza Abd Rahim, Roslina Mamat, Hazlina Ab Halim, Arbaie Sujud and Nur Alia Roslan's (2013) work which further pointed to fact that children are able to provide positive feedbacks when involved in activities related to online anime.

2.3 Discourse Analysis

Much had been said about Discourse Analysis (DA) but the present review focuses on recent literature that utilized DA within the Malay language. Normaliza, Hazlina dan Roslina (2014) used Brown and Yule's (1983) Discourse Analysis theory to discuss and identify the moral values in Malay cartoons and subsequently found that subjects were able to recognize the cartoon characters understudied and discuss the moral values contained in the cartoon. Nurfarhana Shahira et al. (2016) used the same theory to discuss children's utterances interaction through story-telling and digitalization elements within digitalized cartoon story. Children in their study are said to have been stimulated by exhibiting happy and active moods in addition to producing utterances relevant to the context of the study.

According to Brown and Yule (1983), the analysis of discourse, is necessarily, the analysis of language use. As a result, it may not be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purpose or functions which these forms are designed to serve in human affairs. If a linguist focuses on determining the normal nature of a language, discourse analysts will examine the function of the language used. Brown and Yule (1983) contended that discourse exists in various forms such as written and non-verbal. Therefore, research on DA have concentrated on speech which appear when it is deemed appropriate and necessary. Within DA approach, the use of language in context by the speaker, and the potential relationship between the speaker and the utterance is more emphasised as opposed to the relations of one sentence to another.

There are four elements discussed in Brown and Yule's (1983) DA namely: reference, implicature, presupposition, and inference. In order to explicate 'reference', Lyons (1968: 404) maintained that reference refers to "the relationship which holds between words and things". Lyons (1977) further added that it is the speaker who refers (by using some appropriate expression): he invests the expression with reference by the act of referring". In short, reference is being treated in DA as an action on the part of the speaker or writer. On the other hand, the notion 'presupposition' is a pragmatic one. It is the assumptions the speaker makes about what the hearer is likely to accept without challenge (Givon, 1979). Grice (1975) referred to implicature to account for what a speaker implies, suggests or means as distinct to what the speaker literally says, while inference exists when the hearer has no access to the speaker's intended meaning to the extent the speaker has to make his own assumptions or inference in order to arrive at the interpretation. Hence, within the context of the present study, DA is felt to be relevant to be used as the underpinning theory.

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Sampling

The main aim of the study was to examine children's utterances based on their interaction after being exposed to an animation film. The present study is a qualitative one utilising observation technique by analysing children's utterances based on Malaysian popular animation character Upin and Ipin. A total of 21 school children aged nine years were chosen as the subjects of this study. They came from an average socio demographic background where initial survey, prior to the real study, showed that they were quite reluctant to speak due to their limited socialization skills and shyness. The subjects were sampled from one school in a suburban area in one of the central states in Malaysia. Nine year-olds were chosen because children from this age group are thought to have reached concrete operation which justify analysing their thinking abilities (Erikson, 1963). Quota sampling was applied whereby the researcher decided on the subjects' selection based on certain characteristics and needs (Sugiyono, 2011), in this case, age and

gender. These children were then divided into four groups consisting of 5 to 6 people per group.

3.2 Instrumentation

The instrument used in this study was the Malaysian animation DVD film Upin and Ipin entitled *Geng Pengembaraan Bermula* (The Beginning of Hiking Gang). This animation film was chosen because it has sparked phenomena in the local animation industry and had successfully raised RM6.3 million in proceeds from cinema (Maimunah Alias, 2009). Being the first animation to be shown in cinema, the characters Upin and Ipin were also selected by UNICEF as ambassadors for the Children United Nation Society funds (Rohaniza Idris, 2013). It was the intention of the researchers to encourage and elicit the children into forming more utterances via interview questions. Selected scenes from the animations were selected at random. Specifically, the scenes which had been utilized in this paper are scenes 6, 14 and 18.

3.3 Research Instruments and Procedures

Two research instruments were used: semi structured interview questions and observation. A self-developed semi structured interview questions were constructed to elicit the children to participate in each of the three interview sessions. To address the validity issue on interview questions, steps were taken that the questions posed are short, easily understood, and relevant to the situations. Prior to that, prospective questions were checked by two experts in the field to ensure the consistency of the questions asked. Observations were conducted during viewing sessions in order to examine the children's socialisation and as interaction well as how certain words are produced while the interview questions were posed to preselected focus groups. All interviews and interactions of the subjects (done in Malay language) were recorded and the conversations were transcribed for further analysis.

3.4 Analysis

Following Brown and Yule's (1983) Discourse Analysis (DA), in depth analysis was further implemented on the data collected. Within approach DA, the use of language in context by the speaker, and the potential relationship between the speaker and the utterance is more emphasised as opposed to the relations of one sentence to another. There are four elements discussed in Brown and Yule's (1983) DA namely: reference, implicature, presupposition, and inference.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Discourse analysis (DA) theory was the underpinning theory embraced. Evidently, subjects were seen to communicate with one another and showed high confidence in communicating their opinions. The utterances produced were dependent upon what they viewed as well as their past life experiences. As previously discussed, Brown and Yule (1983) outlined four principles in analysing a discourse. The following are brief excerpts from children's utterances based on the film animation Upin and Ipin. For the purpose of discussion, only selected examples from the data collected (done via random selection) from each element are discussed below.

4.1 The Element of Presupposition

Presupposition plays an important role in DA. In the reflection, presupposition existed within the speakers and was also based on "common ground" owned by the speakers. According to Stalnaker, presuppositions are what are taken by the speaker to be the *common ground* of the participants in the conversation (Stalnaker, 1978). This is further echoed through what Givon (1979: 50) referred to as "... the assumptions the speaker makes about what the hearer is likely to accept without challenge".

Brown and Yule (1983) reiterated that DA should make use of pragmatic approach in language

learning studies. This has been promptly supported by Givon (1979). The present study, thus, uncovered the speaker’s intended meaning in utterances besides examining the element presupposition within the children’s utterances. In the utterances below, subject S2 said that Tok Dalang is also the grandfather of Upin and Ipin (*Upin dan Ipin punya atok tu*). S2 added that both “Opah and Tok Dalang are siblings” (*Opah dengan Tok Dalang tu adik beradik*). Here, it can thus be implied that S2 understood the story line very well since he knew the relationship between the two cartoon characters. In addition, S2 could have been a fan of the characters Tok Dalang and Opah. Subject S5 also nodded showing that she understood the relationship by saying “no wonder... they are close” (*Patut la...rapat*). She also displayed her reaction that she understood why Tok Dalang and Opah has a close relationship in the story.

Delving further into each of the utterances below, it is clearly seen that S2 was suggesting that the two characters, Tok Dalang and Opah, are siblings through her utterance “Tok Dalang is the brother, opah is the sister” (*Tok Dalang abang. Opah adik*). This can be regarded as presupposition while S5 has well accepted the presupposition through her utterance “No wonder they are close (*Patut la...rapat*). As such, S2 made a presupposition because she was assuming that S5 could accept the context of the relationship of the two cartoon characters without any objection or further explanation. This was in line with Brown and Yule (1983) who asserted that presuppositions originate from phrase and proposition. Filmore and Langendoen (1971) was also in agreement that presupposition plays an important role in a discourse while Rani et al. (2004) also approved that conversations make use of both implicit and explicit communication.

The transcription in Table 1 presents the children’s utterances during their post-viewing conversation taken from Scene 18.

Table 1. Presuppositions S2 and S5 based on Conversation from Scene 18.

Script	Character
Alang, did you see my grandsons, Ros and her brothers? They have not come back since this afternoon. (<i>Alang, kau ada nampak cucu-cucu aku, Ros dan adik-adiknya? Tak balik balik dari siang tadi.</i>)	Opah (<i>Grandmother</i>)
Like this ... after the maghrib prayer, We will gather here... and we shall go to the orchard to find them, ok... (<i>Beginilah lepas maghrib nanti kita kumpul. Di sini, kita pergi dusun cari mereka, ya?</i>)	Tok Dalang (<i>Village mastermind</i>)
Utterances by the subjects	Subject
That’s Upin and Ipin’s grandfather (<i>Upin, Ipin punya atok tu</i>).	S2
Opah and Tok Dalang are siblings (<i>Opah dengan Tok Dalang tu adik beradik</i>)	S2
Tok Dalang is the brother, opah is the sister (<i>Tok Dalang abang, opah adik</i>)	S2
No wonder they are ... close (<i>Patut la... rapat</i>)	S5

In Table 2, subject S3 (male) said, “Just like my aunt” (*Macam mak sedara saya*). In this case, S3 was implying that Ros (the character in Upin and Ipin) is as fierce as his aunt. At the same time, S5 uttered, “More like Miss Ardayu right.” (Referring to the teacher). When Miss Ardayu is angry, she is like a lion... haha. She is the one who said when you are angry, you are a lion”. What S5 was implying is that similar to a lion, Miss Ardayu (the teacher) is also fierce and full of anger. Being fierce is synonymous to a lion since lions belong to a group of fierce animals. And this fact is endorsed by Miss

Ardayu herself because her anger is synonymous to a lion’s fierceness. In short, both S3 and S5 equated fierceness and lions in their reflections.

Further to this, an example pointing to the fact that accurate presuppositions will increase the communicative value of each utterance can be gathered in Table 2. S3’s utterance contained presupposition which implied that he had an aunt. According to Brown and Yule (1983), even though the public does not know that S3 had an aunt, this information is indirectly informed to the listeners via “non-controversial information” (a term used by Grice, 1981 as cited in Brown and Yule (1983). S3 said “my aunt” and not “I have an aunt and she is ...”. As a result, there is no need for S3 to highlight this information. S5, on the other hand said, “More like Miss Ardayu (referring to the teacher). When Miss Ardayu is angry, she is like a lion... haha. She is the one who said when you are angry, you are a lion. Here, S5 presupposed that what is being said is acceptable by the hearer without any objection. The above is in line with what Stalnaker (2002:701) proposed:

When speakers speak, they presuppose certain things, and what they presuppose guides both what they choose to say and how they intend what they say to be interpreted. To presuppose something is to take it for granted, or at least to act as if one takes it for granted, as background information – as common ground among participants in the conversation.

Table 2. Presuppositions S3 and S5 Based on Conversation from Scene 6.

Script	Character
Eh, Where are Upin and Ipin going? Let’s get back. (<i>Eh, mana Upin dan Ipin nak pergi mana tu? Mari balik.</i>)	Ros
Yeah... we are going back, you (sister) are the one who is late. (<i>Ye lah nak balik dah ni, kakak yang lambat.</i>)	Ipin
Ishh... (showing anger) (<i>Ishh...</i>)	Ros
Utterances by the subjects	Subject
Just like my aunt (<i>Macam mak sedara saya</i>)	S3
More like Miss Ardayu, right. (Referring to the teacher). When she is angry, she is like a lion... haha. She is the one who said when you are angry, you are a lion. (<i>Macam Cikgu Ardayu kan. Kalau marah macam singa... haha.</i> <i>Cikgu Ardayu yang kata kalau marah jadi singa.</i>)	S5

From S5’s utterances, she presupposed that Miss Ardayu is fierce and if she scolds her pupils, she looks like a lion. This was apparently assumed by S5 and evidently in the animation story, Miss Ardayu (the teacher) admitted this. In reality, children do make connections between animals and human beings. As a matter of fact, Zaitul Azma (2005) in her study on Malay children’s language and thoughts also indicated that children create concepts as well as elaborate and restrict meanings of words. Additionally, Sinclair (1970) is in the opinion that children’s language development portrays their central cognitive competence. This competency is gained through the children’s experience with the object and action. Table 2 depicts the script from Scene 6 and the subjects’ utterances.

4.2 Implicature

According to Brown and Yule (1983), the notion ‘implicature’ is used to explicate what the speakers imply, suggest, or mean, which are distinct from what the speakers literally say. Grice (1975) listed two types of implicature namely conventional implicature and conversational implicature. The present study examined the latter closely since it is of much greater interest to the discourse analyst (Brown & Yule,

1983) and at the same time, it is derived from a general principle of conversation with a number of conventions or maxims which the speakers normally follow. Conversational maxims support four maxims namely: 1) quantity 2) quality 3) relation and 4) manner. Excerpts from the children’s conversation when reflecting their animation viewing that form a basis for the discussion on implicature are also known as “cooperative principle”. The conversation implicature will be matched with the data given below. Interestingly, the researchers found only three (quantity, relation and manner) out of four maxims when scrutinizing the data. Quantity refers to how one’s contribution is made informative and not more than what is required. Relation, on the other hand, refers to relevancy of the discussion while manner refers to how perspicuous is the conversation contribution besides other characteristics such as orderly, brief and avoiding ambiguity and obscurity.

In Table 3, examples of utterances which follow the maxim “relation” are presented. Subject S15 said, “After that he went into the Durian Runtuh village close to Uncle Muthu’s stall”. He was trying to explain how the characters Lim and Badrul ended up at Muthu’s stall. Further to this, S13 through his utterance tried to explicate Lim and Badrul’s intention of their stopover at Muthu’s stall through his utterance “He asked the whereabouts of Tok Dalang’s house”. On the other hand, S10 who did not want to be left behind in the discussion said, “*Roti canai, roti canai, roti canai!*” just to mention the types of food sold at the stall. Subjects S14 and S13 added more food menus by saying “*Nasi goreng, sirap, everything is there!*” In other words, what the children were saying is there is a host of food sold at Muthu’s stall. From the aforementioned utterances produced by the children, it can be concluded that these utterances are in compliance with the maxim “relation” in cooperative principle proposed by Grice (1975) as appeared in Brown and Yule (1983). Put it differently, what is being said is relevant to the topic being discussed. The utterances made match with the context of the conversation. Table 3 presents the conversation from scene 6 and the subjects’ utterances.

Table 3. Implicature S10, S13, S14 and S15 Translated Conversation from Scene 6.

Script	Character
Eighty sen (Badrul and Lim arrived at Muthu’s food stall) (<i>Lapan puluh sen.</i>) (<i>Badrul dan Lim tiba di gerai makanan Muthu.</i>)	Muthu
Ish, these children! Hurm... where is my grandfather’s house? (<i>Ish, budak budak nih! Hurm mana ah rumah atuk aku?</i>)	Badrul
We ask the people around here lah... (<i>Kita tanya orang kat sini je lah.</i>) (Upin and Ipin trying to mimic Uncle Muthu’s dialect while having a good laugh)	Lim
Hey, what is this... don’t disturb! (<i>Hei, apa ni jangan buat kacaulah!</i>)	Muthu
Eh, that’s OK uncle, we just want to know the way to Tok Dalang’s house. (<i>Eh, tak pe uncle, kami nak tahu jalan ke rumah Tok Dalang je.</i>)	Badrul
Utterances by subjects	Subject
After that he went into the Durian Runtuh village close to Uncle Muthu’s stall. (<i>Lepas tu dia pergi masuk kampung Durian Runtuh kat Kedai Uncle Muthu.</i>)	S15
He asked the whereabouts of Tok Dalang’s house. (<i>Dia tanya kat mana rumah Tok Dalang</i>)	S13
<i>Roti canai. Roti canai. Roti canai.</i>	S10
Nasi goreng, sirap (<i>Fried rice, syrup</i>).	S14
Everything is there! (<i>Semua pun ada!</i>)	S13

Further, data illustrated in Table 4 match another maxim (manner) in conversational implicature. Subject S2 in her utterance tried to provide information based on the action in one of the scenes i.e. that is to fill up a form (documentation) in a comic. However, confusion arises with the utterance of the lexical third person singular “he/she” (*dia*). What S2 meant was that “there is a form to be filled up and that one has to fill up the form later”. Using third person singular “*dia*” could further create confusion amongst other participants in the conversation. Here, the use of “*dia*” could mean he/she (third person singular for human being) and “*dia*” could also be referred to the form (non-human object). According to Grice (1975), in Brown and Yule (1983), S2 has violated one of the maxims “manner” since the sentences she uttered contained ambiguity. S2 should have avoided using such a sentence since she has not followed the principle of manner in conversational implicature.

Table 4. Implicature and subjects utterances.

Utterances	Subjects
There is a form in the comic. (<i>Dia ada borang dalam komik tu</i>).	S2
He has to fill up the form later. (<i>Dia kena isi borang tu nanti</i>).	

Another maxim which could be found in the data was the maxim “quantity”. However, the researchers could not stop but noticing how one of the children triggered intended disturbance so as to convey and add information in the midst of taking turn to speak. Referring to the data in Table 5, S15 said “Tree” but this was refuted by S12 who said, “No, not like that!” This clearly shows that S12 refused to provide room for S15 to contribute towards the conversation. He also tried to show off his knowledge about the animation through his utterance, “There is one tree that Tok Dalang...” In this case, S12 was only being self-centred by intervening in the conversation. This finding is consistent with Zaitul Azma Zainon Hamzah’s (2002) and Siti Muslihah Isnain and Normaliza Abd Rahim’s (2012) studies which discussed problems in turn taking in spoken discourse amongst children.

Table 5. Implicature S12, S13, S14 & S15 Conversation from Scene 14.

Script from Scene 14	Character
Hi, all these trees are planted by me and my grandfather, Eh! Oi! What are you doing? (Hai biasanya pokok semua ni aku dengan atuk aku yang tanam. Eh! Oi! Apa kau buat tu?)	Badrul
Climbing durian tree, what else? (Panjat pokok durian la apa lagi?)	Lim
Aiyo, nobody climbs a durian tree. Wait for the durians to fall down lah. (Aiyo mana ada orang panjat pokok durian! Tunggu durian jatuh lah.)	Rajo
Utterances by subjects	Subject
Tree (<i>Pokok</i>)	S15
No, not like that! (<i>Tak, bukan macam tu!</i>)	S12
There is one tree that Tok Dalang (<i>Ada satu pokok tu Tok Dalang</i>)	S12
Tok Dalang planted it!! (<i>Tok Dalang tanam!</i>)	S15
Big! <i>Besar!</i>	S12
And then cut down all! <i>Lepas tu semua tebang!</i>	S13,S14,S15
That’s why it is called falling durian. All shaking. (<i>Sebab tu panggil durian runtuh. Semua bergegar.</i>)	S12

To further explicate the diversity in the conversation, S15's further uttered "Tok Dalang planted it!" What he was trying to do was to stress his knowledge about who planted the tree. S12 added to the conversation by saying "Big!" to refer to the size of the tree planted by Tok Dalang followed by S13, S14 and S15's utterances "And then cut them all down!" These utterances show the condition of the tree planted and that in the end, the big tree is being cut down. S12 then said, "That's why it is called falling durian. All shaken." All in all, the children were trying to establish how the place "Kampong Durian Runtuh" (Falling Durian Village) got its name. The conversation has, a matter of fact, followed the maxim "quantity" because all subjects were focused and contributed informatively towards the discussion without unwanted information.

4.3 Reference

In traditional semantic, "the relationship which holds between words and things is the relationship of reference: word refers to things" (Lyons, 1968: 404). Any utterance which is meant to make reference to something must be really in existence. Any meaningful expression refers to something that is unique and independent. The function of reference depends upon the actual meaning by the speaker. According to Idris Aman (2010), cohesion is an aspect in a discourse. It can be defined in terms of the discourse/ text syntactical organisation, whereby the sentences are formed which is coherent and related in terms of its language, be it written or spoken.

As shown in Table 6, subject S3 (in trying to confirm) questioned S4 if Lim which the former mentioned through his utterance was the actual "Lim". Subsequently, S4's replied "Haa" as the answer to the question posed. Their utterances were further added by S2's information when she said, "Upin and Ipin took him to Tok Dalang's house." As such, based on S2's utterance, it can be concluded that third person singular "him" refers to the character "Lim" in the story.

Table 6. Reference S2, S3, S4 based on Conversation from Scene 6.

Script from Scene 6	Character
Dei, come here lah! You two please go and show this brother the way to Tok Dalang's house. (<i>Dei, sini marilah. Haa, kamu dua orang pigi tunjuk ini abang rumah Tok Dalang.</i>)	Muthu
Haa, OK! (<i>Haa, okay!</i>)	Ipin
Tok Dalang's house ey? Haa let's go. Piece of cake. (<i>Rumah Tok Dalang, ey? Haa jom. Senang jer ni.</i>)	Upin
Utterances produced by subjects	Subject
Lim?	S3
Haa!	S4
Upin and Ipin took him to Tok Dalang's house (<i>Upin dan Ipin bawa dia ke rumah Tok Dalang.</i>)	S2

Additionally, in the next excerpt (Table 7), it can be implied that S5 was trying her best to be in the conversation but was intruded by S3. However, S3's utterance was based on her intuition. This type of utterance (using intuition) was mentioned by Tannen (1975) in Siti Muslihah Isnain and Normaliza Abd Rahim (2012). Subject S3 was in the opinion that Kak Ros who is Upin and Ipin's sister is a good sister and had prepared all the necessities for Eid. S3 did mention "her" which specifically referred to Kak Ros but not referring to Opah (the grandmother). If one is confronted with the expression "Kak Ros", the

hearer’s description would be Kak Ros is a lady, having brothers, possessing ferocious personality and is strict as well as caring and good-hearted. Be it true or not, what a speaker has to do is to ensure that the hearer is able to relate with the reference given (Lyon, 1977). S2 also managed to relate her own grandfather to the one mentioned in the story by saying: “My tok (grandfather) and that tok are similar ...yes. His name is Alang, right. We call him Tok Dalang”. Clearly, S2 used ‘his’ to refer to her own grandfather and “we” to refer to herself and her siblings. Together, “reference” is used to form the lexical meaning and at the same time identify the reference employed.

Table 7. Reference S2, S3 and S5 based on Conversation from Scene 6.

Script from Scene 6	Character
Haa Ros, this is yesterday’s money. <i>(Haa Ros, Ini semalam punya duit)</i>	Muthu
Thank you. I need to go. <i>Terima kasih. Ros pergi dulu yer.</i>	Ros
Ros ... please don’t be angry. I have asked your brothers to show the way to Tok Dalang’s house. Why don’t you go too? <i>Ros, jangan marahla, saya sudah suruh awak punya adik tunjuk jalan rumah Tok Dalang. Awak ikut jugalah.</i>	Muthu
Utterances produced by subjects	Subject
That’s KakRos, isn’t it? <i>(Kak Ros, Kan..?)</i>	S5
Haa... was nice when she made the baju kurung dress. <i>Haa.. baik hati masa dia buat baju raya</i>	S3
My tok (grandfather) and that tok are almost alike ...yes. His name is tok Alang, right. We call him Tok Dalang. <i>Tok saya dengan tok tu hampir hampir je. Nama dia tok Alang kan. Kami panggil dia Tok Dalang.</i>	S2

4.4 Inference

Gumperz (1982) said that ‘inference’ is situated and context bound process of interpretation, by means of which participants in an exchange assess others’ intentions, on which they base their response. Moeliono (1988) maintained that contexts consist of situation, participant, time, topic, shape, reminder, code, channel and episode. This is in line with Samsuri’s (1987) interpretation. Besides Brown and Yule (1983), Hymes (1986) also supported the existence of inference as one of the elements in discourse analysis. Hymes (1986) concluded that context exists through the acronym SPEAKING, in which every morpheme comprises setting, participants, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms and genre. As such, it is deemed necessary for the utterances to be analysed from different aspects including inference, which is contained in children’s utterances. Many a time, discourse analysts and hearers alike do not understand the meaning to be delivered by the speaker during utterances. As a result, inference is being used to interpret utterances and the relations within utterances.

In Table 8, utterances made by subjects S2 and S5 provided information about the colour of durian fruit flesh in reality when S2 said, “Yelow!, Yellow!, Yellow!” whereas S3 insisted on the colour as seen in the film when he uttered “The flesh is red... and after that there are many colours in it”. S3 was referring to the colour in the world of Oopet, an alien whose colour is reddish purple. (Oopet is an animal character in the film who likes to eat durian). It appeared that S2 and S5 were presenting their utterances based on their life experiences and not by what they viewed. In the minds of the hearers, there exist inferences within the children’s utterances. Additionally, code switching occurred when using the lexical “colour”.

Instead of using the lexical in Malay (i.e. warna), the children were more comfortable with the English equivalence and switched to the English usage, “Buah dia colour kuning”. As such, the topic of discussion was on the colour of the fruit. The key or manner the participants presented the utterances was full of enthusiasm. The conversation took place in a classroom setting within a discussion context. Amongst the participants, together they watched the film from the same genre, knew the story line and related the story into their own reality. Table 8 illustrates the script and the utterances as discussed above.

Table 8. Inference S2, S3 and S5 based on Conversation from Scene 14.

Script from Scene 14	Character
Eh, Lim, did you hear that? Eh... (Lim gets up and runs to the origin of the sound). Woi! Wait for me! Wait! Where is the durian just now? (<i>Eh, Lim kau dengar tak apa kau ...? (Eh Lim sudah bangun dan berlari ke arah bunyi durian jatuh tu).</i>) Woi ! <i>Tunggu aku!Tunggu! Eh mana durian tadi?</i>)	Badrul
Badrul! Here! (They saw animal’s footprint and durian which has been eaten. <i>Badrul, sini!</i> (Mereka terlihat tapak kaki haiwan dan durian yang sudah dimakan.)	Lim
Utterances produced by subjects	Subject
The flesh of the durian is in that box! (<i>Isi durian dalam kotak tu!</i>)	S5
The flesh is red ... and after that there are many colours in it (<i>Isi tu warna merah lepas tu ada colour-colour dalam tu.</i>)	S3
Yellow! Yellow! Yellow! <i>Kuning! Kuning! Kuning!</i>	S2
The fruit is yellow in colour (<i>Buah dia tu colour kuning.</i>)	S5

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION OF THE STUDY

The main aim of this study was to examine the reflections of children’s utterances and each utterance was analysed based on its context. As such, every utterance produced by human beings has its own meaning and effect irrespective of age. In the above case, nine-year-old children’s utterances had been analysed and diversity of children’s utterance were observed and that each of their utterances follow specific principles as drawn in Brown and Yule.

Coulthard (1977) recounted that Firth (1935) urged linguists to conduct more research on naturally occurring conversations. The use of field research in this study has allowed the researchers to utilise real data from the real world using children’s utterances based on their naturally occurring conversations as a result of film viewing. Behind each of the utterances, the study found that the data matched with a number of principles as proposed by Brown and Yule (1983) such as presupposition, implicature, reference and inference. In fact, every utterance was accompanied by the children’s own styles - a testimony of the diversity in the subjects’ utterances. This finding is also in line with Siti Muslihah Isnain and Normaliza Abd Rahim’s (2012) study, which discovered similar predisposition in their subjects’ utterances. Moreover, the subjects were inclined to present information based on their life experience and contexts. Context plays an important role in unveiling certain ambiguity and uncertainty in speech. Context also managed to show the relationships that exist between the environment, experience, and knowledge of the speakers and listeners alike. Hence, the meaningfulness of the ideas and concepts are more easily detected.

Children, in general, have often been linked to shyness and humbleness. The present study, however, has sought to get the children understudied into presenting their utterances in the form of information as well as opinions using film animation. Contrary to earlier speculations, the children, seemed confident but

excited to present their utterances by providing their opinions, retell the story, seek help, and make objections and intrude by using language. As a consequence, the study has shown the propensity to falsify the opinions that children are shy and are not confident to speak. In fact, given the right stimulus, there are ways to train children to speak and voice their opinions using, in this case, an animation tool. Evidence suggests that low opportunities for verbal interaction in the early years is associated with poor vocabulary and elevated risks of later difficulties in the primary grades when higher comprehension is required (Snow, Burns & Griffith, 1998). Therefore, the use of animation should be seriously considered as a tool in stimulating children to speak in a more systematic and organised manner. Studies on language learning in naturalistic settings have shown the importance of children's verbal interaction with adults at each stage of development. It is, hence, vital for children to maintain interaction with adults despite having multimedia tools in their hands.

Animation could also be utilised as an instrument which can establish moral values for the children (Rezki Perdani Sawai, Salhah Abdullah, Dini Farhana Baharudin & Noranis Ismail, 2009). Despite having some turn taking issues during one conversation (as presented in the findings), the children were observed to have valued their turn takings while verbalising their thoughts about the animation. This was thought to be an important skill as it allows the children to appreciate each other's thought. Those self-centred ones who are prone to dominate the discussion should be taught to appreciate and respect other people's opinions.

Another issue to be highlighted is the importance of choosing suitable animation for the children's viewing since negative ones could be destructive. The themes presented in Upin and Ipin animation are indeed socially-oriented. Among the themes brought forward are love, family, relationships, and diversity in culture, responsibilities, and helping each other. Indeed, given the right themes and proper planning, animation has its place in children language development. As such, future studies should conduct more experimental studies on the use of animation as a tool to elicit children's utterances. Experimental-based studies not only allow researchers to explore the possibilities of other multimedia tools in children language /speech development but such studies could also provide more evidence demonstrating long term effects of animation viewing on children's verbal skills.

Studies in the future should also delve into children's utterances while at the same time diversify the animation tools to be studied. Nevertheless, careful selection of similar animation stories available in the market is crucial. In addition, subjects from different age groups should be considered and their findings compared. Another implication of the present study is that it has shown an alternative approach in eliciting children's utterances. Animation appeared as a promising tool to be utilised within the Malaysian classrooms context as a mean to encourage engagement of young learners in language development.

REFERENCES

- Ball, H. (1982). Who is Snoopy? In J.L. Thomas, (Ed.). *Cartoon and Comic in the Classroom: A Reference for Teachers and Librarians* (pp. 14-20). Littleton: Co Libraries Unlimited.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bliss, J., Ogborn, J. & Whitelock, D. (1989). Secondary School Pupils' Common Sense theories of Motion. *International Journal of Science Education*, 11, 261-272.
- British Broadcasting Company News (2003, March 10). *Television is Damaging Children's Speech*. Retrieved http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/education/2836157.stm
- Coulthard, M. (1977). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Longman.
- Dalacosta, K., Kamariotak-Paparrigopoulou, M., Palyvos, J.A. & Spyrellis, N. (2009). Multimedia Application with Animated Cartoons for Teaching Science in Elementary Education. *Computers and Education*, 741-748.
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and Society*. New York: Norton.
- Fillmore, C. J. & Langendoen, D.T. (Eds.). (1971). *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Firth, J. R. (1935). *The Technique of Semantics Transactions of the Philological Society*. 36-72 (Reprinted in Firth (1957) *Papers in Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press, 7-33).
- Givon, T. (1979). *Understanding Grammar: Perspectives in Neurolinguistics and Psycholinguistics*. New

- York: Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan, (Eds.). *Syntax and Semantics*, pp. 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1981). Presupposition and Conversational Implicature. In P. Cole, (Ed.). *Radical Pragmatics*, pp. 183-98. New York: Academic Press.
- Hymes, D. H. (1986). Discourse: Scope without Depth. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 57, 49–89.
- Idris Aman. (2010). *Analisis Wacana*. Bangi. Penerbit Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Kania Anjani. (2011). *Animasi Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris pada Taman Kanak-Kanak dengan Adobe Flash CS3 Professional*. Program Diploma III Teknik Informasi, Jabatan Matematik, Fakulti Matematik dan Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam Universiti Sumatera Utara Medan, Indonesia. Retrieved December, 4 2013 from <http://repository.usu.ac.id/bitstream/123456789/27360/7/Cover.pdf>.
- Khine, M.S. & Fisher, D. L. (2003). *Technology-rich Learning Environment: A Future Perspective*. Singapore: West Scientific Publishing Co.
- Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maimunah Alias. (2009). *Geng Cetus Fenomena Luar Biasa*. *Sinema Malaysia*. Retrieved December 12, 2013 from http://www.sinemamalaysia.com.my/main/article/GENG_Cetus_Fenomena_Luar_Biasa_2767.
- Moeliono, A. M. (1988). *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Mustafa Atan. (2010). *Implikatur Dalam Ujaran Watak Dalam Filem Seniman Agung P. Ramlee*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- National Literacy Trust and National Association of Head Teachers. (2001). *Early language survey of headteachers*. Retrieved May 10 2017 from <http://www.literacytrust.org.uk/talktoyourbaby/survey.html>
- Nurfahana Shahira Rosly, Normaliza Abd Rahim, & Hazlina Abdul Halim. (2016). Interaksi Ujaran Kanak-kanak Menerusi Elemen Pendigitalan dan Penceritaan. *Gema Online® Journal Language Studies*, 16(1), 1-21.
- Normaliza Abd Rahim. (2012). The Use of Cartoons to Enhance Learning in the Malay Language Classroom. *Wulfenia Journal*, 19(10), 125-137.
- Normaliza Abd Rahim, Hazlina Abdul Halim & Roslina Mamat (2014). Learning via Television Cartoon. *Asian Social Science*, 10(15), 8-15.
- Normaliza Abd Rahim, Roslina Mamat, Hazlina Ab Halim, Arbaie Sujud & Siti Nur Alia Roslan. (2013). The Influence of Online Anime towards Children. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 3(3), 201-205.
- Perzlyo, L. (1993). The Application of Multimedia CD-ROMs in School. *British Journal of Education Technology*, 24(3), 191-197.
- Rezki Perdani Sawai, Salhah Abdullah, Dini Farhana Baharudin & Noranis Ismail. (2009). *Penerapan Nilai-Nilai Islam melalui Penggunaan Media dalam Pendidikan*. Paper presented at the Seminar Kebangsaan Media dan Pemikiran Islam (MIST2009), Bangi, Malaysia, July, 21-22.
- Rohaniza Idris. (2013, December 16). Kongsirahsia Upin & Ipin. *Berita Harian*. Retrieved from http://www2.bharian.com.my/bharian/articles/KongsirahsiaUpin_Ipin/Article/print_html
- Schlobinski, P. (1996). "Empirische Sprachwissenschaft". Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, In Stefan Titscher et al. *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. (2000). London: Sage Publication.
- Samsuri. (1988). *Analisis Bahasa*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Sinclair, H. (1970). The transition from sensory motor behaviour to symbolic activity. *Interchange*, 1, 119-216.
- Siti Muslihah Isnain & Normaliza Abd Rahim. (2012). Gaya Ujaran Berbantu Komputer Dalam Kalangan Kanak-kanak Sekolah Rendah. *Jurnal Bahasa*, 12(1), 126-150.
- Snow, C. E., Burns, S. M., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Sou, W., Wang, W., & Tzeng, Y. (2006). Applying a Multimedia Storytelling Website in Foreign Language Learning. *Computers and Education*, 47, 17-28.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1987). Presumptions of Relevance. *Behavioral & Brain Sciences*, 10, 736-753.

- Stalnaker, R. (1978): Assertion. In P. Cole, (Ed.). *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 9: Pragmatics, New York: Academic Press.
- Stalnaker, R. (2002). Common Ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 25(5), 701-721.
- Sugiyono. (2011). *Statistika untuk Penelitian*. Bandung: Penerbit Alfabeta.
- Tannen, D. (2005). *Conversational Style: Analysing Talk among Friends*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zaitul Azma Zainon Hamzah. (2002). *Gangguan dalam Sistem Giliran Bertutur Kanak-Kanak Melayu: Satu Analisis Pragmatik*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis .Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- Zaitul Azma Zainon Hamzah. (2005). Bahasa, Konteks dan Pemikiran Kanak-kanak Melayu: Satu analisis Pragmatik. *Jurnal Bahasa*, 5(2), 134-153.