# CHAPTER 1

# INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

In communication, people try to deliver something to others trough different ways. Conversation is one of those ways in which the communication occurs by producing utterances. Moreover, Yule (1996) reveals that as one way of communication, the conversation which happens between the first part and the other parts needs the cooperativeness. Hence, in gaining the communication process that runs well via utterances, the involved parts also build the cooperativeness by adjusting the situation faced. Therefore, the assumption obtained in communication will also interact with contextual effect (Sperber and Wilson 1985, cited in Blakemore, 1992).

In the process of producing utterances, language as a medium that conveys the meaning of utterances will also determine how the communication works. Austin (1962) then elaborates the issue of language and communication by making distinction between what the speakers say and what they mean. Constructing the way how people say and how the meaning conveyed, those who produce the language actually have their own roles in leading how the conversation will be brought. Additionally, Austin also separates three basic senses about saying something in *How to Do Things with Words* which are called locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary act. From those three basic senses, illocutionary act is arisen in which then come with the term *speech act.*

Since speech act had become the focus of interest in pragmatic studies, Searle (1976, cited in Levinson 1983) developed Austin's theory about speech acts by also classifying them into some basic kinds of speaking which in reality people do them as kind of action. On the other hand while them both developing the theory of speech act, they found that by those rules, the communication seems conventional. In fact, the particular features in the process of communication cannot be avoided to be occur.

Those particular features in communication certainly affect the behavior of the speakers in saying something, and the behavior itself definitely involves the process of producing utterances and receiving the meaning. Grice (1976, cited in Levinson 1983) in that case tries to figure out on how the hearer can receive the meaning of utterances revealed by the speaker from the level of expressed meaning to the level of implied meaning by his theory called *Cooperative Principles (Grice's Maxims)*, and furthermore, the phenomena of the applied maxims is variously found.

Related to the cooperativeness, it can be realized that a single utterance conveys a whole variety of assumptions (Blakemore, 1992:57). The assumptions themselves can be communicated explicitly or implicitly. When an utterance is communicated implicitly, there will be a speaker who communicates meaning via implicatures and addressee who must recognize them. That behavior in bringing implicated utterances is called *conversational implicature*. Conversational implicature which later called by Levinson (1993:97), only *implicature*, provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean (in some general sense) more than what is actually 'said'.

According to Grice (1978), implicatures are not semantic inferences, but the content of what has been said and some specific assumptions are the basis of inferences which relates to the co-operative nature of ordinary verbal interaction. Grice then makes distinction on how people observe the maxims or not. The first one is if the speaker is observing the maxim in a fairly direct way. See example [1.a]

[1.a] A (to passer by) : I've just run out of petrol
B : Oh, there's a garage just around the corner

(adapted from *Pragmatics*, Levinson, 1983)

The example above contains the cooperativeness which B knew that A needed petrol, and A told him that a garage was close to them, but it still less than fully co-operative.

In fact, not all the conversation built observes the Maxims. Because of some reasons, people fail to fulfill the maxims. The second one below is where the speaker deliberately flouts the maxim.

[1.b] A : Let's get the kids something
B : Okay, but I veto I-C-E-C-R-E-A-M-S

(adapted from *Pragmatics*, Levinson, 1983)

From the example [1.b], B failed to fulfill the maxim of Manner by spelling out the word ice creams. B used spelling in saying *ice cream* because of the presence of children.

Giving details in the process of how implicature exists in conversation, Grice also distinguishes the conversational implicatures in different dimensions. They are *Generalized* conversational implicatures which do not need any

particular context or special scenario, and *Particularized* implicatures which require such specific context (Grice 1989, cited in Levinson 1983:126).

In connection with the observed and flouted maxim in inferences, most of the floutings of the maxims are particularized (Levinson, 1983:126). Focusing on particularized implicature itself, it can be described as a case in which an implicature is carried by saying *p* on a particular occasion in virtue of special features of the context (Grice, 1989). Elaborating the realization of particularized implicature, it can be illustrated by the conversation below [1.c].

> [1.c] A: Teheran's in Turkey isn't it, teacher
> B: And London's in Armenia I suppose.
>
> (adapted from *Pragmatics*, Levinson, 1983)

From that conversation, B's response indicated that A's was incorrect. It means A must have an effort to draw what can be assumed from A's utterance. In this situation, the knowledge needed is to understand what are the special features related to the particular occasion happens in that conversation.

Related to the special features in conversation, it engages with the contexts which appear differently. According to Brown and Levinson (1987, cited in Adhi 2006:15), they claim that before taking a particular action, a speaker must determine the seriousness of a face-threatening act (FTA), and FTA itself contains social variables that play as principals in determining the utterances spoken by the speaker.

Emphasizing on this study, it observes how people respond implicated utterances in particular situations. It also observed how social variables influence the responses to those implicated utterances.

## 1.2. Formulation of the Problems

The study was guided by the following general questions.

1. How are the realizations of responses to implicated utterances found in particularized implicature context performed by Indonesian learning English as a foreign language?

2. To what extent do social variables affect such realization? If any, how?

## 1.3. Aims of the Study

The aims of study are as follows.

1. To investigate the realization of responses to implicated uterances found in particularized implicature context by Indonesian EFL learners.

2. To examine the extent of influence affected by social variables and how they influence on such realizations.

## 1.4. Research Method

The present study is qualitative which is undertaken with a descriptive method. The descriptive method is used since the research is not conducted to seek something or to make the prediction. Gay, L.R (1987, cited from Nuraida 2005) asserts that the descriptive study determines and reports the way things are.

The instruments used in collecting the data for this research were questionnaires and interviews. The form of questionnaire was the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) which was "*originally developed for comparing the speech act realization*" (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989). It contained a number of different situations with the description of social variables. It involved the speaker

and the interlocutor. DCT instrument itself can be described by the following example.

> **At the University**
> Ann missed a lecture yesterday and would like to borrow Judith's notes
> Ann     : _____
> Judith   : Sure, but let me have them back before the lecture next week
>
>   (Blum Kulka *et al,* 1989)

Having read the situation given, the subjects then were asked to complete the blank space as responses from different speakers and situations.

For this study, the instrument itself contained 12 situation in which the types of flouted maxim were followed by the social variables occur. This below is one example of the twelve situations in the instrument that was provided for the subject.

> **Situation #1**
> In your spare time with your close friend, you are talking about someone (T) who seldom attends in classroom lecturing, never submits the tasks, and everybody knows about his laziness.
>
> You         : Do you think T will pass the subject?
> X            : As we know, he is the most diligent student and obviously will get A in this subject!
> You         : _____

From the situation, the subjects (You) is the addressee, and (X) is her/his interlocutor who plays role as a speaker who says an implicated utterance. The subjects accordingly were required to fill the blank with their responses to the implicated utterance as much or as little as they wanted.

Another instrument used was interviews. This instrument can provide additional information that was missed in collecting data via questionnaires. The interviews were conducted in the respondent's first language that is Indonesian to make them more comfortable in expressing their ideas.

**1.5. Population and Sample/Respondent**

The study was conducted at Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, involving 20 advanced (third year) students of English Department. The sample size was satisfactorily represented. It was according to Best and Khan (1989 cited in Libugan 1987), the type of research can define number of subject. Thus, minimum number are tolerable for the study of linguistic research, which has more homogenous behavior compared to other types of survey (Sankoff 1980, cited in Milroy 1987). Furthermore, 20 respondents involved in conducting data analysis would be simpler, more focus and more convenient (Milroy, 1987).

Those 20 respondents were chosen based on their capability of English in order to make them easier to understand the situations given and to provide the proper response with adequate linguistic competence.

**1.6. Research Procedure**

The writer conducted the research based on the following procedures:

*1.6.1    Collecting data*

To achieve the aims of this research, the research was conducted by administrating questionnaires and interviewing the respondents to express their opinion about the situations given. Furthermore, the questionnaires were made based on flouting *maxims*, and adapted the example of situations in Levinson's book (1983). It was also completed with the social variables involved. The respondents for the research were The English Department students specifically students 2006 academic year, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

*1.6.2      Analyzing data*

Data from questionnaires and interviews were analyzed, identified, and categorized into tables according to the patterns occur and social variables involved.

*1.6.3      Interpreting data*

The data were compared each other to investigate the realizations of responses  to implicated utterances in order to have the result, which then followed by descriptions and also supported by tables and charts.

**1.7. Clarification of Terms**

To avoid misunderstanding, and to make discussion run appropriately, there are several terms that need to be classified. They are:

- Implicated      :  the utterance which is implicitly communicated (Blakemore, 1992:57)

- Implicature     : anything that is inferred from an utterance but that is not a condition for the truth of the utterance. It is a theory about how people use language and may be formulated as guidelines for the efficient and effective use of language in conversation (Grice 1975, cited in Levinson 1983:101).

- Responses      : Act or answer which is uttered by the addressee in responding speaker's utterance (adapted from Nuraida 2005:8)

## 1.8. Organization of the Paper

This paper is organized into five chapters:

## CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

This section contains introduction, which discussed background of the study, formulation of the problems, aims of the study, research method, population and sample, research procedure, and organization of the paper.

In addition, the clarification of key terms was presented to avoid misunderstanding.

## CHAPTER 2 THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

Chapter two contained with theoretical foundation, which serves as a basis for investigating the research problem.

## CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology of the research is discussed in this section. It consists of: research method, respondents of the study, data collection, and data analysis.

## CHAPTER 4 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the data. The data are elaborated and discussed based on the obtained results of questionnaires and interviews. They are also presented in the form of the table and chart.

## CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

It contains conclusions of this study and suggestions for further research.