



CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE ENGENDERINGS IN THE INTERACTION BETWEEN ENGLISH INSTRUCTORS

Arini Sabrina^{1✉}, Ahmad Sofwan²

¹Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Negeri Semarang

²Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni, Universitas Negeri Semarang

Info Artikel

Sejarah Artikel:

Diterima Januari 2016

Disetujui Agustus 2016

Dipublikasikan September 2016

Keywords:

conversational implicature;

interaction;

instructor;

gender

Abstrak

In decoding implicatures, especially conversational implicatures, interlocutors should carefully pay attention both on the literal and pragmatic meanings. This importance simultaneously affects educators to be adept at implicating a message conversationally, also at transferring it to their students. The duty gets more challenging for the ones teaching a foreign language. This study then is conducted to investigate the conversational implicatures among English instructors from Indonesia who interact using English as their foreign language. Besides, this study also endeavours to trace what maxims are flouted, and to describe the gender-based difference of implicating a message conversationally. Twelve male and twelve female English instructors were invited to voluntarily participate in informal interactions approximately for fifteen minutes without their notice on the focus of this study, revealing 140 implicatures. These are wide-ranging in terms of contents based on the topics they choose, and are similar in terms of the intended messages which are not the same as the ones have said. Moreover, the exploitations also occur on all four maxims variously: quality, quantity, manner, and relevance. The last, female instructors are observed to implicate more frequently than male ones with the comparison between 88 and 52.

INTRODUCTION

In the interaction, people produce utterances which bring their messages. However, utterance meaning is not always easy to determine as the speaker sometimes conveys their real messages indirectly. Therefore, an utterance meaning should not only consider the semantic meaning, but also pragmatic meaning at once (Stecker, 2003: 17).

Implicature, defined as additional meaning, then emerges as many people sometimes do not say their message as explicit and detailed as possible. Thus, they will neglect the Cooperative Principle and Conversational Maxims which postulate that speaker should transfer the idea of his or her utterance to the interlocutor well through ensuring the message truth (quality), quantity, relevance, and manner.

Implicature also burgeons, revealing some kinds based on the context needed by the interlocutors to grasp the covert meaning. Conversational implicature becomes one implicature kind which is explained by Bublitz and Norrick (2011:

407) as any meaning implicated by, and inferred from, the utterance of a sentence which is meant without being part of what is strictly said. From this point, the interlocutor, chiefly in the conversation, needs to be sharp in observing it, in order that the real message of the speaker can be well-transferred.

The factors causing conversational implicature to occur can be various. These might be such as strengthening speaker's opinion, saving time, and avoiding talking about something. These factors then boost the speaker, in an interaction, to flout one of Conversational Maxims (blatantly failing to observe a maxim as the speaker wishes to prompt the hearer to look for a meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning (Thomas, 2013: 65), and finally to generate the implicature.

Owing to the crucial importance of conversational implicature in the communication, there is a demand for who teaches language, to have capability in delivering such implicature. This gets much more challenging for those who deal

✉ Corresponding author :

Address:

Email : arinisabrina91@gmail.com

Phone :

with foreign language, like English for Indonesian people. The rationale is that it is the English teacher's responsibility not only to transfer the knowledge about what the language is about, but also to equip the students with the knowledge about how to engage and maintain the communication, in which conversational implicature becomes one of the foci. It is also supported by Wang (2011) who argues that implicature is necessary to teach since it can guide the learners' English listening comprehension.

Some questions then arise on how it is naturally engendered by the English instructors in Indonesia as their habit in the English conversation, and how the conversational implicature applications differ between male and female instructors. Gender is considered because Mousa's research (2004) concludes that female implicates a meaning more frequently than male, yet it is counterattacked by Grujicic-Alariste's research (2008) which finds out that male interlocutors pick indirectness more to expose implicatures. Therefore, this research has investigated them thoroughly.

METHODS

This study is categorised as descriptive qualitative in nature. It is conducted in the Language Training Centre (LTC) of Muhammadiyah University of Yogyakarta (UMY), inviting 24 English instructors (12 male and 12 female instructors). These instructors are chosen based on the age, the culture, and the power equality as the control variables. In the data collection, every two instructors are asked to have an informal English conversation which lasts approximately 15 minutes in a certain place. Then, their conversation will be analysed based on three big steps adapted from Miles and Huberman in Punch (2005: 197): data reduction, data display, ended with drawing and verifying conclusions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There are two big parts provided: results and discussion. In the first part, there will be some descriptions of the answers related to the research problems aforementioned. The discussion will follow as the second part to compare the results with the ones from the previous studies and the theories.

Conversational Implicatures and Maxim Flouting Types in Female-Female Interactions

Since there are 24 subjects who are divided into three categorisations with equal members, this

first categorisation must have 4 female pairs (8 subjects). From the analysis, it can be indicated that female-female interactions can yield the frequent conversational implicatures with exploitations on all maxims. It can be justified from **fifty** implicatures as the total from four interactions each of which lasts approximately fifteen minutes. Some examples are exposed on Table 1.

Table 1. Datum 1

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
B	F	Do you think that your job here also influence you when have weekday with your son because I heard few days ago A1's (A's son) sick?
...
A	F	Yeah, ehm, and then, I cannot accompany my son, especially if I have deadline. You know, the job here, full of deadline. We have to work with <u>millions</u> of deadline.

Through this conversation, A talks to B about their daily activities in their workplace. Literally, A's locution is that she and B have millions deadlines. But, in real life, it is impossible to agree that an office has real millions deadlines everyday, even these are as accumulation in a month. However, A does not want to say irrelevantly or wrongly. She is still on the track by giving other proposition which is still related to the context. Conveying an illocution, A actually wants to make an emphasis that she and her colleague have to work with so many deadlines by flouting the maxim of **quality**. Exaggeration, characterised by Flowerdew (2013: 98) as such flouting way, is used in order to express how frequent the deadline rushes their time everyday.

The next topic is about A's family time. B asks A what A did on the previous Sunday. Instead of answering the query directly, A prolongs her answer with some other unnecessary and ambiguous statements. In fact, A's illocution is that she went to SunMor in Sultan Agung Stadium. However, her telling about the other agenda usually done in Sunday becomes the distractor. This finally flouts the maxim of **manner**.

In relation to A's regular activity of having her son massaged by the therapist, B then reacts, saying that she also usually brings her daughter

Table 2. Datum 2

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
B	F	I think I saw picture of you and your family in facebook on Sunday. What did you do?
A	F	You know you will agree with me, too, relates to, what is it? Family time. Sunday for me is a family time. So, every Sunday we have fixed schedule in the morning to, what is it? to go to a hospital near our house to, what is it? to bring A1 (A's son) to have a massage, baby massage.
B	F	Oh, so it's in the hospital?
A	F	Yeah. There's therapist there. So we bring A1 there. And if it is not rain we almost always, you can say that, almost always we go to the therapist to get a massage for A1. And then last Sunday we went to... Do you know Sultan Agung Stadion? In Pacar...
B	F	In Giri Bantul?
A	F	It's in the west Imogiri street...
B	F	I don't think I know it.
A	F	Near with Mbak Ari's house. There's a kind of Sun...SunMor-Sunday Morning.
B	F	Oh, SunMor in Jalan Imogiri
A	F	Ya. in the Sultan Agung Stadion. But not always yeah, we do that, stadion. But the fixed schedule is every Sunday we will go to the therapist to have massage for A1.

to the traditional baby therapist or so called as *Mbah dukun bayi* in Javanese. However, B does not observe the **quantity** maxim and breaches it. She wants to deliver an implicature that she brings her daughter to *Mbah dukun bayi* yet omitted after she raises her question to A to ask whether she knows such therapist or not.

Table 3. Datum 3

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
B	F	Oh, that's great! Usually I bring B1 (B's daughter)..
A	F	B1... the little one?
B	F	Yeah, but not in like special therapist. <u>Do you know mbah dukun bayi?</u>
A & B	F	(laughing)

The next implicature is discovered in F's question below to E on the way E keeps her all responsibilities in balance. That is the only illocution F wants to propose. But, she adds her question with the other question which means the same. This way, used to make the proposition clearer, is called as tautology. Meibauer in Mey (2009: 366) believes that this kind of trope flouts the **quantity** maxim as the speaker repeats the proposition using similar words or even the exact words aforementioned.

Table 4 Datum 4

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
F	F	How do you keep everything in balance? What are your strategic things in balance? I mean your family runs well, your career runs well, and then...

E then answers it simply as stated in the following sample:

Table 5. Datum 5

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
E	F	I believe in God. That is the key.

How can E justify that the only key is believing in God? Why can believing in God keeps everything in balance? What does E really mean? The answer is that she believes in God as The One who has regulated her life. Although she has five children and many things to do, God has arranged everything in balance. She believes that even there is a problem, it will not go beyond her ability. That is why, her belief is the initial thing she does. This long explanation is intentionally left by E, since she might assume that F will un-

derstand the meaning beyond what she has said. E's action, thus, can be referred to as disobeying a maxim of **quantity**.

Besides giving less information required, the speaker can also give information which is more than needed. It is done by F when she feels that E does not give the answer she expects. As the implicature, she wants to know the real effort endeavoured by E to keep all her responsibilities well done. Instead of giving the brief question, F prolongs it to make sure that E really understands what she means. F is consequently indicated to flout the maxim of **quantity**.

Table 6. Datum 6

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
F	F	Yes. But, I mean n-no-no, your intention, your personal intention to, to make things go in balance. For example, okay, my family should run well, how I run my family, how I bring my children. In the other side, err..., you can also pursue your career, and then, of course you cannot just say I believe in God without trying or to do anything. You can pursue your career, and you can also, what is it? You can also become a committed worker, for example. So, how do you keep things in balance?
E	F	Yeah-yeah-yeah.

In the following sample, it can be seen that E totally flouts the relevance maxim since there

is no relevance in E's utterance which answers F's query. The full excerpt is provided below to give context understanding.

Focusing on E's bad habit, F asks what real ways E has prepared to change her habit. E should answer it by mentioning the strategies. Conversely, she tells about her obstacles in changing her being late habit. This must be irrelevant to what should be needed. However, the answer is still relevant in which E's illocution is that she has intention and maybe some strategies to change the habit, but unfortunately she also has many obstacles that F should know. Even, the problems here are thought more important for E to talk than the strategies she should explain. From that, it can be concluded that E flouts the **relevance** maxim.

Conversational Implicatures and Maxim Flouting Types in Male-Male Interactions

Based on all the male-male interactions, it can be calculated that the sum of implicatures is **thirty-three** with only three maxims flouted: quality, quantity, and manner. This total implicatures are fewer than the ones from female-female interactions which are fifty. Apart from the comparison to the female-female interactions, there are some samples depicting the implicatures from male-male interactions.

In this exchange, I wants to figure out how J's teaching teaching activities run. Ideally, the answer could be short like *well* or *not well*. In actual fact, J describes it with so many expressions which lead only to the last expression *there's no problem for that* which is also referred to the illocution. The rest words used are considered un-

Table 7. Datum 7

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
F	F	Do you have an intention to change that particular...
E	F	Yeah, of course- <i>lah</i> . So.
F	F	What is it?
		Because something like this. Sometimes, yeah, so, me, I as, err...career, working mother, sometimes I feel bit guilty to my children, because I spend seven hours in the office, and sometimes more. Sometimes my, I am in the house, but not my soul. Sometimes I get and I know that you understand that kind of feeling. Sometimes, err..., to pay my guilt, I, my, I force myself to-I force myself to be, I force myself to, what? To take care of all of my children needs, start from, err..., preparing, what? their uniforms, and then after that all of, then waters, their food, their meal to be taken,er..., to schools, and then take them to the schools, and then after that, yeah, make sure that they have already do, err..., finish their homework, and then accompany them when they have homework, and then after that, what? Many things, and because I have five, it takes more time.
E	F	

necessary, since those have similar meaning with the last expression. Thus, J is caught to flout the maxim of **quantity**.

Table 8. Datum 8

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
I	M	So, how's your teaching? Ya, it's, you know, I don't have any problem with my materials, my classes, my students, and also everything I need to teach. There's no problem for that.
J	M	

In the next sample, J implicates another meaning. The implicature emerges after J talks about his girlfriend. I then asks whether J talks about his girlfriend or his ex-girlfriend although previously J has clearly mentioned *have a girlfriend*. It is done merely to make sure that I and J have the same understanding. Responding to I's curiosity, J only continues without giving a direct answer.

Table 9. Datum 9

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
J	M	You know, I actually have-have a girlfriend. Don't you know that?
I	M	You have-you have or you had?
J	M	(thinking and laughing)
I	M	You have?
J	M	At this moment I'm not really sure whether it is officially my girlfriend or not. But I have relationship with someone.

From the long explanation, there is no *yes* or *no* expression to answer I's question, although actually J wants to say *yes, I'm talking about having a girlfriend now, not my ex-girlfriend*. The obscure answer, accordingly, is categorised as breaking the maxim of **manner**.

After that, to make a situation full of laughter, I pretends to ask whether J's mate is a woman or man, although J has mentioned *girlfriend* indeed. This blatantly flouts the maxim of **quality**. In that condition, I does not want the answer as he does that for the sake of joking. This is also

supported by I's laugh as the response to J's answer.

Table 10. Datum 10

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
I	M	<u>Is she or is he?</u>
J	M	Of course she.
I	M	(laughing)

Conversational Implicatures and Maxim Flouting Types in Male-Female Interactions

I can say females win the implicature battle (implicating 38 meanings compared to 19 ones). Furthermore, similar to the first categorisation, this yields 4 full maxim exploitations. The examples can be started from Q and R's conversation which focuses on LGBT (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender) as the hottest issue that day. To start the implicature, Q, female instructor, makes a joke about R.

Table 11. Datum 11

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
Q	F	I believe that marriage must happen with man, err... different gender, I mean, male and female.
R	M	Man and woman (laughing)
Q	F	And then, okay. That is...But I do respect people choice.
Q	F	If you are interested in that kind of marriage...
R	M	(laughing)
Q	F	Okay...I will still respect you.

In this case, Q puts her idea about the concept of marriage. She holds an idea of different sex marriage. However, a highlight is also given through implicating that she respects the people who support or even do same sex marriage. She construes her idea by intentionally giving false information in order to make a joke about R. In fact, Q has known that R is in her line about marriage concept. Her smile when Q delivers the locution also supports that she does not mean her statement. To sum up, Q's way is called as flouting the **quality** maxim.

The second implicature is addressed by R as he gives his comment on Q's idea before. The complete utterances are provided below.

Table 12. Datum 12

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
R	M	Well, me personally, basically. I also told my students that, okay, I'm basically reject this kind of marriage.
Q	F	Indeed.
R	M	Reject it. But, because I have no solution for that.
Q	F	Aha?
		I just keep what people did about that. I just like when <u>people hold it as man and man, woman and woman...</u>
R	M	that's their right.

As mentioned before, R also has the same idea as Q. He does not agree with the same sex marriage, but he still respects the ones having the opposite idea. R, in his underlined utterance, wants to say that he will still respect the people who support man-man or woman-woman marriage. But, R here omits the marriage by still considering that Q will understand what he says. That is why, **quantity** maxim is flouted as R gives less information.

In the next conversation, S and T talk about the problem they find in teaching the material to the students. There are several students complaining that they are taught about general English for communication, but then they are tested with TOEFL. Seeing this phenomenon, T throws a simile to implicate that they teach their students certain materials, but they test them by giving some difficult tests not representing the materials learnt. This action is finally categorised as exploitation of **manner** maxim since T gives an obscure expression.

Table 13. Datum 13

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
T	M	Confusing? That's right. <u>It is like err...we teach our students to ride a bike, but we have to test them by</u>
S	F	To swim maybe?
		<u>Riding swimming or riding motorcycle, or car.</u> That's
T	M	why, yeah...

Relevance becomes the next and the only maxim flouting type occurring in W and X's dialogue. It happens after X brings his plan not to

be permanent instructor. X does not give the relevant answer. Yet, she repeats X's last word in her singing.

Table 14. Datum 14

Subject's Code	Gender	Utterance
X	M	That's why I will be happy to be non-permanent instructor, forever.
W & X	F & M	(laughing)
W	F	<u>(singing) forever and I...</u> (laughing)

By singing, W brings the interaction to be more fun situation. The word *forever*, although also stated by X, is actually taken differently by W. Here, she wants to convey the illocution that she has understood what X means (indicated also by W's laughter as the initial response) and only wants to continue the conversation through making a joke. To conclude, W can be regarded to flout the relevance maxim.

Gender-Based Difference of Engendering Conversational Implicatures

There is an assumption for this research saying that female can implicate a meaning more frequently than male. This is, after analysing all the data, finally accepted since female instructors, either in the same-gender or cross-gender interaction, are captured to yield the more implicatures. The following tables represent the implicature frequency difference between male and female in the same-gender interactions:

Table 15. Conversational Implicature Frequencies in Female-Female Interactions

A & B	C & D	E & F	G & H	TOTAL
12	12	11	15	50

Table 16. Conversational Implicature Frequencies in Male-Male Interactions

I & J	K & L	M & N	O & P	TOTAL
8	6	8	11	33

From the tables, it can be described that female instructors are able to naturally implicate a message more frequently compared to the male ones. The evidence is not only from the whole frequency of the implicatures, but also from the total from each of the interactions. It is then evi-

dent that the least implicature frequency from the female interaction group even becomes the most leading one in the male groups. So far, these all support the preliminary assumption.

Such conclusion is strengthened by the last interaction category in which female instructors conquer the implicature frequency war. Although the implicature frequencies among all the interactions range from seven up to twenty-three, the female's power to implicate a message more frequently is constant. The table below gives the calculation:

Table 17. Conversational Implicature Frequencies in Male-Female Interactions

Male & Female Group	F	M	Total
Q & R	7	6	13
S & T	5	2	7
U & V	8	6	14
W & X	18	5	23
Total	38	19	57

Besides the implicature total, it is also important to trace the distribution of maxim exploitation based on gender below:

Table 18. Maxim Exploitation Distribution Based on Gender

	Female	Male	Total
Quantity	52	33	85
Quality	21	13	34
Relevance	2	0	2
Manner	13	6	19
Total	88	52	140

From the table, it can be traced that quantity maxim exploitation constitutes the most repeatedly way to engender a conversational implicature. But, females are still regarded to do more exploitation on such maxim. This can be seen through their frequency of fifty-two compared to the males' one which has only thirty-three.

Finally, it can be concluded that the study then runs well with 88 implicatures yielded from females, and 52 from males. These numbers then support Mousa's idea (2004) that female does better in implicating a message more frequently than male. This finally can be related to Lakoff's idea in Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003: 158),

who is supported by Vaezi and Afghari (2015) also Macaulay (2001), saying that women are more indirect than men, since Rundquist (1992) regards implicature as one type of indirectness. This indirectness, explained by Simpson and Mayr (2010: 19), might be caused by different nurturance in certain subcultures and socialisation. Women and men are nurtured to be nice or competitive.

CONCLUSION

After twenty-four English instructors' utterances in their one-to-one interactions are observed, the answers can be exposed. Firstly, there are 140 different conversational implicatures found such as about agreement, disagreement, explanation, joke, complaint, and so forth. These are also varied in terms of topics and contexts. But, the most important conclusion is that all the analysed utterances do not literally represent the intended messages. This finally indicates that utterances, when analysed, should consider not only the pragmatic meanings, but also the semantic meanings in the beginning.

Then, the implicatures are engendered by variously flouting the maxim of quantity, quality, manner, and relevance. Quantity maxim exploitation is regarded as the most frequently found way while relevance is seen otherwise. It can be measured through 85 quantity maxim exploitations versus 2 relevance maxim one.

There is evident proof to conclude that female instructors implicate a meaning more frequently than male ones. It can be justified from the females' 88 implicatures against males' 52 ones. However, the order to flout the maxim is not so dissimilar. In fact, both male and female instructors have the same pattern of flouting the maxim quantity as the most repeatedly exploitation, followed with quality, manner, and relevance. Here, males even do not exploit the relevance maxim at all. This is slightly different from females who contribute two cases.

REFERENCES

- Bublitz, Wolfram, and Neal R. Norrick. 2011. *Foundations of Pragmatics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Eckert, Penelope, and Sally McConnell-Ginet. 2003. *Language and Gender*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Flowerdew, John. 2013. *Discourse in English Language Education*. Oxon; Routledge.
- Grujicic-Alatraste, Lubie. 2008. Pragmatics in Academia: The Role of Gender and Power Relations in the Use of Implicatures. *TESOL & Applied Linguistics* 8: 1-3. Retrieved 12 April 2016 from <http://tesol-dev.journals.cdrs.columbia.edu/>

- wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2015/06/3.6_ForumGrujicic_2008.pdf.
- Macaulay, Marcia. 2001. Tough Talk: Indirectness and Gender in Requests for Information. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 293-316. Retrieved 12 April 2016 from <https://www.ffri.hr/~ibrdar/komunikacija/seminari/MacAulay,%202001%20-%20Gender%20and%20indiretedness%20in%20requests%20for%20in.pdf>.
- Mey, Jacob L. 2009. *Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics (2nd Ed.)*. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd.
- Mousa, Wafa'a Abd El Motti Al Seid. 2004. *The Effect of Age, Gender, and Culture on the Use and interpretation of Implicature: A Pragmatic Study*. Thesis of Yarmouk University. Retrieved 12 April 2016 from repository.yu.edu.jo/handle/123456789/553607. Accessed on 3 October 2015.
- Punch, Keith F. 2005. *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Rundquist, Suellen. 1992. Indirectness: A Gender Study of Flouting Gruce's Maxims. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18: 431-449. Retrieved 12 April 2016 from www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/037821669290083N.
- Simpson, Paul, and Andrea Mayr. 2010. *Language and Power: A Resource Book for Students*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Stecker, Robert. 2003. *Interpretation and Construction: Art, Speech, and the Law*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Thomas, Jenny. 2013. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.
- Vaezi, Ramin, and Akbar Afghari. 2015. She Talks, He Talks: Gender, Indirectness, and Length. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research* 2: 232-237. Retrieved 12 April 2016 from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275241067>.
- Wang, Haiyan. 2011. Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 2: 1162-1167. Retrieved 12 April 2016 from 10.4304/jltr.2.5.1162-1167.