

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This introduction chapter deals with the background of the study, research questions, research objectives, significance of the study, scope and limitation of the study, and definition of key terms.

A. Background of the study

In the development of the use of language as a communication tool between humans, Chomsky (1965) solved the study of the language rules system of social rules studies that determine contextual use of language. He did this by making a distinction between competence and performance, as well as communicative competence and communicative performance.

According to Chomsky, competence consists of mental representations of the linguistic rules that underlie the internal grammar of the speakers. The grammar is more implicit and is evident in the intuition of the speakers about the grammatical sentences. Meanwhile, performance consists of using the grammar in understanding and producing language. The distinction between competence and performance has been developed to cover communicative aspects of language (Ellis 1997).

More simply, competence refers to the understanding of the rules, while performance is related to the use of the rules socially. He refers to humans abstracted from contextual boundaries; he refers to humans in contextual boundaries that determine the act of speech. He refers to the ideal in reality of communicating.

In general, communicative competence includes the knowledge that the speakers and hearers have about underlies language behavior or and speech behavior correctly, and about constitutes language behavior effectively in relation to goals of communicative purpose. Therefore, it includes linguistic knowledge and pragmatics knowledge.

Meanwhile, communicative performance consists of using two actual knowledge, these are linguistics and pragmatics in understanding and producing discourse. Thus, communicative performance is a manifestation of communicative competence in communication and is essentially synonymous with language behavior.

More specifically, communicative competence involves knowledge not only about the language code, but also what will be said to whom, and how to say it correctly in certain situations. Communicative competencies relate to the social and cultural knowledge that speakers have to help them use and interpret linguistic forms.

It can be exemplified that a person who uses taboo expressions in public and causes aggravation to be said that he/she "does not know well", that is, he/she does not obtain certain rules for social action in the use of language. For the example, the greeting is spoken by students to the teacher. In the roles of communicative competence of language, the student will greet their teacher by saying "How are you, sir?" not "What's up?". Because "What's up" is more appropriate to say to their friend than their teacher. Then, the teacher as someone who is respected for his dedication in education, it has been very polite and

appropriate if the teacher gets the greeting “How are you, sir?” from students in asking how they are. That can all occur in communication between humans.

In essence, humans are social beings. Humans are social beings who in daily life cannot be separated from others, because humans also need others to interact. When humans interact with others, they use language as their tools. The existence of language, experts sparks several theories related to the language. One of them is Linguistics, which is a science that studies its language will provide an understanding of nature and the whole intricacies of language, and how language performs its role in human life in society. Linguistics, as the science, is divided into several branches including Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics.

One of the branches of linguistics is pragmatics. It has some definitions from the experts. Pragmatics studies the use of language by humans depend on the social condition where they live and with whom they interact (Mey, 2001). However, the focus of pragmatics is addresser's meaning that has the contextual meaning between addresser and addressee (Yule, 1996); because sometimes the utterances of addresses are difficult to understand by the addressee. Afterward, the pragmatics includes the use of language, communication, context, and interpretation implicitly. So, pragmatics is the study of addresser meaning what people mean by their utterances rather than what the words or phrases might mean by themselves.

In communicating, the addresser and addressee indirectly work together (Yule, 2006). The collaboration that they do is the addresser tries to make the

addressee understand with his/her utterances and addressee tries to understand what the addresser is saying. The addresser will try to make his/her speech does not confusing, it does not make fool of someone, and also it does not have hide information. Instead, the addressee also tries to understand the meaning of the addresser's speech indeed to understand the addresser's utterances. At that time, the addresser and the addressee also carry out the cooperative principle through expressions to protect the face of the addresser. The cooperative principle is talk exchange between addresser and addressee (Grice, 1975). In order for cooperation to work properly, there are principles of cooperation that should be followed. In this principle of cooperation, there are four maxims as follows; maxim of the quantity, the maxim for the quality, maxim of the relation and maxim of the manner.

In addition, in the conversation, there will ever be a lack of communication. This happens due to the lack of understanding of the addresser and the addressee about the principle of conversation. Addresser does it because he/she thoughts that what he/she has said is uncertain and could endanger the addressee's face. These phrases are called hedges which are to protect the addresser that what he/she says is not totally accurate. Not only the principle of conversation, but hedges on conversation also needed for caution in issuing expressions. Hedges focuses on expressions used by a person when he/she is not sure that he/she will obey the maxims (Yule, 1996). Hedges cautious notes about how an utterance should be taken when giving information. Yule added that there are four types of a maxim that must be obeyed by addresser. Types of hedges are

hedges of the quantity maxim, hedges of the quality maxim, hedges of relation maxim, and hedges of manner maxim (1996).

Hedges of the quantity maxim will apply when the addresser has the limited information and the addresser does not fully obey the information. When the addresser does not as truthful as normally expected, he/she will practice the hedges of the quality maxim. Afterward, the hedges of relation maxim will be used by the addresser if he/she does not obey that his/her says is relevant. And the last is the addresser delivers messages in perspicuous ways by using hedges of manner maxim. The addresser delivers the messages because the messages may be obscure, ambiguous, not brief, and not in good order (Chojimah, 2015).

Like what happens in a statement, "*As far as I know, she is married*". In this utterance, the addresser makes a strong statement that *she is married*. It means that the addresser is fully responsible with the quantity of the information he/she shares. But by prefacing it with, *as far as I know*, the addresser simultaneously eliminates the quantity of information being conveyed and advises the addressee to measure how much he/she observes the hedges of quantity maxim.

Another example shows, "*This may sound like a dumb question, but it has beautiful eyes, right?*". The statement is appeared by a student when he/she reads and discusses a reading narrative text of fable and the text has a beautiful picture of white rabbits that has blue eyes. The statement gives the information that the addresser would like to change the current topic. The addresser prefaces his/her utterance with *this may sound like a dumb question, but.....* It means that the addresser applies the hedges of relation maxim.

The addresser does not only avoid infractions by applying maxims but the addresser should understand language function. When the addresser says something, he/she must understand which whom and where said. The language that uses to make a conversation with a friend is different with language that uses to make a conversation with the lecturer or director. Making conversation with an adult and making conversation with the older one then the addresser is different in electing the language function.

These are two statements that produce by a student to his/her lecturer, “*Could you want to lend me a ballpoint?*” with “*I want to borrow your ballpoint!*”. Between two statements, the statement *Could you want to lend me a ballpoint?* is more polite and appropriate than *I want to borrow your ballpoint!*. This happens because when the addresser wants to say something, he/she must understand with whom he/she is communicating or he/she should know who the addressee of his/her utterance is. Although *I want to borrow your ballpoint!* has the correct grammar structure and *Could you want to lend me a ballpoint?* has a wrong grammar arrangement (it should be “would you like to lend me ballpoint?”) but *Could you want to lend me a ballpoint?* is still more appropriate to use than *I want to borrow your ballpoint!*. Because grammatical error will not cause social conflicts, even the correct grammar arrangement will not guarantee to avoid social conflicts.

The limited knowledge about hedges and the lack of skills in the use of hedges variations will affect the quality of the addresser's language appropriately

and politely. Because how much input the addresser gets about hedges will affect how much variation the addresser uses in its output in the communication.

Pragmatics discussion, especially hedges are found in oral and written language. In written Language, hedges are used by the writer to provide information to the reader. Whereas, in the oral languages, hedges can occur in a communication between two or more people. In classroom discourse, there are also hedges in the utterances of the class communities. For example; lecturer lectures, communication between lecturer and students, communication between students and students, and others.

Many studies have been done related to the matter of hedges types in ELT classroom discourse. The study was using hedges by the tertiary students when addressing questions in a discussion session of a presentation to the presenters and the lecturer. There were nine students of Language in using a course of the master of English education program in a State University in Bandung. Introductory phrases were the most frequently-used forms used to hedge and hedges function mostly to attenuate epistemic commitment in addressing questions. Although hedges used when addressing questions in a discussion session of a presentation, some findings indicated that the hedges were not entirely in line with academic conventions. Then, the researcher used qualitative research and the data conducted by transcribing and coding the hedges types used by tertiary students (Faris, 2015).

Hedging devices also used in Kurdish spoken of 35 people discourse to indicate a lack of complete commitment to the truth of the proposition, and a

desire not to express the commitment categorically, or to lessen the impact of an utterance. The research showed that hedging as a mitigating device is extensively employed in different conversations. The study has shown hedging devices have the same roles in Kurdish as they have in English. They used hedges to reduce the certainty and sureness of the utterances. It indicated that some pragmatics devices modify the epistemic strength of the statement in the Kurdish language just as they do in English and Arabic. The researchers conducted data by applied observation, tape recording, and interviews (Behnam & Khaliliaqdam, 2012).

Hedges of the speeches of King Abdullah II of Jordan, as well as to examine the pragmatics functions of these devices. Twenty-five political speeches of King Abdullah II, randomly selected from the official website of King Abdullah were analyzed adopting Salager-Meyer's taxonomy. The study revealed that the most frequently used hedging device in King Abdullah's speech is modal auxiliaries, and the most frequently used hedging device subcategory is the modal auxiliary "can". The findings suggest that these hedging devices fulfill several pragmatics functions. These findings contribute to the understanding that speaking a second language (Arabic, in the case of King Abdullah II) neither affects the types of hedging devices nor the functions these devices perform. Moreover, contrary to scientific discourse (e.g., medicine), the research concludes that political discourse as a non-scientific genre resort to hedging devices to express indirectness, politeness, lack of commitment and probability. The researchers applied a mix method there is a quantitative and qualitative approach (Rabab'ah & Rumman, 2015).

China English lecturer often use interpersonal metafunction when teaching English in their classroom. It aims is the classroom environment or teacher-student relationship becomes a concern for the registries features of teacher talk in EFL classroom and the application of hedges can contribute to the positive emotional response in the process of learning. This study is determined by the contextual variables, and it can enable learners to move beyond their current interlanguage receptive and productive capacities. The method in this study is qualitative research by applied classroom observation and transcription from the teacher-students interaction (Jixin & Xiaoting, 2017).

Not only in China, but a study in Iranian also showed that there is a significant difference in using of hedges between female and male English lecturer' spoken. Their teaching experience varied from 15-19 years with their age ranged between 41 until 50 years old. This study shows that male lecturer use hedges more often than female lecturer with a difference in the female corpus is 35,54 compared to 41,93 in male lecturer corpus. The researchers used a mix method in this study. The first approach in this study is a qualitative approach. In other words, they are carefully analyzed in their contexts that are functioning as hedges. One teaching session of each instructor was videotaped and the instructors were asked to view their video and to recollect their reasons for resorting to different activities for teaching. Their recollections were recorded and transcribed. And the second is the quantitative approach, which is also presented to identify the frequency of various devices and to produce comparable data across the genders (Tajik & Ramezani, 2018).

A study has been conducted also on the use of hedges and boosters in L1 and L2 argumentative paragraphs of Turkish students. The results of this study showed the participants in this study often express an appropriate degree of certainty and pragmatics vagueness while writing in L1 and L2. The findings further indicate that there is a parallelism between the teaching materials used in academic writing classes and the types, frequencies, and functions of hedges and boosters produced in L2 paragraphs. This research showed that the frequency of using hedges in L2 is higher than L1. It happened because of differences in their language and culture (Sedef, 2012).

Considering the previous research reviewed and informal research done by the researcher, there is no depth analysis of hedges types in ELT classroom discourse. The analysis of hedges types is only focused on addressing questions in a discussion session of a presentation to the presenters and the lecturer, the researcher applied qualitative approach by using transcribed and coded the hedges types that used by tertiary students. Pragmatics devices modify the epistemic strength of the statement in the Kurdish language just as they do in English and Arabic, the researchers conducted data by applied observation, tape recording, and interviews (qualitative approach). Later hedges in the speeches of King Abdullah II of Jordan that related to Salager-Meyer's theory by applying mix method those are the quantitative and qualitative approach.

Furthermore, Hedges in China English lecturer researched by the qualitative approach by using classroom observation and transcription from the teacher-student interaction. Not only it, the differences of using hedges by female

and male English lecturer' spoken in Iranian that conducted by mix method, qualitative and quantitative approach. And the last is using hedges and boosters in L1 and L2 argumentative paragraphs of Turkish students and the researcher collected the data by descriptive statistics qualitative approach. Therefore, a study which focuses on the analysis of hedges types that used by lecturer' and students' utterances need to be conducted in order to know how far the hedges in ELT classroom discourse.

According to the explanation above, the researcher wants to conduct research about the analysis of hedges found in ELT classroom discourse of English education department of IAIN Tulungagung with discourse analysis approach in qualitative research as the research design. Therefore, the researcher is going to conduct the research entitled "*Hedges in ELT Classroom Discourse*". Hence, the researcher is going to conduct a discourse analysis of the qualitative design.

B. The research questions

Based on the background of the study explained in the previous section, this study is conducted to answer the research questions formulated as:

1. What types of hedges are used by the lecturers in the classroom?
2. What types of hedges are used by students in the classroom?
3. Why particularly hedges are employed more than others by lecturer and student?

C. The research objectives

Regarding the research problems above, the objectives of the study are formulated as follow:

1. To know the types of hedges are used by the lecturers in the classroom.
2. To know the types of hedges are used by students in the classroom.
3. To know the reason why particularly hedges employed more than others by lecturer and student are.

D. The significance of the study

The result of this research is to give some theoretical and practical advantages for the following parts:

1. Theoretically, this study offers some benefits for further directions and research about hedges in ELT classroom discourse. It also provides useful information for English practitioners in designing English materials especially in English skill and content course.
2. Practically, the result of this research is beneficial for:
 - a. The English students

It is expected that this study enlightens the English students to provide better use of hedges types in more variation. Additionally, it helps the English students in evaluating the existing hedges types and developing it continues to gain in better communication targets.

- b. The English lecturers

The result of this research provides an analysis of the hedges types in ELT classroom discourse. It can be used by the lecturers as

their assessment in the teaching-learning process to know their abilities and students' ability in placing the hedges types based on its' function and variety.

c. The curriculum developers

The curriculum developers can make the results of this research as a reference in revising and developing teaching materials according to what students need and communicative material that is competent in the field of Pragmatics.

d. The researcher

This research is useful for the researcher to convey her ideas precisely, to identify and to have a good understanding of hedges in ELT classroom discourse especially in spoken language.

E. Scope and limitation of the study

The researcher conducts the study focusing on the analysis of hedges which used in ELT classroom discourse of English language and teaching program of school of graduate students of IAIN Tulungagung. This research is limited on hedges found in ELT classroom discourse of second semester of English language and teaching program of school of graduate students of IAIN Tulungagung. In this case, the aspects to be studied by researchers are limited to the types of hedges used in lecturer' and students' utterances used in the ELT classroom discourse which focus on spoken language. Then, reasons why certain hedges are more often used by lecturer' and students' utterances in their spoken language of communication in the classroom.

F. Definition of key terms

In order to make the readers understand the words that are provided in this research, the researcher provides some definitions of key terms as follows:

1. Hedge

The hedge is an expression used by speakers when they are not sure to observe cooperative principles (Yule, 1996).

2. Classroom discourse

Classroom discourse is the distinctive type of discourse that occurs in classrooms (Nunan, 1993). It means that all verbal activities that occur in the classroom, including teacher lectures, interactions between lecturer and students, and interactions between students and students can be referred to as classroom discourse. Then, this research focuses on spoken discourse.