

**UNIVERSITY OF ÇUKUROVA
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**IMPLIED MEANING IN DRAMATIC TEXTS:
AN ELT CONTEXT**

Cihan TEKİN

MA THESIS

ADANA/2007

UNIVERSITY OF ÇUKUROVA
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

IMPLIED MEANING IN DRAMATIC TEXTS:
AN ELT CONTEXT

Cihan TEKİN

SUPERVISOR: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU

MA THESIS

ADANA/2007

To ukurova University Institute of Social Sciences,

We certify that this thesis is satisfactory for the award degree of Master of Arts in the department of English Language Teaching.

Head: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU
(Supervisor)

Member of Examining Comittee: Asist. Prof. Dr. Hatice UBUKU

Member of Examining Comittee: Asist. Prof. Dr. Silvia Z. AKINCI

CONFIRMATION

I confirm that these signatures are belong to the comittee members./...../ 2007

Prof. Dr. Nihat KKSAVA
Director of the Institute

P.S.: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures and photographs in this dissertation, whether original or quoted from other sources, is subject to the law of Works of Art and Thought No: 5846.

Not: Bu tezde kullanılan zgn ve baka kaynaktan yapılan bildiriflerin, izelge, ekil ve fotorafların kaynak gsterilmeden kullanımı, 5846 Sayılı Fikir ve Sanat Eserleri Kanunu'ndaki hkmlere tabidir.

ÖZET

İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ ALANINDA TİYATRO OYUNLARINDAKİ ÖRTÜK ANLAM

Cihan TEKİN

Yüksek Lisans Tezi İngiliz Dili Anabilim Dalı

Danışman: Doç. Dr. Hatice SOFU

Eylül, 2007, 80 Sayfa

Bu çalışma söz edimleri ve konuşma sezdirileri teorilerinin tiyatro oyunlarındaki örtük anlama ulaşmadaki işlevini araştırmayı amaçlamıştır. Bunun yanı sıra, bu çalışma Çukurova Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümündeki öğrenci okurların tiyatro oyunlarında örtük anlama ulaşıp ulaşmadıklarını araştırmayı amaçlamıştır. Öğrencilerin örtük anlam farkındalıklarını ölçmek için Çukurova Üniversitesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bölümünde okuyan üçüncü sınıf öğrencilerinden oluşan bir grup katılımcı seçilmiştir. Katılımcılar, tiyatro eserlerinden özellikle seçilmiş iki alıntıyı okumak ve örtük anlam anlayışlarını ölçen soruları yanıtlamakla görevlendirilmiştir. Bulgular, katılımcıların ironi ve eğretileme içermeyen alıntı 2deki örtük anlamlara ulaşmada daha iyi performans gösterdiklerini sergilerken eğretileme ve ironiler içeren alıntı 1de nispeten daha zayıf performans gösterdiklerini sergilemiştir. Bulgular ayrıca katılımcıların örtük anlama yönlendirildiklerinde daha iyi performans gösterdiklerini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bu nedenle, sonuçlar göz önünde bulundurularak sözcelerin edimsel yanlarına ve sözcelerden çıkarılan sezdirilere dikkat çekilerek öğrencilerin örtük anlamlara yönlendirilebilecekleri söylenebilir. Bununla birlikte, sonuçların değerlendirilmesi, söz edimleri ve konuşma sezdirileri teorilerinin tiyatro eserlerini yorumlamada kullanılmasının İngiliz Dili Eğitimi bölümlerinde etkili bir yaklaşım olabileceğini göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Söz edimleri, konuşma sezdirileri, çıkarım yapma, tiyatro oyunu.

ABSTRACT**IMPLIED MEANING IN DRAMATIC TEXTS:
AN ELT CONTEXT****Cihan TEKİN****Thesis of Master of Arts, English Language Teaching Department****Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice SOFU****September, 2007, 80 Pages**

This study aims to investigate the function of theories of speech act and conversational implicature in inferencing the implied meaning in dramatic texts. Additionally, it aims to investigate whether the implied meaning in drama can be arrived at by the student- readers in ELT department in Çukurova University. In order to investigate students' awareness of implied meanings in drama a participant group of third- year students in ELT department in Çukurova University have been selected. Participants have been assigned to read two specifically selected extracts from dramatic texts and answer questions measuring their understanding of implied meanings. The findings have revealed that participants have showed a better performance in inferencing the implied meanings in the extract 2 which do not include ironies or metaphors whereas they have showed a relatively poor performance in inferencing the extract 1 which includes ironies and metaphors. Findings have also revealed that participants have showed a better performance when they are guided to implied meanings. Thus, considering the results it can be asserted that students can be directed to implied meanings in the theatrical text by highlighting the illocutionary aspect of utterances and implicatures drawn from these utterances. Additionally, the evaluation of the results illustrates that using speech act theory and conversational implicatures in interpreting the drama in ELT departments can be an efficient approach to the study of drama.

Key words: Speech acts, conversational implicature, inferencing, dramatic texts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a pleasure for me to thank all the people who contributed to this study. First of all, I would like to express my gratitude, to my thesis advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice Sofu for her long term support, encouragement, and valuable remarks.

I would like to thank Asst. Prof. Dr. Tijen Türeli, Asst. Prof. Dr. Hatice Çubukçu and Asst. Prof Dr. Mehmet Seyis for their contribution.

I'm indebted to family especially my mother Şahize, my sister, Özlem and my brother Doğan for their encouragement.

I owe speacial thanks to my friends Gülay Efe, Mert Büyükcan, for their warm encouragement and motivation.

I would like to thank my friends Özlem Atay and Şehnaz Nigar Çelik for their friendship and motivation in the course of my post graduate education.

I'm also indebted to third year ELT students of 2006-2007 academic year in Çukurova University.

Lastly, I would like to express my deepest grattitude to my father for his extraordinary support; without his encouragement it would be impossible to complete this study. I would also like to stress that this study has been dedicated to the memory of my father Ziver TEKİN.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZET.....	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	viii

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of The Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	3
1.3. Aim and Scope of the Study.....	3
1.4. Research Questions	4
1.5. Operational Definitions	4

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction	5
2.2. Definition of Pragmatics	5
2.3. Austin's Speech Act Theory	6
2.3.1. The Collapse of Performative Hypothesis	7
2.3.2. Locutionary Acts	9
2.3.3. Illocutionary Acts.....	9
2.3.4. Perlocutionary Acts	11
2.3.5. Primary and Implicit Performatives	11
2.4. Searle's Speech Act Theory	13
2.4.1 Searle's Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts	14
2.4.2. Searle's Conditions for Speech Acts	15
2.4.3. Indirect Speech Acts.....	16
2.5. The Relevance of Speech Act Theory to Dramatic Texts	18
2.5.1. The Application Of Speech Act Theory To Dramatic Texts.....	19

2.6. Conversational Implicature	21
2.6.1. Violation of Maxim	22
2.6.2. Flouting of Maxim	23
2.6.2.1. Flouts Exploiting Quality Maxim	23
2.6.2.2. Flouts Exploiting Quantity Maxim	24
2.6.2.3. Flouts Exploiting the Relation Maxim	24
2.6.2.4. Flouts exploiting the Manner Maxim.....	24
2.6.3. Opting out of a Maxim	25
2.6.4. Infringing Maxims.....	25
2.6.5. Clash.....	26
2.7. Summary	26

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction	27
3.2. Participants	27
3.3. Materials.....	28
3.3.1. Implied Meaning in Extract 1.....	28
3.3.2. Implied Meaning in Extract 2.....	33
3.4. Procedure of the Study	36
3.5. Data Analysis	37

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1. Introduction	38
4.2. Speech Act Theory in Inferencing the Dramatic Dialogue in ELT.....	38
4.3. The Effect of Conversational Implicature in Inferencing Drama	42
4.4. The Participants' Understanding of Implied Meaning in First Section	44
4.4.1. The Participants' Identification of Speech Acts in the Two Extracts	44
4.4.2. The Participants Understanding of Implicatures in the Two Extracts	46
4.4.3. The Participants Understanding of Global Intentions in the Two Extracts.....	47

4.4.4. Differences in Understanding of Implied Meaning in Extract 1	49
4.4.5. Differences in Understanding of Implied Meaning in Extract 2	50
4.5. The Participants' Understanding of Implied Meaning in Second Section	51
4.5.1. The Participants' Identification of Speech Acts in the Two Extracts	52
4.5.2. The Participants' Understanding of Implicatures in the Two Extracts	54
4.5.3. The Participants' Understanding of Global Intentions in the Two Extracts	55
4.5.4. Differences in Understanding Of Implied Meaning in Extract 1 in Second Section	56
4.5.5. Differences in Understanding Of Implied Meaning in Extract 2 in Second Section	58
4.6. Differences in Understanding Implied Meaning in Both Extracts in First and Second Sections	58
4.7. Summary	60

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1. Introduction	61
5.2. Research Questions and Findings	61
5.3. Implications for ELT	63
5.4. Implications for Further Studies	63
REFERENCES	64
APPENDICES	68
CURRICULUM VITAE	80

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Illocutionary Force in Syntactic Structure	17
Table 3.1: Speech Acts in Extract 1	31
Table 3.2: Implicatures in Extract 1	32
Table 3.3: Global Intentions of the Speakers in Extract 1.....	33
Table 3.4: Speech Acts in Extract 2	35
Table 3.5: Implicatures in Extract 2	36
Table 3.6: Global Intentions of the Characters in Extract 2.....	36
Table 4.1: The Participants' Identification of Speech Acts in Extract 1	44
Table 4.2: The Participants Identification of Speech Acts in Extract 2	45
Table 4.3: The Participants Understanding of Implicatures in Extract 1	46
Table 4.4: The Participants' Understanding of the Implicatures	47
Table 4.5: The Participants' Understanding of Global Intentions in Extract 1	48
Table 4.6: The Participants' Understanding of the Global Intentions in Extract 2.....	48
Table 4.7: The Participants' Identification of Speech Acts in Extract 1	52
Table 4.8: The Participants' Identification of Speech Acts in Extract 2.....	53
Table 4.9: The Participants' Understanding of the Implicatures	54
Table 4.10: The Participants' Understanding of the Implicatures	55
Table 4.11: The Participants' Understanding of the Global Intentions in Extract 1	55
Table 4.12: The Participants' Understanding of the Global Intentions in Extract 2.....	56
Table 4.13: The Participants' Understanding of implied meaning in Extract 1 first and second sections.....	58
Table 4.14: The Participants' Understanding of implied meaning in Extract 2 first and second sections	59

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Extract 1	67
Appendix 2: Questions for Extract 1 in First Section	70
Appendix 3: Extract 1 (Underlined version).....	71
Appendix 4: Questions for Extract 1 in Second Section.....	74
Appendix 5: Extract 2	75
Appendix 6: Questions for Extract 2 in First Section	77
Appendix 7: Questions for Extract in Second Section.....	78

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of The Study

Although drama is an important literary genre, getting students to engage with it as a text of speech related to theatre is not an easy matter (McCharty,1998:90). Drama unlike other genres of literature is written to be performed on the stage. Hence, the theatrical nature of it makes the dramatic study evasive and elusive. This type of literature requires more effort from the readers since the readers have to view the text in close relation to its imagined performance (Shen and Feng, 2001: 79). Additionally, drama is the neglected child due to the fact that it is in the mode of spoken conversation. Culpeper et al. (1998,i) Therefore, for many centuries there have been limited numbers of pedagogy for drama texts.

Indeed, there are two present methods, to teach drama to student readers; namely, the traditional method and performance-oriented method. The traditional method which is based on the practice of reading the text plays and discussing them in class is influenced by the dramatic criticism of 1940's, 1950s' and 1960's which treats plays rather like poems analysing metaphors, strands of imagery and so on, often lifts parts of plays out of context ignoring the dialogic aspect of them (Short, 1998: 158). This strategy provides no ways of analysing texts what is commonly held to be the stuff of drama meanings which are implied behind the words characters speak and made apparent on the stage by the use of gestures, tone of voice etc (ibid). On the other hand, the inefficiency of dramatic criticism in explaining these features has led some critics like Styan to assert that implied meanings in drama can only be observed in performance (Styan, 1960: 65). However, the performance of a play may not always be available to instructors and students. Teachers and students have to take the text as its object rather than the performance and have to understand them without necessarily seeing them.

Some other instructors, have attempted to integrate the performance- oriented teaching in drama courses. These instructors have highlighted the dialogic aspect of a play and suggested mini- performances acted by students in the classroom. They suggest that performance activities can be useful since they require the active engagement of the students (Collie and Slater, 1984:163, Showalter, 2003: 82). Similarly, McCharty (1996: 91) proposes

a strategy to the interpretation of drama including mini- performances and writing activities in order to get away from traditional, unmotivating modes of analysis.

However, these methods of teaching drama, have deficiencies in that they provide no way to access the implied meanings which are hidden behind the words that characters speak. Besides, in a functional analysis of drama contextual consideration should be taken into account. This means dramatic texts should be treated as a series of communicative acts, not just as a configuration of phonetic, syntactic and lexical patterns (Short,1998). A strategy including these features is proposed by scholars of pragmatics. They have focused on drama as a conversational genre (Short, 1998, 1996, 1996; Culpeper et al. 1998) Applying the theories of speech acts and conversational implicature to the interpretation of drama they have contributed to the study of drama.

Although, these theories are used in the analysis of naturally occurring conversation as Spitz states :

In many respects, the dialogue in which characters in dramatic texts take part is similar to everyday conversation, ...For example, both dramatic and everyday discourse have interlocutors who speak alternately and not simultaneously. Furthermore, just as in natural occurring conversation, the characters in plays can be seen as organising their speech by connecting their utterances with preceding utterances it is above all this sequential organisation of dramatic dialogue that makes it amenable to be analysed as conversation. (2001:1)

Characters in plays are believed to observe the same principles. Therefore, accessing drama texts with the techniques to analyse real conversation can provide valuable insights and simultaneously a clarification of different aspects of drama (e.g. Short, 1989, Simpson, 1989, Simpson, 1993, Leech 1992, Thornbarrow, Coulthard 1998) .

Based on the previous research, it can be asserted that speech act and conversational implicature theories can give insights in inferencing the unstated aspect of meaning of utterances of characters and illuminate the social relations among the characters. Besides, using these theories can provide an efficient strategy in teaching drama in ELT departments.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Traditional dramatic study is a text-based study including the reading plus commenting procedure. That approach is insufficient since it lifts parts of plays out of context. Another approach to the dramatic study regards the recognition of drama as a performance. It comes to dominate the field of pedagogy against the traditional unmotivating modes of analysis and springing from the classical view of “action is one of the significant physical components of drama which distinguishes it from the other types of art.” (Nutku, 2001: 29).

Seeing the inefficiency of the present methods in analysing texts what is commonly held to be implied behind the words that characters speak, some scholars suggest that applying the speech act and Gricean conversational implicature in the analysis of dramatic texts can provide useful insights in the field. On the one hand, through speech act theory it is possible to stress the performative aspect of utterance meaning and avoid the students taking the meaning of the utterance in dramatic texts at face value (Efe, 1993:42).

On the other hand, through conversational implicature it is possible to arrive at implied meaning by observing the characters’ exploitation of maxims. To be specific, considering the fact that these principles are exploited by the dramatist for arousing a realistic effect it is possible to make inferences about the unstated meanings in drama by looking at the speech act productions and observance of the Cooperative Principle of the characters (Short, 1998:58).

1.3. Aim and Scope of the Study

This study aims to represent the function of using the theory of speech act and conversational implicature in assigning meaning to the utterances in dramatic texts through related literature. Additionally, the study aims to provide some statistical findings about the student readers’ awareness of the implied meanings (including situations and dynamic social relationships between the characters.) in drama.

The evaluation of the findings will provide an insight to drama studies in ELT departments and it will provide a background to experimental studies which investigate the effects of using the speech act and conversational implicature in ELT department in drama courses.

1.4. Research Questions

The aim of the study is to search for two questions:

1- What is the function of theories of speech acts, cooperative principle, from pragmatics in making inferences about the implied meanings in dramatic interaction represented in related literature?

2- Are the student readers in ELT department in Çukurova University aware of the implied meanings based on the stated words in dramatic texts?

1.5. Operational Definitions

Implied Meaning: In this study, we refer to implied meaning as the unstated pragmatic meaning drawn from the literal meaning of the utterances via a path of inferences.

Pragmatics: Pragmatics is the field which focuses on meaning as a dynamic process, involving the negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer, the context of utterance and the meaning potential of an utterance (Thomas, 1995:22).

Inference: An inference is any additional information used by the listener to connect what is said to what is meant.

Locutionary act: The production of sounds and words with meanings.

Speech Act Theory: It is the theory which focuses on the action performed through utterances. Promising, warning, threatening, requesting are all distinct examples for speech acts. Today speech act, illocutionary force and force are used interchangeably.

Illocutionary Force: Illocutionary force is an inference the addressee is expected to make from the 'literal' sense of the expression exactly as uttered and the mutually assumed context in which it is uttered.

Conversational Implicature: Conversational implicature can be defined as implicit meaning drawn from the obvious flouting of a Gricean conversational maxim in combination with adherence to the cooperative principle. Thus, if somebody flouts the maxim he actually prompts the hearers to infer something about the reasons for his behaviour and interactions still goes on since hearers gets the implicature.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

In this part the general definition of pragmatics is tried to be provided and speech act theory and conversational implicature is to be explained and the function of these approaches in inferencing is tried to be represented. Additionally, the functions of these theories in the interpretation of drama are also represented through previous studies.

2.2. Definition of Pragmatics

The classical definition of pragmatics is that “it is the field interested in meaning in context” (Thomas, 1995: 1). Some scholars claim that pragmatics attempt to understand not only the meaning of words but also what the speaker of those words intend to convey. They treat pragmatics as the study of ‘intended speaker meaning’ (Yule, 1996:127). However, both definitions ignore the dynamic aspect of meaning in the field of pragmatics. As Thomas claims pragmatics reflects the view that:

meaning is not something which is inherent in the words alone, nor is it something which is produced by the hearer alone, nor is it produced by the speaker alone. Making meaning is a dynamic process, involving the negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer, the context of utterance (physical, social and linguistic) and the meaning potential of an utterance. (1995:22)

The principles of pragmatics focus on the intended speaker meaning and stress the importance of context along with the functions of the utterances and the role of the hearer. Therefore, using this theory as an approach to inferencing in the dramatic texts can be a good approach in the study of drama. Furthermore, accessing dramatic texts with theories of pragmatics can be an efficient strategy in developing a pedagogy in the study of drama in ELT departments.

2.3. Austin's Speech Act Theory

Austin in *'How to do things With Words'* (1962) aims to show that language is used not only to describe things but to do things as well. Therefore, some utterances have no truth conditions instead they are used to perform some acts. In fact, what Austin has done is to classify utterances as "*constatives* and *performatives*. Constatives are the statements which are intended to record some information about some facts. They are truth bearing utterances and it is possible to establish whether or not the statements are true. For example, according to Austin it is possible to establish whether "The "King of France is bald" is true. On the other hand, performatives are the statements in which the saying of the words constitutes the performing of an action as in the following examples:

I do (take this woman to be my lawful wedded wife)- as uttered in the course of a marriage ceremony.

I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth"- as uttering when smashing the bottle against the stern.

I give and bequeath my watch to my brother- as occurring in a will.

I bet you sixpence it will rain tomorrow.

(Austin, 1962:5)

For Austin, in saying " I name this ship the Queen Elizabeth" the speaker is not describing what he is doing but actually performing the action of naming the ship. Similarly, in saying "I do (take this woman to be my lawful wedded wife) the speaker performs the act of marrying. Furthermore, Austin at the beginning of his book has suggested that there are limited number of performative acts and only performatives have the property of allowing the speaker to do action by uttering the verb. For example; by saying "I promise" and "I order" it is possible to order or promise.

Performatives have some qualifications which distinguish them from non-performative verbs. Firstly, they have to be in the first person as in "I name this ship Queen Elizabeth." Secondly, It is essential for a performative to be in the simple present tense as in "I promise to come." Thirdly, they have to be in the active mood as in " I sentence you to ten years' prison." Furthermore, performatives should pass hereby test.
For example;

I (hereby) name this ship Queen Elizabeth.

I (hereby) promise.

I (hereby) sentence you to ten years' prison.

Besides, for the successful performance of the act so named, certain conditions have to be fulfilled of. These are felicity conditions set by Austin. Thomas (1995) includes a more succinct version of these conditions as in the following:

A: (i) there must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect.

(ii) the circumstances and persons must be appropriate.

B: The procedure must be executed (i) correctly (ii) completely.

C: Often

(i) the persons must have the requisite thoughts, feelings, and intentions and

(ii) if consequent conduct is specified, then the relevant parties must do it.

(1995: 37)

Thus, only an authorized speaker, only in the relevant situation should perform the certain act. In other words, the execution of the act can be unsuccessful or infelicitous due to abuses of the conditions. For example, in the act of naming the ship, if someone other than an authorized person within the relevant situation and procedure is to throw a bottle of champagne at a ship and attempt to it, the speech act of naming is not performed.

2.3.1. The Collapse of Performative Hypothesis

Austin's performative hypothesis has collapsed for a number of different sorts of reasons. Firstly, there is no grammatical way of distinguishing performative verbs from non-performative verbs. The qualifications which distinguish performatives from constatives is not distinctive. Because, there are the examples of performatives that is not in the first person nor in the active mood nor in the simple present tense. Furthermore, some scholars have criticized this aspect of theory (Dascal, 2003: 510; Shiffrin, 1994: 51). Dascal has called the attempt to explain an utterance, based on the present tense in indicative sentences as speech act fallacy. Examples which undermine the grammatical distinctiveness of performative verbs are as in the following:

E.g.1: The court finds the accused not guilty. (The example is taken from a naval court martial, rather than a civilian court.)

E.g. 2: Your employment is thereby terminated with immediate effect.

E.g. 3: A: Are you denying that the government has interfered?

B: Yes, I'm denying that. (Thomas, 1995: 45)

Secondly, using the performative verbs does not mean performing actions. For example in "I promise I'll come over there and kill you if you don't shut up!" speaker performs an action but not the action of promise. Rather, if context is taken into account it performs the act of threatening.

Thirdly, there are ways of performing actions which do not involve using performatives. In other words, it is possible to perform acts without using performative verbs. It is unusual to use verbs such as "invite" or "insult" while inviting or insulting somebody but there is the action of inviting or insulting. Therefore it is possible to assert that in saying anything one is performing some kind of act as it is stated by Grundy:

... Even the simplest, most neutral statement still has some effect on the world in which it is enunciated. And this effect is obtained by some sort of illocutionary act. ... The difference between such acts and the original, 'performative' ones would then be either in the change they operate on the world, or in their respective forces... or both – but not in the performative quality of one of the members of the distinction. (1995:167)

Viewed in this light, it is possible to assert that the classification of utterances as performatives and constatives is not distinctive. Actually, Austin has himself realized this and having concluded that statements also have a performative aspect he has abandoned the distinction between "constatives" and "performatives". Now he asserts that through the use of an utterance a speaker can perform three acts simultaneously:

Locutionary act: The production of sounds and words with meanings.

Illocutionary act: The issuing of an utterance with conventional communicative force achieved "in saying".

Perlocutionary act: The actual effect achieved by saying.

2.3.2. Locutionary Acts

Locutionary act refers to utterance meaning and saying anything consisted of three act simultaneously:

(A.a) always to perform the act of uttering certain noises (a 'phonetic' act), and the utterance is a phone;

(A.b) always to perform the act of uttering certain vocables or words, i.e. noises of certain types belonging to and as belonging to a certain vocabulary ... to a certain grammar, with a certain intonation &c. This act we may call a 'phatic' act; and the utterance which is it the act of uttering a 'pHEME' ... and

(A.c) generally to perform the act of using that pHEME or its constituents with a certain more or less definite 'sense' and a more or less definite 'reference' (which together are equivalent to 'meaning'). This act we may call a 'rhetic' act...

(Austin, 1962: 92-93)

2.3.3. Illocutionary Acts

Illocutionary act refers to speaker's communicative intention and it is through locutionary act that hearer interprets the illocutionary force of an utterance. Illocutionary force is significant in interactions since in order to have a successful communication speakers should distinguish between the truth- conditional aspect of what a statement is and the action it performs; between the meaning of the speaker's words and their illocutionary force. Sometimes, the illocutionary force of the utterance is correctly interpreted by the hearer as in the example:

The speakers are Lord Peter Wimsey; an amateur detective, and Bunter, his butler.

"If, Bunter, you do not immediately sit down here and have your supper, I will have you drummed out of the regiment"

Bunter [drew] up an obedient chair. (Thomas,1995: 50)

Bunter (hearer) correctly interprets the illocutionary force of Lord Peter's utterance as an invitation or request (in the form of a mock threat) to join his employer for supper. In this

case the intention of the speaker is determined. However conversation is not always clear cut and sometimes breakdown in communication occur (Carter, et al, 2002: 245) and the illocutionary force can be misinterpreted as in the example:

A man and a woman enter an art gallery. The man is carrying a plastic carrier bag. The woman goes to buy the admission tickets, while her husband has gone ahead into the gallery.

Official: Would the gentleman like to leave his bag here?

Woman: Oh no, thank you. It's not heavy.

Official: Only... we had.... We had a theft here yesterday, you see.

(Ibid, 50)

In order to identify the illocutionary force of an utterance context should be taken into consideration (Carter and Nunan, 1993: 65). When context is taken into account in the example, it is obvious that the illocutionary force of B's first utterance is to request A's husband to leave his bag, but A interprets it as an offer. The problem in the example stems from the fact that the same statement could have a different illocutionary force in different contexts. In a case like that speech acts as Mey states (2001: 219) have to be situated in order to be effective. Since they both rely on, and actively create, the situation in which they are realized". In the example, official tries to explain the situation in his following utterances.

Besides, social environment also should be considered in identifying illocutionary acts. For example, considering the utterance "Smile! You are recorded" have the potential to be a request considering that it is used by a film director. However, when a person see a notice "Smile! You are recorded" in a big shopping store he can infer that it is a warning. It implies "Do not attempt to steal anything we are watching you" (Kiran 2001; 214). Similarly, "What time is it?" could, depending on the context and situation and the environment of utterance mean any of the following:

The speaker wants the hearer to tell her the time;

The speaker is annoyed because the hearer is late;

The speaker thinks it is time the hearer went home.

2.3.4. Perlocutionary Acts

Perlocutionary act refers to the effect the speaker wish to achieve by saying the utterance. For example, in an interaction when A says: “It is hot in here” B will probably open the window. The intention of the speaker in this case, is to make a request and it is interpreted correctly by the hearer and perlocutionary effect is achieved. The important point as Austin (1962:117) suggest, is that for the successful performance of the illocutionary acts uptake has to be secured. That is, hearer has to interpret the force of the utterance. In other words, only the speaker’s correct interpretation of illocutionary acts can give way to the achievement of the perlocutionary effect.

Herman (1995: 178) like Coulthard (1998: 18), stress that there is a debate over the boundaries of illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect since there is an ambiguity about where the illocutionary act ends and perlocutionary effect begins. However, Herman suggests that the perlocutionary effect is related to intended illocutionary force of the utterance. For the example above, the speaker’s intention is a request, then the recognition of the commitment the speaker make the hearer responsible is a request and this is the intended perlocutionary effect.

Similarly, Clark (1996: 139) and Croddy (2002) stress the importance of the recognition of illocutionary force for the achievement of the perlocutionary effect. Croddy contributed to the distinction of illocutionary acts and perlocutionary effects by stating that “the performance of the action requires that an audience justifiably believe that the speaker intends to be held responsible for satisfying a commitment as having resulted from the performance.” (p.1116) Therefore, although Austin attaches importance to the intentions of the speaker in completing an illocutionary act as scholars claim the recognition of hearer is also important.

2.3.5. Primary and Implicit Performatives

Although there is no significant importance between primary and (According to Thomas (1995) explicit performatives) implicit performatives it is worth exploring the difference between them. Explicit performatives are those in which performative verbs are used to imply the intended illocutionary acts like:

We remind you that all library books are due to be returned by 9th June.

I promise I will be there.

I order you to leave.

There are various situations which require the use of explicit performatives. Some situations require the use of explicit performatives for a difference in the emphasis while others imply a degree in the formality. Some may strengthen the action intended. In the examples below we have exemplified these situations:

Example 1: I apologize.

I'm sorry.

Example 2: We remind you that all library books are due to be returned
by 9th June.

All library books are due to be returned by 9th June.

Example 3: I swear I love you.

I love you.

The illocutionary force of both statements in the first example is apologize but there is a difference between them in terms of emphasis. The use of performative verb “apologize” emphasizes the illocutionary force. The purpose of the both statements in the second example is to remind or inform. However, the use of performative verb “remind” makes the statement more formal. In the third example, the primary performative seem to be necessary to dispell the doubts in the mind of the addressee, plus it strengthens the force of the illocution. A speaker first prefer implicit performative and then tries the explicit one in order to avoid the implication of unequal power relationship or a set of rights on the part of the speaker. This can be illustrated through a nice example by Thomas.

Example: King Arthur, [A] is talking to anarcho-syndicalist peasant [B]:

A: Be quiet!

B: [Peasents continue talking]

A: Be quiet! I order you to be quiet!

B: Order eh? Who does he think he is?

A: I'm your King.

B: Well, I didn't vote for you.

A: You don't vote for kings.

B: Well how do you become King, then?

A: The lady of the lake, her arm clad in the purest

Shimmering samite held aloft Excalibur from
 The bosom of the water, signifying by Divine
 Providence that I Arhur, was to carry
 Excalibur. That's why I'm your king.

B: Listen, strange women lying in a ponds distribut-
 ing swords is no basis for a system of governmen-
 ment. Supreme executive power derives from a mandate
 from the masses, not from some farci-
 cal aquatic ceremony.

In the example King Arthur uses implicit performative verbs “ Be quiet” and then moves on to the explicit form. However, the second speaker is a anarcho- syndicalist person and do not accept the existence of monarchs and performatives does not have the intended effect. In other words, since the uptake of the second speaker is not secured the perlocutionary effect is not succeed (Thomas, 1995:46).

2.4. Searle's Speech Act Theory

J. R. Searle (1979), developed speech act theory beyond Austin's original work. In his book *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts* he states that his main purpose is to develop a reasoned classification of illocutionary acts into certain basic categories or types. He finds weaknesses in Austin's taxonomy and criticizes Austin for confusing the illocutionary acts and illocutionary verbs and causing overlapping categories. Additionally, he criticizes Austin for the deficiency in the consistent principle or set of principles on the basis of which the taxonomy is constructed:

The most important weakness of the taxonomy is simply this. There is no clear or consistent principle or set of principles on the basis of which the taxonomy is constructed. Only in the case of Commissives has Austin clearly and unambiguously used illocutionary point as the basis of the definition of a category. Expositives, insofar as the characterization is clear , seem to be defined in terms of discourse relations... Exercitives seem to be at least partly defined in terms of the exercise of authority.

(Searle, 1979: 10)

Having illustrated the deficiencies in Austin's taxonomy of illocutionary acts Searle has attempted to systematize and formalize Austin's work. Thus, he has set out three dimensions of variation in which illocutionary acts differ from one another and on which he has built his taxonomy. These are illocutionary point, direction of fit, and sincerity condition (expressed psychological states).

Illocutionary point: It is the purpose of the illocutionary act. For example, the purpose of an order is to get the hearer to do something.

Direction of fit: Some illocutions have their illocutionary point to get words to the world while some have it to get the world to match the words. For example, assertions have a word-to-world direction of fit and requests have a world-to-word direction of fit.

Expressed Psychological State: In the performance of an illocutionary act speaker express some attitude, state, etc. Searle, tries to make a classification of illocutionary acts based on the expressed psychological states:

If one tries to do a classification of illocutionary acts based entirely on differently expressed psychological states ... one can get quite a long way. Thus, belief collects not only statements, assertions, remarks and explanations, but also postulations, declarations, deductions and arguments. Intention will collect promises, vows, threats and pledges.

(Searle, 1979: 5)

Having set out the dimensions Searle has presented an alternative taxonomy. His taxonomy includes five categories of illocutionary acts:

- 1-Representatives (Assertives)
- 2-Directives
- 3-Commissives
- 4-Expressives
- 5-Declarations

2.4.1 Searle's Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts

1-Representatives (Assertives): The illocutionary point or the purpose of this class is to represent a state of affairs in which a belief is expressed as in stating or asserting. The assertives have a word-to-world fit, that is the intention is to make the words fit the world.

Example: Some are very old and some are very new.

Example: I went to the Amish quilt exhibit.

2-Directives: The illocutionary point of this class is to get the hearer to do something for the speaker. There is a world-to-word direction of fit and the sincerity condition is a wish or desire. Directives function as request, command or suggestion.

Example: Follow the directions.

Example: Could you do the dishes?

3-Commissives: The illocutionary point of this class is to commit the speaker to some future course of action. There is a world-to-word direction of fit and the sincerity condition is intention. Commissives function as promises or refusals.

Example: Don't worry I'll be there.

Example: Maybe I can do that tomorrow.

4-Expressives: The illocutionary point of this class is to express the psychological state as in apologies, laments etc . There is no direction of fit and they can express a wide range of psychological state.

Example: What a great day!

Example: Oh my, that's terrible.

5-Declarations: The illocutionary point of this class is to bring about a new state of being in the world. However, declaratives cause changes when they are successfully performed. They have both a word-to-world and a world-to-word direction of fit and there is no sincerity condition.

Example: I now pronounce you husband and wife.

Example: I find you guilty as charged.

2.4.2. Searle's Conditions for Speech Acts

Searle set out a series of conditions which allow the utterances to count as speech acts of certain kind. These conditions are: preparatory condition, sincerity condition and essential condition.

- 1- Preparatory conditions:** the speaker must be authorized to perform the certain act, for instance, he must be legally entitled to name the ship. He must have evidence for

what he states.

- 2- **Sincerety conditions:** the speaker must mean what he says, he must believe it to be true. For example, he must be sorry for what he apologizes for, or he must believe that his promise is of authentic benefit to the listener and so on.
- 3- **Essential conditions:** the speaker is obliged by a promise to perform the act indicated; he is committed by an assertion to a particular belief- the utterance, that is counts as social commitment or undertaking.

For example, Searle's rules for promising are as in the following:

Propositional act	Speaker (S) predicates a future act (A) of Speaker (S)
Preparatory condition	S believes that doing act A is in H's best interest and that can do A
Sincerety Condition	Speaker intends to do act A.
Essential condition	S undertakes an obligation to do act A. (Thomas 1995: 95)

2.4.3. Indirect Speech Acts

Searle states, "the simplest cases of meaning are those in which the speaker utters a sentence and means exactly and literally what he says." (Searle, 1979: 30). However, there are cases in which a speaker says one thing and mean what he says and means something more. As in the example: "Can you open the door?" In this example a sentence with interrogative form is taken not only as a question but also as a request. To be more precise, the speaker gets the hearer to open the door by asking a question. These cases are indirect speech acts in which "one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another." (Searle, 1979:31). Indirect speech acts are cases in which form and function do not match. The performative hypothesis has suggested that illocutionary force is represented in syntactic structure as illustrated:

Table 2.1: Illocutionary Force in Syntactic Structure

Form of the utterance	Function of the utterance
Declarative	Assertion
Imperative	Order/ imperative
Interrogative	Question

(Hurford, Heasley, 1988: 241)

However, indirect speech acts reveals that the form of the utterance need not give a direct indication of the force.” as in the examples:

Will you (please) pass the salad.= Please pass the salad. (Question form, imperative force)

Why don't you pass the salad.= Pass the salad. (Question form,imperative force)

I'd like to set the table now = Set the table now. (Declarative form, imperative force)

Is that good! = That is good! (Question form,imperative force)

(Vershueren p.107)

“In indirect speech acts the speaker communicates to the hearer more than he actually says by way of relying on their mutually shared background information, both linguistic and non linguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer.” (Searle, 1979: 30. Searle has proposed a schema which express the meaning of indirect speech acts. Additionally, he has proposed Gricean conversational implicature along with the mutually shared factual background information of the speaker and hearer and ability of hearer to make inferences. Searle gives the step to derive meaning of indirect speech acts for the example below:

Student X: Let's go to the movies tonight.

Student Y: I have to study for an exam.

Step 1 : I have made a proposal to Y, and in response he has made a statement to the effect that he has to study for an exam (facts about the conversation)

Step 2 : I assume that Y is cooperating in the conversation and that therefore his remark is intended to be relevant. (principles of conversational cooperation).

Step 3 : A relevant response must be one of acceptance, rejection, counterproposal, further discussion, etc. (theory of speech acts).

Step 4 : But his literal utterance was not one of these, and so was not a relevant response (inference from Steps 1 and 3).

Step 5 : Therefore, he probably means more than he says. Assuming that his remark is relevant, his primary illocutionary point must differ from his literal one (inference from Steps 2 and 4).

Step 6 : I know that studying for an exam normally takes a large amount of time relative to a single evening, and I know that going to the movies normally takes a large amount of time relative to a single evening (factual background information).

Step 7 : Therefore, he probably cannot both go to the movies and study for an exam in one evening (inference from step 6)
Step 8 : A preparatory condition on the acceptance of a proposal or on any other commissive, is the ability to perform the act predicated in the propositional content condition (theory speech acts).

Step 9 : Therefore, I know that he has said something that has the consequence that he probably cannot consistently accept the proposal (inference from Steps 1,7, and 8).

Step 10 : Therefore, his primary illocutionary point is probably to reject the proposal (inference from Steps 5 and 9).

(Searle, p. 33-35)

2.5. The Relevance of Speech Act Theory to Dramatic Texts

There has always been attempts to apply the principles of speech act theory to literary text since speech act theory is used to make the internal workings of a text explicit (Traugott and Pratt, 1980: 255). However, application of speech act theory to the literary works create a dichotomy both in pragmatics and literature. Austin (1962:22) has claimed that the utterances in fiction were “parasitic” on those real world utterances and they should be excluded from consideration in performative hypothesis. On the other hand, Searle (1975) in his *Logical Status of Fictional Discourse* expresses the language of fiction treating it as a macro- speech act. He expresses the language of drama as in the following:

It is not so much the author who is doing the pretending but the characters in the actual performance. That is, the text of the play will consist of a series of directions to the actors as to how they are to pretend to make assertions, and to perform other actions.

The playwright represents the actual and pretended actions and the speeches of the actors, but the playwright's performance in writing a recipe for pretense than engaging in a form of pretense itself. A fictional story is a pretended *representation* of a state of affairs; but a play, that is a play as performed, is not a pretended representation of a state of affairs but the pretended state of affairs itself the actors pretended *to be* the characters. (p.328)

Stanly Fish (1976: 983-1025) in his influential criticism *How to Do Things with Searle and Austin* integrates speech act theory to Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*. He focuses on the illocutionary behaviour of Coriolanus in the light of principles of the theory and at the end claims that the application of speech acts to drama is always possible but it is futile. He claims that his analysis is valid because *Coriolanus* is a speech act play.

Similarly, some scholars like Oort (1995:2), Bennet and Royle(1994:168) and, Corrigan claims that literary text and drama can be illuminated through the principles of speech act theory. Corrigan (1994: 379-399) expresses the relationship between speech acts and characteristics of drama. In her application of speech acts to *Cymbeline* she attempts to represent the relevance of speech act theory to the generic characteristics of drama:

The major relevance of Speech Act theory to drama remains indisputable: in drama words generate action, or rather a plot unfolds out of a series of Speech Acts, and "the action rides on a train of illocutions" ... Thus, the attractiveness of Speech Acts still consists in their central concern with language.

(p.380)

2.5.1. The Application Of Speech Act Theory To Dramatic Texts

Many scholars, use the principles of speech act theory to illuminate different aspects of drama. Herman in her book quotes from Elam, in order to represent that the gap between the locutionary act and its uptake can be material for comic episodes:

Sir Andrew Bless you, fair shrew.

Maria And you too, sir.

Sir Toby Accost, Sir Andrew, accost.

Sir Andrew What's that?

Sir Toby My niece's chambermaid.

Sir Andrew Good Mistress Accost, I desire better acquaintance.

Maria My name is Mary, sir.

Sir Andrew Good Mistress Mary Accost,--

Sir Toby You mistake, knight; '*Accost*' is front her, board her, woo her, assail her.

Sir Andrew By my troth, I would not undertake her in this company. Is that the meaning of *Accost*?

(Elam 1989:209,1.3.43-55)

The misunderstanding of Sir Andrew is plausible considering that it is drawn from context via a path of rational inference, but it is not related to Sir Toby's intended meaning which focuses on the verb "Accost" as an act. Furthermore, Herman, uses speech act classification in the pretence to account for the difficulty to change the ingrained assumptions:

Othello What, did they never whisper?

Emilia Never, my lord.

Othello Nor send you out o' the way?

Emilia Never.

Othello To fetch her fan, her gloves, her mask, nor nothing?

Emilia Never, my lord.

Othello That's strange.

Emilia I durst, my lord, to wager she is honest, Lay down my soul at stake: if you think other,

Remove your thought; it doth abuse your bosom.

If any wretch have put this in your head,

Let heaven requite it with the serpent's curse!

For, if she be not honest, chaste, and true,

There's no man happy; the purest of their wives

Is foul as slander.

Othello Bid her come hither: go.

[Exit EMILIA]

She says enough; yet she's a simple bawd

That cannot say as much. This is a subtle whore,

A closet lock and key of villanous secrets
And yet she'll kneel and pray; I have seen her do't.

(Herman, 1995: 232-233)

Othello by asking questions requests for information and since the uptake is secured perlocutionary effect is achieved and thus Emilia responds his questions. Emilia, on the other hand, use the speech acts of denial in order to contradict infereble beliefs about the infidelity of Desdmona. Nevertheless, although the illocutionary force of Emilia's utterance as denials recognized by Othello he can not totally believe or disbelieve her. That is, perlocutionary effect is not achieved. Besides, the perlocutionary effect of Emilia's advice also fails since Othello do not "remove his thoughts."

The application of speech acts to dramatic dialogue is by no means limited to those scholars we have referred above . Valerie Lowe (Culpeper et al, 1998:128-141) also exploits the principles of speech act theory in order to illustrate the unhappy nature of Tituba's confession in Arthur Miller's play *The Crucible*. Besides, Lowe's analysis attempts to stress that acts of Tituba and Rebecca are interpreted differently by the other characters on the one hand and the reader on the other. Besides, Dan McIntyre (2004: 151) looks at the speech act productions of the characters in Dennis Potter's *Brimstone and Treacle* in order to represent the ways in which point of view in drama indicated.

2.6. Conversational Implicature

Grice in "*Logic and Conversation*" suggested that when people interacts with one another they acknowledge a kind of tacit agreement to cooperate towards mutual ends (Grice, 1975:47). In other words, a conversation is a co-ooperative endeavour and there is the underlying assumption that participants of a conversation have purposes for conversing. This is the "Cooperative Principle" which is "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged."

The Cooperative Principle derives four maxims:

The Maxim of Quantity

- a Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purpose of the

exchange.

- b Do not make your contribution more or less informative than is required.

The Maxim of Quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true.

- a Do not say what you believe to be false.
- b Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

The Maxim of Relation

Make your contributions relevance.

The Maxim of Manner

Be perspicuous.

- a Avoid obscurity of expression.
- b Avoid ambiguity
- c Be brief (ibid, p.47)

These maxims unlike rules can be broken or flouted. Flouting of the maxims causes the generation of conversational implicature. Thus, conversational implicature is the implicit meaning drawn from the obvious flouting of a conversational maxim in combination with adherence to the cooperative principle. Viewed in this light, if somebody flouts the maxim he or she actually prompts the hearers to infer something about the reasons for his behaviour and interactions still goes on since hearers gets the implicature.

We will examine cases of nonfulfillment of conversational maxims individually by exemplifying each in the light of Thomas' (1995) and Mooney's (2004) schema.

2.6.1. Violation of Maxim

Grice defines violations as unostentatious nonobservance of a maxim; if a speaker violates a maxim in some cases "he will be liable to mislead". Hence, in this case speakers secretly break the maxim by lying (Grice, 1975).

Thomas illustrated this with the examples below:

An English athlete, Diana Modahl, the defending Commonwealth Games 800 metres champion, pulled out of her opening race and returned to England. Caroline Searle,

press officer for the England team said:

‘She has a family bereavement; her grandmother has died.’

(Thomas, 1995: 73)

The next day it was announced that she had been sent home for the use of drugs. Ms. Searle told the truth while saying that she went home. Although it was true that Ms. Diane went home, the implicature (the reason returning home bereavement) was false. The explanation of Ms. Searle generated the implicature that Ms. Modahl gone home because of her grandmothers death. This is the violation of quality maxim.

2.6.2. Flouting of Maxim

When somebody flouts a maxim, it is obvious to participants and listener perceives the difference between what the speaker says and what he meant by what he says which gave rise to conversational implicature. As, Mooney states, “ The case of flouting is an illustration of exactly why the CP and the subordinate maxims are useful. Flouts of maxims explains how a hearer can recuperate a seemingly inappropriate response by adding, as it were, a conversational implicature to the mix.”

A is asking about a mutual friend’s new boyfriend.

A: Is he nice?

B: She seems to like him (Thomas, 1995: 66)

In this example B’s response generates the implicature that third part’s new boy friend is not nice.

2.6.2.1. Flouts Exploiting Quality Maxim

When the speaker says something which is blatantly untrue the maxim of quality flouts and the listener is forced to look for an implication. In the example below, since clearly the answer can not literally be true, the listener forced to look for another plausible interpretation. Thus, A infer that B want to imply that she peeled a large number of potatoes and that the experience was time consuming and exhausted.

A: ‘How many potatoes did you peel?’

B: ‘Millions’

2.6.2.2. Flouts Exploiting Quantity Maxim

This type of flouts occur when a speaker give less or more information than required. In the example below it is obvious that B is writing and thus quantity maxim flouts. It is very likely that A will infer that he or she wants to be left alone.

Example:

A: What are you doing?

B: Writing.

2.6.2.3. Flouts Exploiting the Relation Maxim

This type of flouts occur when the speaker says something which is obviously not related to the topic at hand. Hence, the speaker again have to draw an implicature. In the example below, speaker flouts the relation maxim. Thus, it is very likely that bishop will infer that Susan is not interested in the subject of women's ordination and wishes to change the subject.

Geoffrey is a vicar, trying hard to curry favour with his bishop. The speaker is Susan, his wife, who couldn't care less about the church, religion (or for that matter, for Geoffrey).

We were discussing the ordination women. The bishop asked me what I thought. Should woman take the services? So long as it doesn't have to be me, I wanted to say, they can be taken by a trained gorilla. 'Oh yes', Geoffrey chips in, 'Susan's all in favour. She's keener than I am, aren't you, darling?' **'More sprouts anybody?'** I said.

2.6.2.4. Flouts exploiting the Manner Maxim

The flouts occur when the utterances of the speakers are ambiguous or obscure. The following is an example of a flout of the maxim of manner.

Example:

This interaction occured during a radio with an un-named official from the United States Embassy Port-au-Prince, Haiti:

Interviewer: Did the United States Government play any
part in Duvalier's departure?

Did they, for example, actively encourage him to leave?

Official: I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion. (Ibid:70)

The official could simply say “yes” or “no”. The important point in this case is the blatancy of the non observance which triggers the search for an implicature. The implicature is that the official have a clash of goals: the desire to claim credit for what she sees as a desirable outcome, while at the same time avoiding putting on record the fact that her government has intervened in the affairs of another country.

2.6.3. Opting out of a Maxim

A speaker opts out from the operation both of the maxim and of the Conversational Principle by unwillingness to cooperate in the way the maxim requires. Grice exemplifies this as “ I can not say more; my lips are sealed.” (1975:49). Besides, opting out can occur when the speaker perhaps for legal and ethical reasons can not reply in the way expected. Opting out can also occur when the speaker avoid hurting a third part as in the example.

Ruth Rendell, a famous crime novelist, was being interviewed by an equally famous psychiatrist, Professor Anthony Clare. Clare asked Rendell about her husband:

AC: You married him twice. You’ve been interviewed many times, but I’ve never seen a satisfactory explanation for that very interesting fact.

RR: Well [*pause*] I don’t think I can give you one. That is not to say that I don’t know it but I do know it but I cannot give it. I don’t think that to give it would be a very good idea, particularly from y husband (Thomas, 1995).

2.6.4. Infringing Maxims

Thomas (1995) and Mooney (2001) suggest that the non- observance occur due to imperfect linguistic performance of the speaker. In this case, speaker has the imperfect command of the language (a young child or a foreign learner) rather than the desire to generate an implicature.

2.6.5. Clash

A clash may result from an imperfectly informed speaker trying to co-operate. In this case, the speaker unable to fulfill the quantity maxim without violating the quality maxim. Grice suggest that a clash can generate an implicature (Grice,1975:49). For example: If A asks B “where a grocery is” and B replies “ somewhere around the corner” A will conclude that B does not know exactly where is the grocery store is.

2.7. Summary

Austin focused on the performative aspect of language and certain conditions (felicity conditions) that authorize the “happy” or “felicitous” performance of language. Additionally, he stress the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts which are the dimensions of the theory. Searle on the other hand, attempt to systematize Austin’s work with regulative rules and categorize speech acts in terms of meaning and communication. Grice contributed to meaning by providing a theory which represents how we can move from what is said to what is implied. In other words, he allows us to ignore the surface meaning and instead tap into the underlying meaning. Each of these scholars offer something specific in the field. Thus, an eclectic approach can be helpful for the purposes of integrating the principles to the workings of dramatic dialogue as we have supported with related literature.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents information about the procedure of the study: selection of participants and materials, data collection, research procedures, and the method of data analysis.

This study aims to investigate the function of speech act theory and conversational implicature in inferencing the implied meanings in dramatic dialogue in the related literature. However, since application of conversational speech acts and implicature bring the risk of “intentional fallacy” (see Talibi, n.d.) confusing intentions of the characters with authorial intentions, it must be stressed that our investigation is totally based on the dramatic texts and utterances of characters. We have not investigated playwrights’ intentions in this study.

Another aim is to investigate if ELT students in Çukurova University have an awareness of implied meaning leading to interpretation of social dynamics of interaction in dramatic texts. By doing all this, it is aimed to obtain statistical data and provide a background for further studies. It is also aimed to provide an insight for the dramatic studies in ELT departments.

3.2. Participants

The study aims to search if the students in Çukurova University studying in ELT department have an awareness of implied meanings in dramatic texts. Therefore, 30 ELT students --out of approximately 180- in Çukurova University in the 2006-2007 academic year have been randomly selected. The participants were third- year students who had taken university entrance examination measuring their proficiency in English in order to study in ELT department. The data collection finished by May 2007 and participants had already taken some courses on literature such as:

‘Introduction to Literature’

‘Short Story’ and ‘Novel’

Participants hadn’t taken drama courses before.

They also had taken some linguistics courses such as:

‘Introduction to Linguistics I’

‘Introduction to Linguistics II’

‘Türkçe’nin Ses ve Biçim Bilgisi

‘Türkçe’nin Söz Dizimi ve Anlam Bilimi’

3.3. Materials

In order to investigate if the student readers have an awareness of the implied meanings in drama, two extracts from English plays have been selected. The first extract is from William Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* while the second extract is from Bernard Shaw’s *Arms and the Man* for the purpose of the study. (see appendices 1 and 5 for both extracts) These particular plays have been selected due to the implied meanings they include. Extract 1 is a relatively difficult text because of its figurative language (metaphors and ironies) used by the playwright. Besides, written in 16th century this text includes old terms of English which is illuminated by the researcher by including the modern equivalents of the terms in the texts. The background of the interaction in extract 1 has been clarified and characters are introduced through additional information written in the text given the participants.

3.3.1. Implied Meaning in Extract 1

In the background of the interaction, the interaction proceeds among three participants: King Claudius, Queen Gertrude and Hamlet. Queen Gertrude’s husband, Hamlet’s father, King Hamlet has been dead. Not long after his death Queen Gertrude is going to marry his brother Claudius. They are interacting just before the marriage ceremony of King Claudius and Queen Gertrude begins.

Implied meaning which leads to interpretation of social relations among the characters in extract 1 can be grasped through the observation of speech acts exploitation of the characters and implicatures generated by the characters.

The utterances of Claudius, his exploitation of performatives, suggest that he is trying to console Hamlet after his fathers’ death as illustrated in following lines:

Claudius: How is it that the clouds still hang on you?

Hamlet: Not so, my lord; I am too much i’ the sun.

Considering the context of the utterances (the death of Hamlet's father), it is possible to take the illocutionary force of the utterance as advice to stop grieving for his father's death. However, considering that he is going to marry his mother not long after Hamlet's father's death it has the potential to be a question bidding for information. Therefore, it suggests that Claudius does not believe the fact that Hamlet is mourning for his father and he implies that he looks for another reason.

Claudius's other utterances have the potential to be speech acts of suggestion as in the following lines:

**“We pray you, throw to earth
This unprevailing woe”**

Although, speech act exploitation of the king mostly suggests that he concerns for Hamlet knowledge of his hasty marriage evoke suspicions about his sincerity. Similarly, conversational implicature of Claudius consolidate this deduction. For example, the assertion of the king (**You are the most immediate to our throne**) flouts the maxim of quantity in that as the son of the queen and the former king Hamlet is surely the most immediate to the throne. There is no need to remind this fact. Although this statement is used to represent his sincerity it generates the implicature that they are on no good terms and his intention is to compromise. However, Claudius' wordy attempts to compromise fails since Hamlet does not believe in his sincerity.

Queen Gertrude's utterances consists of request or suggestion as in the following lines:

**Good Hamlet, cast thy nighted colour off,
And let thine eye look like a friend on Denmark.
Do not for ever with thy vailed lids
Seek for thy noble father in the dust:**

Her purpose is to request Hamlet to forget about his father's death which shows her concern for Hamlet. However, her utterances of “And let thine eye look like a friend on Denmark.” as a speech act of request flouts the maxim of relevance in this context . In this case, the point is about the relationship between King and Hamlet. The possible implications of this sentence can be :

A: You do not look like a friend on King Claudius.

B: You have reasons for not looking like a friend on King Claudius (since our marriage authorizes his kingship and fatherhood) but I wish you to compromise with him.

Hamlet begins his verbal activity by:

“A little more than kin, and less than kind.” This riddling sentence spoken aside to audience can be interpreted through the context. Considering the context it seems to be a rejection of both linguistic and social bond that Claudius indicate when he addresses Hamlet in terms of their kinship. However, this utterance also has the potential to be an accusation suggesting that king is not kind due to the hasty marriage which authorizes his kingship. This utterance flouts both the manner and quality maxim as an irony. The implication is that Hamlet does not approve what King Claudius does and reject being a relative.

“Not so, my lord; I am too much i’ the sun.” The illocutionary force of this utterance can be a denial to refute the claim of king. Moreover, it has the potential to be an accusation that so much attention is paid to him. This statement flouts the manner maxim since it is not direct and clear. The implication is that Hamlet draws a parallel among “sun” and “son” by using homophoneous sounds. Additionally, “I am too much in the sun” means Hamlet is the son of two fathers. One is a biological dead father and the other is Claudius.

“Seems, madam! nay it is; I know not ‘seems.’ Considering his following utterances it is inferrable that he is accusing his mother since he thinks she is pretending to mourn. This utterance flouts the relevance maxim. The implicature is that Hamlet accused his mother for her seeming grief.

Without considering the context , the speech act exploitation of the characters indicate that in the interaction Claudius and Gertrude attempt to advice Hamlet to stop mourning. However, through the observation of speech acts and conversational implicatures in the context it can be concluded that Claudius and Gertrude know that Hamlet do not approve their marriage. Besides, he accuses them of their seeming emphyaty with him and do not believe their sincerety. Thus, they want to compromise. On the other hand, Hamlets’ ironic utterances function as accusations directed to both Claudius and Gertrude. The purposes of the speakers drawn from the performative aspect of utterances clarify the situation and give insights about the relationship between the characters. In other words, identification and observation of the

speech act exploited by the characters illuminate the intentions and attitudes of characters towards each other.

Students' understanding of implied meaning has been measured according to the checklists formed by the collections of specific utterances of the characters. Since implied meaning can be arrived at by the identification of speech act types, global intentions and conversational implicature our checklist includes three tables for Extract 1. Table 3.1 represents the speech act exploitation of the characters and Table 3.2 represents conversational implicatures generated by the characters while table 3.3 represents the global intentions of the speakers.

The illocutionary forces of characters in the Extract 1 are categorized according to Searle's speech act taxonomy. And they are listed below:

Table 3.1: Speech Acts in Extract 1

Locutionary Act	Possible illocutionary force 1	Possible illocutionary force 2
1-Hamlet: A little more than kin, and less than kind.	Rejection of being a relative	Accusation
2-Claudius: How is it that the clouds stil hang on you?	Suggestion	Question (bids for information)
3-Hamlet: Not so, my lord; I am too much i' the sun.	Denial	Accusation
4-Gertrude: Good Hamlet, cast thy nighted colour off,	Suggestion	
5-Gertrude: And let thine eye look like a friend on Denmark.	Request	Accusation
6-Hamlet: Seems, madam! Nay it is; I know not 'seems.'	Denial	Accusation
7-Claudius: We pray you, throw to earth This unprevailing woe.	Request	Suggestion

Understanding the illocutionary forces of the utterances is the first step to grasp the implied meaning behind literal utterances. In Table 1, the specific utterances which give clues about the intended and implied meanings in Extract 1 are listed. The data collected from the participants have been analysed firstly through Table 3.1.

Table 3.2: Implicatures in Extract 1

Utterances of the Characters	Reasoning	Implicated
1-Claudius: You are the most immediate to our throne	Claudius flouts the quantity maxim. Hamlet knows that he is the most immediate to throne.	He wants to compromise with Hamlet.
2-Gertrude: And let thine eye look like a friend on <u>Denmark</u> .	Gertrude flouts the relation maxim in the context.	Hamlet does not look like a friend to king.
3-Claudius: But now, my cousin Hamlet, and my son,	Claudius breaks the manner maxim. He addressed Hamlet in terms of two different kinship.	He is Hamlet's father since he is getting married with his mother.
4-Hamlet A little more than kin, and less than kind.	Hamlet flouts the manner maxim. The utterance is ambiguous.	He rejects the kinship king offered.
5-Hamlet Not so, my lord; I am too much i' the sun.	Hamlet flouts both the manner and quality maxim.	He criticises king that so much attention is paid on him.
6-Hamlet Seems, madam! Nay it is; I know not 'seems.'	Hamlet flouts the relation maxim by relating 'seem' with pretence of doing.	Gertrude pretending to mourn. She is not sincere.

Understanding implications is the second step to arrive at the implied meanings. However, making inferences about the unstated meanings requires grasping the implicatures created by the characters. Thus, data collected from the participants have been analysed

through also table 3.2 which represent the implicatures generated by the characters in Extract 1.

Table 3.3: Global Intentions of the Speakers in Extract 1

Characters	Global Intention
Hamlet	Accusing
Gertrude	Attempting to compromise
Claudius	Attempting to compromise

In order to measure participants' understanding of implied meanings functionally it is also important to check if participants understand the macro- speechs act (global intention) created by characters. The global intentions of the speakers are listed above. Lastly, as the third step, the data has been collected analysed through Table 3.3.

3.3.2. Implied Meaning in Extract 2

Extract 2 is an easier text with respect to Extract 1. Thus, identifying the illocutionary forces of the utterances does not compel the readers to think as hard as they do in the Extract 1. The implied meanings in Extract 1 heavily lie beneath the true identification of both illocutionary forces of the utterances and implicatures despite the metaphors and ironies. However, implied meanings in the Extract 2 lies mostly beneath the true identification of the implicatures and illocutionary forces generated by the dramatic characters.

In extract 2, the interaction proceeds among Sergius, Bluntschli and Raina. Sergius and Raina are engaged couple. Sergius first utterances' are speech acts of accusing, threatening and challenging:

You have deceived me.

You are my rival.

I brook no rivals.

At six o'clock I shall be in the drilling-ground on the Klissoura road, alone, on horseback, with my sabre.

It is Bluntschli who is being accused, threatened and proposed to a challenge. Bluntschli, on the other hand, agrees to fight with Sergius. Upon Raina's question he states

that he does not know the reason for the challenge. However, he adds **“In the morning I shall be off home; and you’ll never see me or hear of me again.”** functioning as a promise to go. Taking into account Searle’s preparatory conditions for promise (S believes that doing act A is in H’s best interest and that S can do A) it is possible to assert that Bluntschli concerns for the couple. The utterance **“You and he will then make it up and live happily ever after** suggest (again in the light of the preparatory condition of Searle) that he feels himself obliged to go for the happiness of the couple. Taking into consideration that in the context of the utterance he has not been informed about the reason for fighting; it is obvious that he knows the reason. He understands that Sergius is accusing Raina and Bluntschli of having an affair.

Raina’s response (**I never said I wanted to see you again.**) as denial is produced to refute this inferable assumption. In fact, Raina flouts the relevance maxim since she focuses on one aspect of his utterances. In other words, her being so sensitive to the implication of Bluntschli’s utterances suggest that Raina tries to contradict assumption about her infidelity. Nevertheless, Raina’s feeling is inferred from her last utterance **“Are you”** which bids additional information for Bluntschli’s utterance **“Why, the young lady doesn’t even know whether I’m married or not.”** Raina loves Bluntschli and we learn that she collapses (from stage directions) when she understands that Bluntschli has the possibility to be married. However, Raina misinterprets the illocutionary force of this utterance since she takes it at face value. The illocutionary force of this statement is a denial to contradict Sergius’ assumption. Considering that this denial is being performed on behalf of Raina against the accusation of Sergius to Raina (**You love that man!**) it is possible to conclude that Bluntschli tries to protect Raina which implies that he also loves her. Thus, speech acts and implicatures suggest that Bluntschli and Raina love each other and this fact justifies Sergius suspicions.

Table 3.4: Speech Acts in Extract 2

Locutionary Acts	Possible Illocutionary Force 1	Possible Illocutionary Force 2
1-Sergius: You have deceived me.	Assertion	Accusation
2-Sergius: I brook no rivals.	Assertion	Threat
3-Sergius: At six o'clock I shall be in the drilling ground, On the Klissoura road, alone, on horseback, with my sabre.	Assertion	Challenges to A fight
4-Bluntschli: You and he will then make it up and live happily ever after.	Assertion	Promise
5-Raina: I never said I wanted to see you again.	Denial	Refutation
6-Sergius: You love that man!	Assertion	Accusation
7-Bluntschli: Why, the young lady doesn't even know whether I'm married or not.	Assertion	Refutation
8- Raina: Are you?	Request for information	

The illocutionary forces of characters in extract 2 are listed in table 4. The data gathered from both first and second part of the data collection procedure, for the Extract 2, have been analysed firstly through the table 3. 4 which represent the illocutionary forces of the utterance spoken by the characters in Extract 2.

Table 3.5: Implicatures in Extract 2

Utterances	Reasoning	Implicated
1-Bluntschli: You'll never see me or hear of me again.	Bluntschli flouts the relation maxim. He understands the reason for challenging.	He understands that he is a danger for their love.
2-Raina: I never said I wanted to see you again.	Raina flouts the relation maxim by attempting to refute the infereble assumption of Bluntschli.	It's not infereble from his utterance that Raina wants to see Bluntschli. Thus, Raina actually want to see Bluntschli.
3-Raina: Are you?	Raina flouts the relation maxim through her question.	She concerns Bluntchli's marital status.

Implicatures generated by characters in extract 2 are listed in table 5. The data gathered from both first and second part of the data collection procedure, for the Extract 2, has been analysed secondly through the table 3.5 which represents the implicature generated by the characters in Extract 2.

Table 3.6: Global Intentions of the Characters in Extract 2

Characters	Possible Global Intention 1	Possible Global Intention 2
Sergius	Accusation	Challenge
Bluntschli	Denial	Protecting Raina
Raina	Denial	Request information about Bluntschli

Macro speech acts of the speakers in Exract 2 are listed in table 3.6. The data collected from the participants for the Extract 2 has been analysed also through Table 6 as the third step of investigation of implied meaning.

3.4. Procedure of the Study

In order to investigate participants' understanding of the implied meanings in drama participants were given two extracts. The data collection procedure carried out in two

sections. In the first section, both extracts were given (firstly the extract from *Hamlet* and then the extract from *Arms and the Man*) and participants were asked to answer general questions about their initial impressions. By asking the general questions, our aim was to avoid leading participants to implied meanings. Therefore, the first section makes up undirected data collection procedure. In the second section, the same extract given to the participants once more and they were asked to answer more specific questions highlighting the utterances which include implied meanings. Specific questions were asked in order to trigger participant's interpretation. Additionally, some utterances which include implied meanings had been underlined and the participants were asked to comment on them. Therefore, the second section makes up directed data collection procedure. The participants were informed about the names of plays and playwrights. Data collection procedure lasted 60 minutes; (20 minutes for each extract) and it was observed by the researcher that all of the participants were able to answer the question on time.

3.5. Data Analysis

Descriptive research design have been used to analyse the data gathered from both the first and the second part of the data collection. The participants' interpretation of implied meanings for Extract 1 in both first and second sections of the procedure have been evaluated through Tables 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3. Likewise, participants' understanding of implied meaning in Extract 2 in both first and second parts of the procedure have been evaluated through tables 3.4, 3.5, and 3. 6. The frequencies and percentages of inferencing implied meaning (illocutionary forces, implicatures and global intentions) have been calculated and evaluated.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter comprises of two sections. In first section, the findings about the effects of theories of speech acts and conversational implicature in inferencing dramatic texts is to be analysed. Additionally, the data obtained from participants in data collection procedure in two sections (first section: undirected data collection procedure , second section: directed data collection procedure) is to be analysed. The frequencies and percentages of speech acts identified and implicatures understood and global intentions understood in both extracts are to be represented in tables. Additionally, differences between the participant's understanding of implied meanings in first and second sections are to be analysed.

4.2. Speech Act Theory in Inferencing the Dramatic Dialogue in ELT

Drama is different from other types of literature in that it is written to be performed on the stage. Therefore, it is a difficult job to make judgements about the implied meaning behind the words on the page in drama texts. Students have to make inferences in order to get the possible interpretation. The sources of inference student reader use is mostly the general assumptions or more specific text based inferences. However, identifying and observing the speech act exploitation of characters can allow reader to arrive at implied meaning and make judgements about the attitudes of the characters and thus social relations among the characters.

Speech act theory illustrates that the surface form of a statement gives no clue about the intended meaning of the speaker in an interaction. Every statement has a performative aspect and in order to grasp the implied meaning it is important to distinguish between the truth- conditional aspect of a statement and the action it performs. In other words, in order to get the implied meaning and avoid taking utterances literally it is essential to identify the illocutionary force of the statements.

Efe (1993: 42) suggests that the it is necessary to look at the performative aspect of utterances in order to distinguish between what the character says and what he implies in the dramatic interaction. The extract below taken from Shakespeare's *Richard II* can illustrate

the importance of recognition of illocutionary force on the part of the hearer.

Exton

Didst thou not mark the king, what words he spake,
 'Have I no friend will rid me of this living fear?'
 Was it not so?

Exton

And speaking it, he wistly look'd on me,
 And who should say, 'I would thou wert the man'
 That would divorce this terror from my heart;
 Meaning the king at Pomfret. Come, let's go:
 I am the king's friend, and will rid his foe.
 (Efe, 1993: 42, Shakespeare, Richard II, V. Iv.1-2, 7-9)
 'Have I no friend will rid me of this living fear?'

This statement is in the interrogative form and functions as an assertion. Thus, the intention of the speaker is to express his feeling by the rhetorical question. Nevertheless, Exton takes the question literally and determine the purpose of the statement as a request or desire. His misinterpretation causes a false implication which is 'I would thou wert the man.' And thus, interaction and events proceed according to his interpretation. The important point here is that the knowledge of indirect speech act enables the reader to infer that hearer takes the question literally and draw a false implication.

The observation and identification of implied meaning through speech act value of utterances provide useful insights about the relations between the characters. For example, in an interaction taken from the *Taming of the Shrew* the attitudes of Katharina and Petruchio towards each other can be inferred from the speech acts they use as in the following:

Petruchio Good morrow, Kate; for that's your name, I hear.

Katherina Well have you heard, but something hard of hearing:
 They call me Katharina that do talk of me.

Petruchio You lie, in faith; for you are call'd plain Kate,

(II.i.182-184)

"They call me Katharina that do talk of me."

Without considering the context of the interaction it would be possible to assert that speaker use this utterance for introducing herself. However, looking at the response and interpretation of the hearer it is possible to assert that speaker expresses her thoughts which denies the close relationship he indicates by using the shortened form of her name.

As represented with this example, utterances perform actions, characters can mean more than their words say and the inference of an illocution when a related verb is not used in their expression depends upon the readers correct assessment of the characters' speech act choice.

As Short (1996) suggest identifying and observing speech acts allows the reader to grasp the intended meaning of characters and thus grasp the social relations of the characters. In the example taken from Short, it is possible to identify the speech act status of utterances and deduce the situation and social status of the characters:

Face : Believ't I will.
Subtle : Thy worst. I fart at the.
Dol Common : Ha' you your wits? Why, gentlemen! For love-
Face : Sirrah, I'll strip you.

It is quiet obvious that Face and Subtle are quarreling and threatening each other without their tone of voice or gestures. The intended meaning of the utterances can be drawn from their exploitation of speech acts. Besides, since the speech acts and social status have a relationship (Stubbs, 1983: 161) the fact that Subtle and Face threatening each other also allows us to deduce they are of roughly equal social status.

Speech act theory allows readers to understand how characters in dramatic texts can mean considerably more than their words say and according to hearers' attitude, social dynamics of interaction between characters can be interpreted. Additionally, one important aspect of speech act theory in drama is that there are cases in which characters used illocutionary acts as tools to perform "macro speech acts" (Landa, 1998: n.s). Macro speech acts introduced by Van Dijk in order to explain the sequence of individual acts as an overall act (Elam, 162). Sometimes characters' total speech acts serve to perform a global illocutionary act in a whole text. For example, it is possible to observe Iago in *Othello* performing the macro speech acts of accusing Desdemona in the scene III.iii.

IAGO

My noble lord--

OTHELLO

What dost thou say, Iago?

IAGO

Did Michael Cassio, when you woo'd my lady,

Know of your love?

OTHELLO

....

IAGO

For Michael Cassio,

I dare be sworn I think that he is honest.

OTHELLO

I think so too.

IAGO

Men should be what they seem;

Or those that be not, would they might seem none!

...

IAGO

I am glad of it; for now I shall have reason

To show the love and duty that I bear you

With franker spirit: therefore, as I am bound,

Receive it from me. I speak not yet of proof.

Look to your wife; observe her well with Cassio;

Wear your eye thus, not jealous nor secure:

I would not have your free and noble nature,

Out of self-bounty, be abused; look to't:

I know our country disposition well;

In Venice they do let heaven see the pranks

They dare not show their husbands; their best conscience

Is not to leave't undone, but keep't unknown.

OTHELLO

Dost thou say so?

IAGO

She did deceive her father, marrying you;
And when she seem'd to shake and fear your looks,
She loved them most.

OTHELLO

And so she did.

IAGO

Why, go to then;
She that, so young, could give out such a seeming,
To seal her father's eyes up close as oak-
He thought 'twas witchcraft--but I am much to blame;
I humbly do beseech you of your pardon
For too much loving you.

(Othello, III,iii)

It is obvious that all the illocutionary-perlocutionary effect of Iago is to perform one illocutionary act which is accusation (**Look to your wife; observe her well with Cassio**). Observing the macro speech acts of the characters as well as individual speech acts in deducing situation and character relations can be an important aspect of complex inferential process of textual understanding.

4.3. The Effect of Conversational Implicature in Inferencing Drama

We have seen that understanding motives behind utterances is often crucial in a functional interpretation of drama. Nevertheless, the relationship between the surface form of an utterance and its underlying meaning is not always straightforward. We asserted that using speech act theory in inferencing the implied meaning is a functional strategy. However, there are some cases in dramatic text in which the speech act types of utterances can not be determined. At this point, one may borrow Grice's implicature theory. Because it is designed to explain how hearers get from what is said to what is meant and thus lead to an additional level of meaning beyond semantic meaning of the word utters.

Conversational implicatures are produced in the drama on similar grounds as in natural occurring conversation. Implicatures are derivable from an informal set of step-by-step inference (Yule and Brown 33). Thus, they have a considerable relevance for the study of dramatic texts (Pridham, 2001: 38; Sanger, 2001:28; Short, 1996:169; Elam, 1980: 173). The effect of using conversational implicature in reasoning of drama texts can be illustrated with the exchange below taken from the first scene of *Romeo and Juliet*.

Abraham: Do you bite your thumb at us, sir?

Sampson: I do bite my thumb, sir.

(Short, 1996: 169, I.i.43-44)

The flouting of quantity maxim by Sampson imply the aggression of him and the near war between the Capulets and Montagues. Similarly, following example suggest how it is possible to draw certain implications from the breaking of maxim through metaphors.

Romeo: If I profane with my unworhiest hand

This holly shrine, the gentle sin is this:

My lips, two blushing pilgrims, ready stand

Too smooth that rough touch with a tender kiss.

(p.170, I.v. 95-98)

It is obvious that Juliets' hand is not holly shrine but stating it as such, implies Romeo's devotion. Likewise, his lips are not two blushing pilgrims, but it is infereble that he wants his love to be regarded as quasi-religious love.

Conversational implicature allows reader to work out the reasons for the generation of the implicature (the reason for non- observance of the maxims by characters.) which highlight something unstated about the characters. Some scholars, applied the conversational implicature to make judgements about the qualifications of the character in dramatic texts. Because, focusing on dramatic dialogue in terms of conversational implicature makes it explicit to see how characteristics of speakers are being constructed. Bennison (in Culpeper et al: 1996: 78-81) looks at the conversational behaviour of Anderson in Tom Stoppards' *Professional Fool* and suggest that using conversational implicature is a precise method in the analysis of dramatic characters. Similarly, (in Culpeper et al: 1996: 54-66) using conversational implicature try to provide an interpretation of the roles of Kathy and Petruchio and shows how

it can be possible to reconstruct the inferential chains which lead us to a particular interpretation.

4.4. The Participants' Understanding of Implied Meaning in First Section

In the first section, the participants read extract 1 and they were asked to comment on the total situation that is; what happens in the interaction. Additionally, participants were asked to comment on the relations among the characters. The main aim of the first section was to see if participants can identify the illocutionary forces of utterances and infer what is not stated but implied in the text without any directions. Additionally, it was aimed to investigate if the global intentions of the characters could be understood by participants.

The data collected from the first section of the procedure was analysed in terms of speech acts, implicatures, global intentions. The frequencies and percentages of understanding speech acts, implicatures and macro speech acts, are illustrated in tables and differences between participants' understanding of implied meanings in both extracts were evaluated.

4.4.1. The Participants' Identification of Speech Acts in the Two Extracts

Table 4.1: The Participants' Identification of Speech Acts in Extract 1

Speech Acts	Frequencies of understanding	Percentages of Understanding
Speech Act 1	2	6.6
Speech Act 2	15	50
Speech Act 3	0	0
Speech Act 4	14	46.6
Speech Act 5	2	6.6
Speech Act 6	0	0
Speech Act 7	14	46.6

In section 1, the participants were given an extract from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (see appendix 1 for extract 1) and assigned to read the text and answer general questions about the

total situation in interaction and relationships between the characters. In the table above, the frequencies and percentages of participants' understanding of illocutionary forces are illustrated. As can be seen in the table, speech act 2, 4, and 7 were identified by approximately 14 participants whereas speech act 1 and 5 were identified by only 2 participants. Besides, speech act 3 and 6 were not identified by any of the participants. The reason for participants' better understanding of speech act 2, 5, and 7 is that they do not include double meaning (4-**Gertrude**: Good Hamlet, cast thy nighted colour off, 7-**Claudius**: We pray you, throw to earth. This unprevailing woe.).

On the other hand, speech act 1 and 5 were identified by only 2 participants. Participants failed to understand speech act 1 which includes Hamlets' dialectic utterances as in (1-**Hamlet**: A little more than kin, and less than kind). Since participants took the utterances at face value they did not see the underlying meaning of Hamlet's utterances. Similarly, speech act 3 and 6 were not identified by any participants. This may be because these utterances include irony and word plays which are not identified by any participants.

Participants also failed to identify speech act 5 (5-**Gertrude**: And let thine eye look like a friend on Denmark.). Because, identification of it requires the grasping implicature (you do not look like a friend on King) which makes the illocutionary force of the utterance **accusation**. Since participants focused on the visible aspect of interaction in extract1 they missed this implicature as well.

Table 4.2: The Participants' Identification of Speech Acts in Extract 2

Speech Acts	Frequencies of understanding	Percentages of understanding
Speech Act 1	27	90
Speech Act 2	28	93.3
Speech Act 3	28	93.3
Speech Act 4	6	20
Speech Act 5	16	53.3
Speech Act 6	27	90
Speech Act 7	3	10
Speech Act 8	18	60

In section 1, the participants were also given an extract from Bernard Shaws' *Arms and The Man* (see appendix 5 for extract 2) and assigned to read the text and answer general questions about the total situation in interaction and relationships between the characters. In the table above, the frequencies and percentages of participants' understanding of illocutionary forces in extract 2 are illustrated. As can be seen in the table, Speech acts 1, 2, 3, 6, were identified by approximately 27 participants. Thus, we can infer that these speech acts were identified mostly since they are performed by Sergius in an explicit way. He is directly accusing or challenging other characters (**1-Sergius:** You have deceived me, **6-Sergius:** You love that man! **2-Sergius:** I brook no rivals) and the participants showed a good performance in identifying his speech acts.

Speech act 5, and 8 were identified by approximately 17 participants. These speech acts were performed by Raina. Therefore, it can be asserted that Raina's utterances were not understood as well as Sergius'. The reason for this is that Raina's utterances were not as explicit as Sergius'. Speech act 4 was understood by 6 participants and speech act 7 was understood by 3 participants. Participants fail to understand that Bluntschli make a promise to go (speech act 4) and refute the claims of Sergius in (speech act 7). Thus, we can conclude that since Bluntschli's utterances are less direct than the other characters' participants had difficulty in identifying them.

4.4.2. The Participants' Understanding of Implicatures in the Two Extracts

The frequencies and percentages of understanding implicatures are illustrated in Table 4.3 and Table 4.4

Table 4.3. The Participants' Understanding of Implicatures in Extract 1

Implicatures	Frequencies of Understanding	Percentages of Understanding
Implicature 1	6	20
Implicature 2	2	6, 6
Implicature 3	6	20
Implicature 4	2	6,6
Implicature 5	0	0
Implicature 6	2	6,6

In the second step in the first section of data analysis, participants' understanding of implicatures were analysed. That is, participants answers' and commentaries in extract 1 were analysed in terms of implicatures. Participants' understanding of implicatures are illustrated in the table above. As can be seen in the table, implicature 3 and 1 understood by only 6 participants as Claudius' attempts of compromise. These participants grasped implicatures 3 and 1 since they focused on the context and situation of them. Implicature 2, 4 and 6 were understood by only 2 participants. Implicature 5 was not understood by any participants. The reason for the poor performance in understanding implicatures generally may spring from participants' taking the utterances disregarding the context.

Table 4.4: The Participants' Understanding of the Implicatures in Extract 2

Implicatures	Frequencies of Understanding	Percentages of Understanding
Implicature 1	6	20
Implicature 2	16	53.3
Implicature 3	18	60

Implicatures understood by the participants in extract 2 are illustrated in the table above. As can be seen in the table, implicature 3 was understood by 18 participants and implicature 2 was understood by 16 participants. Participants understood that these implicatures, generated by Raina, imply her affection towards Bluntschli. However, only 6 participants grasped implicature 1 and suggest that Bluntschli also loves Raina. Other participants were observed to miss implicature 1 since they states that they did not find any clues indicating affection of Bluntschli to Raina.

4.4.3. The Participants' Understanding of Global Intentions in the Two Extracts

The frequencies and percentages of understanding the global intentions of the characters are illustrated in table 4.4 and table 4.5

Table 4.5: Participants' Understanding of Global Intentions in Extract 1

Characters' global intention	Frequencies of understanding	Percentage of Understanding
Character 1 (Hamlet)	4	13.2
Character 2 (Gertrude)	3	10
Character 3 (Claudius)	5	16.6

The last step of data analysis in the first section, is the analysis of macro speech acts in extract 1. Participants' understanding of macro speech acts is illustrated above. As can be seen in the table, 4 participants understood Hamlet's macro speech act in the whole interaction which is **accusation**. 3 participants understood truly that Gertrude is attempting to **compromise** with Hamlet. 5 participants understood that Claudius is attempting to **compromise**. That is, generally, participants were not able to determine the global intentions of the characters. Thus we can conclude that they failed to understand the illocutionary forces of dialectic utterances of Hamlet which shapes the total interaction

Table 4.6: The Participants' Understanding of the Global Intentions in Extract 2

Characters' global intention	Frequencies of Understanding	Percentages of Understanding
Character 1 (Sergius)	27	100
Character 2 (Bluntschli)	16	53.3
Character 3 (Raina)	18	60

The last step of data analysis in the first section, is the analysis of macro speech acts in extract 2. Participants' understanding of macro speech acts is illustrated above. As can be seen in the table, Sergius' macro speech act which is **accusation** is identified by 27 participants. On the other hand, Bluntschli's global intentions which are **refutation** and **protecting Raina** were observed by 16 participants. Besides, Raina's global intentions which are **denial** and **bids for information** were arrived at by 18 participants. The reason for the better understanding of Sergius' global intention is that his individual utterances were understood better by participants than other characters' individual utterances.

4.4.4. Differences in Understanding of Implied Meaning in Extract 1

All the participants were able to explain the total situation in the extract 1. They understood that after his father's death Hamlet is mourning and Claudius and Gertrude try to console him. Thus, it can be asserted that visible aspect of dialogue was understood. However, most of the participants were observed to focus on surfacial meaning of utterances. Focusing on the surface meaning of the words caused most of the participants to ignore illocutionary aspect of utterances and make inferences as stated by a participant.

Example 1 P: King Claudius; as far as I understand, he's the step father of Hamlet. He's his uncle. He as the king tries to console him and gives him advice about life. He is just like a real father. He wants Hamlet to be happy. He is insisted on persuading him.

The participants took utterances literally and they did not understand the illocutionary forces of them which caused the misinterpretation of qualification of characters. Some participants concluded that Hamlet is an obedient boy due to his kind answer "I shall obey my lord" and failed to understand that it is an evasive answer to get rid of King Claudius' wordy attempts to compromise. Besides, some participants observed the terms of the address used by the characters and interpreted the situation and relationship between the characters. For example, a participant claimed that Cladius' address of "my son" represents his sincerity and good attitudes towards Hamlet. Some other participants on the other hand, made judgements on the basis of utterances regardless of context. For example, a participant quoted from the characters: "Good Hamlet..... Good mother" and concluded that they have a sincere relationship.

Implicatures were important in providing a way to the interpretation of relations between the characters. Thus, participants' failure to grasp the implicatures drawn from Hamlet's utterances caused them to ignore the fact that Hamlet does not like king and disapproves their marriage. For example, the participants failed to understand the fact that Hamlet is rejecting the kinship Claudius suggests in implicature 4 (A little more than kin, and less than kind.) Only 2 participants grasped the implicature 4 and conclude that "Hamlet does not want to be King's son." Some participants, on the other hand, assigned a false meaning to implicature 1 (You are the most immediate to our throne) and suggested that King's use of this utterance is representing his sincerity. Some participants stated that in the

same utterance the king reminds that Hamlet will be the next king as in the quotation taken from a participant:

Example 2 P: Gertrude and Claudius love Hamlet and advice him. Hamlet is very warm and good boy. He has good attitude towards their advice. Hamlet will be the next king and her mother and step father educate and give him information or advice.

However, as previously discussed, it was a wordy attempt to **compromise with Hamlet** due to the his inappropriate behaviours (hasty marriage with his sister- in -law.) Only two participants grasped the implicature 2 and concluded that Hamlet does not like the king.

The participants were not able to determine the global intentions of the characters. Except for 6 participants who suspected that Hamlet seems to blame the king and the queen, and the king and the queen attempts to compromise with him, all the participants claimed that the characters have a sincere relationship as it is stated by some participants in the following quotations:

Example 3 P: “ They are kind to each other. They seem to understand what stages Hamlet is going on. They are trying to help him.”

Example 4 P: “They are respectful to each other.”

Example 5 P: “ Hamlet is respectful to king Claudius. Queen Gertrude likes Hamlet and Hamlet likes Queen Gertrude.

Some participants on the other hand, truly suspected that Claudius may be insincere or Hamlet may blame the king and the queen. However, they did not support it with implicatures in the text. A participant stated: “ The uncle seems positive to Hamlet but I am not sure of he’s being sincere.”. However, that participant did not support what he stated by underlining the related utterances. Yet, another participant, claimed that “ Hamlet blames the other characters. He treats them like an enemy, questions them and feels hatred.” However, that participant also did not support what he claimed with related utterances.

4.4.5. Differences in Understanding of Implied Meaning in Extract 2

All the participants were able to comment on the situation without being given any background information in the data collection procedure. They understood that Sergius and Raina are a couple and Sergius is suspicious about the fidelity of Raina. They also understood

that the third part is Bluntschli and he is challenged to a fight by Sergius as stated by a participant: “Two men are going to fight for a woman, Raina.”

Unlike Extract 1, participants showed a good performance in identification of illocutionary forces in Extract 2. The participants’ true identification of speech acts provide a true interpretation of situation and relations between the characters. For example, all the participants were able to identify Sergius’s speech act of “You love that man” as an **accusation**. Thus, they infer that Sergius blames Raina and Bluntschli for deceiving him.

Implicatures drawn in this extract indicate the affection of Raina and Bluntschli towards each other and the participants showed a good performance in understanding implicatures. One participant states: “At the end of the extract Raina says ‘Are you?’ to Bluntschli and this is a clue for her affection towards Bluntschli.” Besides, implicatures which shows the affection of Raina and Bluntschli were understood by many participants are as such:

Example 1 P: “I think Raina’s last sentence (Are you?) justified Sergius suspicions. Also, Raina says that ‘I never said I wanted to see you again.’”

Example 2 P: “Bluntschli says ‘in the morning I shall be off home and you’ll never see ever after’ and Raina says ‘I never said I wanted to see you.’ These shows their loves.

Example 3 P: “She got shocked when she hears the utterance saying “She even doesn’t know whether I’m married or not.”

One participant drew an additional implicature from Bluntschli’s utterances (**Why, the young lady doesn’t even know whether I’m married or not.**) “Bluntschli’s not wanting to tell her that he is married is a clue for interpreting that he loves her, too”. Although the implication is true, the reasoning is false. Bluntschli is not married, Besides, as a denial this statement indicates Bluntschli’s attempt to refute the accusations of Sergius about Raina’s infidelity which implies his love.

The participants were also capable of observing the global intentions of characters. They identified macro speech act of Sergius as accusation whereas Raina’s macro speech act is identified as **denial** and **bids for information**.

4.5. The Participants’ Understanding of Implied Meaning in Second Section

In the second section, the participants were given the same extracts a second time but this time important utterances which give clues about the implied meanings are underlined

(only in the first extract) and some specific questions leading to illocutionary forces and implicatures were asked. The aim of the second section was to investigate if the participants could see the speech act values of utterances and implicatures after related utterances were highlighted.

The data collected from the second section of the procedure were analysed in three steps for both extracts: speech acts, implicatures, and global intentions. The frequencies and percentages of understanding speech acts, implicatures, global intentions, are illustrated in tables and differences between participants' understanding of implied meanings in both extracts were evaluated.

4.5.1. The Participants' Identification of Speech Acts in the Two Extracts

The frequencies and percentages of speech act identification of participants illustrated in Table 4.7 and Table 4.8.

Table 4.7: The Participants' Identification of Speech Acts in Extract 1

SPEECH ACTS	Frequencies of understanding	Percentages of Frequency
Speech Act 1	10	33.3
Speech Act 2	22	73,3
Speech Act 3	0	0
Speech Act 4	20	66.6
Speech Act 5	11	36.6
Speech Act 6	10	50
Speech Act 7	20	66.6

In second section of the first step, the participants were given *Hamlet* a second time. However, this time utterances which are significant in terms of illocutionary forces and implicatures were underlined and some specific questions directing them to illocutionary aspects and implicatures were asked. In the table above, the participants' understanding of speech acts of extract 1 in second section is illustrated. As can be seen in the table, there is an increase in the understanding of illocutionary forces in second section with respect to first section (see section 4.2.1.). In the second section, speech act 2 was understood by 22

participants. Speech act 7 and 4 were understood by 20 participants. These speech acts do not include double meaning. Therefore, as in the first section, they were understood mostly. On the other hand, speech act 3 which has double meaning was not identified by any participants as in the first section. Speech acts 5 , 1, and 6 were understood by more participants in the second section. Therefore, we can conclude that underlining utterances and asking about the function of utterances which shape the interaction increased the numbers of speech acts identified by the participants in second section.

Table 4.8: The Participants' Identification of Speech Acts in Extract 2

Speech Acts	Frequencies of understanding	Percentages of understanding
Speech Act 1	30	100
Speech Act 2	30	100
Speech Act 3	30	100
Speech Act 4	12	40
Speech Act 5	25	83.3
Speech Act 6	30	100
Speech Act 7	15	50
Speech Act 8	25	83.3

In second section of the first step, the participants were given *Arms and the Man* a second time. However, this time some specific questions directing to illocutionary aspects and implicatures were asked. In the table above, participants' understanding of speech acts in extract 2 in second section is illustrated. As can be seen in the table, there is an increase in the understanding of illocutionary forces in second section with respect to first section. (see section 4.2.1.) Speech acts 1,2,3, and 6 were understood by all the participants. . The reason for the higher performance may be because of the fact that these speech acts were performed by Sergius in an explicit way. On the other hand, the participants' attention was attracted to love triangle of three characters by specific questions. Thus, participants focused on Raina's and Bluntschli's utterances in terms of affection between them and speech act 5 which is Raina's **refutation** and speech act 8 which is Raina's **bid for information** were identified by more participants with respect to section 1. Similarly, speech act 7 which is the

denial of Bluntschli on behalf of Raina and speech act 4 which is the promise of Bluntschli were identified by more participants in the second section.

4.5.2. The Participants' Understanding of Implicatures in the Two Extracts

The frequencies and percentages of understanding implicatures are illustrated in table 4.9 and 4.10.

Table 4.9: The Participants' Understanding of the Implicatures in Extract 1

Implicatures	Frequencies of Understanding	Percentages of Understanding
Implicature 1	10	33.3
Implicature 2	15	50
Implicature 3	16	66,6
Implicature 4	10	33.3
Implicature 5	0	0
Implicature 6	5	16.6

In the second step of the second section of data analysis, the data analysed in terms of implicatures. That is, participants answers'and commentaries in extract 1 were analysed in terms of implicatures. Participants' understanding of implicatures are illustrated in the table above. There is an increase in understanding all implicatures ,except for 5, when compared to first section (see section 4.2.2). Implicature 3 was identified by 16 participants, implicature 2 was identified by 15 participants. These implicatures were understood mostly in both sections. The reason is that they do not include word plays or double meaning unlike implicature 5 which includes double meaning. Implicature 1, 4, and 6 were identified by more participants. The reason for this is that underlining utterances and asking specific questions attracted participants attention to the implicatures.

Table 4.10: The Participants' Understanding of the Implicatures in Extract 2

Implicatures	Frequencies of Understanding	Percentages of Understanding
Implicature 1	13	43.3
Implicature 2	25	83.3
Implicature 3	25	83.3

In the second step of the second section of data analysis, participants answers' and commentaries in extract 2 were analysed in terms of implicatures. Participants' understanding of implicatures are illustrated in the table above. There is an increase in understanding total implicatures. The reason for the higher range of grasping the implicatures is that specific questions direct the students to the utterances of Raina and Bluntschli. All implicatures suggest the affection of Raina and Bluntschli. However, Bluntschli's utterances are less direct. Therefore, as can be seen in the table, implicature 1 was identified by less participants.

4.5.3. The Participants' Understanding of Global Intentions in the Two Extracts

Table 4.11: The Participants' Understanding of the Global Intentions in Extract 1

Characters' Global Intentions	Frequencies of Understanding	Percentages of Understanding
Character 1 (Hamlet)	14	46.6
Character2 (Gertrude)	12	40
Character 3 (Claudius)	16	53.3

The last step of data analysis in the second section is the analysis of macro speech acts in extract 1 and 2. The Participants' understanding of macro speech acts in extract 1 is illustrated above. As can be seen in the table, Claudius' global intention was understood by 16 participants, Hamlet's global intention was understood by 14 participants and Gertrude's global intention was understood by 12 participants. The participants were observed to focus on the relationship between Hamlet and Claudius and conclude that there is a problem in their relationships. Therefore, Claudius and Hamlet's global intentions were understood mostly.

Besides, there is an increase in understanding global intentions in second section when compared to first section (see section 4.2.3). The reason for the increase is that underlining significant utterances and asking specific question compelled the readers to focus on context and tap into underlying meaning.

Table 4.12: The Participants' Understanding of the Global Intentions in Extract 2

Characters' global intention	Frequencies of Understanding	Percentages of Understanding
Character 1 (Sergius)	30	100
Character 2 (Raina)	25	83.3
Character 3 (Bluntschli)	20	66.6

The last step of data analysis in the second section is the analysis of macro speech acts in extract 1 and 2. The participants' understanding of macro speech acts in extract 1 is illustrated above. As can be seen in the table, Sergius' macro speech act which is **accusation** is identified by all the participants. On the other hand, Bluntschli's global intentions which are **refutation** and **protecting** Raina is arrived at by 20 participants. Besides, Raina's global intentions which are **denial** and **bids for information** were arrived at by 25 participants. The reason for participants' better understanding of Sergius' global intention is that his utterances are more direct than the other characters'. On the other hand, Bluntschli's global intention was ignored by 10 participants since utterances of Bluntschli's less direct than the other characters'. Besides, there is an increase in understanding global intentions in second section when compared to first section.

4.5.4. Differences in Understanding Of Implied Meaning in Extract 1 in Second Section

The results indicated that participants showed a better understanding for extract 1 in second section of the procedure. The participants focused on the function of the utterances as well as the context of them. Illocutionary forces of the utterances were identified by more participants. For example, speech act 1 was identified by 2 participants whereas it was identified by 10 participants in the second part. One participant identified speech act 1 by saying "Hamlet deny the kinship between him and Claudius by saying **A little more than**

kin, and less than kind.” However, some participants were still loyal to surface form of utterances. Some participants’ commentaries on the same utterance exemplify this:

Example 1 P: “King Claudius is good at governing but he is lack of kindness and education.”

Example 2 P: “Hamlet does not deny the kinship between him and king.”

Implicatures were also understood by more participants in the second section. More participants stated that “King Claudius is not sincere in his utterances ‘But now, my cousin Hamlet, and my son,’. And Hamlet do not like King Claudius and blame him.” Nevertheless, the participants still showed poor performance in observing the implicatures. Especially implicatures generated by Hamlet’s riddling utterances were not understood by participants as it is stated by a participant:

Example 3 P: I don’t understand the underlined utterances. Words are uttered under some other meanings. I have difficulty in understanding what they intend to say.

The participants can be divided into two groups on the basis of understanding global intentions. Those in the first group did not see any problem in the interaction and inference the relationships among the characters as such:

Example 4 P: Claudius is a lovely man and he and Queen Gertrude try to console Hamlet. Hamlet obeys them but he is so sad and can not forget his father. But he decides to obey them and stay with them.

On the other hand, those in the second group, understood that there is a gap between the surface form and intentions of the characters. They suggested that Hamlet is blaming the queen and king.

Example 5 P: Claudius do not say what he really feels, he tries to make a father like figure. Actually, Claudius and Gertrude try to justify their marriage by saying death is a natural phenomena. Hamlet blames them.

4.5.5. Differences in Understanding Of Implied Meaning in Extract 2 in Second Section

The participants had been observed to show a good performance in understanding implied meaning in extract 2 in the first section. However, they had a better understanding in the second sections. As it is illustrated, the percentages of understanding speech acts, implicatures, global intentions increased after participants were directed to implied meaning.

The participants showed an extraordinary performance in identifying speech acts except for speech act 4. Speech act 4 was identified only by 12 people as a promise. (**You and he will then make it up and live happily ever after.**) Besides, these participants understood the implicature drawn from the promise which is the concern of Bluntschli for Raina.

Although most of the participants understood the implication drawn from Sergius' and Raina's utterances a few student did not see implicatures drawn from Bluntschli's utterances. These participants did not notice Bluntschli's feelings towards Raina since they focused on the explicit aspect of interaction rather than the implied meanings in it.

4.6. Differences in Understanding Implied Meaning in Both Extracts in First and Second Sections

One of the main aims of the data analysis was to see if asking specific questions or underlining the specific utterances (in terms of speech acts, implicatures, global intentions.) change understanding. As explained before, in the first section the participants were not directed to implied meanings by specific questions; whereas, in second section they were directed to implied meanings to see the difference in understanding. The percentages of participants' understanding of implied meaning in first and second part of the procedure are illustrated in the tables below.

Table 4.13: The Participants' understanding of implied meaning in Extract 1 in first and second sections

Implied Meaning	Percentages of understanding in first Part %	Percentages of understanding in second part %
Speech Acts	22.3	46.6
Implicatures	9.9	33.3
Global Intentions	13.2	50

As can be seen in the table, the participants showed a better understanding of speech acts, implicatures and global intentions in second section of the procedure. Hence, we can conclude that the specific questions in second section enabled participants to focus on the function of the utterances as well as the context of them. Illocutionary forces of the utterances, implicatures, and global intentions were identified by more participants. However, as can be seen in the table, implicatures were identified by less participants in both sections with respect to speech acts and global intentions since implicatures in extract 1 are mostly generated by the dialectic utterances and word plays of Hamlet.

Table 4.14: The participants' understanding of implied meaning in Extract 2 in first and second sections

Implied Meaning	Percentage of understanding in first Part %	Percentage of understanding in second part %
Speech Acts	62.5	82.07
Implicatures	44.4	69.96
Global Intentions	67.7	83.33

The participants' understanding of implied meaning in extract 2 is illustrated in the table above. As can be seen in the table, participants showed a better understanding of speech acts, implicatures, and global intentions in the second section of the procedure. The reason for the higher performance is that specific questions in the second section enabled participants to focus on the function of the utterances as well as the context of them. Illocutionary forces of the utterances, implicatures, and global intentions were identified by more participants.

Therefore, it can be asserted that it is possible to prompt the students to implied meaning by asking specific questions. Besides, considering the increase in the understanding of implied meaning in extract 1 it can be asserted that underlining the related utterances and asking for participants' comments is also a good strategy to direct participants to illocutionary forces of the utterances, implicatures. Additionally, increase in the identification of individual speech acts provided a way to observe the macro speech acts (global intentions) and participant show a greater success in identifying them.

4.7. Summary

The data collection procedure included two sections. The main aim of the first section was to see if participants can identify the illocutionary forces of utterances, infer implicatures, and observe global intentions in extracts. The aim of the second part was to see if asking specific questions could trigger participants' understanding of implied meanings. Thus, analysis of data included two parts.

The results obtained from the first and second parts of the data analysis showed that the participants were triggered by the specific questions. Because there is an increase in the identification of speech acts, implicatures, and global intentions in the second part. Thus, participants were prompted to the intended meanings in both extracts.

Besides, results revealed that participants did not show the same range of success in both extracts. Since the extracts do not cover the same number of speech acts further statistical analysis could not be done. However, individual analysis of speech acts, implicatures, and global intentions showed that participants had a better understanding of speech acts, implicatures and global intentions in extract 2. The reason for the greater success of participants' understanding the Extract 2 may be because this extract was taken from a play written in modern English. Conversely, Extract 1 includes speech acts and implicatures which can not be identified easily due to metaphorical and ironical language. The metaphors and ironies in extract 1 compels the readers to think more and harder to get the implied meaning.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1. Introduction

This study aimed to represent the function of using the principles of pragmatics such as speech act and conversational implicature in assigning meaning to the situations and social relationships among characters in dramatic texts through related literature. Additionally, the study aimed to provide some statistical findings about the student readers' awareness of the implied meanings in drama (including situations and dynamic social relationships between the characters.)

By doing all these, it was aimed to provide an insight to dramatic study in ELT departments and to provide a background to an empirical study which shows the effects of using the units of pragmatics and in ELT department in drama courses.

This chapter presents information about the findings of the research in terms of research questions. Additionally, it presents implications for ELT and further studies.

5.2. Research Questions and Findings

The aim of the study was to search for two questions:

1-What is the function of theories of speech acts, cooperative principle, in making inferences about the implied meaning in dramatic interaction in related literature?

The most important contribution of speech act theory to meaning is in its representation of the distance between the form and function of the utterances. Lexical meaning of an expression gives no clue about the meaning. Thus, in order to understand the motives of the speakers it is important to understand the function of the utterances. Austin's speech act theory makes it possible to classify the utterances according to their functions which allows readers to identify the intentions of the speakers.

Searle contributed to theory by setting rules and attaching significance to the listener's interpretation of utterances. His theory allows reader to investigate the fully dynamics of conversational interaction by considering the role of the hearer, thus moving to the opposite end of the communicative scale.

Conversational implicature theory stresses that meaning in a conversation is conveyed,

not just through individual utterances but also through the way utterances interact with one another. Knowledge of conversational principle enables the readers to suppose that four maxims are being observed by the characters. In the contrary cases, readers look for an implicature (reason for the behaviour of the characters).

We have seen how pragmatic theories of speech act and conversational implicature may go some way towards explaining how the function of utterances is inferred. They show how in the light of general knowledge of the world the receiver can reason from the literal, referential meaning of what is said to the pragmatic meaning of what the sender is intending to do with his or her words.

Focusing on the dramatic interaction in these ways helps students to ignore the surface meaning and instead taps into the underlying meaning which provides them with insights about the hidden motives of the characters. Besides, it enables students to make judgements about the attitudes of the characters and thus social relations among the characters are illuminated.

The second research question was:

2- Are the student readers in ELT department in Çukurova University aware of the implied meanings based on the stated words in dramatic texts?

In order to investigate students' awareness of implied meanings in drama a participant group of third- year students in ELT department in Çukurova University was selected. The participants were assigned to read two specifically selected extracts from dramatic texts and answer questions measuring their understanding of implied meanings. Data collection procedure included two parts. In the first part; the participants answered general questions. By asking general questions it was aimed to avoid directing participants to specific utterances. In the second part, the participants answered specific questions and comment on the underlined utterances in extract 1. Findings revealed that the participants showed a better understanding in the second part of the data analysis. It can be asserted that participants were triggered by the specific questions in second part and they are prompted to implied meanings.

Besides, the results also revealed that the participants had a better understanding of speech acts, implicatures and global intentions in extract 2. The reason for the greater success of participants' understanding the Extract 2 may be because this extract was from a play written in modern English whereas extract 1 includes speech acts and implicatures which can not be identified easily due to metaphorical and ironical language. The metaphors and ironies in extract 1 compelled the readers to think more and harder to get the implied meaning.

5.3. Implications for ELT

Due to the theatrical nature of it, dramatic study in ELT departments is a complex matter. Students have to make inferences in order to get the possible interpretation. We suggested the application of theories of speech act and conversational interaction in inferencing the implied meanings behind the utterances of characters in plays. We demonstrated (through related literature) the effect of the theories in conveying implied meaning in dramatic interaction. Additionally, we demonstrated how the motives of the characters behind the utterances can be made explicit by giving examples from various plays highlighting the context of the utterances. Lastly, we argued that studying drama texts in this way can assist in the interpretation of dramatic texts, provide valuable insights into characterization and the relationship between characters.

Based on the results of this study, it can be asserted that teachers should guide the students to implied meaning in dramatic dialogue by stressing illocutionary forces and implications of the utterances in the texts highlighting the context. Additionally, while doing this instead of giving the illocutionary forces and implications directly, teachers can ask for the functions of specific utterances or ask specific questions digging for the underlying meaning of the utterances.

5.4. Implications for Further Studies

The effects of application of using speech act theory and conversational implicature in inferencing the implied meaning in dramatic texts were investigated in this study. It is concluded that using these principles can make the internal workings of drama texts explicit. Our study is restricted to the representation of effects of these theories in the related literature. Thus, further experimental studies measuring the effect of using these principles; including participants' being trained on these principles and investigating their application the principles to the dramatic texts can be conducted. Besides, in our study we analysed extracts focusing on the character to character interaction (communication in the play) regardless of authorial intention. Further studies including the application of these principles accounting for the interaction on a higher level between the implied authors and the readers can be conducted. Lastly, since understanding dramatic texts requires the understanding of many elements such as characterization, plot, theme, point of view further research investigating the effect of pragmatic principles of speech acts and conversational implicatures in understanding these elements can be conducted.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962), *How To Do Things with Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- Bennet A. & Royle, N. (1995), *An introduction to literature, criticism, and theory: Key critical concepts*: Prentice Hall Harvester Wheatsheaf: Great Britain.
- Bennison, N. (1998), 'Accessing character through conversation Tom Stoppard's *Professional Foul*', in J. Culpeper, Short, M. and P. Verdonk.(eds) *Exploring the language of Drama, from text to context*. pp 67-82. London: Routledge.
- Brown G. and G. Yule. (1983), *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter R. & Nunan, D. (1993), *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. Penguin: London.
- Carter, R., Goddard, A., Reah, D., Sanger, K., Bowring, M. (2001), *Working with texts: A core introduction to language analysis*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Clark, H (1996), *Using Language*. Cambridge University Press. Great Britain.
- Collie J. & Slater, S. (1984), *Literature in the Classroom : A resourcebook of ideas and activities*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Cooper, Marilyn, M. (1998), 'Implicature, convention and The Taming of the Shrew', in J. Culpeper, Short, M. and P. Verdonk.(eds.). *Exploring the language of Drama, from text to context*. pp 54-66. London: Routledge.
- Coulthard, Malcolm. (1998), 'An Introduction To Discourse Analysis'. New York: Longman
- Culpeper, Short, M. and P. Verdonk. *Exploring the language of Drama, from text to context* London: Routledge.
- Croddy, S. W. 'Performing Illocutionary Speech Acts:an analysis'. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 34 (2002) 1113-1118
- Dascal, M. (2003), *Interpretation and Understanding*. John Benjamins Publishing: Amsterdam.
- Efe, Fehmi. (1993), *Dram Sanatı: Göstergibilimsel Bir Yaklaşım*. İstanbul: YKY.
- Elam, K. (1980),*The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. London and New York. Methuen & Co.
- Feng, Z. and D. Shen.(2001), 'The Play off the Stage: The Writer Reader Relationship In Drama.' *Language and Literature*. 10 (1): 79-83.
- Glazov-Corrigan, Elena. "Speech Acts, Generic Differences, and the Curious Case of Cymbeline." *SEL: Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 34 (1994): 379-99.
- Grice, H. P. (1975), *Logic and conversation*. In Cole, P. And Morgan, J. (eds). *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 3, Speech acts. New York: Academic Press, 41-58.

- Grundy, P.(1996), *Doing Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Fish, Stanley E. "How To Do Things with Austin and Searle: Speech Act Theory and Literary Criticism." *Modern Language Notes* 91 (1976): 983-1025.
- Herman, V.(1995), *Dramatic Discourse: Dialogue as Interaction in Plays*. London: Routledge.
- Hurford, J. R.& Heasley. (1988), B. *Semantics: a coursebook*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kıran, Z. (2001), *Dilbilimine Giriş (Dilbilgisinden Dilbilime)*. Seçkin Yayıncılık: Ankara.
- Landa, J. A.G. (1988, Online edition 2004) *Annotations on Volosinov's Marxism and the philosophy of Language*. Retrieved August 11, 2007 from http://www.unizar.es/departamentos/filologia_inglesa/garciala/publicaciones/voloshinov.html
- Leech, G. (1992), Pragmatic Principles in Shaw's 'You Never can Tell' in M. Toolan (ed.) *Language, Text and Context: Essays in Stylistics*, pp.259-78. London: Routledge.
- Lowe, V. (1998). 'Unhappy Confessions in The Crucible A pragmatic Explanation', in J. Culpeper, Short, M. and P. Verdonk.(eds.). *Exploring the language of Drama From Text to Context*, pp 128-141.London: Routledge.
- McCarthy. M. (1998), 'Reconstructing and deconstructing: Drama texts in the classroom.' in R. Carter J. McRae (eds) *Language, Literature and the Learner Creative Classroom Practice*. London and New York: Longman.
- McIntyre, D. (2004), Point of View in drama: a socio- pragmatic analysis of Dennis Potter's *Brimstone and Treacle*. *Language and Literature*. Vol 13 (2): 139-160.
- Mey, J. (2001) *Pragmatics an introduction* . Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mooney, A. (2004), 'Cooperation, violations and making sense'. *Journal of Pragmatics*: (36) 899-920
- Nutku, Ö. (1998), *Dram Sanatı*. İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi
- Pridham, F. (2001), *The Language of Conversation*. London: Routledge.
- Sanger, Keith. (2001), *The language of drama*. London: Routledge,
- Searle, John R. (1975), 'The Logical Status of Fictional Discourse'. *New Literary History*, 6, 319-332.
- Searle, John R. (1979), *Expression and Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Simpson, P. (1989), 'Politeness Phenomenon in Ionesco's *The Lesson*', in R. Carter and P. Simpson (eds.) *Language, Discourse and Literature*, pp.171-93. London: Unwin.
- Simpson, P. (1993), *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. London: Routledge.
- Shakespeare, W. (1994), *Hamlet*. New York: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Shiffrin, D. (1994), *Approaches to Discourse*. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Showalter, Elaine. (2003), *Teaching Literature*. UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Short, M. (1989), 'Discourse Analysis and the Analysis of Drama', in R. Carter and P. Simpson (eds.) *Language, Discourse and Literature*, pp.139-68. London: Unwin.
- Short, M. (1996), *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*. Harlow: Longman.
- Short, M. (1998), 'Discourse Analysis and the analysis of drama' in J. J. Weber (ed) *The Stylistics Reader*. London: Arnold, 158-193.
- Short, M. (1998), 'From Texts to Dramatic Performance', in J. Culpeper, Short, M. and P. Verdonk (eds) *Exploring the Language of Drama, from text to context*. pp. 6-18. London and New York: Routledge.
- Spitz, Alice. (2001), 'Who's got the upper hand? Dominance and domineeringness in dramatic dialogue'. *Pragmatics in 2000: Selected papers from the 7th International Pragmatics Conference*, Vol. 2. ed. by Enikő Németh, 555-570. Antwerp: International Pragmatics Association
- Stubbs, M. (1983), *Discourse Analysis the sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Chicago: Chicago Press.
- Styan, J.D. (1960), *The elements of drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Talibi, I. (n.s.). 'Pragmatics and the Analysis of Literature'. *Literary Stylistics Lecture Notes*. No. 22. www.Courses.nus.edu.sg/course/ellibst/IsI22.html.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Thornbarrow, J. and S Wareing. (1998/2000), *Patterns in Language — An Introduction and Literary Style*. Routledge and Foreign Languages Teaching and Research Press.
- Traugott, E. C. and Pratt, M. L. (1980), *Linguistics for Students of Literature*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc.

- Oort, Richard, van. (1995), 'The Anthropology of Speech-Act Literary Criticism: A Review Article', *Anthropoetics* I, no. 2. Retrieved July 20, 2007 from
[http: // www.anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap0102/vano.htm](http://www.anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap0102/vano.htm)
- Vershueren, J.(1999), *Understanding Pragmatics*. New york: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996), *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Extract 1

King Claudius: King Hamlet's brother he comes to the throne after his death.

Queen Gertrude: King Hamlet's wife. After his death she has married to Claudius. Thus, she is the wife of King Claudius.

Hamlet: King Hamlet's son.

KING CLAUDIUS

Take thy fair hour, Laertes; time be thine,

And thy best graces spend it at thy will!

But now, my cousin Hamlet, and my son,--

HAMLET

[Aside] A little more than kin, and less than kind.

KING CLAUDIUS

How is it that the clouds still hang on you?

HAMLET

Not so, my lord; I am too much i' the sun.

QUEEN GERTRUDE

Good Hamlet, cast thy nighted colour off,

And let thine eye look like a friend on Denmark.

Do not for ever with thy vailed lids

Seek for thy noble father in the dust:

Thou know'st 'tis common; all that lives must die,

Passing through nature to eternity.

HAMLET

Ay, madam, it is common.

QUEEN GERTRUDE

If it be,

Why seems it so particular with thee?

HAMLET

Seems, madam! nay it is; I know not 'seems.'
 'Tis not alone my inky cloak, good mother,
 Nor customary suits of solemn black,
 Nor windy suspiration of forced breath,
 No, nor the fruitful river in the eye,
 Nor the dejected 'havior of the visage,
 Together with all forms, moods, shapes of grief,
 That can denote me truly: these indeed seem,
 For they are actions that a man might play:
 But I have that within which passeth show;
 These but the trappings and the suits of woe.

thine: old use for *yours*

thy: old use for *your*

thee: old use for *you*

Denmark: King

KING CLAUDIUS

'Tis sweet and commendable in your nature, Hamlet,
 To give these mourning duties to your father:
 But, you must know, your father lost a father;
 That father lost, lost his, and the survivor bound
 In filial obligation for some term
 To do obsequious sorrow: but to persever
 In obstinate condolement is a course
 Of impious stubbornness; 'tis unmanly grief;
 It shows a will most incorrect to heaven,
 A heart unfortified, a mind impatient,
 An understanding simple and unschool'd:
 For what we know must be and is as common
 As any the most vulgar thing to sense,
 Why should we in our peevish opposition

Take it to heart? Fie! 'tis a fault to heaven,
 A fault against the dead, a fault to nature,
 To reason most absurd: whose common theme
 Is death of fathers, and who still hath cried,
 From the first corse till he that died to-day,
 'This must be so.' We pray you, throw to earth
 This unprevailing woe, and think of us
 As of a father: for let the world take note,
 You are the most immediate to our throne;
 And with no less nobility of love
 Than that which dearest father bears his son,
 Do I impart toward you. For your intent
 In going back to school in Wittenberg,
 It is most retrograde to our desire:
 And we beseech you, bend you to remain
 Here, in the cheer and comfort of our eye,
 Our chiefest courtier, cousin, and our son.

QUEEN GERTRUDE

Let not thy mother lose her prayers, Hamlet:
 I pray thee, stay with us; go not to Wittenberg.

HAMLET

I shall in all my best obey you, madam.

KING CLAUDIUS

Why, 'tis a loving and a fair reply:
 Be as ourself in Denmark. Madam, come;
 This gentle and unforced accord of Hamlet
 Sits smiling to my heart: in grace whereof,
 No jocund health that Denmark drinks to-day,
 But the great cannon to the clouds shall tell,
 And the king's rouse the heavens all bruit again,
 Re-speaking earthly thunder. Come away.

Exeunt all but HAMLET (Shakespeare, Hamlet act I, scene ii)

Appendix 2: Questions for Extract 1 in the First Part**Questions**

First Part

- 1- Summarise what is happening in this extract?
- 2- What are the characters' attitudes and feelings towards each other?
(King Claudius, Queen Gertrude and Hamlet). Support your decision by underlining the related utterances.

Appendix 3: Extract 1 (Underlined Version)

KING CLAUDIUS

Take thy fair hour, Laertes; time be thine,

And thy best graces spend it at thy will!

But now, my cousin Hamlet, and my son,--

HAMLET

[Aside] A little more than kin, and less than kind.

KING CLAUDIUS

How is it that the clouds still hang on you?

HAMLET

Not so, my lord; I am too much i' the sun.

QUEEN GERTRUDE

Good Hamlet, cast thy nighted colour off,

And let thine eye look like a friend on Denmark.

Do not for ever with thy vailed lids

Seek for thy noble father in the dust:

Thou know'st 'tis common; all that lives must die,

Passing through nature to eternity.

HAMLET

Ay, madam, it is common.

QUEEN GERTRUDE

If it be,

Why seems it so particular with thee?

HAMLET

Seems, madam! nay it is; I know not 'seems.'

'Tis not alone my inky cloak, good mother,

Nor customary suits of solemn black,

Nor windy suspiration of forced breath,

No, nor the fruitful river in the eye,

Nor the dejected 'havior of the visage,

Together with all forms, moods, shapes of grief,

That can denote me truly: these indeed seem,

For they are actions that a man might play:

But I have that within which passeth show;
 These but the trappings and the suits of woe.

KING CLAUDIUS

'Tis sweet and commendable in your nature, Hamlet,
 To give these mourning duties to your father:
 But, you must know, your father lost a father;
 That father lost, lost his, and the survivor bound
 In filial obligation for some term
 To do obsequious sorrow: but to persever
 In obstinate condolement is a course
 Of impious stubbornness; 'tis unmanly grief;
 It shows a will most incorrect to heaven,
 A heart unfortified, a mind impatient,
 An understanding simple and unschool'd:
 For what we know must be and is as common
 As any the most vulgar thing to sense,
 Why should we in our peevish opposition
 Take it to heart? Fie! 'tis a fault to heaven,
 A fault against the dead, a fault to nature,
 To reason most absurd: whose common theme
 Is death of fathers, and who still hath cried,
 From the first corse till he that died to-day,
 'This must be so.' We pray you, throw to earth
 This unprevailing woe, and think of us
 As of a father: for let the world take note,
 You are the most immediate to our throne;
 And with no less nobility of love
 Than that which dearest father bears his son,
 Do I impart toward you. For your intent
 In going back to school in Wittenberg,
 It is most retrograde to our desire:
 And we beseech you, bend you to remain
 Here, in the cheer and comfort of our eye,
 Our chiefest courtier, cousin, and our son.

QUEEN GERTRUDE

Let not thy mother lose her prayers, Hamlet:
I pray thee, stay with us; go not to Wittenberg.

HAMLET

I shall in all my best obey you, madam.

KING CLAUDIUS

Why, 'tis a loving and a fair reply:
Be as ourself in Denmark. Madam, come;
This gentle and unforced accord of Hamlet
Sits smiling to my heart: in grace whereof,
No jocund health that Denmark drinks to-day,
But the great cannon to the clouds shall tell,
And the king's rouse the heavens all bruit again,
Re-speaking earthly thunder. Come away.

Exeunt all but HAMLET

(Shakespeare, Hamlet act I, scene ii)

Appendix 4: Questions for the Extract 2 in Second Part

Second Part

Questions

- 1-What do speakers intend to mean in underlined utterances ?
- 2-What does Hamlet imply by saying “ Seems, madam! nay it is; I know not ‘seems.’”
- 3-What does Gertrude intend by saying “Thou know’st ‘tis common; all that lives must die?”
- 4-Do you think intentions of the speakers are understood by the hearers?
- 5- Define the attitudes and feelings of the speakers towards each other?

Appendix 5: Extract 2

SERGIUS *[gravely, without moving]* Captain Bluntschli.

BLUNTSCHLI. Eh?

SERGIUS. You have deceived me. You are my rival. I brook no rivals. At six o'clock I shall be in the drilling-ground on the Klissoura road, alone, on horseback, with my sabre. Do you understand?

BLUNTSCHLI *[staring, but sitting quite at his ease]* Oh, thank you: that's a cavalry man's proposal. I'm in the artillery; and I have the choice of weapons. If I go, I shall take a machine gun. And there shall be no mistake about the cartridges this time.

SERGIUS *[flushing, but with deadly coldness]* Take care, sir. It is not our custom in Bulgaria to allow invitations of that kind to be trifled with.

BLUNTSCHLI *[warmly]* Pooh! Don't talk to me about Bulgaria. You don't know what fighting is. But have it your own way. Bring your sabre along. I'll meet you.

SERGIUS *[fiercely delighted to find his opponent a man of spirit]* Well said, Switzer. Shall I lend you my best horse?

BLUNTSCHLI. No: damn your horse!--thank you all the same, my dear fellow. *[Raina comes in, and hears the next sentence]*. I shall fight you on foot. Horseback's too dangerous: I don't want to kill you if I can help it.

RAINA *[hurrying forward anxiously]* I have heard what Captain Bluntschli said, Sergius. You are going to fight. Why? *[Sergius turns away in silence, and goes to the stove, where he stands watching her as she continues, to Bluntschli]* What about?

BLUNTSCHLI. I don't know: he hasn't told me. Better not interfere, dear young lady. No harm will be done: I've often acted as sword instructor. He won't be able to touch me; and I'll not hurt him. It will save explanations. In the morning I shall be off home; and you'll never see me or hear of me again. You and he will then make it up and live happily ever after.

RAINA *[turning away deeply hurt, almost with a sob in her voice]* I never said I wanted to see you again.

SERGIUS *[striding forward]* Ha! That is a confession.

RAINA *[haughtily]* What do you mean?

SERGIUS. You love that man!

RAINA *[scandalized]* Sergius!

SERGIUS. You allow him to make love to you behind my back, just as you treat me as your affianced husband behind his. Bluntschli: you knew our relations; and you deceived me. It is for that that I call you to account, not for having received favors never enjoyed.

BLUNTSCHLI [*jumping up indignantly*] Stuff! Rubbish! I have received no favors. Why, the young lady doesn't even know whether I'm married or not. --

RAINA [*forgetting herself*] Oh! [*Collapsing on the ottoman*] Are you?

Appendix 6: Questions for the Extract 2 in First Part**Questions****The First Part**

1- Summarize what is happening in the extract?

2- What are the characters' attitudes and feelings towards each other?

(Sergius, Bluntschli, Raina). Support your decision by underlining the related utterances.

Appendix 7: Questions for Extract 2 in Second Part**Questions****The Second Part**

1-Do you think Bluntschli and Raina have some attraction towards each other? Why?

2-Are there any utterances in the text suggesting that Raina has attraction towards

Bluntschli? Underline them.

3-Are there any utterances in the text suggesting that Bluntschli has attraction to Raina.?

Underline them.

4-Is there a confession made by Raina?

5- Are there any utterances of Bluntschli or Raina justified Sergius suspicions?

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name : Cihan TEKİN
 Place and Date of Birth : Adana- 21. February.1981
 E- Mail : tekin-cihan@hotmail.com

EDUCATION

2007 (MA) University of Çukurova Institute of Social Sciences
 Department of English Language Teaching
 2000- 2004 (BA) University of Ege Faculty of Letters
 Department of English Language and Literature
 1996- 2000 Danişment Gazi Anatolian High School

EXPERIENCE

2005-... Sinanpaşa Yatılı İlköğretim Bölge Okulu-Aladağ/ Adana
 (English Teacher)

PRESENTATION IN CONFERENCE

20-21 October, 2005 ‘Accessing Character through Conversational Interaction:
 Jimmy Porter in *Look Back in Anger*’
 3rd International Postgraduate Conference
 in Linguistics and Language Teaching University of Çukurova