



Presupposition Triggers Of Teacher Talk In Higher Education Institution

Umi Aisyah Sulistyning Tyas[✉], Dwi Rukmini, Sri Wuli Fitriati

Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Article Info

Article History:
Accepted 19 August
2019
Approved 20 August
2019
Published 15 March
2020

Keywords:
Presupposition
Triggers, Teacher Talk

Abstract

The present study is aimed at investigating the way of presupposition triggers realized in the lecturer talk. This qualitative research is conducted in English class of the State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) Salatiga by purposive sampling. The present study serves reading class recordings as the data. Reading class was chosen for the reason of similar process in making prediction on reading, i.e. schemata theory, with presumption on presupposition. It is equipped by observation and documentation in order to enhance confidence in the ensuing findings. The finding shows that presupposition triggers realized by the several categories; they are definite description, factive verb, implicative verb, change of state verb, iterative, verb of judging, temporal clause, comparison and contrast, non-restrictive relative clause, and question. The most frequent used category is definite description, with the simple structure of possessive construction and definite noun phrase. Another important result is the preference to use question as the next favored triggers.

© 2020 Universitas Negeri Semarang

[✉] Correspondence Address:
Kampus Pascasarjana Unnes, Jl. Kelud Utara III, Semarang, 50237
E-mail: umi.aisyah.st@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

This research investigated presupposition triggers happened in English language classrooms, especially in the talks of the lecturers. It is about presuppositions which are very common phenomena of language uses in a society. It is speakers' assumption to be the case before making utterances. Some lexical elements or constructions which are introduced a presupposition are called as presupposition triggers. This research investigated the occurrence of presupposition triggers in the classroom context. It was about how presuppositions of the lecturer were comprehended by the students as their listeners.

This study needs to be conducted because of several reasons. First is the growing interest for studying teacher talk (TT) in some ways. Lynch (2010) at least proposed three importance things why TT needs to be conducted. The first is that people have recognized the vital link between comprehension and progress in the foreign language. The second is that studies of classroom language have shown that certain aspects of teacher talk influence the way learners use the language. The third is the realization that it is not easy for the learners to understand what the teacher is currently trying to focus their attention on.

Second, I found that researches about presuppositions were often investigated from casual conversations. Meanwhile in educational field, it was rarely conducted. It was proven by the part of previous studies that I have attached to. It would be a fresh study and beneficial for educators to know how presuppositions happened in the classroom context. In addition, based on preliminary research that I have taken in the classroom, in some ways, I found that students have a kind of mismatch response towards the lecturer's intention. It was in line with the third reason for studying teacher talk proposed by Lynch (2010), i.e. the students felt difficult to understand the lecturer's intention. For example in a conversation when a lecturer and students conversed about the students' learning goals of that day, the lecturer asked to a

female student, "*What's your strategy? Do you have any strategy this time?*" It meant he asked about the strategy to be used to get the goals or target. But the student answered, "*I wanna get new vocabulary.*" Then the lecturer criticized and restated his order, "*No, your strategy.*" Then she replied, "*I will open dictionary and remember the vocabulary . . .*" As Selinker says in Rani et al. (2006, p. 168), to understand utterances, speaker and hearer have to resort to various kinds of general knowledge of the world. Both the participants should have previous knowledge to be the case. It could not be understood independently by a single way understanding. That is why presupposition is needed to be learnt.

Some researchers such as Bonyadi and Samuel (2011), Zare', Abbaspour, and Nia (2012), also Abrusan (2011, 2013, 2015) have been investigated the occurrences of presupposition in some occasions. The two first researches reported in presupposition application on mass media, they were newspaper editorials and TV broadcasts respectively. Meanwhile Abrusan had in deep interest in soft and hard trigger of presupposition. Related to TT, in this way was lecturer talk, Yanfen and Yuqin (2010), Szendroi (2010) and Setiawati (2012) studied about lecturer talk in English classes, ESP (English for Specific Purposes) classroom, and EYL (English for Young Learners) classroom. The present study investigated the occurrence of pragmatic presupposition in the context of English class students in the university.

By studying pragmatic presupposition, both lecturers and learners infer more information because of broader discussion toward the responses. It is not restricted to learn about the utterance meaning, but also the context which are included in the utterance. So, based on those considerations, I intend to analyze the ways of presupposition triggers realized in lecturer talk happened in the classroom interaction.

METHOD

In the present study, I discovered the presupposition triggers in the lecturer talk which belongs to pragmatic analysis. This qualitative research was conducted in English language class at State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) Salatiga. The research site was chosen by purposive sampling. The researcher put a lecturer who taught reading class subject because it has been displayed the phenomena of presupposition in the classroom interaction. It was also based on needs on the researcher’s job site in case of monitoring learning process. Moreover, such kind of analysis was needed to be done in capturing the real learning atmosphere. It was useful to evaluate both lecturers’ and students’ performance. A single meeting for a lecturer was served as the data.

The units of analysis of this research were phrases, clauses and utterances produced by the lecturers for presupposition analysis. Pragmatic presupposition trigger classified by Karttunen’s classification of presupposition triggers (n.d.) in Levinson (1983). The research instruments were obtained from the classroom observation and documentation. The classroom interaction flow was monitored from the observation which was done at once with recording activity.

The present study served reading class recordings as the data. Reading class was chosen for the reason of similar process in making prediction on reading (schemata theory) with presumption on presupposition. In addition, after having preliminary studies on reading and speaking classes, the availability of lecturer-students interaction was met through teaching-learning on reading class more than speaking ones.

The procedures of collecting data involved several steps, i.e. observing the classroom, recording and documenting, also transcribing; whereas, the steps of analysis which were arranged for pragmatic analysis are (1) identifying the clause, (2) categorizing the triggers, (3) calculating the frequency, and (4) interpreting. This research was equipped by

observation and documentation in order to enhance confidence in the ensuing findings.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

As mentioned earlier, this study classifies presupposition triggers based on Karttunen’s (n.d.) classification with numbers of thirteen. They are (1) definite description, (2) factive verb, (3) implicative verb, (4) change of state verb, (5) iterative, (6) verb of judging, (7) temporal clause, (8) cleft sentence, (9) implicit cleft with stressed constituent, (10) comparison and contrast, (11) non-restrictive relative clause, (12) counterfactual condition, and (13) question. The triggers then coined as PT followed by number as the kinds of presupposition triggers mentioned, for instance PT1 means definite description. Table 1 presents the frequency of each trigger based on the data in the classroom interaction transcript.

Table 1. Kinds Presupposition Triggers

	Number of triggers
PT1	167
PT2	4
PT3	1
PT4	5
PT5	7
PT6	2
PT7	6
PT8	0
PT9	0
PT10	2
PT11	1
PT12	0
PT13	58

As shown in the Table 1, definite description (N=167) is the most frequently used to show the existence of certain entities by the use of possessive construction. Question (N=58) is the next favored tools of triggering presupposition. The structure of yes/no questions, alternative questions, and WH-questions treat information as assumed to be true and accepted as true by listener, as Yule

formulated (1996, p.28). Iterative (N=7), temporal clause (N=6), change the state verb (N=5), and factive verb (N=4) linguistic markers are also applied to express the lecturer's intended meaning; even the numbers are not so significant. Meanwhile verb of judging, comparison and contrast, implicative verb, and non-restrictive relative clause happen for one to two times. The remaining triggers, such as verb of cleft sentence, implicit cleft with stressed constituent and counterfactual condition are not found in the transcription.

The analysis of selected excerpt of presupposition triggers on lecturer talk indicated by '>>' to realize certain linguistic features described.

1) Definite description

T : We are in a good topic today. And then we are in *the stuff of our second reading*. Did you do *the reading*, already?

In a given situation, the lecturer starts the class with asking some questions, such kind of affirmation toward the students about the today's material after praying and reciting Quran.

(a) The stuff of our second reading >> there is a second reading passage as it is come after the previous topic.

(b) The reading >> the previous reading as previously mentioned.

There is a second reading passage as it is come after the previous topic. It is a different topic, a new topic which is not continuing or studying over the previous.

T : You only have 5 seconds to answer or to mention *the vocabularies*. If you cannot mention three vocabularies in 5 seconds, and then you get punishment, you will get the punishment, and you have to move here (point at the front of class).

Teacher arranged a vocabulary quiz before discussing the next material. The students should mention three vocabularies in five second. He also explains how the rules of quiz are.

(c) The vocabularies >> the vocabularies which should be mentioned in brief supposed not to be get a punishment
One of the rules of vocabulary quiz is mentioning three vocabularies within five seconds. If they cannot mention it, consequently the student should pay the punishment.

2) Factive verb

T : Look for the keywords, ok. So you find the keyword first to get the idea, So you do scanning. But be careful, if you *remember* scanning and skimming is different

The lecturer suggests a female student to make sure of her strategies in purpose of getting main idea. He reminds her to revise her strategy.

(d) But be careful, if you remember scanning and skimming is different >> scanning and skimming is different

The lecturer asks a female student to check her strategy of getting main idea, whether it is true or false.

T : . . .

I *know* that you have done the Mickey mouse. Most of you have done the Mickey mouse. *I'm glad* that you have done the Mickey mouse from home. That's what I expected without I order you to do the exercise, you have done it before. That's good.

. . .

The topic discuss of that day is not the Mickey mouse as the students had done, but they did it without any command or order from the lecturer.

(e) I know that you have done the Mickey mouse >> the students have done the exercise on Mickey mouse

(f) I'm glad that you have done the Mickey mouse from home >> the students have done the exercise on Mickey mouse

The students have done the exercise before any order or command.

3) Implicative verb

T : . . .

I'm glad that you have done the Mickey mouse from home. That's what I *expected* without I order you to do the exercise, you have done it before. That's good.

...

- (g) That's what I expected without I order you to do the exercise, you have done it before. >> the students have done the exercise

The students have done the exercise before any order or command.

4) Change of state verb

T : ...

Just for refreshing before *we start on the lesson*.

...

The pointing game ended by mentioning ten vocabularies by the punishing student. Because he got confused, the lecturer asked his friends to help. When all the words completely mention, the lecturer continue to start the next material.

- (h) . . . we *start* on the lesson >> the class has not discussing the lesson yet.

One thing comes after another. The lesson study comes after the pointing game has completely finished. The word "start" means that the lesson has not even delivered or asked yet to the students. It states that the atmosphere of the class will be change because of the essence of the discussion.

T : Alright, I give you 15 minutes, starting from now, and we will *stop* at 3

The lecturer starts the meeting by reciting *basmalah* and instructs the students to sit nearby their groups as it is arranged a week before.

- (i) Ok, before we *begin* >> an activity, i.e. studying about journal article review, will be started.

The lecturer set the students' sits as the learning activity goals to be done that day.

5) Iterative

T : ...

Over there, that's the only sit left. Alright, so please don't come late *again* in the next meeting, because otherwise, you will not get any sit.

...

In the middle of setting that day goals of learning, there are two female students who came late to the class. They are little bit confused to search the sits left, until the lecturer shown them.

- (j) Alright, so please don't come late again in the next meeting >> there is (are) student(s) who come late.

The lecturer reminds the students to do not come late to the class, because they are probably get no sit because of the full amount.

T : ...

Ooo keyyy done?? Done? Done? Stop, stop, everyone stop, no writing, and please put all your pens on the tables.

No write *anymore*

I will interview one by one

...

The students perform the task of ten questions. It supposed to be the time to stop writing.

- (k) No write anymore >> people write something before.

That day material is about the passage of federal policies for native people and some exercises related to it. The students are given 15 minutes to finish till the time of discussion.

6) Verb of judging

T : ...

So I'm *assuming* that with your strategies, I'm *assuming* that you will need at least one minute, two minutes to read the whole text.

Can you read the whole text in two minutes?

...

That day material entitled federal policies for native people. It consisted of ten questions and five paragraphs long. The students are asked to learn the passage and do the exercises.

- (l) So I'm *assuming* that with your strategies, I'm *assuming* that you will need at least one minute, two minutes to read the whole text. >> the students need two minutes to read the text

The lecturer has prediction that the students can read the whole text on two minutes.

7) Temporal clause

T : . . .

Just for refreshing *before* we start on the lesson.

. . .

The pointing game ended by mentioning ten vocabularies by the punishing student. Because he got confused, the lecturer asked his friends to help. When all the words completely mention, the lecturer continue to start the next material.

(m) Just for refreshing before we start on the lesson >> the lesson started

The lecturer ends the game by saying that the activity is merely to refresh their mind, instead of recalling memory of vocabularies at once.

T : . . .

Understand first about the strategies, skimming and scanning. Ok, I will let you revise your strategy *while* I'm asking the others.

The lecturer suggests a female student to make sure of her strategies in purpose of finding main idea. He reminds her to revise her strategy.

(n) I will let you revise your strategy while I'm asking the others >> the lecturer was asking the other students

The lecturer is intended to ask another student after that female student.

8) Cleft sentence

This trigger is not found in the data of lecturer talk.

9) Implicit cleft with stressed constituent

This trigger is not found in the data of lecturer talk.

10) Comparison and contrast

T : . . .

If you want to find the main idea, I think skimming is *the better way, better strategy*.

. . .

It discuss about the students' strategy to get their goals of learning. The lecturer

explains the different between skimming and scanning.

(o) If you want to find the main idea, I think skimming is *the better way, better strategy* >> there is a wrong way done by the student to find the main idea of the text, which the correct way or strategy to apply is skimming, not scanning as she did.

The teacher gave arrangement to the students to choose a suitable strategy based on the purpose of finding main idea.

11) Non-restrictive relative clause

T : . . .

It is another pointing game like what we did last week, first ping pong paw.

. . .

In order to warm up that day's meeting, the lecturer propose some activities to do, such as do chatting, telling story, or gaming and the students chose to do gaming. The lecturer then arranged a kind of pointing game.

(p) It is another pointing game like what we did last week, first ping pong paw >> the previous pointing game is ping pong paw game.

The teacher arranged another pointing game because the previous does not run well. It is a kind of vocabulary game.

12) Counterfactual condition

This trigger is not found in the data of lecturer talk.

13) Question

T : . . .

Do you think that you still need to do what we do last week? Anda masih mau menggunakan target minggu kemarin?

After finishing in taking the game, the lecturer does reflection to the previous material whether it is relevant or not to do previous to that day material.

(q) Do you think that you still need to do what we do last week? >> there are several options to do the same way, same activity as it is done previously.

The lecturer asked for opinion to the students whether they need to do the same activity as previous week or not.

T : Ok same with her, even though you find difficult word, you try to not open dictionary. *How will you get the meaning?* Do you guess the meaning?

The lecturer asked a female student about her reading target. Then he clarified her about the way she will take to get the meaning of the text.

(r) How will you get the meaning? >> a student has way(s) to get the meaning of a given passage.

The lecturer asked the way his students get the meaning of a given passage.

T : Ssstttt, the others . . .

Why can't you read all the text?

The lecturer asked for the students' problems on reading certain passage of reading for TOEFL subject that day. A male student then said that he cannot read all the text; he only read the text partially. He said that his problem because of the necessity to share his paper for two.

(s) Why can't you read all the text?? >> a (male) student cannot read all the text for a reason.

The lecturer asked the reason why he (a male student) only read some parts of the text, the reason why he cannot read all.

The finding shows that the most frequent used category is definite description, with the simple structure of possessive construction and definite noun phrase. It is in line with Bonyadi et al. (2011) and Zare et.al (2012). They used the term existential presupposition as coined by Yule (1996) for determining this category, but essentially, both are the same. Moreover, Schimd (2001) strongly stressed that existential presupposition is one of the least refutable presuppositions ever used.

Another important result is the preference to use question as the next favored triggers. Question in classroom interaction is as a strategy to gain student participation and involvement to the activity. Once it attracts student response, it also raises the implicit meaning of the lecturer utterance. When the students have previous knowledge to the utterance, they can easily understand what the lecturer talked to. It affect to their comprehension to the subject matters,

moreover this kind of previous knowledge are also being the process of reading activity, i.e. schemata (Carrel & Eisterhold, 1987; Fahriany, 2014).

CONCLUSION

Presupposition triggers realized by the several categories; they are definite description, factive verb, implicative verb, change of state verb, iterative, verb of judging, temporal clause, comparison and contrast, non-restrictive relative clause, and question. Definite description and question are the most numerous equipped in the lecturer talk. Definite description has a strong determination than other triggers as it shows in possessive construction and definite noun phrase. While question is the best strategy to actively raise student response as well as contain previous knowledge as it is exist in presupposition and reading process.

REFERENCES

- Abrusan, M. (2011). Predicting the Presupposition of Soft Triggers. *Linguist and Philos* (2011) 34:491-535. DOI 10.1007/s10988-012-9108-y page 491-535.
- Abrusan, M. (2013). On the Focus-sensitive Presupposition Triggers too, again, also, even. *Proceeding of Sinn und Bedeutung* 18 page 6-23.
- Abrusan, M. (2015). Presupposition Cancellation: Explaining the Soft-Hard Trigger Distinction. Available online at <http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/TMzNzZiN/PresuppositionCancellation.NALSdraft.pdf>. [accessed at November 12th, 2015]
- Bonyadi, A. & Samuel, M. (2011). Linguistic Nature of Presupposition in American and Persian Newspaper Editorials. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 3(1), 1-16.
- Carrel, P.L. & Eisterhold, J.C. (1987). Schema Theory and ESL Reading Pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(4), 553-573.

- Fahriany. (2014). Schema Theory in Reading Class. Indonesian Journal of English Education (IJEE), 1 (1), 17-28.
- Lynch, T. (1996). Communication in the Language Classroom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rani, A., Arifin, B. & Martutik. (2006). Analisis Wacana Sebuah Kajian Bahasa dalam Pemakaian. Malang: Bayumedia Publishing.
- Setiawati, L. (2012). A Descriptive Study on the Teacher Talk at EYL Classroom. Conaplin Journal; Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1 (2), 33-47.
- Schmid, H.J. (2001). Presupposition can be a Bluff. Journal of Pragmatics, 33, 152-173.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)00027-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00027-3).
- Szendroi, I. (2010). Teacher Talk in the ESP Classroom-the Result of a Pilot Observation Study Conducted in the Tourism Context. WoPaLP, 4, 39-58.
- Yanfen, L & Yuqin, Z. (2010). a Study of Teacher Talk in Interactions in English Classes. Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 33(2), 76-86.
- Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Zare', J., Abbaspour, E. & Nia, M.R. (2012). Presupposition Trigger-A Comparative Analysis of Broadcast News Discourse. International Journal of Linguistics, 4(3), 734-743.