

**IMPLICATURE IN THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS DEBATE  
BETWEEN BARACK OBAMA AND JOHN McCAIN**

**SKRIPSI**

*Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
For the Degree of Sarjana Pendidikan (S.Pd)  
English Education Program*

**By**

**KIKI ANNISA**  
**1202050051**



**FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION  
UNIVERSITY OF MUHAMMADIYAH SUMATERA UTARA  
MEDAN  
2016**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Bacground of the Problem.....	1
B. Identification of The Problem.....	4
C. Scope and Limitation.....	4
D. Formulation of The Problem .....	5
E. The Objective of The Study.....	5
F. Significance of The Study .....	5
<b>CHAPTER IIREVIEW OF LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>7</b>
A. Teoritical Framework .....	7
1. Pragmatics .....	7
2. Context .....	8
3. Presupposition .....	9
4. Inference.....	10
B. Types of Implicature   11	
1. Implicature.....	11
a. Conventional Implicatur.....	13
b. Conversational Implicatur .....	14
c. Generalized Conversational Implicature .....	15
d. Particularized Conversational Implicature .....	15
C. Cooperative Principle .....	16
a. Maxim of Quality .....	17

b.	Maxim of Quantity .....	17
c.	Maxim of relation.....	17
d.	Maxim of Manner .....	18

**CHAPTER III METHOD OF RESEARCH ..... 19**

A.	The Research Design .....	19
B.	The Source of Data .....	20
C.	The Teqnique For Collection Data .....	20
D.	The Technique For Analyzing Data .....	20

## **ABSTRACT**

**Annisa, Kiki, NPM 1202050051, "Implicature In The Presidential Elections Debate Between Barack Obama and John McCain", Skripsi Education of Teacher' Training and Education. University of Muhammadiyah Sumatra Utara. Medan. 2016.**

This study deals with implicature in the presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and John McCain. The aims of this study are (1) to describe kinds of implicature in presidential elections between Barack Obama and John McCain (2) to derive the dominant type of implicature used in presidential elections between Barack Obama and John McCain. The technique used in this study was library research, and was conducted at the library of UMSU at jalan Muchtar Basri No.3 Medan by using descriptive qualitative method. The data of this study were taken from in the presidential elections between Barack Obama and John McCain on September 26<sup>th</sup> 2008. There are 18 sentences. The finding of this study showed that there were three types of implicature found in the presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and John McCain, namely, conversational implicature, generalized implicature, particularized implicature. There are three types of implicature used in presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and John McCain. The total percentage of each types of implicature was 5% or 27,8% of conversational, 8% or 44,4% of generalized, 5% or 27,8% of particularized. So the most dominant types of implicature of the presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and John McCain is generalized implicature types.

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### A. Background of the Study

Implicature has an important functions in a speeces Barack Obama and John McCain in the presidential elections. This is implicature his speech Barack Obama and John McCain had influenced. Those his speeces in words Barack Obama and John McCain need study, this is study makes to study the presidential elections.

The term “implicature” is used by Grice (1975) to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says (Brown and Yule: 1983). For instance, “I looked at my watch after two hours and realized that only twenty minutes had passed” (Grundy: 71).

Levinson also states that implicatures can give pragmatic explanations to the phenomenon that can be explained by using theory of linguistics and show the differences between what is literally said and what is intended to convey. Paul Grice (1975) divides implicature into two types, conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Conventional implicature is not based on the cooperative principle or the maxims. It does not have to occur in conversation, and does not depend on the special contexts for the interpretation, conventional implicature deals with specific words, such as ..like ...but..yet and ..even (Yule, 1996: 45) The second type is conversational implicature, it refers to the inference a hearer makes about speakers intended meaning that arises from their

interpretation of the literal meaning of what is said (Paltridge:2000). According to Grice, conversational implicature is the theory how people used the language. It is a theory how people communicate to others. Brown and Yule (1983) state that conversational implicature is something that deals with cooperative principle or maxims. In addition, H.P Grice divides conversational implicature into generalized and particularized conversational implicatures.

Generalized conversational implicature is the implicature which is not required from the particular context of situation in inferring the meaning, all of them got only from the maxim, especially maxim of quantity and maxim of manner (Paltridge, 2000: 45). When there is no special or particular context that follows to give the additional meaning of the utterances it is called generalized conversational implicatures. The other type of conversational implicature is particularized conversational implicature. The particularized conversational implicature can be defined as the assumption of the hearer in understanding the utterances by relying on the context of situation maximally (Yule, 1996: 42-43). In short.

Conversational implicature is expressed in a particular or special context. This study focus on the conversational implicature since as Levinson (1992:97) states that the notion of conversational implicature is the single most important ideas in pragmatics. The other reason is that implicature can show the difference between what is literally said and what is intended to convey, because it is not matter of sentence's meaning but instead of utterances meaning. The hearer may imply further information from what the speaker actually says. This study takes a

debate as the data source because in debate people speak to convey their ideas and facts. They also have to oppose. In a debate, candidates state and defend their positions on major issues. Debate is natural conversation (Stubbs, 1983:33). The debate which is chosen is the one made between Barack Obama and John McCain on September 26th 2008 held in Mississippi University. As the first debate, there are crucial issues debated by Barack Obama and John McCain. They make the debate very interesting since both of candidates always release many sharp statements in order to criticize the opponent, more over they also practice the *language game* (David Crystal,1995: Part V).

The debate between Barack Obama and John McCain cannot be separated from the war of language game which contains a lot of conversational implicatures. There are some studies previously done in this field, they used some objects and different contexts, such as Head Lines in a News Paper, Head Line in Breaking News, and Advertisements. Syaifullah (2002), for example, examined implicature of Headlines Used in Jakarta Post based on Grices theory of implicatures. The researcher focused his study on the cooperative principles. In his study, Syaifullah found two kinds of conversational implicature: generalized implicature and particularized implicature.

The researcher also gave a description about Floating and Hedging Maxims. Ahmadi (2003) who analyzed the implicatures in Headlines of Breaking News METRO TV also found two kinds of implicatures: generalized and particularized. Another relevant study was carried out by Harianto (2003). The researcher study focused on the conversational maxim and the special terms used

by Indonesian Chatters. In his study, he found that short/special terms and abbreviation/short message are often used to express their facial expressions, he also made a conclusion that maxim of quantity are often flouted and hedged. Yazid (2004) focused on the implicit meaning from the advertisements, emphasizing on floating and hedging maxims. The study looked at the advertisements published in Yellow Pages. Not many writers, however, studied conversational implicature used in the spoken discourse, such as in debate. The previous studies, for instance, use written object. Based on the reason above, this study analyzes spoken object in debate, entitled “ Implicatures in the Presidential elections Debate between Barack Obama and John McCain”.

## **B. Identification of the Problems**

Based on the background of study presented this study is identified as being related to.

1. kinds of conversational implicatures used in the debate between Barack Obama and John McCain,
2. realitations of conversational implicatures in the debate between Barack Obama and John McCain and
3. reasons for the use of conversation implicature.



### **C. Scope and Limitation of the Study**

This study is limited at the use of implicatures made by Barack Obama and John McCain held in Mississippi University on September 26<sup>th</sup> 2008 and the scope within conversational implicature that falls into four types: conventional implicature, conversational implicature, generalized conversational implicature, particularized conversational implicature.

### **D. Formulation of the problem**

The problem of this research were formulated as follows.

1. What kinds of implicature are found in presidential elections between Barack Obama and John McCain?
2. What type of implicature is dominantly used in presidential elections between Barack Obama and John McCain?

### **E. The Objectives of the study**

In line with problem, the objectives of the study are

1. to describe kinds of implicature in presidential elections between Barack Obama and John McCain and,
2. to derive the dominant type of implicature used in presidential elections between Barack Obama and John McCain.

### **F. Significance of the Study**

The findings of the research are expected to be theoretically and practically useful and having great contributing for the following respects.

Theoretically:

The finding theoretically add the contributions in pragmatics study especially implicature. The findings of the study are expected to be one of references and alternative information about how to applied pragmatics study especially implicature theory in the real field namely debate and focused on types of implicature namely conversational implicature.

Practically:

1. The finding of the study are expected can give more exploration toward conversational Implicature in the debate and can give deeper analysis toward the types of conversational implicature which exists in the debate.
2. The finding of the study are expected can provide and enrich the conversational implicature study from different phenomenon and object.
3. This study also expected can fill the gap of the previous related study.



## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

#### **A. Theoretical Framework**

##### **1. Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of intended meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by the listener. According to Yule (1996:3). Pragmatics the main concern is not in the literal meaning, but what speaker intends to do with their words and what it is which makes this intention clear.

Pragmatics is especially interested in the relationship between language and context. It includes the study of how interpretation of language is made depending on the speakers knowledge, how speakers use and understand utterances, and how the structure of sentences is influenced by relationships between speakers and hearers according Richards (2000:5). Grundy (2000:10) also states that pragmatics is the study of language used in contextualized communication and the usage principles associated with it. Pragmatics is interested more in what people mean by why what they say, than what words or phrases might, in their most literal sense by themselves (Yule :1996). Consider, for example, a simple and familiar utterance such as “How are you?”. Grammatically, it is an interrogative English sentence; taken literally, it is a question about someones health. It also more typically be a greeting, to be

answered reciprocally along the lines of “Fine thanks, how are you?”. Yet, it could also, depending on context take on many other meaning besides.

### **1.1 Context**

Grundy (2000: 72) states that in the case of implicature, context helps us to determine what is conveyed implicitly but not explicitly stated by the speaker. The researcher also adds that context is not treated as given common ground, but rather as a set of more or less accessible items of information which are stored in short term and encyclopedic memories or manifest in the physical environment. Macro and micro contexts are often drawn in the conversation analytic.

Macro contexts are said to be distal in the sense that they exist outside the talk exchange. In contrast, micro contexts are created within the micro domain of the talk exchange. So, whether talk is determined or constrained by distal context with context seen as presumptive or whether in fact it is talk which creates context (Grundy, 2000:195). Cook (1998:10) states that context is the unity of discourse with considering the world at large, and it is influenced by the situation when we receive the messages, cultural and social relationship within the participants, what we know and assume the sender knows.

Hymes in other side view that the role of context in interpretation as, on the one hand, limiting the range of possible interpretations and, on the other, as supporting the intended interpretation. It shows that the term context is often used instead of situation or discourse situation. Its function is to make clear the interpretation between speakers in certain conversation whereas there are some implied meanings in conversation.

## 1.2 Presupposition

Grundy (2000:119) defines presupposition as the existing knowledge common to the speaker and does not therefore need to assert. In addition, Renkema (1993: 54) states that presupposition is used to denote a special type of implicit information. So, if certain information is understood by the speakers or hearers because of certain knowledge between them, the speakers do not need to state the information explicitly. Grundy also adds that presupposition termed as shared assumptions, and presupposition as assumption and subordination. In many discussion of the concept presupposition is treated as a relationship between two propositions Stalnaker as quoted by Brown and Yule (1983: 29) states that presuppositions are what are taken by the speaker to be common ground of the participants in the conversation.

Givon as quoted in Brown and Yule defines presupposition as the assumptions the speaker makes about what the hearer is likely to accept without challenge. Yule (1996: 25) further defines that presupposition with something the speaker assumes to be the case prior for making utterance. It will be clearer when we consider the example; “My uncle will come from Australia tomorrow”. These utterances can be assumed that (1) I have an uncle and (2) He is in Australia now, not in a place where I am uttering the sentence. Presupposition can be divided into *potential presupposition* and *existential presupposition*. *Potential presupposition*

is related to the use of large number of words, phrase and structure which may become actual presupposition in context with speaker. For example, the sentence where did she buy the book? presupposition of this sentence can lead the listeners to believe that the information is necessarily true, rather than the sentence, Did she buy the book? In short, the presupposition is structurally dependent. Existential presupposition is not only assumed to be present in possessive construction, but also more generally in any definite noun phrase, for instance, when someone says „my car is red” he/she presupposes that he/she has a car (Yule, 1996:27). To sum up, the presupposition is the first assumption of hearer about what is being told by the speaker. In this case, the hearer give her/his first assumption on the context of situation that built by the speaker. There are several types of presupposition which are differentiated by the use of words, structure, phrase or even expression. All of the assumption can be correct and also incorrect.

### **1.3 Inference**

Inference is a collective term for all possible implicit information that can be derived from a discourse. The term inference comes from Latin „inferre which means „to carry in, this term is used to show the phenomenon of the discourse address knowledge or information which can be used to understand the information. For example, “*Padi is well known in Indonesia*” when the speaker says this utterance the assumption comes from the hearers will be in variant since almost of Indonesian have known with “Padi” either a food plant or a name of group band. Then, the knowledge absolutely needed in order to find out

which one is the appropriate meaning. When the speaker says this kind of utterance he/she must produce the inference. Inference can be interpreted as the process that is used by the hearer for recognizing the implicature from speaker's utterances (Renkema, 1993: 158). In inference, the writers or speakers use linguistic forms to enable the readers or listeners to identify something, conversely, in inference listener or reader has to infer correctly which entity the speakers intend to identify by using a particular referring expression, since there is no a direct relationship between entities and words (Yule, 1996:19). So, readers or hearers depend very much on the process of inference to get further interpretations if they have no direct accesses to the speakers or the writers intended meaning. Inference as the process which the reader or the hearer go through to get from the literal meaning of what is written or said to what the writer or the speaker intended to convey (Brown and Yule, 1983:256). It means that the reader or hearer constructs meaning by what they take the words to mean and how they process sentences to find meaning. They infer an implicit meaning based on the social convention, shared knowledge, shared experience or even shared values. For instance, when a speaker says, "Rudi gets the highest score in speaking class". It means that what the speaker intended to convey is "Rudi is very good at speaking".

## **2. Implicature**

The term "implicature" is used by Grice (1975) to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or mean, as distinct from what the speaker literally says (Brown and Yule: 1983). In the Gricean model, the bridge from what is said



(the literal content of the uttered sentence determined by its grammatical structure with the reference of indexicals resolved) to what is communicated is built through implicature. Yule (1996:36) adds that implicature is a primary example of more being communicated than is said but in order for them to be interpreted, some basic cooperative principle must first be assumed to be in operation. Furthermore, Grice as quoted by Levinson (1992: 97) explains that the term of implicature to be a general cover term to stand in contrast to what is said or expressed by the truth condition of expression, and to include all kinds of pragmatics. In fact „implicature is something that produced by the speaker to the hearer in order to express the message of what he wants to convey, in this case context becomes the important role to understand what the speaker mean in and implied way. Implicatures can be part of sentence meaning or dependent on conversational context, and can be conventional or unconventional (Rahardi, 2008: 52). Levinson (1992:97) further, states that the notion of conversational implicature is of the single most important ideas in pragmatics. It is said so since the conversational implicature gives some contributions to the pragmatics. First, implicature stands as paradigmatic example of the nature and power of pragmatic explanations of linguistic phenomena. A second important contribution by thenotion of implicature is that it provides some explicit account of how it is possible to mean (in some general sense) more than what is actually. Thirdly, the notion of implicature seems likely to effect substansial simplifications in both the structure and the context of semantic description. Grice divided implicature into conventional imlicature and nonconventional implicature (conversational

implicature). Conventional implicature is non-truth-conditional inferences that are not derived from super ordinate pragmatic principles like the maxims, but are simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expression. For example when our children once choose a tube of toothpaste on the grounds that it had colored stripes in it and the legend on the tube said, “Actually fight decay”. The lexical item “actually” has a literal meaning or entailment – it means in reality or in actuality, because it is closely associated with the particular lexical item, so, it can be said as conventional implicature (Grundy, 2000:84). To have better understanding on the implicature Grice as quoted by Levinson (1992: 114-118) proposed some characteristics of implicature they are; (1) In certain condition, conversational implicature can be cancelled either explicitly or contextually (cancelable), (2) The implicature is attached to the semantic content of what is said, not to the linguistic form, and therefore implicature can not be detached from utterance simply by changing the words of utterance for synonyms (non-detachable), (3) The implicature prerequisites the conventional meaning from the sentence uttered, but the content of conversational implicature do not include the conventional meaning (non conventional), (4) The truth of conversational implicatures content doews not depend on what is literally said, but it can be calculated from how the words are uttered (calculable), (5) An expression with a single meaning gives rise to different implicature on different occasions, and indeed on any one occasion the set of associated implicatue may not be exactly determinable (indeterminate).

## **2.1 Types of Implicature**

### **2.1.1 Conventional Implicature**

According to Grice (Brown and Yule, 1983:31) conventional implicature are determined by the conventional meaning of the words used. In conventional implicature, cooperative principles like the maxims do not influence the intended meanings (Levinson, 1992:127). They are simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expression. For example in the sentence “I meet a girl”. The word “girl” has implication/intended information such as; hair, lip, eyes and nose. I do not need to say “I meet a girl who has nose, hair, eyes and nose”, because it is closely associated with the particular lexical item, thus, it can be said as conventional implicature. Further, Yule (1996: 45) says that conventional implicatures do not rely very much on the cooperative principles or the maxims applications. The implicatures are associated with specific words and results in additional conveyed meanings those words are used. In this case, an accepted rule of language in use is the main factor of deriving an accurate meaning rather than the cooperative principle and its maxims.

### **2.1.2 Conversational Implicature**

The greater interest to the discourse analysis is the notion of conversational implicatures which is derived from general principles of

conversation plus a number of maxims speakers will normally obey (Brown and Yule, 1983:31). Conversational implicature refers to the inference a hearer makes about speakers intended meaning that arises from their interpretation of the literal meaning of what is said (Paltridge: 2000), it can be identified into three types, first the speaker deliberately flouts a conversational maxim to convey an additional meaning not expressed literally. Second, the speakers desire to fulfill two conflicting maxims results in his or her flouting one maxim to invoke the other and then the last, the speaker invokes a maxim as basis for interpreting the utterance.

Example:

A: will sally be at the meeting?

B: He car broke down.

+>sally will not be at meeting

Person A reasons:

- (1). I assume B is following the rule of relevance
- (2). He remark would not be relevant unless the fact that sally's car has broken down is relevant to whether or not she will be at the meeting.
- (3). I know that when people's cars break down often they cannot get to work, or cannot get there on time.
- (4). If sally will be late to work or will not get to work all, then she will miss the meeting.
- (5). B probably assumens I will reasonin this way, and has not said anything to stop me from doing do.

- (6). I conclude that B intends to convey that sally will not be at the meeting.

### **2.1.3 Generalized Conversational Implicature**

Grice as quoted by Levinson (1992: 126) distinguished conversational implicature into generalized and particularized implicature. He asserts that generalized conversational implicature is implicature that arise without any particular context or special scenario being necessary ( Grundy, 2000: 81-82). Therefore, generalized conversational implicature is inferable without reference to a special context. In generalized conversational implicature, a speaker can use the maxim of quantity to invite the inference that no more can be said, as in:

*A: "I wish you buy a bag and shoes"*

*B: "I buy a bag"*

By the illustration above, it means that the speaker B do not buy shoes and it can be understood that the utterance is informative as required for the speaker A.

### **2.1.4 Particularized Conversational Implicature**

In contrast with the generalized conversational implicature, particularized conversational implicature require such specific context (context-bound). Besides, all implicature that arise from the maxim of relevance are particularized for utterances are relevant only with respect to the particular topic or issue at hand. In addition, the exploitation or flouting maxims can be categorized as particularized

implicature (Levinson, 1992:126).

In short the implicature that rely much on the special context, it is can be classified into particularized conversational implicatures (Cummings, 1999: 19).

For example:

A: *“I’m so sorry for making you wait in a long time”*

B: *“That’s fine, it just like waiting for one year”*

In this context of situation shows that the speaker A requests an apologizing since making B waiting for him in a long time. But in particular context, the hearer B is getting angry even he says *“that’s fine”* and he extremely bored as he says *“it just like waiting for one year”*. Because there are basically most common, the particularized conversational implicature are typically just called implicature (Yule, 1996: 43).

## 2.2 Cooperative Principle

In order for a person to interpret what we say, the philosopher Paul Grice, in his article „logic and conversation (1975) argues some kind of cooperative principle must be assumed to be in operation. According to Grice, people assume that there are some kind of rules for interaction that direct us to a particular interpretation of what a person is saying, unless we receive some indication to the contrary. He describes the cooperative principle thus: 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 (Grice 1975:45). The cooperative principle 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. Within this principle, he suggested four maxims:

### **2.2.1 Maxim of Quality**

We should say what we believe to be true and what we have evidence for (the maxim of quality).

Example : A: “I Have to go to my campus early”. B: “I have no something to do”. It gives rise the implicature that B has a free time for taking up A to the campus..

### **2.2.2 Maxim of Quantity**

We should make our contribution as informative as is required for the particular purpose and not make it more informative than is on this occasion required (the maximum of quantity).

Example : A: “Why do you want to leave the company?” B: “Because I know that our situation soon will be devastating”. It gives rise to the implicature that the speaker convinces that the situation of the company not benefits.

### **2.2.3 Maxim of Relation**

We should make our contribution relevant to the interaction or we should indicate in what way it is not.

Example : A: “How about OVJ program?” B: “OVJ is very interesting program”.  
 A can deduce from B’s reaction that B means that OVJ is very interesting program. Thereby B’s answer is relevant with the question being asked.

#### **2.2.4 Maxim of Manner**

We should be clear in what we say. That is we should avoid ambiguity or obscurity and be brief and orderly in our contribution to the interaction.

### **3 Definition of Debate**

A debate is a discussion or structured contest about an issue or a resolution. A formal debate involves two sides: one supporting a resolution and one opposing it. Such a debate is bound by rules previously agreed upon. Debates may be judged in order to declare a winning side. Debates, in one form or another, are commonly used in democratic societies to explore and resolve issues and problems. Decisions at a board meeting, public hearing, legislative assembly, or local organization are often reached through discussion and debate. Indeed, any discussion of a resolution is a form of debate, which may or may not follow formal rules (such as Robert’s Rules of Order). In the context of a classroom, the topic for debate will be guided by the knowledge, skill, and value outcomes in the curriculum.

Debate is contention in argument, strife, dissension. Quarreling, controversy, especially a formal discussion of subjects before a public assembly or legislature. In parliament or in any deliberative assembly.



Debate is method of formally presenting an argument in disciplined manner. Through logical consistency, factual accuracy and some degree of emotional appeal to the audience are elements in debating, where one side often prevails over the other party by presenting a superior 'context' and framework of the issue. The outcome of debate may depend upon consensus or some formal way of reaching a resolution. Rather than the objective facts. In a formal debating contest, there are rules for participants to discuss and decide on differences, within a framework defining how they will interact.

Debating is carried out in assemblies of various types to discuss matters and to be taken, often by voting. Deliberative, legislative assemblies, and meetings of all sorts engage in debates in particular, in parliamentary democracies a legislature debates and between candidates for elected office, such as the leaders debates that are sometimes held in democracies. Debate is also carried out for educational and recreational purposes, usually associated with educational establishments and debating societies. The major goal of the study of debate as a method or art is to develop the ability to debate rationally from either position with equal ease.

### **3.1 Structure for Debate**

A formal debate usually involves three groups: one supporting a resolution (affirmative team), one opposing the resolution (opposing team), and those who are judging the quality of the evidence and arguments and the performance in the debate. The affirmative and opposing teams usually consist of three members

each, while the judging may be done by the teacher, a small group of students, or the class as a whole. In addition to the three specific groups, there may an audience made up of class members not involved in the formal debate. A specific resolution is developed and rules for the debate are established.

### **3.2 Debate Preparation**

1. Develop the resolution to be debated.
2. Organize the teams.
3. Establish the rules of the debate, including timelines.
4. Research the topic and prepare logical arguments.
5. Gather supporting evidence and examples for position taken.
6. Anticipate counter arguments and prepare rebuttals.
7. Team members plan order and content of speaking in debate.
8. Prepare room for debate.
9. Establish expectations, if any, for assessment of debate.

### **3.3 Conducting Debate**

Debate opens with the affirmative team (the team that supports the resolution) presenting their arguments, followed by a member of the opposing team. This pattern is repeated for the second speaker in each team. Finally, each team gets an opportunity for rebutting the arguments of the opponent. Speakers should speak slowly and clearly. The judges and members of the audience should be taking notes as the debate proceeds. A typical sequence for debate, with suggested timelines is, as follows:

1. The first speaker on the affirmative team presents arguments in support of the resolution (5 – 10 minutes)
2. The first speaker on the opposing team presents arguments opposing the resolution (5 – 10 minutes)
3. The second speaker on the affirmative team presents further arguments in support of the resolution, identifies areas of conflict, and answers questions that may have been raised by the opposition speaker (5 – 10 minutes)
4. The second speaker on the opposing team presents further arguments against the resolution, identifies further areas of conflict, and answers questions that may have been raised by the previous affirmative speaker  
(5-10 minutes)
5. The rules may include a short recess for teams to prepare their rebuttals (5 minutes)
6. The opposing team begins with the rebuttal, attempting to defend the opposing arguments and to defeat the supporting arguments without adding any new information (3 – 5 minutes)
7. First rebuttal of the affirmative team (3 – 5 minutes)

8. Each team gets a second rebuttal for closing statements with the affirmative team having the last opportunity to speak. (3 – 5 minutes each)
9. There cannot be any interruptions. Speakers must wait their turns. The teacher may need to enforce the rules.

#### **4 Biography of about Barack Obama and John McCain**

##### **4.1 Barack Obama**

Barack Hussein Obama II was born on August 4, 1961, in Hawaii. His parents, who met as students at the University of Hawaii, were Ann Dunham, a white American from Kansas, and Barack Obama, Sr., a black Kenyan studying in the United States. Obama's father left the family when Obama was two years old, after further studies at Harvard University, returned to Kenya, where he died in an automobile accident nineteen years later. After his parents divorced, Obama's mother married another foreign student at the University of Hawaii.

Obama is the first African American to hold the office and the first president born outside the continental United States. Born in Honolulu, Hawaii, Obama is a graduate of Harvard Law School, where he was president of the Harvard Law Review. He worked as a civil rights attorney and taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago Law School between 1992 and 2004.

In 2004 Obama received national attention during his campaign to represent Illinois in the United States Senate with his victory in the March Democratic Party primary, his keynote address at the Democratic National

convention in July, and his election to the Senate in November. He began his presidential campaign against Hillary Clinton in 2008, he won sufficient delegates in the Democratic Party primaries to receive the presidential nomination. He then defeated Republican nominee John McCain in the general election, and was inaugurated as president on January 20, 2009. Nine months after being named the 2009 Nobel Peace Prize laureate.

#### **4.2 John McCain**

John Sidney McCain III was born August 29, 1936. Is the senior United States senator from Arizona. He was the Republican presidential nominee in the 2008 United States presidential elections.

McCain followed his father and grandfather, both four star admirals into the United States Navy, graduating from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1958. He became a Naval Aviator, flying ground attack aircraft from aircraft carriers. During the Vietnam war, he was almost killed in the 1967 USS Forrestal fire. In October 1967, while on a bombing mission over Hanoi, he was shot down, seriously injured.

He secured the nomination in 2008 but was defeated by Democratic candidate Barack Obama in the general election, losing by a 365-46 percent in the popular vote.

**B. Conceptual Framework**

Therefore, the researcher choose implicature as the one of significant aspects in conversation for the following reasons: implicature is an alternative to implication which has additional meaning in logic and informal language, so through this research the researcher to explain how important in use implicature of conversation so that words of conversation are polite.

The researcher is able to help the students, the reader and other researcher to get a deep understanding of implicature and the researcher believes that some of the problem conversation can be solved.

Implicature will be with taking the sample “implicature in the presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and John McCain” and it will be analyzed in the library of UMSU.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHOD OF RESEARCH**

#### **A. Research Design**

The research will be conducted by using descriptive qualitative method analysis will non participant observation. It means that, this researcher describes the phenomena of language that is used in the presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and John McCain. It is a qualitative study since the data are in the forms of utterances which are not statistically analyzed and directed toward determining the nature of situation, as it exists at the time of study. According to Arikunto (2010:14) says that, "Descriptive develop the concept based on the available data and followed flexible research design that was suitable to the context". In this case of this research, the descriptive qualitative design used to analyze the types of implicature and the most dominant of implicature in the presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and Jhon McCain.

#### **B. The Source of Data**

The source of the data is from the presidential candidate speeches in the Barack Obama and John McCain (the first debate) held in Mississippi University on September 26th 2008.

### **C. The Technique of Collecting Data**

The data of this research will be implicature relations that found in the debate between Barack Obama and Jhon McCain. The data were collected by doing some steps:

1. Reading the script about the presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and Jhon McCain and understanding the script.
2. Collecting the resources of literature will be related to the topic discussed.
3. Organizing each sentences in the presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and Jhon McCain that have types of implicature.
4. Counting the types which is most dominant.

### **D. The Technique of Data Analysis**

The data will be analyzed by applying the following steps, Identifying the implicature in presidential elections debate Obama and Jhon McCain by underlining the implicature after reading the data, classifying them based on the types of implicature analysis in a form table, counting the kinds of implicature use in the presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and Jhon McCain and then tabulating the frequency of each kinds of implicature, converting the

frequency of each kinds of implicature into percent by following formula:

$$X = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where



X= The percentage of items

F= The number of types of implicature

N= Total of implicature

Finding out the most dominant kinds of implicature as the result and the last finding out why it becomes the most dominant types of implicature.

## CHAPTER IV

### DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

#### A. Data

The data of this research was taken from the presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and John McCain which consist of 18 debate. The data was identified and classified into the types of implicature found in presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and John McCain.

**Table 4.1**

#### **Proporitas of Implicature**

<b>No</b>	<b>Kinds of implicature</b>	<b>Total number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1	Conversational	5	27,8%
2	Generalized	8	44,4%
3	Particularized	5	27,8%
<b>Total</b>		18	100%

Based on table it above it, could be explained that there were 5 Conversational implicature (27,8%), 8 generalized implicature (44,4%), and particularized 5 (27,8), and the most dominant types in the presidential elections debate between Brack Obama and John McCain is generalized implicature (44,4%).

#### 4.1 Conversational Implicature

The greater interest to the discourse analysis is the notion of conversational implicatures which is derived from general principles of conversation plus a number of maxims speakers will normally obey. The analysis of conversational implicature from the presidential elections between Barack Obama and John McCain.

- a. *Well, the first thing we have to do is get spending under control in Washington. It is completely out of control,* the sentence is conversational implicature. Because he flouts conversational maxim to convey an additional meaning not expressed results literally.
- b. *As president of the united states, I want to assure you, I have got a pen. This ones kind of old. I have got a pen, and I am going to veto every single spending bill that comes across my desk. I will make them famous, you will know their name,* the sentence is conversational implicature. Because he flouts conversational maxim to convey an additional meaning not expressed results literally.
- c. *But lets be clear, earmarks account for \$18 billion in last years budget. Senator McCain is proposing an this is a fundamental dufference between us \$300 billion in tax cuts to some of the wealthiest cprpotations and individuals in the country \$300 billion,* the sentence is conversational implicature. Because he flouts conversational maxim to convey an additional meaning not expressed results literally.

- d. *Maybe to senator obama its not a ;ot of money, but the point is that you see, I hear this all the time, it is only \$18 billion. Do you know that it's the last five years? Do you know that it's gone completely ou of control to the point where it corrupts people? It corrupts people,* the sentence is Conversational Implicature. Because have flouts conversational maxim to convoy an additional meaning not expressed results laterally.
- e. *I don't know where john id gettong his figures, lets just be clear. What I do id I close corporate loopholes, stop providing tax cuts to coporations that are shipping jobs overseas so that were giving tax breaks to companies that are ivesting here in the united states,* the sentence is Conversational Implicature. Because have flouts conversational maxim to convoy an additional meaning not expressed results laterally.

#### **4.2 Generalized Conversational Implicature**

Generalized conversational implicature is implicature that arise without any particular context or special scenario being necessary. Generalized conversational implicature is inferable without references to a special context.

Analyze of Generalized conversational implicature from the presidential elections between Barack Obama and John McCain.

- a. *I know we have to, but thids is classic example of walking the walk and talking the talk,* the sentence is generalized implicature, because suggest that something which has happened should not be discussed anymore and should not be reapearted anymore..

- b. *We had an energy bill before the states senate. It was fesfooned with critistmas tree ornaments*, the sentence is generalized implicature. Because it will not happen in reality. The presupposition of the uttrence means that the energy bill was not fesfooned with critistmas tree ornaments.
- c. *I think just is, you know, kind of hard to swallow*, the sentence is generalized implicature. Because means something which is very hard to be swallowed in which it usually refers to a kind of food.
- d. **You're using a hatchet where you need a scalpel**, the sentence is generalized implicature. Because means that there is a hatchet used by someone to cut something whereas it should be cut by scalpel.
- e. *We have to use our military wisely. And we did not use our military wisely in Iraq*, the sentence is generalized implicature. Because means that the united states military have to be used in appropriate way but in reality they are not.
- f. *Washed out our hands*, the sentence is generalized implicature. Because means that there should be a president who concerns how to leave, when to leave, and what to leave.
- g. *I looked into Mr. putin eyes, and I saw three letters, a K,a,G and a B*, the sentence is gendralized implicature. Because means an activity done in order to make something clean.

- h. *I don't think I need any on-the-job training*, the sentence is generalized implicature. Because which mean as kind of training in order to improve the skill.

### 4.3 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Particularized conversational implicature required such specific context. Besides, utterances are relevant only with respect to the particular topic or issue at hand. In addition.

Analyze of Particularized Implicature from the presidential elections Between Barack Obama and John McCain:

- a. *We haven't seen the language yet*, the sentence is particularized implicature. Because which means that there is nothing happened.
- b. *It's hard to reach across the aisle from that far to the left*, the sentence is Particularized Implicature. Because means to change something.
- c. *It's well known that I have not been elected Miss congeniacity in the United states nor with the administration*, the sentence is Parricularized Implicature. Because means that there is a contest to elect miss congeniality in unite states senate and McCain is not elected.
- d. *The next president of united states is going to have to decide how we leave, when we leave, and what we leave behind*, the sentence is Particularize Implicature. Because means that there should be a president who concerns how to leave, whe to leave, and what to leave.

- e. *Shining beacon on hill*, the sentence is Particularized implicature. Because means an event when there is something shining again.

## B. Data Analysis

### 1. Types of Implicature

After collecting the data, they were identified and classified based on the types of implicature which found in the Presidential election debate between Barack Obama and John McCain, it was found that there were three types of implicature found in the debate. They were conversational implicature, Generalized implicature and particularized implicature. The following table was the data based on the data obtained from the debate.

**Table 4.2**

**The types of implicature found in the presidential debate between Barack Obama and John McCain**

No	Source	Types of Implicature		
		Conversational	Generalized	Particularized
1	The haven't seen the language yet.			√
2	I know we have to, but this is classic example of walking the walk and talking the talk.		√	
3	We had an			

	energy bill before the United States Senate. It was festooned with Christmas tree ornaments.		√	
4	It's hard to reach across the aisle from that far to the left		√	
5	I think just is, you know, kind of hard to swallow		√	
6	you're using a hatchet where you need a scalpel		√	
7	It's well known that I have not been elected Miss Congeniality in the United States Senate nor with the administration.			√
8	we have to use our military wisely. And we did not use our military wisely in Iraq.		√	
9	The next President of United States is going to have to decide how we leave, when we leave, and			√



	what we leave behind.			
10	Well, the first thing we have to do is get spending under control in Washington. It is completely out of control	√		
11	As president of the united states, I want to assure you, I have got a pen. This ones kind of old. I have got a pen, and I am going to veto every single spending bill that comes across my desk. I will make them famous, you will know their name	√		
12	Washed out our hands		√	
13	I looked into Mr. Putin eyes, and I saw three letters, a K, a G, and a B		√	
14	But lets be clear, earmarks account for \$18 bilion in last years budget.			

	<p>Senator McCain is proposing an this is a fundamental dufference between us \$300 billion in tax cuts to some of the wealthiest cprpotations and individuals in the country \$300 billion</p>	√		
15	<p>Maybe to senator obama its not a ;ot of money, but the point is that you see, I hear this all the time, it is only \$18 billion. Do you know that it's the last five years? Do you know that it's gone completely ou of control to the point where it corrupts people? It corrupts people</p>	√		
16	<p>Shining beacon on hill</p>			√
17	<p>I don't think I need any on-the-job training</p>		√	
18	<p>I don't know</p>			

	<p>where john id gettong his figures, lets just be clear. What I do id I close corporate loopholes, stop providing tax cuts to coporations that are shipping jobs overseas so that were giving tax breaks to companies that are ivesting here in the united states</p>	√		
--	--	---	--	--

Based on table 4.2 thw total types of implicature of the presidential election debate between Barack Obama and John McCain is 18 sentence. The total each of conversational is 5, generalized 8, and particularized 5.

**2. The Dominant Types of Implicature found in the presidential election debate between Barack Obama and John McCain**

After getting the realization, the analyzis was conducted to derive the dominant types of implicature of the presidential election debate between Barack Obama and John McCain. And the dominant types of implicature of the presidential elections debate between Barack Obama and John McCain is generalized implicature.

### **C. Research Findings**

The counting to the analysis of the data there were there types of implicature that found of the presidential election debate between Barack Obama and John McCain. After analyzing the data on the use type implicature of the presidential election debate between Barack Obama and John McCain, three were 18 sentence, with types in implicature of debate, types of implicature found in the presidential election debate between Barack Obama and John McCain are conversational implicature, generalized implicature, particularized implicature. From the percentage above, the most dominantly used is generalized implicature (44,4%).

## CHAPYTER V

### CONCLUSSION AND SUGESSTIONS

#### A. Conclusion

After analyzing the data, conclusion are drawn as the following.

1. There were three types of implicature analysis foun in the presidential debate between Barack Obama and John McCain. Namely, Conversational implicature, Generalized implicature, Particularized implicature. The total number of each types of implicature is 18. Which 5 or 27,8% of conversational, 8 or 44,4% of generalized, and 5 27,8% of particularized.
2. The most dominant types of implicature analysis in the presidential debate between Barack Obama and John McCain is Generealized Implicature, that 8 with percentage 44,4%.

#### B. Suggestion

Based on the conclusion above, suggestion are stated as the following:

1. The students should make other research about implicature, expecially conversation, generalized, and particularizedto enlarge knowledge. They can analyze about implicature in the others debate.
2. The readers, especially those who still learn English should study the types of implicature they are convensational, conversational, generalized, particularized, and portations mass that can be found in the presidential debate between Barack Obama and john McCain .

3. The last writer of this research also hopes that this study can be references for any body who wants to study sbout this topic futher, and suggest to the next research abserve more deeply.
4. The result of this study are expected to be useful for teacher expecially English teacher in teaching pragmatics.

## REFERENCES

- Arifulhaq. 2014. *Pragmatics A Hand Book For Students*. Medan: Ratu Jaya
- Brown. 1983. *pramatics*. America. Great Britain: Cambridge University
- David Crystal. 1995. *Language game*. Chicago. Great Britain: University of Chicago Press
- Levinson. 1992. *Generalized Conversational implicature*. London. Cambridge University
- Leech, G.N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. Great Britain: Cambridge University
- Peccei Jean Stilwell. 1999. *Pragmatics*. London and New York: Routledge
- Syaifullah. 2002. *Kinds of implicature*. Jakarta. Great Britain: Ui
- Yule George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. England. Great Britain: Oxford University Press
- <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/implicature> Accessed on March 23, 2016
- [https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/united\\_states\\_presidential\\_election\\_2008](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/united_states_presidential_election_2008) Accessed on March 23, 2016
- <http://idebate.org/about/debate/what> Accessed on March 23, 2016