

Ain Shams University
Faculty of Arts
Department of English

**Conversational Implicature
In English and Cairene Arabic:
A Study in Contrastive Linguistics**

An MA Thesis submitted by
Ahmed Mahmoud Ahmed Mahmoud Abu-hassoub
To
The Department of English Language and Literature
Faculty of Arts – Ain Shams University
In Fulfillment of the Requirement of the Master of Arts Degree in
Linguistics

Under the supervision of
Amal Ibrahim Al-Kary
Professor of Linguistics
And
Head of the English Department
Ain Shams University

2007

جامعة عين شمس
كلية الآداب
قسم اللغة الانجليزية وآدابها

الإضمار في المحادثة بين الإنجليزية واللهجة القاهرة: دراسة في اللغويات التقابلية

رسالة مقدمه من

أحمد محمود أحمد محمود أبوحسوب

إلى قسم اللغة الانجليزية وآدابها
كلية الآداب – جامعة عين شمس
للحصول على درجة الماجستير في اللغويات الانجليزية

بإشراف

الأستاذ الدكتور/ أمل إبراهيم القاري
أستاذ اللغويات ورئيس قسم اللغة الانجليزية
كلية الآداب – جامعة عين شمس

2007

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deep gratitude to professor Amal Ibrahim Al-Kary who has been exceptionally generous with her time and her insightful remarks. She has been an indispensable source of guidance for me. I owe special thanks for her encouragement and support.

I would like to thank all the participants, who responded to the questionnaires, and I appreciate their efforts in that. I would, also, like to thank my friend, Mohamed Hasan, who helped me extracting data from questionnaires, and taught me the basics of statistics. I would like to express my appreciation to my work colleagues at Roda Institute in Cairo for providing me with their experience.

I would like to thank all those who taught me at Sohag faculty of Arts and Cairo faculty of Arts. I would, also, like to acknowledge my special debts to my parents, my wife, and friends whose help and moral support culminated in the present study.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	i
List of Tables used	v
Abstract	vi
Transcription Conventions	viii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Topic of Research	6
1.3 Aim of the study	6
1.4 Significance of the study	7
1.5 Scope of the study	8
1.6 Definition of Terms	9
1.6.1 Cooperative Principle (CP)	9
1.6.2 Grice's Maxims of Conversation	10
1.6.2.1 Maxims of Quality	12
1.6.2.2 Maxim of Quantity	12
1.6.2.3 Maxim of Relevance	14
1.6.2.4. Maxims of Manner	15
1.6.3 Flouting and violating a maxim	18
1.6.4 Maxim clash	20
1.6.5 Conversational inferences	22
1.6.5.1 Entailment	22
1.6.5.2 Presupposition	22
1.6.5.3 Conventional Implicature	23
1.6.5.4 Conversational Implicature	25

1.6.5.4.1 Generalized and Particularized Conversational Implicatures	29
1.7 Distinctive features of Conversational Implicatures	31
1.8 Rationale of the study	35
1.9 Conclusion	36
Chapter Two: Literature Review	
2.1 Implicature as a Theory	38
2.2 Implicature as Convention	40
2.3 Implicature and Politeness	41
2.4 Conversational implicature and context	42
2.5 Conversational implicature and particles	43
2.6 Conversational implicature related to passive voice	44
2.7 Conversational implicature and code switching	44
2.8 Speaker's intended meaning versus hearer's interpreted implicature	45
2.9 Cross Cultural Studies on Conversational Implicature	45
2.10 Conclusion	49
Chapter Three: Research Method	
3.1 Introduction	51
3.2 Research questions	51
3.3 Procedures	51
3.4 Instruments	52
3.5 Subjects	55
3.6 Conclusion	58

Chapter Four: Data Analysis

4.1 Introduction	60
4.2 Analysis of the situations in Arabic	61
4.3 Analysis of the situations in English	74
4.4 Implicatures Uses of the First Group	87
4.4.1 Age and Use of Implicature of the first group	89
4.4.2 Sex and Use of Implicature of the first group	92
4.5 Implicatures Uses of the Second Group	93
4.5.1 English Proficiency and Implicature Uses of the Second group	96
4.5.2 Sex and Implicature Uses of the second group	100
4.6 Similarities and Differences in using implicatures in English and Arabic	103
4.7 Conclusion	103

Chapter Five: Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Conclusions	106
5.2 Recommendations for further research	112

Bibliography

Appendices

A.1 The Selected Situations	129
A.2 English Questionnaire version	132
A.3 Arabic Questionnaire version	137
A.4 Summary of the responses in English	142
A.5 Summary of the responses in Arabic	143

List of the Tables Used

Table 1: the participants who do not speak English (first group)	56
Table 2: the participants who speak English (second group)	56
Table 3: the least implicatures used in English and in Arabic	84
Table 4: the implicatures mostly used by the subjects in English and in Arabic.	86
Table 5: the percentage of implicatures use in Arabic of the first group	88
Table 6: percentages of the flouted maxims in Arabic	88
Table 7: the uses of implicatures by the participants of the first group according to their ages	89
Table 8: flouting the maxims in Arabic in relation to age as they are getting older	91
Table 9: the relationship between implicature use in Arabic and Age.	91
Table 10: a general view of using implicatures in Arabic by males and females of the first group	92
Table 11: the uses of the maxims by males and females in Arabic.	93
Table 12: implicatures in English in the second group responses.	93
Table 13: percentages of the flouted maxims in English	96
Table 14: the subjects' uses of implicatures in English in relation to years of English exposure	97
Table 15: uses of maxims by the participants of the second group according to their years of English exposure.	98
Table 16: the development of implicature uses as the participants become more proficient in English	99
Table 17: the uses of implicatures and the maxims by males and females in English	102

Abstract

This study aims at exploring and analyzing conversational implicatures in Cairene Arabic. It, also, aims at testing whether variables as age and sex have influence on the use of conversational implicature in Arabic or not, and whether English proficiency affects the use of conversational implicature in English as a nonnative language or not.

In addition, the present study aims at contrasting conversational implicatures between spoken Arabic as a native language and spoken English as a foreign language. To fulfill the purpose of the study, data was collected from Cairene Arabic, transcribed and analyzed by the researcher according to Grice's (1975) "Cooperative Principle". Two questionnaires were administered to a group of Cairenes to test the use of Conversational Implicature. One of them is in Arabic and the other is in English. Most of the situations put in the questionnaire are collected from the English literature. This helps to make comparison of the Arabic implicatures and the English ones. It was obvious that conversational implicatures can function differently in different contexts.

This study fills a gap in pragmatics since it is an attempt of finding conversational implicature in Arabic. It also, fills a gap in the field of cross-linguistic studies as it attempts to study conversational implicatures in Arabic and in English.

The results of the present study indicate that implicatures exist in Arabic. Moreover, Arabic involves implicatures more than English does. Also, the results reveal that there are some situations in which the participants use implicatures least, and there are some other situations where implicatures are mostly used.

Regarding age, the results of the first group reveal that implicatures are used by younger participants more than by old participants. Younger

participants tend to be less relevant, less truthful, and more informative than what is required. However, older participants are relatively less informative, and more truthful in their Arabic responses. Regarding sex, the study reveals that males generally use implicatures in Arabic more than females do at all ages. Regarding English proficiency, the results exhibit that the more the participants are proficient in English, the more they use implicatures in their English responses.

The study proves that there are some similarities in the use of implicatures in English and Arabic, such as: the maxim of quantity is the most flouted maxim to raise implicature either in English or in Arabic. However, the least exploited maxims are the maxims of manner and quality.

Still there are some differences in the usage of implicature. Implicatures that are raised out of flouting the maxims of relevance and quality are detected to appear in Arabic more than in English. Also, Arabic responses tend to be more informative than what is required. On the contrary, the English responses tend to be less informative than what is required especially the responses of the most English exposed participants. Arabic does not tend to use the strategy of spelling words out as a way to implicate something. However, English does.

Transcription Conventions

The study uses morpho-phonemic transcription system adopted from El-Menoufy (1963) with some amendments. It includes eleven Arabic vowel symbols and twenty-eight consonant symbols. These are presented below:

The Arabic short vowel symbols are:

/a/ as in (?ana) I

/e/ as in (laaken) but

/u/ as in (bukra) tomorrow

/i/ as in (delwa?tti) now

/o/ as in (?o^cud) sit down

The Arabic long vowel symbols are:

/aa/ as in (saaket) silent

/a:/ as in (ra:h) he went

/ee/ as in (?ana geet) I came

/ii/ as in (?abriil) April

/uu/ as in (ruuh) go

/oo/ as in (?eljumeen dool) these days

The Arabic consonant symbols are:

/?/ glottal stop as in (?ana) I or as in (wa?t) time

/q/ as in (ṣaḍiiq) friend

/r/ as (ra:ʔj) view

/x/ as in (xarag) went out

/ʃ/ as in (ʃajjeb) absent

/h/ as in (hadiqa) garden

/ṭ/ as in (ta[̣]baan) tired

/ṭ/ as in (ṭ ab[̣]an) sure

/ḍ/ as in (ba[̣]ḍ) some

/ʃ/ as in (ʃaḥi) awake

/ẓ/ as in (ẓariif) genteel

The other consonant symbols are shared with English. These are:

/b, t, d, ɸ, ð, k, g, m, n, l, f, s, z, ʃ, h, w, and j/

// Slashes are used to denote phonemic transcription of the Cairenes' Arabic responses.

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the aim of the present thesis, its significance, its limits, and rationale of the study. In addition, it introduces different types of conversational inferences. It tries, also, to display the most relevant terms.

It is not possible to understand speakers fully without knowing what they have implicated as well as what they have said. Implicature, as proved later, is very often used by speakers. Speakers usually try to get their messages across implicitly. Implicit communication works very well. The point is that how speakers can use implicit intention and for what purposes they are accustomed to employ these intentions. Moreover, it is important to see if there are any variables influencing the use of conversational implicature.

Grice (in 1968, 1975, 1978, and 1989) explained that while speakers and hearers are conversing with each other, they assume cooperation in terms of the topic discussed. Cooperation is normally achieved by the observance of certain conversational maxims. These are some norms stated by Grice for a successful human communication. Speakers are supposed to follow (observe) these maxims while conversing with each other. Nonobservance of these maxims (flouting) leads to raising what Grice calls "Conversational Implicatures." In short, conversational implicatures are defined as those "indirect or implicit meanings of an utterance derived from context that is not present from its conventional use." (Grice, 1975)

Grice argued that the flout of the maxims seems to hinder understanding. However, when readers draw proper implicatures, and think of cooperation, they will understand the speaker and get the intended meaning.

Example 1:

A: can you tell me the time?

B: well, the milkman has come. (Levinson, 1983: 97)

B's response is not a proper answer on the surface but when we think at a deeper level, we will find that B answered the question. If we consider the time of the coming of the milkman we will reach the desired answer.

Therefore, conversational implicature is of great importance as it restores understanding and helps interlocutors communicate successfully. It is, also, important as it largely works in human speech as will be seen later in the study.

Example 2:

If a mother says to her son, "Did you do your homework and put away your books?" (Kitao, 1990) and he replies, "I put away my books," any native English speaker would understand that the son's reply means he did not do his homework. In isolation, nothing in the grammar of "I put away my books" includes that meaning. It is implicated rather than literally said.

Grice realized that to understand an utterance one needs not only shared general knowledge of the world and linguistic knowledge but also knowledge of communicative principles, and shared contextual knowledge as well. Therefore, Grice asserted that one needs both semantic and pragmatic meanings to reach full understanding of an utterance.

While semantics is the study of the meanings of literal utterances, pragmatics is defined by Leech (1983) as "the study of meaning in relation to speech situations." Pragmatics studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation which is usually a conversation.

Pragmatics has been defined by Levinson (1983, p. 21) as "the study of the relations between language and context that are basic to an account of

language understanding". This definition implies that understanding an utterance involves more than understanding words and grammatical structures. Understanding, also, involves making inferences connecting what is said to what is mutually assumed or known, or to what has been said previously.

Pragmatics distinguishes two intents or meanings in each utterance. One is the informative intent or the sentence meaning and the other is the communicative intent or speaker meaning. (Sperber & Wilson, 1986)

The ability to recognize the form as well as the intended meaning of an utterance or the ability to comprehend and produce a communicative act is referred to as pragmatic competence (Kasper, 1997) which includes one's knowledge about the social distance, social status between the speakers involved, the cultural knowledge and the linguistic knowledge explicit or implicit

Meaning in pragmatics is defined as relative to a speaker or user of the language, whereas meaning in semantics is defined as a property of expressions in a given language, in abstraction from particular situations, speakers, or hearers. When asked if she could reach the salt, a Chinese dinner guest replied, "Yes, my arms are long" (Kitao, 1990). It is clear here that she did not get the intended meaning.

Example 3: Can you pass the salt? (Kitao, 1990)

Example 3 has two meanings: 1) Semantic meaning: Are you able to pass the salt? 2) And its illocutionary force (pragmatic meaning): please pass the salt. The difference here exists as we differentiate between what does X mean (semantic meaning), and what did you mean by X (pragmatic meaning). (Leech. 1983:6)

The task of pragmatics is to explain the relation between these two types of meaning: the sense (which has often been described as the 'literal' or face value meaning) and the illocutionary force.

Leech (1983: 30) assumes that the sense can be described by means of a semantic representation in some formal language or notation. The force will be represented as a set of implicatures.

The present study takes into consideration the communicative principles of conversation as well as the linguistic knowledge of subjects and the context of situations.

On the one hand, the present study concentrates on analyzing Conversational Implicature in Cairene Arabic. This is due to its recurrence and its importance in communication as it plays a role in utterance interpretation, and indicates how the interpretation of one utterance contributes to the interpretation of the other. It also, explains how it is possible to mean more than what is actually said. The present study tries to describe whether or not conversational implicature exists in Arabic. If conversational implicature exists in Arabic, the present study will try to see what influences its presence; age, or sex.

On the other hand, the present thesis tries to study conversational implicatures in English as a nonnative language of the Cairenes. This is to test whether those, who speak English as a nonnative language, have been affected by learning English or not, and to see if their English responses are different from or similar to the Arabic responses of those, who do not speak English.

Research on how native and nonnative speakers of English use and interpret conversational implicatures has revealed that nonnative speakers of English do not interpret implicatures the way native speakers do. This difference may be partly due to differences in degree of pragmatic competence. Also, it may be due to difference in background; social or cultural.

Like many other languages, Arabic has social and pragmatic functions different from those of English. For example, indirectness is not necessarily an indication of politeness, and imposition is a sign of familiarity and hospitality rather than impoliteness.

Furthermore, Formulaic expressions in Arabic differ from those of English in terms of pragmatic force: 'thank you', for instance, which may indicate acceptance in English may be a sign of refusal in Arabic.

1.2 Topic of Research

The topic of the study is to research , describe and examine the issue of Conversational Implicature in Arabic, and to examine it in English by Cairene speakers. In addition, the study tries to test whether variables as age, sex and exposure to English have influence on the use of conversational implicature or not.

1.3 Aim of the study

The aim of this study is to explore the use of conversational implicatures in Arabic and English as spoken by Cairenes. It is necessary to research conversational implicatures to show how they are exploited differently in various languages and in various contexts. Consequently, speakers will be acquainted with the various uses of conversational implicature, realize their importance and be more precise in assigning the exact functional meaning of different uses of such implicatures.

As a first step, the study aims at collecting published data on English conversational implicatures. The conversational implicatures are identified and analyzed. Then, the data are given in English and in Arabic to a number of Cairene speakers in the form of questionnaire. This aims at analyzing the Cairenes' use of conversational implicatures in English as a nonnative language and in Arabic as a native language. The study also, aims to explore to what extent the Cairenes' uses of implicature are similar or not to those uses in English literature. (See chapter three: method of research.)

The present research also, aims at considering variables that can influence the use of conversational implicature such as age and sex, and tries to see whether these differences have any influence on the presence of conversational implicature in Arabic or not. It aims at observing the influence of English proficiency of nonnative speakers on using implicatures in English as well.

1.4 Significance of the study

The study fills a gap in discourse analysis research since conversational implicatures in Arabic have not until now been seriously researched. It has been proved by many studies that Conversational Implicature exists in English. To my knowledge there has not been much work done on conversational implicature in Arabic. Further, hardly any study has attempted describing the use of conversational implicatures by Arabic speakers. Therefore, the present study focuses more on implicature in Cairene Arabic.

The study, also, is significant as it contributes to research on contrastive linguistics because it explores the presence and use of conversational implicatures in Arabic and tries to contrast these to the conversational implicatures in English as spoken by Cairenes.

1.5 Scope of the study

The study is concerned with conversational implicatures in Arabic as spoken by Cairenes. Other speakers of Arabic are not included within the limits of this study. Conversational implicatures in English, as spoken by Cairenes, are within the scope of the study. English implicatures by native English speakers are not involved. However, reference will be made to English implicatures as published in the literature of English.

Written texts are not within the scope of this investigation though reference will be made to written form whenever relevant. This is due to the fact that conversational implicatures occur more frequently in spoken discourse.

Post questionnaire is not used, as the present study examines the ability to use implicatures, not the ability to comprehend and interpret them. Therefore, the situations in the present study are explained and the context is clearly given to the participants in advance.

The present study is concerned with the use and manifestation of conversational implicature in Arabic. Therefore, comprehending and interpreting of Arabic conversational implicatures are not included. Also, factors that determine the primacy of observing the maxims in Arabic are not included in the present research.

The reasons for generating conversational implicature, e.g., conciseness, politeness, avoiding misconceptions, are not tackled in the present study. However, some of these are referred to when relevant. The issue of cultural influence on using implicature is not included either.

1.6 Definition of Terms

1.6.1 Cooperative Principle (CP)

Grice (1975) sees that language is based on a form of cooperation among the speakers. The participants of a conversation cooperate in saying what makes sense in the exchange. They obey certain principles in their participation to sustain the conversation. Grice (1975, and 1978) suggested that there is a set of general considerations applicable to conversational dialogues.

assumptions guiding the conduct of conversation. These arise, it seems, from basic rational considerations and may be formulated as guidelines for the efficient and effective use of language in conversation to further co-operative ends. (Levinson, 1983:101)

Grice called the sum of these considerations “Cooperative Principle” (often referred to in the literature as CP). This cooperative principle is a kind of tacit agreement by speakers and listeners to cooperate in communication. The Cooperative Principle states that:

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)

This implies that one should not supply information, which he can assume that his audience already has. Nor should he supply inadequate piece of information. Grice (1975) assumes that participants cooperate in the conversation by contributing to the speech.

According to Grice (1989: 26, 30, 31), a speaker makes conversational implicature when he conforms to this cooperative principle. Hearers try to work out what a speaker means. They do this by assuming that he is being cooperative. Grice argues that:

Conversation ... is a co-operative endeavour and that what enables conversation to proceed is an underlying assumption

that we as conversants have purposes for conversing and that we recognize these purposes are more likely to be fulfilled if we co-operate. (Cooper, 1998:56)

This means that speakers in a conversation have to cooperate and have purposes to fulfill. These purposes can vary greatly, they can be mixed, and they are often not fulfilled unless conversants cooperate.

Example 4: A: "I'm out of petrol"

B: "There is a garage around the corner." (From Grice, 1975)

B may be taken to implicate that the garage is open and has gas to sell. Apart from this assumption, B's response would be irrelevant. However, participants tend to observe the principle of cooperative conversation.

Example 5: A: "Where did Sam go?"

B: "Out some where" (online)

B is not giving A all the information he asks for. However, if A concludes that B is being cooperative and conveys as much relevant information as he has evidence for, then A can infer that B does not know exactly where Sam went.

1.6.2 Grice's Maxims of Conversation

The Gricean "Cooperative Principle" is broken down into four maxims of conversation. These maxims are "quantity, quality, relevance, and manner" (Grice, 1975:45). They presume that speakers give enough information, tell truths and speak in relation to the context of the speech. They present meaning clearly and concisely, and avoid ambiguity.

These principles are supposed to guide conversational interaction in keeping with the general cooperative principle. They are common expectations in a communicative situation between human beings. They specify methods in which speakers may fulfill cooperation and may vary from culture to culture in their recurrence of use.

"Maxims" differ from "rules" in that they are seen as generally valid rather than to count only for specific cases. This means that the maxims are

applied to all kinds of conversations on all occasions. Rules ought to be obeyed in a specified case. In addition, rules ought to be obeyed and not to be violated. However, speakers may flout a maxim and still be cooperative. Speakers do not always adhere to the maxims. In fact, they violate them very frequently. Harnish, (in Davis, 1991: 331) said: that "it is impossible to obey all the maxims at once. A maxim may be infringed."

Grice, also, does not mean that participants in cooperative conversation follow these maxims to the letter but rather that:

in most ordinary kinds of talk these principles are oriented to, such that when talk does not proceed according to their specifications, hearers assume that contrary to appearances, the principles are being adhered to at some deeper level (Levinson 1983) .

Therefore, the maxims are not absolute rules, as said before, because human communication functions to a great degree by the flouting of maxims. A speaker may be faced with a clash between different maxims. The term is discussed below. Clash of maxims leads to a failure to fulfill some maxim.

A speaker, also, may flout a maxim and his listener understands that. This case gives rise to a "conversational implicature". Grice seems to reserve the title 'conversational implicature' for those aroused by flouting a maxim. According to Grice, implicatures are generated by the deliberate flouting of conversational maxims. In such a case, the speaker is said to "exploit" a maxim.

The significant point is that even when the maxims are flouted, addressees assume that they have been followed and construct some internal logic that allows the conversation to be seen as compliant with the cooperative principle. In such case they help the speaker to say more than

what he is saying. They do so through implicatures, which can be implied by the utterance. The maxims are handled below:

1.6.2.1 Maxims of Quality

Super-maxim: “Be true” try to make your contribution one that is true. Speaker tells the truth or an adequate evidence for it.

Do not say what you believe to be false.

Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

The maxim of Quality also has two parts, and demands that the speaker says only what he believes to be true or that for which he has sufficient evidence.

Therefore, the maxim of quality states that one should assert only what one justifiably believes. So speaker should not purposely speak untruths, yet, he gives seemingly factual details. He plays with relation often, creating crazily logical connections. In other words, “Make your contribution true according to your knowledge.”

If we say something for which we lack adequate evidence, we do not know whether what we say is true or false. It can be summarized in the precept ' Avoid telling untruths'. (Leech,1983: 16).

1.6.2.2 Maxim of Quantity

Super-maxim: “Be brief”: Speaker is as informative as required. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Thus, the maxim of quantity states that one should not assert less than is possible. This means that the expression must convey to the listener all the meanings intended by the speaker. The maxim of Quantity requires the cooperative speaker to say as much but no more than is required for his particular purposes in the talk exchange. This maxim is flouted when the speaker obviously gives more or less information than the situation requires.

Example 6: A: Did you do the reading for this week's seminar?

B: I intended to (Implicature: No). (online)

Here B's answer would of course be true if B intended to do the reading and then did, but then the answer would violate the maxim of quantity. A, assuming the maxim to be observed, is likely to infer the answer no. Here, the implicature is implied, contextual, and cancelable. The word 'cancelable' means that implicature can be cancelled. Here, B can cancel the implicature 'no' and continue to say, "I intended to do it and I managed to", which implies 'yes' and cancels the implicature 'no'.

Example 7:

A: Did you drink all the bottles of beer in the fridge?
(online)

B: I drank some. (Implicature: B did not drink them all.)

As mentioned above, these maxims are basic assumptions, not rules, and they can be broken. Grice distinguished between the speaker secretly breaking them, e.g. by lying, which he termed violating the maxims; and overtly breaking them for some linguistic effect, which he called flouting.

These first two maxims were considered together by Leech, as they frequently work in competition with one another: the amount of information S gives is limited may be due to avoidance of telling an untruth.

Example 8: A: you will go to Tibet on Tuesday.

B: How did you know?

A: I wasn't telling you, I was asking you. (online)

The utterance "you will go to Tibet on Tuesday" can be heard as assertion.

Example 9: (said before):

Mother: Have you done your homework and put away your books?

Son: I've put away my books (Kitao, 1990)

The reply is less informative than required. It does not supply all of the information asked for. Flouting the maxim of quantity by not giving

sufficient information generally implicates negative information. Therefore, the mother understands that the son is communicating that he did not do his homework.

1.6.2.3 Maxim of Relevance: Be relevant.

The maxim of Relevance urges the speaker to make his contribution relevant. A response should be relevant to the topic of a discussion. It should be directly relevant.

When the answer is not directly relevant, the person to whom the answer is directed asks himself what conditions must obtain for the answer to be relevant. He may induce what the answerer intended to communicate by his answer. The induction is based on the literal meaning of the answer and on the assumption that would make the answer relevant to the question. (Peter Cole, 1975:258)

This is the maxim that is violated in the example of “John is cooking dinner tonight.” “I’d better get out of the house”. (Williams. 1991) On the surface, 'John’s cooking dinner' appears to be not related to 'getting out of the house.'

However, if the cooperative principle is in effect, then a meaning is constructed that connects the two utterances, and an implicature is raised. Depending on the context, more than one implicature may be raised by the same utterance. One of them is that John is not a good cook.

Example 10: Johnny: Hey Sally, let’s play marbles

Mother: How is your homework getting along Johnny?
(Levinson, 1983: 111)

The ‘irrelevant’ utterance of Johnny’s mother is intended by her to remind her son to do his homework before going to play marbles, and is intended to underline that Johnny is not yet allowed to play.

The Relevance maxim is very often flouted. In everyday speech, we often use one sentence to convey the meaning of another.

Example 11: “It's cold in here” (Cole 1975, and Leech 1983).

If an old man says (11) to his son, he may be giving an order to close the window. This does not mean that the meaning of “it's cold in here” is the

same as the meaning of “close the window.” It only means that, under certain circumstances, saying one thing may entail the communication of another. The father’s sentence has two levels of meaning in context: the literal sense of “that it is cold” and a fact that may be inferred from the literal sense that “that the son had better do something about the cold”. The inferred meaning is dependent on the literal meaning. Both are levels of meaning.

Example 12: When A is asked about B's intelligence, A says "He dresses well." The utterance appears irrelevant. However, it raises the implicature that B is not intelligent. What raises this implicature, in fact, is flouting the maxim of relevance. (Tom Mc Arthur, 1992)

1.6.2.4. Maxims of Manner: Super-maxim: Be perspicuous.

Avoid obscurity/of expression.

Avoid ambiguity.

Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity.)

Be orderly, and polite.

The maxim of Manner means to be clear. It instructs speakers and addressees to use and interpret each other as using the same language. In addition, it instructs them not to use ambiguous or long expressions. It cautions the speaker to be methodical and to avoid ambiguity (of lexis), obscurity (of expressions), and prolixity. Therefore, speakers should avoid ambiguity or obscurity. They should be direct and straightforward. The maxim may be expressed as: “Make your contribution in a clear, unambiguous, concise, orderly fashion appropriate to the current purposes of the exchange.” (Harnish, 1976)

Here the last one of the sub maxims of manner; "Be orderly", shall probably be understood to mean that one should present the information in an order that is pragmatically adequate for the conversation. This concerns mainly the larger constituents of speech. Within simple noun phrases, word order is mostly given by the grammatical rules of a language. (Evi Angermaier, 1998) However, it is natural that human communication should allow sentence constituents to be placed in a pragmatically adequate order. Manner then demands that conversation should be unambiguous. This means

that participants should neither use vague utterances nor utterances with double meaning.

Example 13: John stole the money and went to the bank.

John went to the bank and stole the money. (Gazdar, 1979)

Here, word order is important and determines whether the money is stolen from the bank or not.

Example 14: "do we have any I-C-E-C-R-E-A-M?"

(Levinson, 1983)

The maxim of manner is violated and exploited when a wife asks her husband 14, in the presence of their young children. Spelling out the words of an utterance is not the normal appropriate manner in which two adults address each other. However, the husband assumes that this unusual delivery is the appropriate manner for this exchange and conforms to the Cooperative Principle. He constructs a rationale that could show how this is the case. The implicature is drawn, then, the wife does not want the children to know what is being mentioned.

In short, all of the above four basic maxims are simply identified as norms that make conversations go properly. They specify what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, cooperative way. Participants should speak sincerely, relevantly and clearly while providing sufficient information.

The core idea of the Gricean theory of Conversational Implicature is that we grasp the implicit message by assuming the observance of the conversational maxims by the speaker. The maxims generate inferences beyond the semantic content of the sentences uttered. In cases of flouting a maxim, the addressee figures out why. This generally induces an implicature. This means that the interpretation of the indirect utterances depends largely on the hearer to grasp the implicit message.

Example 15: A: Is Gail dating any one these days?

B: well, she goes to Cleveland every weekend. (on line)

The answer appears to be irrelevant and not informative enough. However, still A thinks that B is cooperating. So, B must be saying something more or something else. If B tries to say, "Gail is dating someone in Cleveland", this will be relevant and informative. Thus, B tries to implicate that "yes, Gail is dating someone in Cleveland" by saying that "well, she goes to Cleveland every weekend".

Example 16:

A: Have you seen the screwdriver?

B: Look in the desk drawer. (online)

Or: (Have you looked in the desk drawer?)

Here, the hearer can induce that his Speaker implicates that the screwdriver may be in the desk drawer. Moreover, he can also extract that the speaker is not sure about this information. Otherwise, the speaker did not use implicature. This shows that implicature is a statement that adds meaning to the bare meaning of the utterance.

Therefore, cooperative principle and maxims of conversation govern communication. Communication is achieved by the audience recognizing the communicator's informative intention. To communicate efficiently, all the speaker has to do is to utter a sentence only one interpretation of which is compatible with the assumption that he is obeying the cooperation principle and maxims.

Example 17: Peter: Do you want some coffee?

Mary: Coffee would keep me a wake.

(Sperber & Wilson. 1995: 34)

Peter could infer that Mary does not want to stay awake and Mary does not want any coffee.

The explicit content of Mary's utterance does not directly answer Peter's question it is therefore not relevant as it stands. If Mary has obeyed the maxim "be relevant", it must be assumed that she intended to give Peter an answer. He can obtain the expected answer by inferring from what she said.

After reading this long list of principles, we must bear in mind that without them communication would be very difficult, and perhaps would break down altogether. The purpose of these maxims is a maximally effective exchange of information so that we can talk with each other in an efficient and cooperative way. Mey (1993: 71) states: “without cooperation, communication would not be possible, hence we had better cooperate”.

1.6.3 Flouting and violating a maxim

Here, it is worthy to distinguish between two kinds of infringing or disobeying the conversational maxims namely violating and flouting maxims.

Violating a maxim means those cases in which someone is disobeying some maxim, but is neither doing so purposefully nor with the intention that the hearer recognizes that a maxim is being disobeyed. It refers to failing to follow a maxim unintentionally and without any communicative intent, for example, giving irrelevant information due to a misunderstanding of a question.

In contrast, Grice used the term “flouting” to describe situations in which a maxim is being deliberately disobeyed. Flouting a maxim means failing to follow a maxim on purpose, with the intent to communicate something and with the intention that the hearer recognizes it. That is the case when utterances often depend, for their interpretation, on the hearer's ability to recognize that the cooperative principle has deliberately been broken. Grice was not interested in violations of maxims. He was interested in how speakers use the flouting of maxims to communicate meaning.

Each step in a conversational exchange can be analyzed in terms of whether it conforms to the maxims or not. There are four possibilities in which any maxim can be disobeyed: A maxim is disobeyed but without the knowledge of the other participant. A maxim is also disobeyed where a participant overtly opts out, perhaps by saying, "No comment." Or it may be disobeyed as a result of a conflict of maxims, in which case there is a cooperative reason for not following all of them. Another case where a maxim is flouted, is disobeying not secretly nor by avowal, but by a clearly nonconforming performance. This is called “flouting a maxim”. Here, a maxim

appears to be violated but where, upon further reflection, the audience can figure out, on the assumption that the speaker is being generally cooperative, how the speaker is being subtly cooperative. (Grandy, 1989: 517)

Example 18: A: Where's Bill?

B: There's a yellow VW outside Sue's house. (Levinson, 1983)

Literally B's contribution fails to answer A's question, and seems to flout the maxims of quantity and relevance. But we try to interpret B's utterance as cooperative. Having assumed that, we ask ourselves what possible connection there could be between Bill's location and the location of a yellow VW, and arrive at the suggestion that if Bill has a yellow VW, then he may be at Sue's house.

The act of recognizing how a maxim is applied by assumptions about the speaker's adherence to the CP is called Conversational Implicature. In this sense, a conversational implicature is not any kind of implication but an implication dependent on the CP and the maxims. Grice's point is not that we always adhere to these maxims at a superficial level but rather that people will interpret what we say as conforming to the maxims at a deeper level. Grice states:

as long as participants in a mutual enterprise such as a conversation each assume that the other is adhering to the cooperative principle, meanings that are conveyed without

being said, follow as inferences from the fact that some particular maxim appears to be being violated. (Grice, 1975: 45-46)

1.6.4 Maxim clash

A reason for infringement or opting out some maxim is to avoid clashes with another maxim. Harnish, (in Davis, 1991 P.331) said that this infringement "is explained by supposing a conflict with another maxim." Grice, also, acknowledges in his writings that there are often times that his maxims contradict each other; the relevant response, for example, may have to be lengthy to be truthful or being relevant may well entail not providing any more information than is required. This case is called maxim clash or maxim overlap.

Participants may be faced by such contradiction. They obviously see themselves confronted by a conflict between one maxim and another. In such a case, participants are obliged to flout a maxim instead of another. They prefer not to flout quality maxim for instance, and flout another maxim (e.g. Quantity) instead. This is because they could not follow both of them in the same situation, for observing one of them requires flouting the other. In such cases, it is impossible to obey the two maxims together. This is what is called maxim clash.

And the principles may often conflict. If one has partial evidence for an answer that is as informative as is required, one is caught between the maxim enjoining one to be informative and one cautioning against saying things for which you have insufficient evidence. (Grandy, 1989: 517)

Therefore, the result of maxims conflict is the violation of one of them. This is something other than deliberately flouting. Maxims clash seems to be natural that in the particular circumstances the speaker cannot fulfill both of the maxims in question at once. However, it is not in the nature of the clash that any particular maxim must override the other. The speaker must make a choice between giving, for example, not enough information and giving

groundless information. In such case, one maxim of (Quality for example) overrides the other (Quantity).

The following situation in which a sister asks her brother about the birthday of her Aunt Rose, may explain the point.

Example 19: Sister: When is Aunt Rose's birthday?

Brother: It's sometime in April. (Leech, 1983)

The brother does not know the exact day. So he can not provide a sufficient piece of information. Instead, he prefers to give insufficient information rather than to give a false one. I.e. he prefers following quality to observing quantity.

There is some sort of clash between cooperative principle and politeness principle. According to Leech (1983. p83), one may be faced with a clash between being polite and being relevant, or between being polite and giving adequate information at the same time. In such cases, the speaker has to uphold a principle and exploit another.

In short, a speaker may be unable to conform to all of the maxims at once. If two are in conflict, he may have to sacrifice one to the other. For example, it may be impossible in some situation to say as much as is necessary without saying things without adequate evidence.

1.6.5 Conversational inferences

There are four basic types of inferences. They are Entailments, Presupposition, Conventional Implicatures and Conversational Implicature. These are presented below:

1.6.5.1 Entailment

Entailments are the inferences that follow logically from the conventional meaning of what is said. They are direct consequences of the conventional meaning of what is said. It is an implicit meaning that can be logically inferred from a form of expression.

Example 20: "The child spilled the juice," entails "Someone spilled something." (online: *Pragmatics*.[http// L351-pragmatics.html](http://L351-pragmatics.html)).

Entailments are said to be truth-conditional (in the sense that A entails or logically implies B if and only if every situation that makes A true also makes B true).

Example 21: "John left" from "John and Bill left". (online: *Conversational Inferences*. ei//A:\conversational_inferences.htm)

This means that a sentence "S" entails a proposition "P" if and only if "P" is true in all circumstances in which "S" is true.

1.6.5.2 Presupposition

Presupposition is the logical meaning of a sentence or meanings logically associated with or entailed by a sentence. It is an implicit meaning that must be pre-supposed, understood, taken for granted for an utterance to make sense (online. [www. sil.org/ Linguistics/ Glossary Of LinguisticTerms.htm](http://www.sil.org/Linguistics/Glossary_of_LinguisticTerms.htm))

Presupposition is different from logical entailment because the negation of the proposition does not lead to negation of the presupposed proposition. (online: *Conversational Inference*. [ei//A:\conversational_inferences .htm](http://ei//A:\conversational_inferences.htm))

Example 22: “I am washing the vase” presupposes that there is a vase. And “I am not washing the vase” presupposes that there is a vase too.

Unlike entailments, Presuppositions are non-truth conditional inferences that are nevertheless attached by convention to specific forms of expression, such as lexical items. Presuppositions are different from entailments in that if "S" conventionally implicates "P" it will be true that both "S" and "not S" entails "P".

Example 23:

- (a) 'Smith has left off beating his wife' presupposes that.
- (b) Smith has been beating his wife. (Harnish, in Davis: 329)

The truth of what is implied is a necessary condition of the original statement's being either true or false.

Jef Verschueren (1999) defined Presuppositions as:

“relations between a form of expression and an implicit meaning, which can be arrived at by a process of pragmatic inference.”

Stubbs defined presupposition as:

“A presupposition is defined as a proposition which remains constant under negation and interrogation.” (1983:215)

Example 24:

The king of France is not bold

Is the king of France bold?

These two sentences are all said to presuppose: “there is a king of France.” (Stubbs: 215)

1.6.5.3 Conventional Implicature

There are also inference types that are supposed to lead logically to relations between forms and implicit meanings. These are usually called (logical) implications or conventional implicatures i.e. non-explicit meaning

attached conventionally to the linguistic forms. The term conventional implicature is used because these implicatures are due to the conventional meaning of what is said.

Conventional implicatures arise solely because of conventional features of the words employed in an utterance. They are closely allied to what is said in the strict sense. The conventional meaning of the words used will determine what is implicated, besides helping to determine what is said. What is conventionally implicated is part of the meaning force of the utterance.

Conventional implicatures according to Grice (1975) are non-truth conditional inferences. They do not depend on assuming the speaker to be observing the cooperative principle. They do not make use of basic pragmatic principles such as the cooperative principle and the maxims. They are derived rather straightforwardly from the meanings of particular utterances and they are not cancelable.

Example 25: (similar to Grice's example above)

He is a philosopher. Therefore, he is brave. (Levinson, 1983)

In other words, being a philosopher implies that he is brave. "Conventional" means the surface meaning of an utterance. It is to utter something with a particular form and a particular meaning. Unlike Conversational Implicatures, as seen later, which follow from maxims of truthfulness, informativeness, relevance and clarity that speakers are assumed to observe, conventional implicatures are determined by linguistic constructions in the utterance.

Conventional implicatures, in this sense, arise from expressions which, taken by themselves, implicate certain states of the world that cannot be attributed to our use of language; on the contrary, they are given evidence by our language use and are manifested by it. They are not derived from pragmatic principles like the maxims, but are simply attached by convention to particular lexical items or expressions. Consequently, they do not change the truth-conditional content of a word, (Levinson 1983: 127).

By conventional implicature Grice meant one that is part of the meaning of the sentence used. Nevertheless, there are some tools for linking explicit content to the relevant piece of information.

Conventional means for conveying implicit meaning language provides numerous conventionalized carriers of implicit meaning, tools for linking explicit content to relevant aspects of background information. (Verschueren, 1999: 27)

These tools are lexical tools; words like "although, but, this, that" are examples of lexical tools. Take for example: "I am crying although I am happy." It is by convention expected that if somebody cries then he is unhappy and the word "although" signals the opposite expectation.

Xiong (1997) argued that conventional implicature is non-truth-functional, unpredictable, uncancelable, uncalculable, and detachable from the sense of expression and hence, as Xiong said, different from conversational implicature in general.

1.6.5.4 Conversational Implicature

We commonly draw a distinction between what a person's words literally mean and what a person means by his or her words over and above what his or her words literally mean. It was only in the 1970s that conversational implicature started to receive serious examination, and research on conversational implicature appeared to show the crucial role it plays in everyday conversation.

In his article "*logic and conversation*" (1975) Grice pointed out that conversational implicature plays a vital role in utterance interpretation and offered a theory of conversational implicature. Levinson (1983:97) also, drew attention to the importance of conversational implicature and how it helps speakers to mean more than what they said. Bouton (1988, 1989, and 1990) discussed the importance of conversational implicature in cross-cultural communication.

Example 26: A: Wanna go to the movie tonight?

B: I've got a physics exam tomorrow. (Verschueren, 1999) or "I have to work."

A will draw the implicature that B cannot go to the cinema tomorrow. However, B did not say this nor did what he said entail this. The implicated meaning may be something else or the opposite of what is said literally.

Example 27:A: He is an Englishman, he is, therefore, brave.

(Grice: 1975)

B: His being an Englishman implies that he is brave.

Grice observed that speakers who use (27a) implicate (27b). They imply, but do not say, that his being an Englishman implies that he is brave. (26b) can be used with its conventional meaning without implicating what it did. But (27a) cannot be used with its conventional meaning without implicating (27b). Grice argued that only (26b) can raise conversational implicature which, here, is "no, I won't go to the movie tonight." However, (27b) can only raise conventional implicature.

In differentiating between conversational and conventional implicatures, Harnish (in Davis, 1991: 330) stated the following:

In contrast with conventional implicatures, which turn on the meaning of the words used there is a class of implicatures that turn not only on what a person says but also on principles governing discourse. As such, Grice's theory is the most sophisticated, in a line of attempts to account for what has variously been called contextual or pragmatic implication. These implications turn on saying what is said in a discourse of a certain kind. The kind of discourse at issue is one governed by the Cooperative Principle.

Conversational implicature is the last type of inference, and in fact, it is the most important one of them, at least in the present study as it is its topic. Therefore, it is necessary to review the various definitions of Conversational Implicature, since it has been defined by some writers.

Conversational Implicature is defined by Grice, in his 1975 article, "Logic and Conversation," as an indirect or implicit meaning of an utterance derived from context that is not present from its conventional use. Conversational implicature is not part of the conventional meaning of the sentence uttered, but depends on features of the conversational context.

Conversational Implicature is what speakers imply in interaction. Grice observed that an utterance frequently conveys information that is neither explicitly expressed by nor an unavoidable consequence of the words that are actually uttered.

an utterance frequently conveys information that is neither explicitly expressed by nor an unavoidable consequence of the words that are actually uttered. (Williams. 1991: 355)

Example 28: A: John is cooking dinner tonight.

B: I'd better get out of the house. (Donna Glee Williams, 1991)

Here, information is communicated about the quality of John's cooking skills. B's response has raised the implicature "John is not a good cook." The proposition "John isn't a good cook" is not actually contained in the utterance. Neither is it a necessary consequence of the utterance. Grice would state that B's response, "I'd better get out of the house," has raised the implicature "John is not a good cook." Therefore, Implicature refers to an indirect or implicit meaning of an utterance derived from context that is not present from its conventional use. It is an inference that goes beyond an utterance's linguistic meaning in light of conversations.

Huang, (1994: 3) defined Conversational implicatures as:

a set of non-logical inferences that contain conveyed messages, which are meant without being said in the strict sense. They can arise from either strictly and directly observing or deliberately and ostentatiously flouting the maxims.

Another example of implicature can be found in verbal exchanges such as the following:

Example 29: A: Are all the gifts there?

B: Some are. (online)

B did not say that some are not, but it can be derived nonetheless. Therefore, the inference, hearers draw from utterances in conversation, is named Conversational Implicature.

Implicature, then, is seen as the aspect of meaning that a speaker conveys, implies, or suggests without directly expressing it. The utterance “Can you pass the salt?” is literally a request for information about one's ability to pass salt. However, it may be used as a request for salt. Implicature is the process by which such a meaning is conveyed, implied, or suggested. Again in saying, “Some students are in class,” the speaker conveys by implicature that not all students are in class.

What the concept of Implicature makes so salient is that it explains how it is possible to mean more than what is actually said by the single words. Implicatures bridge the gap between what is literally said and what is meant, suggested, what is implied. With implicature we name the meaning of an utterance which is conveyed indirectly or through hints and which is understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated

Gazdar (1979: 38) defined Implicature as:

a proposition that is implied by the utterance of a sentence in a context even though that proposition is not a part of nor an entailment of what was actually said.

Gazdar uses the word “implicature” for “implicata”; thing implicated, and the word “im-plicature” for the theory itself. Grice simply uses the term implicature for the meanings that are worked out by inference

Grice, in a series of articles, defines Conversational Implicature as an implicit meaning inferred from the obvious flouting of conversational maxims in combination with assumed adherence to the cooperative principle.

Conversational Implicature is a class of implicatures that maintains discourse coherence. When we speak implicitly or non-literally, we may be seen to hinder discourse coherence by overtly violating one or more discourse norms. Discourse coherence is restored when a conversational implicature is derived. (Giora 1999, and Searle 1985: 258).

Example 30: (online) When someone says, "what a lovely day for a picnic", on a stormy day, the addressee would reject the literal meaning and replace it with the intended ironic meaning.

In other words, through conversational implicature one can flout any conversational maxim which may at surface level be seen against context, while at the same time one is cooperative at a deeper level. This means that conversational implicature helps to maintain discourse coherence.

1.6.5.4.1 Generalized and Particularized Conversational Implicatures

Conversational implicatures are divided into two subdivisions; generalized conversational implicatures and particularized conversational implicatures. Grice distinguishes between those conversational implicatures that arise without requiring any particular contextual conditions and those that do require such conditions.

In his distinction between them, Grice said that generalized conversational implicatures arise when:

the use of a certain form of words in an utterance would normally (in the absence of special circumstances) carry such and such an implicature or type of implicature (Grice 1975: 563).

The generalized conversational implicatures arise irrespective of the context in which they happen to occur. They arise without any special scenario being necessary. This independency of context makes generalized implicatures easily confused with conventional implicatures, since they are constantly associated with particular linguistic forms. However, generalized conversational implicatures are not conventional since they depend on the assumption that the speaker respects the conversational rules. Several examples are analyzed below: (taken from Levinson, 1983: 133)

Example 31:

“5 years of experience,” implicates ‘not more than 5 years of experience’.

Example 32:

“Some of the boys went to the party.” implicates ‘Not all of the boys went to the party.’

Example 33:

"I walked into a house." implicates the house is not my house.

Example 34:

'John is meeting a woman this evening' implicates 'the woman is not his sister, mother, or wife'.

Example 35:

"Everybody went to the party."

This utterance logically means that there was nobody who did not go to the party or at least, by pragmatic inference, that most of the people went. This has nothing to do with context.

All of these examples illustrate how generalized implicatures are inferred irrespective of the context of the utterance. In contrast, the other subdivision of conversational implicatures, involves implicatures that arise because of some special factors inherent in the context of utterance and are not normally carried by the sentence used. Grice names these as "particularized implicatures". These require specific contexts, which are not derived from the utterance alone, but from the utterance in context. In other words, these depend not only on the content of the utterance and the Cooperative Principle, but also on the context of utterance.

Generalized implicatures are carried by "the use of a certain form of words", whereas particularized implicatures exploit "special features of the context" to enable the audience to identify what the speaker is conveying, (Grice, 1989: 17)

Particularized Conversational implicature may be seen as a specific utterance in a specific situation, which may have had completely different interpretation in a different context. It is worthy to note here that all implicatures that arise from observing the maxim of relevance are particularized, because an utterance is relevant only with respect to the particular topic or issue at hand. For example, the utterance "I've lost my purse" may implicate borrowing money or asking for help to find the purse. These are particularized implicatures since they depend on context.

1.7 Distinctive features of Conversational Implicatures

Grice provides the following six characteristics in his article “*logic and conversation*” (1975).

First, conversational implicatures of an utterance should be recoverable by a reasoning process. Essentially, in this reasoning process is the assumption, that the speaker fulfills the cooperative principle and the conversational Maxims:

to calculate a conversational implicature is to calculate what to be supposed in order to preserve the supposition that the cooperative principle is being observed (Grice, 1975: 309).

According to Grice, conversational implicature must be calculable or worked out, i.e. inferred in a specific way from the cooperative principle using particular facts about the meaning of the sentence uttered and the context of the utterance. Calculability means that an implicature can always be derived by reasoning under the assumption that the speaker is observing pragmatic principles. For every implicature, we can show how an addressee would make the inference in question to preserve the assumption of cooperation from the literal meaning of the utterance and from the cooperative principle.

Second, they can be either cancelable or defeasible. Cancelable implicatures can be eliminated or changed by modifying or adding to the utterance as in the following example:

Example 36:

A: Did you do the reading for this week's seminar?

B: I intended to "Implicature: No."

A is likely to infer the answer "no". However, B can cancel this implicature and continue to say, "I intended to do it and I managed to", which implies 'yes'.

Defeasible implicatures will disappear if they are contradicted by the context or by subsequent utterances.

Example 37:

A: Can I borrow five dollars?

B: My purse is in the hall. But don't you dare touch it. I'm not lending you any more money.

Here it is A's assumption that B's reply is intended to be relevant that allows the inference 'yes'. This implicature has three characteristics. First, that it is implied rather than said. Second, that its existence is a result of the context, the specific interaction. There is no guarantee that in other contexts 'my purse is in the hall' will mean "yes". The third characteristic is that such implicatures are cancelable, or defeasible, without causing a contradiction, i.e. it can be changed by modifying or adding to the utterance. Thus, the implicature "yes" can be cancelled by the addition of extra clauses. To say, for example, 'my purse is in the hall, but don't touch it.' This implies 'no'.

Thus, cancelability means that an implicature can be removed without creating a contradiction. This is to say that it is possible to deny a conversational implicature without contradiction. In this regard, "implicatures are more like inductive inferences than deductive ones,"(Levinson, 1983: 115) i.e. in order to understand implicature one should first know all the details of a sentence, then, reach to what is implicated by the sentence as a whole (inductive process) not vice versa. According to the cancelability principle, one can misunderstand the intended implicature if one takes a

sentence as a whole deductively without paying attention to the constituents that may change the implicature or even cancel it (deductive process.)

According to Sainsbury (199: 179), Grice claimed that what he called "cancelability" is a mark of implicature, and will help us differentiate what belongs to implicature and what belongs to strict and literal saying. In this sense, conversational implicature differs from entailment. Conversational implicature may be cancelled by negation. However, entailment remains unaffected by negation. This means that entailment cannot be cancelled but implicature can be.

Example 38: A: what do you think about Bill and Agatha?

B: well, I like Agatha. (Leech, 1983)

B's response can have the implicature that B does not like Bill, and this may indeed be the right conclusion to draw. But B has asserted no dislike for Bill, and so can always come back later to cancel the implicature and add that he likes Bill too. Here B flouts the maxim of quantity, for not saying as much information as necessary. He did not mention Bill at all. However, A can infer that B does not like Bill unless B negates "cancels" that implicature.

Third, conversational implicatures must be non-detachable. This means that they are properties of the meaning of utterances as a whole, and not simply attached to a single form of expression. This means that implicatures are primarily attached to the semantic content of what is said and not to the linguistic form. So, any linguistic expression with the same semantic content tends to carry the same conversational implicatures.

Fourth, conversational implicatures are non-conventional. "Non-conventional" means that conversational implicatures are not part of the conventional meaning of linguistic expressions. Conversational implicatures are not part of the meaning of the expression to which they are attached. They are not part of the conventional force of utterances but are figured out in context.

Fifth, conversational implicatures must not be truth condition of the sentences involved. In this regard, “an utterance can be true while its implicature is false, and vice versa,” (Levinson, 1983: 117). Conversational implicature is not carried by what is said, but by the saying of it.

Example 39:

A: John tried to win

B: John failed to win. (Gazdar, 1979: 40)

If A is false, it does not follow that B is false.

Sixth, conversational implicatures are indeterminate, so that in spite of their being calculable, their meaning does not have to be stable across instances of use or does not even have to be the same for different users. It must be possible to have two or more implicatures such that the choice of which is involved may prove indeterminate.

Sadock (1978:282-293) adds that conversational implicatures tend to be universal, and motivated rather than arbitrary. Also, conversational implicatures must be context sensitive. That is to say, it depends largely on the context to be correctly discovered.

The basic properties of conversational implicatures can be summarized as: They must be cancelable or defeasible, non-detachable, and calculable. They are not part of the meaning of the expression to which they are attached, nor are they truth condition. Finally, they are "not fully determinable".

1.8 Rationale of the study

One has to point out what contribution the present research adds to the study of conversational implicature. The contribution that the present research hopes to add to the study of Conversational Implicature is to address the gap not filled by any other study in the field. No any of the past studies discussed the use of implicatures in relation to age or sex. The present study attempts to do so.

What this study attempts also, is an investigation of the functions of conversational implicatures in Arabic. Conversational implicatures may help a participant show emotion, irony, teasing, hatred, happiness, bias... etc. The present study tries to discuss the use of implicatures in relation to age and sex. It tries also, to compare the use of implicatures in Egyptian Arabic to those in English by Cairene native speakers. The focus here is on the use of conversational implicatures in Arabic.

1.9 Conclusion

This chapter has introduced the aim of the present thesis, its significance, its limits, and rationale of the study. In addition, it has introduced conversational implicatures and shed light on how these types of inference play a crucial role in utterance interpretation and everyday communication. As illustrated above, it is significant to analyze conversational implicatures for they are indispensable for clarifying speakers' meanings and implications. This chapter has also, located Conversational Implicature within the area of discourse analysis. In addition, it has displayed the most relevant terms.

The next chapter reviews the major studies conducted on conversational implicature in different languages. It attempts to point out to the gaps in the literature that the present research aims to fill.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.1 Implicature as a Theory

This chapter reviews the major studies conducted on conversational implicature in different languages. It attempts to point out to the gaps in the literature that the present research aims to fill.

Implicature as a theory has received little attention. In addressing the validity of implicature to pragmatic linguistic theory, Ken Noro (1979) criticized three issues which are problematic. First, being normal speaker/hearer, cannot always distinguish between what is implicated and what is said. Second, it is difficult to prove the existence of the conversational implicature. Third, there is no theoretical standard for distinguishing the conventional implicature from the generalized conversational implicature.

Hugly and Sayward (1979) examined the first issue stated by Noro. They discussed the ability to grasp conversational implicatures. They said that with the conventional meaning of the words, the conversational maxims, the context of utterance, and background knowledge, speaker/hearer can identify implicatures. They found that conversational implicatures are mostly easy to grasp. However, it is more difficult to give a rational reconstruction of how they are grasped.

It is commonly believed that direct communication is more effective than the indirect one. Despite this, Georgia Green (1987) said that implicature is pervasive in discourse of all genres and styles. Green suggested that implicature may in fact be quicker and more effective than direct statement. She argued that implicature is effective because of the demands it places on the hearer. Green said that the hearer exerts effort in attaining the implicated meaning. Therefore, implicature is effective in this sense.

Francois Recanati (1989) discussed theories of the saying/implicating distinction with special attention to the Gricean framework. Recanati

explored the difference between the conventional meaning of words and what is implicated by uttering the words. Recanati argued that the conventional meaning of words is said to determine or help to determine what is said, but cannot be identified with what is said.

Wilson (1990) outlined a linguistic analysis of political language. The application of presupposition and conversational implicature is illustrated in a study of debates in the British House of Commons. The pragmatic force and function of questions and answers is also explored in a study of press conferences and interviews. It is shown by Wilson that political language often relies on the relationship between implicit and explicit, and between direct and indirect meaning.

Fraser (1990) handled the "conversational maxims" view. He assumed that maxims of conversational implicature operate in politeness, enabling speakers to communicate more than what is explicitly said. Fraser argued that the conversational maxims postulate a set of conversational rights and privileges guaranteed by an implicit contract between speakers.

Tsohatzidis (1993) provided a summary of Grice's proposed mechanism of implicature calculation, and his arguments to the effect that application of this mechanism constitutes a form of rational behavior. A type of conversational implicature is presented such that the supposition that hearers apply the Gricean mechanism in deriving it is inconsistent with the supposition that they are rational agents. It is concluded, here, that the Gricean program faces the dilemma of either abandoning the claim that the Gricean mechanism is in fact used for the calculation of implicatures or abandoning the claim that its use follows from general principles of human rationality.

2.2 Implicature as a Convention

Rob Stainton (1993) in his “Literal Meaning and Implicatures,” said that what speakers communicate is not part of the meaning of the sentence. Stainton gave the following example to give the view:

Example 1:

Is anyone seated here?

It might seem, as Stainton claims, that (1) has only a single meaning (whose answer is inevitably "no", because it is obvious that no one is currently occupying the seat). However, (1) can be used by speakers to ask a perfectly reasonable question, namely:

(2) Can I sit here?

The difficulty Stainton sees is that the standard use of (1) is to ask (2). Hence the claim that (2) is not part of the meaning of (1) is not immediately plausible. Stainton argues that there certainly seems to be some sort of convention governing the use of (1) to ask (2).

Stainton's contribution here is that conversational implicatures become conventional somehow. According to Stainton's view, some sort of convention governs the use of conversational implicatures. In other words, what speakers try to communicate is expressed in a form that involves different meaning. Nevertheless, that form indicates what is communicated, i.e. we can get the message communicated through the form, which involves different meaning. Then, there should be some sort of convention governing that process. Therefore, this indication is achieved by convention.

2.3 Implicature and Politeness

Leech (1983) argued that people, sometimes, uphold politeness principle over the cooperative principle. Leech said:

no claim has been made that the CP applies in an identical manner to all societies. Indeed, one of the main purposes of socio-pragmatics, as I envisage it, is to find out how different societies operate maxims in different ways, for example, by giving politeness a higher rating than cooperation in certain situations, or by giving precedence to one maxim of the CP rather than another. (Leech: 80)

Leech gave two examples where politeness rescues the cooperative principle.

1) A: we'll all miss Bill and Agatha, won't we?

B: well, we'll all miss Bill.

2) Parent: someone's eaten the icing off the cake.

Child: it wasn't ME.

In (1), B apparently fails to observe the maxim of quantity through confirming part of the question and ignoring the rest. From this, one can draw the implicature that B will not miss Agatha. B, as leech said, "could have been more informative, but only at the cost of being more impolite to a third part". Therefore, B suppressed the desired information in order to uphold the Politeness Principle.

In (2), there is irrelevance in the child's reply. The child responds as if he were being directly "accused of the crime". This is because the parent's utterance is interpreted as an indirect accusation. It is implicated rather than explicated. This indirectness is motivated by politeness.

Leech said that in such cases, in which one is faced with a clash between the Cooperative Principle and the Politeness Principle, one has to choose a principle against the other. However, in being ironic, as Leech said, one exploits the Politeness Principle in order to uphold the Cooperative

Principle. A person who is being ironic appears to be deceiving or misleading the hearer at the expense of politeness. However, he is cooperative through implicating.

Leech gave the following example to show avoidance of impolite accusation.

Example 3: A: I've lost a diamond ring.

B: well, Julie was wearing one this morning.

The maxim of quantity is superficially violated by B. Also, B's sentence is irrelevant unless he is suspicious of Julie. The violations of the maxims of quantity and relevance can be interpreted as a way to avoid impolite accusation. This avoidance is an example of exploiting politeness in being ironic.

2.4 Conversational implicature and context

Sungbom Lee (1994) noted that conversational implicatures depend on contextual features and defy formal treatment in logical semantics. He concluded that pragmatic inference is not a matter of logic but of information flow.

However, later in the present study it will be clear that some conversational implicatures are truly linguistic. Conversational implicatures may be altered or even opposed by addition in spite of the presence of the same context. For example the phrase: "my purse is on the table", (Peter Cole 1975: 258) may implicate readiness to lend some money in the situation of being asked to lend money. While in the same situation, the phrase: "my purse is on the table, but don't touch it" implicates a refusal to lend the money. Here, the addition of some utterances led to a different, in fact opposed conversational implicature however, in the same context.

Christopher Gauker (1999) in "the normative nature of conversational contexts", presents that the appropriateness of an utterance depends on the content of a set of sentences or propositions constituting the context of the conversation. Theorists have defined the context as a set of shared assumptions. Against this, Gauker argues that the context is better conceived as a set of propositions that are relevant to the goals of the conversation. The context is relative to a speaker and a time and consists of those propositions that the speaker takes to be assumptions that he shares with his interlocutors.

2.5 Conversational implicature and particles

Particles and modals such as "already, still, any more, yet, even, might, etc." are discussed in terms of whether or not they carry conversational implicatures. Some of these studies are presented below:

Anna Charezinska (1984) discussed the pragmatic concept of implicature relative to the Polish time adverbs (polarity items) and English equivalents: "already", "still", "any more", and "yet". Such words do not affect the truth-value of a sentence, but their meaning must still be described. It is concluded that these items do not carry conversational implicatures.

Robert Francescotti (1995) argued that the term "even" can be defined using conversational implicature, and an attempt is made to specify and isolate its semantic value. "Even" is held by the standard view to have no influence on the truth-value of a sentence. An alternate interpretation has been proposed by Francescotti, stating that "even" does have a truth-value. The standard view is upheld against this interpretation. Francescotti presented different statements and restatements of the two views as well as interpretations. It is concluded that "even" has no truth-value, and only plays a role as a universal quantifier in conversational implicature.

Hollander (2000) purported to answer several questions through the analysis of logical structure of "might". Why does not "might" pattern with

the other modals of possibility under negation? Hollander indicated that "might" expresses uncertainty, not just a kind of possibility. Nor does it appear to differ merely in conversational implicature. Implicatures are predictably cancelable. Such cancellation does not occur with "might". It is concluded by Hollander that the distinction between "might" and the other modals of possibility must therefore be reflected in its semantics, and in its logical structure.

2.6 Conversational implicature related to passive voice

Alice Davison (1980) argued that passive sentences often have different meanings and communicative intent from the corresponding active sentences. Implicatures are more likely to be associated with passive sentences if the construction is "marked," as measured by the restrictions placed on which noun phrases may be promoted to subject position. Davison concluded that conversationally conveyed meanings are based on what appears as topic in subject position.

2.7 Conversational implicature and code switching

Carol Myers Scotton (1982) handled the topic of code switching and its relation to conversational implicature. She said that code switching is a major source of conversational implicatures. It is argued by Scotton that a major reason for maintaining more than one dialect or language in the same speech community is that switching between such codes is a major source of conversational implicatures. Scotton's contribution is that conversational implicatures also arise when addressees calculate the significance of code selection.

2.8 Speaker's intended meaning versus hearer's interpreted implicature

Hiroaki Tanaka (1997) held an investigation into whether the speaker's process of deriving conversational implicature from the phrase "in other

words" and the listener's process of interpreting the speaker's intent are the same. An analysis of the inferential function of "in other words" and the listener's understanding of the speaker's implicature demonstrates pragmatic significance when the listener's interpretation and speaker's intent do not coincide. Tanaka concluded that in spite of the potential for listeners to misconstrue the speaker's intent, conversation retains coherence since both participants share the same cognitive environment.

Christopher Gauker (2001) argues that a speaker conversationally implicates that *p* only if the speaker expects the hearer to recognize that the speaker thinks that *p*. In his paper, Gauker argues that in the sorts of cases that Grice took as paradigmatic examples of conversational implicature there is in fact no need for the hearer to consider what the speaker might have in mind. Instead, the hearer might simply make an inference from what the speaker literally says and the situation in which the utterance takes place.

2.9 Cross Cultural Studies on Conversational Implicature

There are many studies which contrasted the notion of conversational implicature in different cultures. Some of them revealed that Conversational Implicature is a universal language phenomenon. Others argued that it is a language specific. Some of these studies are reviewed below:

Richards (1980) recorded that non-fluent nonnative speakers tended to pay too much attention to the surface meaning of utterances. He further speculated that this affects the language directed toward nonnative speakers (foreigner talk) in that native speakers of a language use more explicit markers of illocutionary force in speaking to nonnative speakers than in speaking to other native speakers.

Lawrence Bouton (1989) studied the comprehension of conversational implicature in English by nonnative speakers (NNSs). He discussed

implicature and its importance and viability in cross-cultural communication. Respondents are often found by Bouton to give ambiguous answers to open-ended questions regarding the intended content of a sample passage involving implicature. Questions are raised about the ability of the multiple-choice format alone to answer questions about implicature. The response of nonnative speakers is used to detail the use of various types of implicature and their comprehension. Bouton concluded that the inclusion of post-questionnaire interviews clarified whether respondents actually grasped the correct implicature when they chose a correct response on the questionnaire.

Salma Omara (1993) investigates the way in which native speakers of Arabic and (American) English interpret and comprehend implicatures. The purpose of Omara's study was to focus on how her subjects interpret and comprehend conversational indirectness in English. Omara's study investigates the variables, which influence their interpretations (proficiency in English, exposure to American culture etc.) It is worthy here to indicate that Omara's study did not handle implicatures in Arabic. However, the present study tries to handle how implicatures are used in Arabic and in English as spoken by Cairenes. In addition, the present study tries to show if age and sex have any significant influence on using implicatures or not. This is not done by Omara.

Omara hypothesized that the nonnative speakers' ability to interpret conversational implicature (that is, their pragmatic competence) in English may be influenced by four variables: 1) Overall proficiency level in English; 2) length of exposure to American culture; 3) level of motivation to learn English and attitude toward Americans and Americans culture, and 4) Strategic interference due to the differences in pragmatic functions between the native language and English.

Omara conducted a comparison between two groups of speakers of English (American) and nonnative speakers of English (Arabic). Statistical analyses of the result revealed significant differences between the two groups in their comprehension and interpretation of implicatures. Length of stay was found to be a significant predictor of nonnative speakers' comprehension of implicatures. The frequency of the expected answers obtained by the native speakers was significantly higher than that of the nonnative speakers. According to Omara, this means that the implicature test was much more difficult for the NNSs than for the NSs. Omara's implication of such findings is that the cultural aspects of indirect communication in American English are acquired through exposure to American society; the longer NNSs are exposed to American culture, the better they understand the pragmatic functions of conversation in English.

Omara also found that the NNSs who have a great deal of English grammar and vocabulary still lack the pragmatic/ sociolinguistic competence that enable them to interpret implicatures the way NSs do.

Omara concluded that it is important to teach L2 learners the pragmatic norms of English including conversational rules and conversational strategies.

Lawrence Bouton (1994) has shown that members of different cultures derive different implicatures from essentially the same utterance in the same context. The question of whether nonnative speakers (NNSs) can learn to use implicature with little or no direct instruction is examined in a study of interaction involving students studying in the United States. Students were tested on their ability to interpret implicatures when they first arrived in the United States and again four years later. The 17-month group had not mastered any of the types of implicature that gave them difficulty when they first arrived, whereas the group with 4.5 years residency generally had

mastered most types of implicature. It is concluded that given a long enough period of interaction with native speakers, NNSs can learn to use and understand implicature without formal instruction.

Muikku-Werner (1995) investigated the use of conversational implicature to infer meanings that are not explicitly expressed, in formal and informal learners of Finnish as a second language. Speakers were asked to interpret seven short conversational passages exemplifying indirect input and violations of Gricean maxims. The results suggested a positive transfer influence of the native language on foreign language learning and a need to teach inference skills.

Kasper (1984) found that nonnative speakers tended to rely too heavily on bottom-up processing in their second language, often taking utterances too literally. It is worthy here to say that Kasper's view supports the point that conversational implicature is an inductive (not deductive) process. Levinson (1983:114) also, supports this point. He says that conversational implicatures are inductive, as inductive arguments are defeasible. Therefore, conversational implicature is inductive rather than deductive.

Zhi Tan (1998) argued that conversational implicature is a communication strategy used to express meaning indirectly. Tan's paper reports the findings of a test on the interpretation of conversational implicature by Chinese learners of English. He found that inability to recognize or interpret conversational implicature might be a barrier in cross-cultural communication.

The present study is different. It tries to investigate the use of different types of conversational implicatures by nonnative speakers of English (Cairene Arabic). It tries to see and explore if there are any differences or/and similarities in using implicatures in Arabic and in English as spoken by them.

2.10 Conclusion

This chapter tried to review the relevant literature pointing to the gaps that previous research left out. The next chapter gives an account of the method of research and Chapterization.

Chapter Three

Method of Research

3.1 Introduction

This chapter gives an account of the research questions, procedures, instruments, and subjects of the study.

3.2 Research questions

The present study tries to find answers to the following questions: 1)Does implicature exist in Arabic? 2)What is the influence of age and sex on using implicatures by the Cairenes? 3)What is the effect of English proficiency, if any, on using implicatures? 4)Are the Cairenes' Arabic implicatures similar to their English ones?

3.3 Procedures

First, data that involve English conversational implicatures were collected from situations and examples given in the literature on Conversational Implicature. Some of these data are taken from naturally occurring conversations.

Second, conversational implicatures were identified from those data and analyzed to show how they are applied. Third, the data were translated into Arabic with some amendments and given in the form of a questionnaire in Arabic to a sample of native Cairene speakers, and in English to another sample of native Cairene speakers who speak English. This is to see whether or not their responses will include implicatures. And if so, the study will try to see if these implicatures are of the same kind of responses published in the literature. It is also, to see if their English language background has an influence on their responses, concerning the implicature, or not.

Fourth, the responses of those speakers were analyzed to identify their implicatures. Each situation in the questionnaire has the first answer

indicating "observance", and the other distracters indicating "implicature". Therefore, if a subject chose one of the distracters, he would flout at least one of the maxims. It was prepared by the researcher in that way to facilitate the process of identifying data. Data were taken out of the questionnaires. They were identified and analyzed. Then, they were classified into two groups. One of them is the data in English, and the other is that in Arabic. The results were analyzed and compared in the responses of the two groups.

The results were counted. Each participant had a questionnaire of 12 situations. So, he would have 12 answers. These answers were collected and grouped according to age, sex and years of English exposure of the participants. The answers were put into tables. Some of the tables are classified according to whether or not the answers include "observance" or "implicatures". Other tables are presented according to the maxims (who flouted what.) Other tables are prepared according to age and sex. The other tables are sectioned according to the period of the subjects' exposure to English. Of course, the data were transferred into numbers and percentages inside these tables. Frequency of the numbers enabled the researcher to count easily.

Fifth, a comparison between implicatures in English and in Arabic was attempted. Throughout the thesis, the researcher tried to analyze why there are some differences in using implicatures in the Arabic and the English of all the participants.

3.4 Instruments

An implicature questionnaire, in the form of a multiple-choice test, was used here. It is included in the appendices. The questionnaire was written in English and translated into Arabic. The Subjects who did not speak English were asked to respond to the Arabic questionnaire. This was intended to test

the Arabic uses of implicature. The Subjects who spoke English were asked to respond to the English questionnaire. The English copy was intended to test the nonnative subjects'¹ use of implicatures in English. Neither of the two questionnaires was timed. It was made clear to the participants that no answer is false. However, they were requested to respond with the most likely answer. Three variables were tested in the questionnaire; Age (under 20- between 20 and 40- over 40 years old), sex (males- females), and years of exposure to English (under 10 years- between 10 and 20- over 20 years).

The questionnaire consisted of twelve short dialogues, with the message in each conveyed through an implicature. A question and four answer choices followed each dialogue. Each question has an answer indicating "observance", and the other distracters indicating "implicature". Always, the first answer does not flout any maxim, i.e. observes all maxims. The other answers are intended to flout any of the maxims and subsequently, raise implicature. Only one of these answers (choice No. two) was the "expected" answer (i.e. the response that includes English implicature as published in the literature). The third answer was intended to be a distracter. Most of these distracters were chosen from among the responses which Cairene speakers provided while responding to the questionnaire in an open-ended format during a series of pilot studies. Some examples elicited from these pilot studies are:

1. /huwwa ?ana hanaam delwa?tti lessa baadri/, "I won't sleep now" in response to /?inta °amalt elwwagib beta°ak we rattebt kutubak/ "Did you do your homework and put away your books?"

¹ Non native subjects here mean Cairene Arabic speakers, as they are nonnative English speakers.

2. /huwwa ?ana faaker ?akalt ?eih ?annaharda/, "I don't remember what I have eaten today", in response to /?emta ^{ci}id milaad ^cammiti nura/, "when is Aunt Nora's birthday?"

3. /huwwa da wa?t ?ele^cb jaa ^camr/, "is this time for playing, Amr?" in response to /?eih ra:ʔjjik ja ma:ma: til^cabi ma^caayaa ʃuwwajja/, "Hey Mamma, let's play something."

4. /mumken taaxud menni ʃuwwajja lehad ma tlaaʔii maħaṭṭa/, "I can give you some till you find a gas station" in response to /xalaṣt banziin/, "I'm out of gas."

5. /miʃ haakul/, "well, I won't eat" in response to /^cabdu huwwa ?elli hajgahhiz ?el^caʃa ?annaharda/, "Abdu is cooking dinner tonight."

6. /ja^cni/, "yeah!" in response to /?eih ra:ʔjjek felmaṭ^cam dah/, "what do you think of this new restaurant?"

In addition to the three choices stated previously, a blank space in each dialogue was left for the participants to fill in if the choices mentioned did not appeal to them. However, hardly any of these was filled in by the subjects. Most of the subjects answered 1, 2, or 3 (where 4 is the blank space.)

It is worth noting that the implicatures elicited were classified according to Grice's types (resulting from flouting the maxim of Quantity, Relevance, Quality, or Manner). Some other implicatures were seen to arise as the result of flouting more than one maxim at the same time.

The reason why the implicature questionnaire was designed in a multiple-choice instead of an open-ended question format is that the former has been found to be a more effective means for testing the use of implicatures. Lawrence Bouton (1989) found that respondents are often found

to give ambiguous answers to open-ended questions regarding the implicature.

Post-questionnaire is not included as the present study examines the ability to use implicatures in Arabic, not the ability to comprehend and interpret them. The situations in the present study are explained and the context is clearly given to the participants. Therefore, there is no need to use any post-questionnaires to test whether or not respondents actually grasp the correct implicature when they choose a correct response on the multiple-choice questionnaire. This is because the respondents in our questionnaire know the situations and the context, and if their responses are the expected implicatures, this will prove their ability to use the same English or Arabic implicatures in the same context.

3.5 Subjects

All subjects are speakers of Cairene colloquial Arabic of different age. Difference in age may reveal difference in the use of implicature. Many of these subjects are my colleagues at work and their relatives. Others are my study colleagues in Cairo. Others are my students during my work in Cairo. Questionnaires were spread to one hundred and twenty one participants. Twenty six of these participants did not comprehend many of the questions of the questionnaire. These did not fulfill the requirements of the questionnaire. For instance, a man when asked about the health of his mother and if she was back or not, though he was told that she was back, he replied: she was died. Another participant when asked to play with her son, she replied: "ok." However, she was told that she had to remind her son that he might not be free to play at that time. Such participant and the like were excluded.

The participants, who satisfied the requirements of the study questionnaire, were ninety five. Forty of them speak English (20 males and

20 females). They differ in their English proficiency (measured by years of English exposure). This was taken into consideration from the beginning. Years of English exposure were included in the head of the questionnaire. These participants were told to answer the questionnaire in English. The other participants (55, "30 males and 25 females") do not speak English. These answered the questionnaire in Arabic. Table no. 1 and table no. 2 show the numbers of the participants in detail according to their age, sex, and years of exposure to English.

males under 20 years old	females under 20 years old	males from 20 to 40 years old	females from 20 to 40 years old	males more than 40 years	females more than 40 years	Total of all participants who do not speak English
10	10	10	10	10	5	55

Table 1 shows the participants who do not speak English (first group)

males with English exposure less than 10 years	females with English exposure less than 10 years	males with English exposure between 10 and 20 years	females with English exposure between 10 and 20 years	males with English exposure more than 20 years	females with English exposure more than 20 years	total of all participants who speak English
5	5	10	10	5	5	40

Table 2 shows the participants who speak English (second group)

There were some problems that faced the researcher. One of them was the long time required to implement pilot studies, final form of questionnaire, and required to extract data out of the material, Also, the time required to explain the questionnaire to each one of the participants (sometimes it was a participant at a time). Another problem was to make many of the participants recognize the questionnaire and apprehend its importance in the field. Most of the participants were not familiar with questionnaires. They did not know

much about questionnaires. Therefore, they would reply carelessly if the importance of the questionnaire to the study was not explained to them. These were told about the importance of questionnaires. Also, they were told that neither of the answers is false (no right or wrong replies). However, the participant was instructed to choose the most likely answer.

A third problem was that I could not find English native speakers. Only three English natives were available. Therefore, most of the examples on English implicatures were taken as published in the English literature.

A fourth problem was the difference in the number of each group of participants. This difference gives an incorrect basis of calculations during the comparison of the results. The problem is that some groups consisted of 10 participants and other groups consisted of 5 participants. Statistically, the results of the 10-participant groups represent double the results of the 5-participant groups. Therefore, the results of the 5-participant groups are doubled later during data analysis. This principle was adopted to extract percentages of implicature uses.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter presented the research questions, method of research, and the research procedures. The next chapter attempts an analysis of the data collected. It, also, reports the results and the data in tabular form.

Chapter Four

Data Analysis

4.1 Introduction

This chapter reports the results of the study. First, it exhibits and reviews the situations in Arabic and in English one by one. Then, it tries to set the differences and similarities between Arabic and English Conversational implicatures of the subjects.

The study shows that Arabic includes implicature as many languages do. However, as revealed later, its manifestation is different. There are implicatures in 62% of the total Arabic responses.

In general, there is a negative relation between age and use of implicature in Arabic. In other words, the subjects become more observant of the maxims of conversation as they get older. Statistics reveal that younger participants use implicatures much more than older participants do. Keen observation, also, reveals that males generally use implicatures more than females at all ages.

On the other hand, the use of implicatures in the English responses of the subjects is less than that in the Arabic responses. The total percentage of the use of implicature in the English responses of the subjects is 59%.

It is obvious from the previous introduction that the study of implicature is important. The higher percentage of implicature in the responses of the participants in general proves this. Also, it is clear that Cairenes use implicatures in their speech more than observance either in Arabic or in English ("62% vs. 38%", "59% vs. 41%" respectively.) The next section gives details about the participants' responses and their uses of implicatures in Arabic and in English. It handles the situations one by one first in Arabic and then in English.

4.2 Analysis of the situations in Arabic

55 subjects responded to the questionnaire in Arabic. Each one of them answered 12 questions. The results are as follows:

1. A asks about the health of B's mother. She is back but she is not well yet.

A: Is your mother back and well? (Gazdar, 1979)

B: Well, she is back, yes. (Implicature: she is not well. Flouting the maxim of quantity, giving insufficient information)

Transcription:

A: /hejja waldetak kuwajjesa delwa?tti wi reg^cet bessalama wala la?/

B: /?a:h hejja reg^cet ?ajwa/

63% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 18% of them used implicature as B, where B's reply is the answer of the native speakers of English as published in the literature and it is always choice no. 2 in the questionnaire. These participants flouted the maxim of quantity by giving insufficient answer as they did not say if the mother is well or not. Nevertheless, any listener will infer that the mother is not well yet. Those subjects may try to avoid saying something bad about the mother's health. Instead, they try to implicate what they mean.

Those, who observed the maxims of conversation, responded: "she is back, but she is not well yet." /walla:hi hejja reg^cet laaken lessa ta^cbaana/. It may be due to the situation itself; it is a question about the health of the addressee's mother and it is preferred to speak explicitly without implicating.

Other subjects (19%) avoided speaking explicitly and said answers such as /ʔalḥamdu lellaah/, "thank God" or /ʔa:h kuwwajjessa/, "she is well." These flouted the maxims of quantity and quality respectively.

2. A mother asks her son about his homework which was not done yet.

Mother: "Did you do your homework and put away your books?"
(Kitao, 1990)

Son: I put away my books. (Implicature: I did not do the homework. Flouting the maxim of quantity.)

Transcription:

Mother: /ʔinta ʕamalt ʔelwaagib betaaʕak we rattebt kutubak/

Son: /ʔana rattebt ʔelkutub/

25% of the participants used implicature as the one used by the son. 33% did not use any implicature. These subjects, who did not implicate, said /laʔ ma ʕamaltif ʔelwaagib/, "I didn't do any homework yet."

Those who behaved as the son (or as the native speakers of English), implicated the same meaning which is "they have not done any homework yet". However, they did not say that explicitly as it is a situation where they would show laziness by not doing the homework. They gave insufficient information which was a speech strategy to cover not doing the homework. It was interesting, here, that females over 40 years old were the most subjects who responded in that way. It seems that they imagined their kids being in the same situation.

Some other subjects (42%) responded /huwwa ʔana hanaam delwaʔttillessa badri/, "I won't sleep now". This flouts the maxim of relevance and

implicates that they did not do the homework yet. It is a strategy to avoid answering explicitly too. Other subjects gave answers such as /bukra ?agaaza/, "tomorrow is a vacation", /Kamaan juwajja/, "I'll do it later", /?ana ta^cbaan we ^caajez ?anaam/, "I am tired and want to sleep", /baṭni wag^caani/, "my stomach aches", and /la? ?ana ?aşli ga^caan huṭili ?aakul/, "no, I am hungry". All these responses may show excuses and reasons which implicate that the homework is not done yet. These responses flout the maxim of quantity by being less informative.

Other answers may show boredom of doing homework such as: /huwa kul joom ?elwwagib/, "every day there is homework?" Other answers may show some sort of relation between the presence of father and doing homework. These were /huwwa baba geh/, "did my father come back? That may show that in the presence of the father the kid will do his homework.

Also, it is found that some subjects flouted the maxim of quality by not saying the truth. They said /?a:h ^camaltu kulu ?okkeih/, "yes, I did it and it's ok". However, they were told early in the situation that the homework was not done yet. These subjects may tend to do so in order to avoid doing homework or to cover not doing it.

3. A asks B about his feeling toward his colleagues Tamer and Shaimaa. B does not like Shaimaa.

A: We'll all miss Tamer and Shaimaa, won't we? (Leech, 1983 "We'll all miss Bill and Agatha", with amendments)

B: Well, we'll all miss Tamer. (Implicature: I will not miss Shaimaa. Flouting the maxim of quantity.)

Transcription:

A: /hajj^ciz ^caleina furaa? taamer we [ajmaa? me] keda barḍuh/

B: /?a:h hajj^ciz ^caleina furaa? taamer walla:hi/

47% of the participants used implicature as B. 17% did not use implicature at all. This situation is one of the situations where the participants mostly use implicature as published in the literature. The cause of this is, perhaps, politeness. The participants try to be polite rather than to observe the maxims here. Here, most of the subjects tend to be less informative. They consider that being more informative means being more impolite towards Shaimaa. Therefore, they prefer to give precedence to politeness rather than to the maxim of quantity. Few subjects (17%) observed the maxims without any implications. These subjects said /taamer jemken bas [ajmaa? ma^ctaqed]/, "Tamer is ok, but I guess I won't miss Shaimaa". These mentioned Tamer and Shaimaa in their responses. However, those subjects who implicated the same meaning as published in the English literature (B's answer), did not mention Shaimaa at all. They flouted the maxim of quantity by giving inadequate information. They did not mention Shaimaa because they do not like her. Therefore, they preferred not to say a word about their feeling towards her. It is a polite way to express dislike. They preferred politeness over cooperation here. This raised the implicature that they would not miss Shaimaa.

Other subjects (20%) responded with formulaic expressions such as /rabbina jewwaffa?hum we jrragga^clena tamer bissalama/, "God saves them, and makes Tamer come back safely". Others responded /jemken/, "may be".

Some other subjects (15%) said /hajj^ciz ^caleina furaa? [ajmaa? ?aktar/, "we'll miss Shaimaa much more." This utterance flouts the maxim of quality, as it is not the truth according to the above description of the situation as it is

put in the questionnaire (see appendix 3). However, it is perhaps a way to implicate the opposite i.e. the addressee does not like Shaimaa.

One of the subjects said /ʔa:h ʃajmaaʔ ʔa:h/, "yes, Shaimaa, yes.", which may implicate dislike towards Shaimaa through flouting the maxims of quality (truth) and quantity (not sufficient information).

4. A asks B about his aunt Nora's birthday. B does not know the exact date of her birth.

A: When is Aunt Nora's birthday? (Leech, 1983, "When is Aunt Rose's birthday?" with amendment)

B: It's sometime in April. (Implicature: I do not know the exact day. Flouting the maxim of quantity)

Transcription:

A: /ʔemta ʕiid milaad ʕammiti nura/

B: /huwwa fe ʔabriil baajen/

5% of the participants used implicature as in B. 57% did not use implicatures. Again, most of the answers observed the maxims, without raising implicature. These were /maʕrafʃ wallahi bezzabtʃ ʔemta/, "I don't know exactly when". Few of the answers flouted the quantity maxim and raised the implicature that the addressee does not know the date exactly. These selected B's answer. Through this response, the subjects flouted the maxim of quantity (by not giving adequate information), instead of quality (not to give something which does not have evidence for). This is what is called maxims clash.

28% of the subjects flouted the maxim of relevance. These selected choice no. 3 in the questionnaire which was /huwwa ?ana faker ?akalt ?eh ?annaharda/, "I don't remember what I have eaten today". This answer is not explicitly related to the question. It is a way of exaggeration in terms of forgetting things rapidly. Still this answer bears the implicature that the hearer does not know the exact birthday of Aunt Nora. This way to implicate is different from the way used by English native speakers in the same situation.

10% of the participants answered /has?al baba/, "I will ask my father". /has?al ʿammeti/, "I will ask my aunt", /ta?riiban joom ?essabt/, "may be on Saturday". All of these answers implicate the same meaning that the addressee does not know the exact date and at the same time tries to be cooperative.

5. A student is asking a question, and he is absurdly incorrect.

Student: Tarablus is in Saudi Arabia, isn't it teacher? (Levinson, 1983, "Tehran's in Turkey, isn't it teacher?", with amendments)

Teacher: And Mecca is in Libya I suppose. (Implicature: no. flouting the maxim of quality)

Transcription:

Student: /hejja ʧarablus fi ?ssuʕudejja meʃ keda ja ?ustaaz/

Teacher: /we makka fe lebja meʃ keda barðu/

15% of the participants used implicature as the one used by the teacher. 38% did not use any implicature. The participants, who behaved as the teacher, flouted the maxim of quality by not telling truth. They said /wi makka fe lebja miʃ keda barðu/, "and Mecca is in Libya, I suppose".

However, they were cooperative. They did so through implicature and sarcasm. These subjects preferred to give a mocking answer. They behaved as native speakers of English. They flouted the maxim of quality because it is clear that Mecca is not in Libya. However, they implicated that the question is not correct at all.

Those who answered explicitly as /ṭabʿan la?/, "of course, not", did not flout any maxim. However, the listener feels that there is something missing in it. It is a situation in a classroom between a student and his teacher. Therefore, the teacher is supposed to correct the wrong information of the student. In order to correct it, he must flout at least one of the maxims. Here, most of the subjects (34%) flouted the maxim of quantity by giving more information than required in the question. They answered: /suʿudejjet ʔeeh ṭarabluṣ di mādiina fe lebja de lʿa:ʃima Kamaan ʔamma ʔassuʿudejja fa di ʿa:ʃimetha ʔismaha ʔarrija:d ʿereft kedah ʔin ṭarabluṣ fe ʔessuʿudejja wa lla la?/, "Tarabluṣ is the capital of Libya. But the capital of Saudi Arabia is Arriyad. Did you get it?" This answer flouts the maxim of quantity by giving much more information than is required and raises the implicature that "Tarabluṣ is not in Saudi Arabia". Many of the subjects chose this answer as the situation itself required from the teacher to explain the matter for the student even if he did not observe the maxim of quantity.

13% of the subjects answered: /la? fe lebja/, "no, it is in Libya." , /ʔoʿud saaket we balaaʃ kalaam/, "sit down, and stop speaking", /ʔegles jaaʃabi/, "sit down, stupid", /ʔinta ʿabiit/, "are you a foul?", /ʔinta hatersem ʔelxariitʃa ʿala keifak/, "will you draw the map as you want?", /ʔsʔal ʔessuʔaal ʃaḥ/, "ask the question correctly." All these implicated that the question was incorrect and the answer was no.

6. It is clear that the music is horrendous.

A: What is your opinion about the melody? (online)

B: What a lovely melody! (Implicature: it is a bad melody. Flouting the maxim of quality)

Transcription:

A: /ʔeh raʔjjak fel musiiqa di/

B: /jaa salaam fi ʔagmal men kedah di musiiqa ra:ʔe^cah/

17% of the participants used implicature as in B. 47% did not use implicatures at all. The subjects who used implicatures as B, flouted the maxim of quality and described the melody as it was lovely. Although, it was clear from the situation that the music is horrendous, these subjects preferred to say that it was a lovely one, from which they could implicate the opposite.

The subjects who did not use implicature, responded: /di wehʃa gidan/, "it is very bad". Some of them said: /zaj ezeft/, "it is too bad". Some others politely said: /miʃ ʔadi kedahʔ/, "it is not so good". All of these did so without implicating; they observed the maxims.

36% of the subjects used implicatures through flouting the maxims of quantity and relevance. They said /law hatefdal ʃaʕaalah ʔana haxrug men henea/, "if it's running again, I'll get out", /ʔitfi el kasset/, "turn off the cassette", /fih ahsan men kedah/, "there is better than this", /ja reit titʕaijar/, "it is better to change it", /hijja helwa bas jemken widni hijja eli wehʃa/, "it is good, perhaps my ear which is not good", /hijja di musiiqa/, "is this a melody?", /nahnu fi zaman ʔelfan ʔerradii? ", "we live in a bad century of music", and /ʔelmusalal dah ʔesmuh ʔeh/, "what is the name of this series?".

7. A mother wants to remind her son Amr that he may not yet be free to play.

Son: Hey Mamma, let's play some thing. (Levinson, 1983, " Hey Mamma, let's play marbles" with amendments)

Mother: How is your homework getting along Amr? (Implicature: I think you haven't time to play Amr. Flouting the maxim of Relevance)

Transcription:

Son: /?eih ra?jik ja mama til^cabi ma^caja [wajja/

Mother: /we ?eih ?axba:r ?elwageb beta^cak ja ^camr/

17% of the participants used implicature as used by the mother. 20% did not use any implicature. The participants who replied with implicature as used by the mother, flouted the maxim of relevance. They raised the implicature that in case of not doing the homework, Amr could not play. However, the participants who observed the maxims and produced no implicature, responded: /?inta meʃ fa:di lelle^cb delwa?tti ja ^camr/, "I think you don't have time to play Amr".

63% of the subjects also, implicated the same meaning (I think you haven't time to play Amr) however through flouting other maxims. They said /huwwa da wa?t ?ele^cb ja ^camr/, "is this time for playing, Amr?", /?amma txallas ?elli wara:k ?el?awwal/, "after you have finished what you have to do first", /təjjib we ?eh ra?jjak ne^cmel ?ilwwageb/, "well, let's do your homework", /zaaker ja ħabiibi bukra nel^cab ma^ca ba^cd/, "study my darling, we'll play tomorrow together", and /^camalt elwwageb ?el?awwel/, "did you do your homework first?".

8. A person asks where he can get some gas, because his car is out of gas.

A: I'm out of gas. (Grice, 1975)

B: There is a gas station around the corner. (Implicature: the station may be open and has gas to sell. Flouting the maxim of quantity)

Transcription:

A: /xalast banziin/

B: /?a:h huwwa fiih maḥaṭṭa ba^cd ?innaṣja ʿalaṭuul/

32% of the participants used implicature as B. 27% did not use any. The participants who implicated the meaning as B, supposed that the station was open and there was gas in it to sell. They flouted the maxim of quantity.

However, the participants who did not raise implicature, said: /jemken telaa?i fel maḥaṭṭa ?elli ba^cd ?nnaṣja ʿalaṭuul/, "you may find gas in the gas station just around the corner".

Other participants (10%) said: /mumken taaxud menni juwajja lehadd ma tlaa?i maḥaṭṭa/, "I can give you some till you find a gas station". These gave an extra piece of information as they tried to show generosity and help. Other answers (9%) were like this such as: /mumken ?asa^{ac}dak/, "how can I help you?". Other participants (20%) give insufficient information as: /?uddam juwwajja/, "go straight", /?mfi juwwajja we ?es?al/, "go straight and ask", /fiih maḥaṭṭa hena ?urajjba/, "there is a station near here". Others said: /wallahi muj ʿarfa/, "I don't know". Some others (2%) did not cooperate and said: /wana maali/, "it is not my business".

9. Abdu is not a good cook.

A: Abdu is cooking dinner to night. (Williams, 1991, " John is cooking dinner to night", with amendments)

B: I'd better get out of the house. (Implicature: Abdu is not a good cook. Flouting the maxim of relevance)

Transcription:

A: /^cabdu huwa ?elli hajgahhez ?el^caʃa ?nnaharda/

B: /jeb?a ?aḥsan ?atʃada barrah/

43% of the participants used implicatures as B. 22% did not use any implicature. This situation is one of the situations where the participants mostly used implicature as B. These participants implicated something bad about Abdu as a cook through flouting the maxim of relevance.

Those participants, who observed the maxims (22%), said: /jaah da ?akluh miʃ kuwwajjes/, "oh, he isn't a good cook". They did not use implicature. Other participants (10%) said: /miʃ haakul/, "well, I won't eat". These flouted the maxim of quantity by not giving enough answer. They, also, implicated that Abdu is not a good cook. Other answers (25%) were: /?aakul ?aj ḥaaga/, "I will eat anything", /?ana muʃ ga^can/, "well, I am not hungry", /jaa nha:r ?eswed/, "what a black day!", /?ana ?elli hagahhez ?elʃada be?iidi/, "I will cook myself", /ja salaam law netʃada ^ceiʃ we gebna/, "let's eat bread and cheese at dinner". All these may implicate the same meaning.

10. A parent asks his child if he has eaten the icing off the cake.

Parent: Someone's eaten the icing off the cake. (Leech, 1983)

Child: It wasn't ME. (Implicature: it was not me the one you think that he has eaten the icing off the cake. Flouting the maxim of relevance)

Transcription:

Parent: /fi ĥad ʔakal ʔelkereima men ʕala elkeika/

Child: /miʃ ʔana/

43% of the participants used implicatures as the child. 18% did not use implicatures. This situation is one of the situations where the participants mostly used implicature. Those, who answered as no. 2 in the questionnaire, flouted the maxim of relevance. They said: /miʃ ʔana/, "it wasn't me". They interpreted the parent's utterance as an indirect accusation (Leech, 1983, p81). They, as Leech said, responded to the parent's implicature which is motivated by politeness, rather than to what is actually said. They raised a supposition which is "the father doubts that the son has eaten the icing off the cake." They tried to implicate that this supposition is not true. The answer flouts the maxim of relevance. For, to be relevant means denying the offence of being guilty. Therefore, those, who answered as no. 2 in the questionnaire, are motivated by politeness.

Some of the participants (20%) implicated the same meaning through flouting the maxim of relevance. They said: /ʔana lessa gaj men elmaddrasa/, "I have just come back from school". It was clear that in case of "just coming from school", the son was not the one who had eaten the icing off the cake. Other subjects (19%) gave answers like: /ʔajwa ʔana/, "yes, it was me", /la wallahi miʃ xadt ĥaaga/, "no, I swear, I did eat nothing", /ʔa:h ʔelkereima la? maaʃuftahaaʃ/, "the icing, no, I didn't see it", /del ʔuʦʦa/, "it was the cat", /ʔsʔal mama/, "ask mamma", /ĥad zaj miin jaʕni/, "what do you mean dad?".

11. When asked what she thinks of a new restaurant, a woman didn't like it and replied:

Friend: What do you think of this new restaurant? (Harnish, 1976)

The woman: They have handsome carpets. (Implicature: it is not good. Flouting the maxim of Relevance)

Transcription:

Friend: /ʔeh raʔjjek felmaɕam dah/

The woman: /ʔesseggad ʕanduhum kuwwajes/

3% of the participants used implicatures as the woman. 45% did not use implicatures. The participants, who did as the woman, flouted the maxim of relevance and raised the implicature that the restaurant is not good, except for its carpets.

However, many of the participants observed the maxims and said: /da maɕam weheʃ/, "it isn't so good". 35% of the participants said: /jaɕni/, "yeah!", which flouts the maxim of manner as it is ambiguous. However, it implicates that the addressee did not like that restaurant. The rest of the participants put answers like: /fiih ʔaaḥsan menuh/, "there are better than that", /miʃ baɕṭa:l/, "it is not so bad", /kul fel beit ʔaaḥsan/, "it is better to eat at home". Two of the subjects said: /daa kuwajjs gidan/, "it is very good". They knew that it is not good from the situation. However, they said the opposite. They flouted the maxim of quality to raise the implicature that "it is not good at all." One of the participants said: /kuwajjes/, "it's good". This one preferred politeness over quality maxim.

12. A husband is walking in the street with his wife and their kids. He asks his wife to get some thing for the kids.

Husband: Let's get the kids something. (Levinson, 1983)

Wife: Okay, but I veto I-C-E C-R-E-A-M-S. (Implicature: okay, but I veto ice creams. Flouting the maxim of Manner)

Transcription:

Husband: /ʔeħ raʔjjeħ neġiib ħaaga lelʔwlaad/

Wife: /maafi bas balaaʃ neġiib ʔaalef–jjeħ–siin kaaf–ra:h–jjeħ-miim/

3% of the participants used implicatures as the wife as published in the literature. 28% did not use implicatures at all. The participants, who implicated as the one used by the wife, flouted the maxim of manner as they spelled the words out. They did so, as they did not want to say the word of "ice cream" in front of their kids. These were 3% only as spelling out a word is not common in Arabic conversations.

The participants who observed the maxims, said: /maafi bas balaaʃ ais kreim/, "okay, but I veto ice creams." Other answers (69%) were: /maafi bas ʔaj ħaaga teḍur snaanhum laʔ/, "okay, but I veto every thing that may hurt their teeth", /maafiiʃ filuus/, "no money", /balaaʃ ʔinnaharda/, "not today", /laʔ miʃ kul ħaga jeṭlubuuħa jaxduħa/, "no, not all what they asked for, they get", /ʔajziin nerawwaħ teʕibna/, "we want to go home, we are getting tired", /ħaat ʔaana ʔaaggiibluħum/, "let me bring something".

4.3 Analysis of the situations in English

40 subjects responded in English. Each one answered to a questionnaire with 12 situations. The results are as follows:

1.A asks about the health of B's mother. She is back but she is not well yet.

A: Is your mother back and well? (Gazdar, 1979)

B: Well, she is back, yes. (Implicature: she is not well. Flouting the maxim of quantity, giving insufficient information)

58% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 25% used implicature as B, where B's reply is the answer of the native speakers of English as published in the literature.

The subjects, who observed the maxims of conversation and did not use implicature, responded: "she is back, but she is not well yet." The subjects, who behaved like native English speakers and said: "well, she is back, yes", flouted the maxim of quantity by giving insufficient answer as they did not say whether the mother was well or not. However, they implicated that the mother was not well yet.

Other subjects (17%) also responded the same way, i.e. they avoided speaking explicitly. They said answers such as: "thanks God", "she is well", "yes, she is", "she is back and fine", "yes, she is better", "yes, thanks God", or just "yes". Utterances like these express cultural varieties.

2. A mother asks her son about his homework which was not done yet.

Mother: "Did you do your homework and put away your books?"
(Kitao, 1990)

Son: I put away my books. (Implicature: I did not do the homework. Flouting the maxim of quantity.)

27% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 30% used implicature as used by native English speakers. The subjects, who responded explicitly, said: "I didn't do any homework yet." The subjects, who said: "yes, I put away my books", implicated that they did not do any homework yet. However, they did not say it explicitly. They gave insufficient information to hide not doing the homework.

Other subjects (43%) responded: "I won't sleep now". These flouted the maxim of relevance and implicated that they did not do the homework yet. It is a way to avoid answering explicitly too. Other subjects gave answers such as, "no, I didn't", "I didn't do any homework yet, but I put away my books", "no, I'll do it later", "I will do it latter."

3. A asks B about his feeling toward his colleagues Bill and Agatha. B does not like Agatha.

A: We'll all miss Bill and Agatha, won't we? (Leech, 1983)

B: Well, we'll all miss Bill. (Implicature: I will not miss Agatha. Flouting the maxim of quantity.)

20% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 60% used implicature as B. The subjects, who observed the maxims without any implications, said "Bill is ok, but I guess I won't miss Agatha". The subjects, who implicated the same meaning and said "well, we'll all miss Bill", did not mention Agatha. These subjects flouted the maxim of quantity by giving inadequate information. They did not mention Agatha as a polite way to implicate that they would not miss her. This raised the implicature that they did not like Agatha.

Other subjects (11%) responded with unrelated utterance: "it's good today, isn't it?" These flouted the maxim of relevance to implicate the same meaning too. Other answers (9%) were: "I hope them come back safely", "we will miss both of them", "I hope them good life", "Agatha is ok, but Bill is not." This last sentence flouts the maxim of quality as it is not the truth as illustrated by the situation previously. However, it is a way to implicate the opposite.

4. A asks B about aunt Rose's birthday. B does not know the exact day of her.

A: When is Aunt Rose's birthday? (Leech, 1983)

B: It's sometime in April. (Implicature: I do not know the exact day. Flouting the maxim of quantity)

70% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 23% used implicature as B did. Most of the participants observed the maxims, without raising implicature. They said: "I don't know exactly". The participants, who said: "it's some time in April" and flouted the maxim of quantity, raised the implicature that the addressee did not know the date exactly. These subjects flouted the maxim of quantity (by not giving adequate information), instead

of quality (not to give something which does not have evidence for). They faced what Grice's called "maxims clash".

Few of the subjects (7%) flouted the maxim of relevance. These answered: "I don't remember what I have eaten today". This answer is not explicitly related to the question. This answer implicates that the addressee does not know the exact birthday of Aunt Rose.

5. A student is asking a question, and he is absurdly incorrect.

Student: Tehran's in Turkey, isn't it teacher? (Levinson, 1983)

Teacher: And London is in America I suppose. (Implicature: no. flouting the maxim of quality)

33% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 12% used implicature as the teacher. The subjects, who answered explicitly, said: "of course not, Tehran is in Iran." However, it is a situation in a classroom between a student and his teacher. The question is clearly incorrect. The teacher should correct the wrong information of the student. Therefore, many of the subjects (52%) flouted the maxim of quantity by giving more information than required in the question. They answered: "What? Tehran is a town in Iran, and it's not just a town, it is the capital. But for Turkey, it has another so different capital, which is Ankara, that is. Did you get it?" This answer flouts the maxim of quantity and raises the implicature that Tehran is not in Turkey. Many of the subjects chose this answer as the situation itself requires from the teacher to explain the matter to the student even if he does not observe the maxim of quantity.

Few of the subjects (12%) preferred to give a mocking answer. They said: "and London is in America, I suppose". These behaved as native English speakers. They flouted the maxim of quality because it is clear that London is not in America. However, they implicated that the question is clearly incorrect. Other answers (3%) were: "don't talk again", and "stop speaking".

6. It is clear that the music is horrendous.

A: What is your opinion about the melody? (online)

B: What a lovely melody! (Implicature: it is a bad melody. Flouting the maxim of quality)

68% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 13% used implicature as it is online. Many of the subjects (68%) responded: "it's horrendous." They did not raise any implicature. These did so, as they found no awkwardness to express their bad feeling towards a melody explicitly. Few flouted the maxim of quality and said: "what a lovely melody!" These responded as native English speakers. These subjects preferred to say that it was a lovely one though it was clear from the situation that the music was horrendous. These could implicate the opposite.

Other few subjects (9%) said: "I'll get out." These flouted the maxim of relevance and raised the implicature that the music is not good too. The other participants (10%) gave answers such as: "turn the cassette off", "stop it", "there is better", and "I prefer to change it because I hate this melody."

7. A mother wants to remind her son that he may not yet be free to play.

Son: Hey Mamma, let's play marbles. (Levinson, 1983)

Mother: How is your homework getting along Johnny? (Implicature: I think you haven't time to play Johnny. Flouting the maxim of relevance)

22% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 22% used implicature as the mother did. In this situation, some of the participants observed the maxims, produced no implicature and responded: "I think you haven't time for playing marbles Johnny." Also, an equivalent percentage of the subjects replied with implicature as the mother, flouting the maxim of relevance. These raised the implicature that in case of not doing the homework, Johnny cannot play marbles.

However, 55% of the subjects implicated the same meaning through flouting the maxim of manner. They said: "is this time for playing, Johnny?"

Through this sentence, the mother wanted to remind her son that he might not be free yet to play marbles and he might better do something else (his homework). One of the participants said: "if you finish your homework, I will play with you."

8. A person asks where he can get some gas, because his car is out of gas.

A: I'm out of gas. (Grice, 1975)

B: There is a gas station around the corner. (Implicature: the station may be open and has gas to sell. Flouting the maxim of quantity)

20% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 38% used implicature as Grice did. These implicated the meaning as native English speakers. While those participants, who did not raise implicature, said: "you may find gas in the gas station just around the corner".

The other participants (41%) said: "I can give you some till you find a gas station". They flouted the maxim of quantity to help. Only one answer was "I can help you?"

9. John is not a good cook.

A: John is cooking dinner to night. (Williams, 1991)

B: I'd better get out of the house. (Implicature: John is not a good cook. Flouting the maxim of relevance)

38% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 40% used implicature as B. These implicated the meaning through flouting the maxim of relevance. These behaved like native English speakers. However, the participants, who observed the maxims, said: "oh, he isn't a good cook".

13% of the participants said: "well, I won't eat". These flouted the maxim of quantity by not giving enough answer. They implicated the same meaning. Other answers (9%) were: "I don't think I am hungry", "I will not eat", "well, I don't feel that hungry", "well, I think I will sleep early tonight", and "I stopped eating."

10. A parent asks his child if he has eaten the icing off the cake.

Parent: Someone's eaten the icing off the cake. (Leech, 1983)

Child: It wasn't ME! (Implicature: it was not me the one you think that he has eaten the icing off the cake. Flouting the maxim of relevance)

28% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 33% used implicature as the child did. These flouted the maxim of relevance. They raised the implicature that the father doubted that the son had eaten the icing off the cake, and he had not. They responded to the question through implicating that they had not eaten the icing off the cake.

30% of the participants, also, implicated the same meaning through flouting the maxim of relevance. They said: "I have just come from school". In case of "just coming from school", the son was definitely not the one who had eaten the icing off the cake.

The other participants (9%) gave answers like: "what do you mean dad?", "I ate it", "me I think", "you can ask my brother", "no, I have nothing", and "I don't know."

11. When asked what she thinks of a new restaurant, a woman did not like it and replied:

Friend: What do you think of this new restaurant? (Harnish, 1976)

The woman: They have handsome carpets. (Implicature: it is not good. Flouting the maxim of relevance)

48% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 8% used implicature as the woman did. Only 5 of the participants said: "they have handsome carpets". These behaved like native English speakers. They flouted the maxim of relevance and raised the implicature that the only thing which was good in the restaurant was its carpets. The participants, who observed the maxims, said: "it isn't so good".

37% of the participants said: "yeah!" These flouted the maxim of manner they were ambiguous. However, they were cooperative as they could implicate that they did not like that restaurant. The rest of the participants put

answers like: "I have seen better", "wonderful restaurant", and "it is very good." The last two answers flouted the maxim of quality and raised the opposite implicature which is that "it is not good at all". One of the participants said: "it's good", which flouts the maxim of quality too. Doing so, he preferred to be polite over the maxim of quality. As his answer bears no exaggeration, it may not implicate the opposite.

12. A husband is walking in the street with his wife and their kids. He asks his wife to get some thing for the kids.

Husband: Let's get the kids something. (Levinson, 1983)

Wife: okay, but I veto I-C-E C-R-E-A-M-S. (Implicature: okay, but I veto ice creams. Flouting the maxim of Manner)

38% of the participants did not use implicatures at all. 18% used implicature as the wife did in the literature. The participants, who implicated, flouted the maxim of manner as they spelt the words out. They did so, because they did not want to say the words of "ice creams" in front of their kids.

37% of the participants said: "yeah, but I veto all things that may hurt their teeth." These flouted the maxim of quantity as they gave information more than was required. They tried not to mention the words of "ice creams" in front of their children too. The other participants (7%) said: "there is no money", "let's get that another day", "no, it's not the time for this thing", and "ok, what would you like to them?"

From the preceding results, one can find that there are some situations in which the participants use implicatures least. There are other situations in which the participants use implicatures most whether in Arabic or in English. In the next section, the situations in which implicatures are used least, will be reviewed. Those in which implicatures are used most will follow them.

The situations in which implicatures are used least in Arabic are five. They are listed below:

1. Situation number four in the questionnaire which is about a sister, who asked her brother about aunt Nora's birthday. The brother does not know the exact day. The question was: /?emtaa ˈiid milaad ˈammiti nura/, "when is Aunt Nora's birthday?" Here the participants used implicature of percentage 5%. They responded: /huwwa fe ʔabriil baajen/, "It's sometime in April". These flouted the maxim of quantity.

2. Situation number five in the questionnaire which is about a student, who is asking a question, and he is absurdly incorrect. The question was: /hejja ʔarablu fi ʔssuˈudejja miʃ keda jaa ʔustaaz/, "Tarablus is in Saudi Arabia, isn't it teacher?" Here the participants used implicature of percentage 15%. They responded: /we makka fe lebja miʃ keda barɖu/, "and Mecca is in Libya I suppose". These flouted the maxim of quality.

3. Situation number six in the questionnaire which is about a melody which is currently on, and it is clear that it is horrendous. The question was: /?eh ra:ʔjjak fel musiiqa di/, "what is your opinion about the melody?" Here, the participants used implicature of percentage 17%. They responded: /jaa salaam fi ʔagmal men kedah di musiiqa ra:ʔeˈah/, "what a lovely melody!" These flouted the maxim of quality.

4. Situation number eleven in the questionnaire which is about a woman, who was asked about a new restaurant. She did not like it. The question was: /?eih ra:ʔjjek felmaʔˈam dah/, "what do you think of this new restaurant?" Here the participants used implicature of percentage 3%. They responded /?esseggaad ˈanduhum kuwwajjes/, "they have handsome carpets". These flouted the maxim of relevance.

5. Situation number twelve in the questionnaire which is about a husband, who is walking in the street with his wife and their kids. He asks his wife to get some thing for the kids. The wife does not want to get anything that may hurt them. The question was: /?eih ra:ʔjjek negiib ʔaaga lelʔwlaad/, "let's get the kids something". Here the participants used implicature in

Arabic of percentage 3%. They responded "/maaʃi bas balaaʃ negiib ʔalef-jeh-siin kaaf-ra:h-jeh-miim/", "okay, but I veto I-C-E C-R-E-A-M-S". These flouted the maxim of manner.

In the above situations, most of the subjects hardly used implicatures in Arabic. Therefore, these situations show the least use of implicature. There may be no reason to implicate in such situations. This may be the cause that the meaning of such situations is mostly explicated rather than implicated. Another cause may be that these situations do not endure implicating, e.g., asking about specified piece of information (a date for instance), or asking about opinion of a place. Anyway, the subjects tended to explicate rather than implicate when the exchange being discussed is about someone's feeling towards something, or a discussion on an exact date or place. They did not largely tend to use implicatures out of mocking. They, also, did not tend to use implicature through spelling words out. Such mode switching is rarely used in Arabic.

The situations in which implicatures are used least in English are the same as in Arabic. However, the percentages are different. Table no. 3 shows the least implicatures used in English and in Arabic.

Situation no.	Question	Response	Flout what maxim	percentage in English	percentage in Arabic
4	when is Aunt Rose's birthday	It's sometime in April	Quantity	23%	5%
5	Tehran's in Turkey, isn't it teacher?	And London is in America, I suppose	quality	12%	15%
6	what is your opinion	what a lovely melody	Quality	13%	17%

	about the melody				
11	what do you think of this new restaurant	they have handsome carpets	Relevance	8%	3%
12	let's get the kids something	okay, but I veto I-C-E C-R-E-A-M-S	Manner	18%	3%

Table 3

There are some other situations where implicatures are mostly used. These are the same in English and in Arabic too. In these situations, few of the participants observed the maxims and produced no implicatures. Most of them implicated rather than explicated. These situations are tackled below:

1. Situation number 2 in the questionnaire which is about a mother who asks her son who did not do his homework “did you do your homework and put away your books?” Most of the subjects, here, tended to implicate rather than explicate. They said: "yes, I put away my books". They gave insufficient information, and flouted the maxim of quantity. This is to hide not doing the homework. They implicated that they did not do the homework yet. It is a way to avoid explicit answer.

2. Situation number 3 in the questionnaire which is about the feeling toward the addressee's colleagues Bill and Agatha (Tamer and Shaimaa in Arabic). The addressee does not like Agatha. The question was "We'll all miss Bill and Agatha, won't we?" The subjects mostly said: "well, we'll all miss Bill". Here, the subjects mostly implicated that they do not miss Agatha. They did so by flouting the maxim of quantity. They preferred to implicate as

the situation is critical. They preferred to implicate as a way to be polite rather than to explicate their bad feeling towards Agatha.

3. Question number 8 in the questionnaire which is: "I'm out of gas." This is in fact a request for help; a request for a place which sells gas. It is clear that the situation happens in the street. Most of the participants tended to be less informative. They said: "there is a gas station around the corner". They supposed that the gas station was open and had gas to sell. However, they implicated so. They tried to help as much as they could immediately. They flouted the maxim of quantity too.

4. Question number 9 in the questionnaire which is "John is cooking dinner tonight". Here the participants mostly tended to implicate rather than observe the maxims. They said: "I'd better get out of the house". They might flout the maxim of relevance to implicate that "John is not a good cook".

5. Question number 10 in the questionnaire which is "someone's eaten the icing off the cake." It is a question asked by a father to his son. In fact, it is not a question. It is an accusation. Most of the subjects tried to vindicate themselves from that accusation. They said: "It wasn't ME!" They tried to implicate rather than observe the maxims. They did so by flouting the maxim of relevance

As seen before, most of the subjects used implicature mostly in the above situations. There must be something in the situations themselves which makes that large number of the participants implicate either in English or in Arabic. Table no. 4 shows the percentages of the implicatures mostly used by the subjects in English and in Arabic.

Situation no.	Question	Response	Flout what maxim	Percentage in English	percentage in Arabic
---------------	----------	----------	------------------	-----------------------	----------------------

2	Did you do your homework and put away your books?	I put away my books	Quantity	30%	25%
3	We'll all miss Bill and Agatha, won't we?	Well, we'll all miss Bill	Quantity	60%	47%
8	I'm out of gas.	There is a gas station around the corner	Quantity	38%	32%
Situation no.	Question	Response	Flout what maxim	Percentage in English	percentage in Arabic
9	John is cooking dinner to night	I'd better get out of the house	Relevance	40%	43%
10	Someone's eaten the icing off the cake	It wasn't ME!	Relevance	33%	43%

Table 4

Generally, most of the participants tend to use implicatures mostly when they want to hide something (not doing homework for instance), to express bad feelings toward somebody (toward persons whom they do not like), to avoid impoliteness, to help people find places, to express their views about somebody's skill especially if he is not good, or to vindicate themselves.

After reviewing all Arabic and English situations including those that used implicatures most or least, and after displaying the data of the study, it is important to handle those data statistically in order to elicit results easily. The

next part presents a statistical analysis of the results. The purpose of this part is to see the similarities and differences of using implicatures in Arabic and in English of the subjects. It is, also, to see the influences of age, sex, and exposure to English on using implicatures in speech. The subjects are divided into two groups. One of them is those who do not speak English. The other group is those who speak English. Results of group no. 1 are discussed first.

4.4 Implicatures Uses of the First Group

The first group consists of 55 participants who do not speak English so they answered the questionnaire in Arabic. They include five females over 40 years old whose answers were doubled. Table No. 5 shows the percentage of implicatures use in Arabic of the first group.

Observance	Implicatures	Total
277	443	720
38%	62%	100%

Table 5

The table reveals that implicature exists in Arabic. Flouting of the maxims of conversation is used in Arabic exchanges more than observance of them (62%: 38%).

In general, it was clear from the subjects' responses that the quantity maxim is the most flouted maxim in the first group responses. Therefore, most Arabic implicatures are raised out of flouting the maxim of quantity. Implicatures raised out of flouting the maxim of relevance come next. Manner and quality are the least flouted maxims to raise implicatures in Arabic. Table no. 6 shows percentages of the flouted maxims in Arabic.

observance	277	38%
Quantity	229	32%
Relevance	115	16%

Quality	35	5%
Manner	64	9%

Table 6

It is important to note here, that most of quantity floutings in Arabic are due to being over informative. In other words, the subjects tend to be over informative in their Arabic exchanges.

4.4.1 Age and Use of Implicature of the first group

Concerning age, the results reveal that younger participants use implicature more than older participants in the responses of the first group. This is because younger participants tend to flout the maxims of conversation more. This shows that the older participants are much more observant of the maxims of conversation in Arabic. Older participants use implicatures in Arabic less than the younger participants do. In other words, the responses of the old participants included the minimum limit of using implicature at all (30.2%). Results indicated that the younger participants tend to be over-talkative. They tend to go around the point of speech. In general, they have a tendency to mean things more than what they actually say. However, the older participants tended to be more truthful. The cause of this may be that they are more responsible and frank than the younger participants.

Table no. 7 shows the uses of implicatures by the participants of the first group according to their ages.

55 participants	20 Participants under 20 years old	20 Participants from 20 to 40 years old	15 Participants over 40 years old (10 males + 5 females whose results were doubled)
Implicature	154	155	134
Percentage	34.8%	35.0%	30.2%

Table 7

In relation to the maxim of quantity, results indicate that younger participants flout it more, as they mostly tend to be over informative. Many of the young participants when flouting the maxim of quantity, tended to give more information than what was required. However, most of the older participants' tended to be less informative when they flouted the maxim of quantity. The older participants seem to make their statements deducible rather than directly stated. This may be due the fact that the older participants have more experience and are more linguistically competent than the younger, which enables them to use a few number of words to express their ideas.

As regards to implicatures of flouting the maxim of relevance, all the participants similarly use them very much in Arabic. In other words, flouting the maxim of relevance comes in second degree at all ages in the Arabic responses.

The participants similarly when they were told that Abdu is the one who would prepare the dinner the day, many of them said, /jeb?a ?aaḥsan ?atʕada barrah/, "it's better to get out of the house". This implicates that Abdu is not a good cook. This is done through flouting the maxim of relevance. Also, when they were asked whether they would miss Tamer and Shaimaa, (they did not like Shaimaa), some of them responded /?eh ra:?jjak figgaw ?enharda/, "it's good today, isn't it?". This is, also, done by old and young subjects similarly.

In respect to implicatures out of the maxim of manner, the younger and old participants used them likewise. They all flouted the maxim of manner little. They tend to be obvious and clear at most times. Concerning implicatures out of flouting the maxim of quality, the old participants are the least users of them. It seems that the older participants are relatively more truthful. For instance, when asked /hejja ʕarabluṣ fi ?ssuʕudejja miʃ keda jaa

?ustaaz/, "Tarablus is in Saudi Arabia, isn't it teacher?", only one of the old participants replied /we makka fe lebja miġ keda barġu/, "and Mecca is in Libya, I suppose". Also, in the situation of the son who did not do his homework, some of the younger participants replied /?a:h ?amaltu kulu ?okkeh/, "yes, I did it and it's ok". These did not tell the truth in order to avoid speaking about doing homework. However, few of the old participants tended to do so. Table no. 8 presents flouting the maxims in Arabic in relation to age.

The maxims	Ob	Qt	R	QI	M	Total
Participants under 20 years old	86	83	39	11	21	240
Participants from 20 to 40 years old	85	76	40	17	22	240
Participants over 40 years old	106	70	36	7	21	240

Table 8

In short, age and the use of implicature in Arabic have negative relationship. The participants, who are over forty years old, are the least users of implicatures in Arabic. However, young participants use implicatures mostly in their Arabic responses. Table no. 9 shows the relationship between implicature use in Arabic and Age.

Age of the participants	Implicature uses in Arabic
Under 20 years old	35%
Between 20-40 years	35%
Over 40 years old	30%

Table 9

4.4.2 Sex and Use of Implicature of the first group

Regarding sex, results show that males use implicatures more than females do. For instance, in reply to the question “I am out of petrol” /xalašt banziin/, females, who do not know where a gas station is, tend to say “I don’t know” /wallahi ?ana muġ ʿarfa/. While most males, who also do not know a place of a station say, “you can go further steps and ask for one”, /?uddam ġewwajja wes?al/. They implicate that they do not know rather than saying it directly. Another instance is when asked whether Mecca is in Libya, many men said, “no, it’s in America” /la? di f ?amriika/. They flout the maxim of quality, as they do not tell truth. However, they are still cooperative as their reply is absurdly incorrect just as the question. They implicate mockingly that Mecca is not in Libya. Women, in the same situation tended to say just "no" without implicating. Table no. 10 is a general view of using implicatures in Arabic by males and females of the first group.

Males	Females
52%	48%

Table 10

The results revealed that females exceeded males only in using the maxim of quantity. Females tended to be considerably more talkative than males, especially younger females, as their responses showed more quantity violations most of which were due to over informativity. Males tended to flout the maxims of quality and the maxim of relevance more than females. Therefore, males tended to be less relevant and less truthful. Concerning the maxim of manner, males and females similarly flouted it. Table no. 11 shows the uses of the maxims by males and females in Arabic.

Maxims	Males	Females
Quantity	49%	51%
Relevance	55%	45%
Quality	66%	34%
Manner	50%	50%

Table 11

4.5 Implicatures of the Second Group

The next part tries to discuss the responses of the second group, the subjects who speak English. The thesis has 40 participants who speak English. They include five males and five females with English exposure less than ten years, and five males and five females with English exposure more than twenty years. The results of these were doubled. All the subjects of the second group answered the questionnaire in English. This is to explain differences and similarities between using implicatures in English and in Arabic of the two groups.

Concerning the English responses, the results reveal that using implicature in English by the second group is more than observing the maxims. Table no. 12 shows implicatures in English in the second group responses.

Observance of the maxims	Implicature uses in English	Total
297	423	720
41%	59%	100%

Table 12

Moreover, implicatures exist in Arabic by the first group more than in English by the second group. This means that when a participant responds in his native language (Arabic) he uses implicatures more than he does in a foreign language (English). Or, perhaps, Arabic as a language includes implicatures more than English does.

The study reveals that the participants still flout the maxim of quantity more than the other maxims. Most of such infringements of the maxim of quantity in English tend to be less informative than what is required especially in the responses of the participants with the greatest exposure to English. This may mean that English tends to be less informative than Arabic. This information may conduct us to think of learning English as if it has influence on being less informative while conversing with others in English. Especially, the Arabic responses of the first group, as seen before, tend to be more informative than what is required in many of the exchanges being discussed.

The fact that the maxim of quantity is mostly flouted may be due to three reasons:

First, it can be flouted in two ways; this means that it can be either flouted by giving more or less information. This makes it subject to infringement much more than any other maxim (may be twice).

Second, many of its flouting, especially those in Arabic, are because Arabic may be redundant, i.e. it tends to be more informative than what is required, more than other languages, e.g. English.

Third, when asked about something, the subjects would generously give all about it. It is, perhaps, something in the nature of the subjects to give much more information when knowing something. Anyway, the preceding three reasons, at least, for flouting the maxim of quantity put this maxim in a position of importance in speech, especially in Arabic speech.

Concerning relevance, English responses use many implicatures by flouting this maxim. It is the second maxim in order to be flouted by the participants in English. This was the case in Arabic of the first group too. However, the maxim of relevance is flouted in English by the second group less than in Arabic by the first group. This can be explained as English is more cohesive than Arabic.² I.e. English responses include more cohesive devices such as the repetition of names and relative pronouns and, the use of words as: “and, well, yet, this, it, oh...” Besides, the participants are more skilful in their native language than in their second language. They can use unrelated Arabic utterances and serve the topic being discussed at a deeper

² I mentioned here the word “cohesive” and not “coherent” as both English and Arabic responses are coherent i.e. related in terms of meaning, but they are sometimes not related in terms of form (named cohesion), and this is what we call relevance violation.

level. They cannot do that in all situations in English, which binds them to be relative to the topic explicitly and implicitly.

For implicatures out of flouting the maxim of manner, there is no any considerable difference between Arabic and English uses of them. Therefore, English efficiency has no observable influence here.

The least implicatures used in English are those out of flouting the maxim of quality, just as the case in Arabic of the first group. However, the participants of the first group flouted that maxim in Arabic more than the participants of the second group did in English. It seems that the subjects tend to follow the Grice's statement about telling the truth and saying only what they have evidence for in English more than in Arabic.

Table no. 13 shows percentages of the flouted maxims in English.

Observance	297	41%
Quantity	229	32%
Relevance	105	15%
Quality	23	3%
Manner	66	9%

Table 13

4.5.1 English Proficiency and Implicature Uses of the Second group

The subjects, who are exposed to English over 20 years, use implicature in English more than those who are less exposed to English. Likewise, the participants, who are less exposed to English (mostly are younger participants) use implicatures in English less frequently than those, who are more English exposed (older participants). It is necessary here to point that the older the participants are, the more they are exposed to English. (It is a coincidence here in the study.) This means that they continue grasping English and the English features, e.g., continue reading, writing, and listening to English. Therefore, they can implicate more in English along with their mastering of the English language. This may explain the fact that older participants' responses are more similar to the English expected answers than the younger ones in using implicatures.

Table no. 14 shows the subjects' uses of implicatures in English in relation to years of English exposure.

Exposure to English/ number of participants	Implicature	Percentage
Less than 10 years/ 10 participants whose results were doubled	140	33%
10-20 years/ 20 participants	133	31%
More than 20 years/ 10 participants whose results were doubled	150	36%

Table 14

The results indicated that the participants, who are more exposed to English, used implicatures out of flouting the maxim of quantity more than the other participants did. In their responses, the participants, who are more exposed to English, tend to give inadequate information. They tend to be less informative than what is required. Therefore, they flout the maxim of

quantity. This is, perhaps, because of their advanced skill in expressing ideas in a few number of words in English. However, the subjects, who are less exposed to English, tend to give more information than what is required. These cannot express themselves as briefly as the situation requires. Therefore, they are more informative than what is required in many of the situations.

On the contrary, the maxim of relevance is flouted by those who are less exposed to English more than those who have a considerable amount of English. Results reveal that the participants, who are more exposed to English, use related utterances more than the other participants. Using cohesive devices and knowing variety of vocabulary might make the utterances of these participants more relevant than the other participants' are. Table no. 15 shows observance and uses of maxims by the participants of the second group according to their years of English exposure.

Exposure to English/ number of participants	Ob	Qt	R	Ql	M	Total
Less than 10 years/ 10 participants whose results were doubled	100	72	36	8	24	240
10-20 years/ 20 participants	107	70	41	6	16	240
More than 20 years/ 10 participants whose results were doubled	90	87	28	9	26	240

Table 15

As we said before, along with his progress in learning English, a person can grasp more English implicatures as well. When he was at his first steps concerning learning English, any subject could hardly use expected English implicatures. As time goes on, the Subjects' uses of the English implicatures, as published in the literature, become increasingly observable.

The study finds that those who are exposed to English more than 20 years have answered in a way similar to English (38%). While those who are exposed to English between 10 and 20 years have chosen the English expected answers less than the former (33%). The subjects who are exposed to English less than 10 years have scored the least percentage which is (29%). This implicates that those participants, who speak English, especially those who are more exposed to it, have been affected by English. Here, the English conversational skills have been acquired. Table no. 16 shows the development of implicature uses as the participants become more proficient in English. It shows the percentages of the subjects' responses in English that are similar to the English expected answers concerning implicatures.

Exposure to English	using the expected English answer
Less than 10 years	29%
10-20 years	33%
More than 20 years	38%

Table 16

The reason for choosing the expected English answer, as said before, is due to the long period of English exposure. However, this is not the only reason. For it may be the situation itself and context which influence the use of implicature by the subjects as the way the English do. For instance, there are certain situations where the subjects were found to be most likely to choose the expected English answers either in English or in Arabic. Two of these are stated below:

1. "Well, we'll all miss Bill" in response to "we'll all miss Bill and Agatha, won't we?" (It was used 60% in English responses, and 47% in Arabic)

2. "I'd better get out of the house" in response to "John is cooking dinner to night." (This was used 40% in English responses, and 43% in Arabic)

It is worthwhile here to say that the participants, who do not speak English, have hardly chosen some of the expected English answers in certain situations in Arabic, e.g. they do not tend to spell the words out as it is adopted in English. This is important indeed, as it indicates that English differs somehow from Arabic in using implicatures. The Arabic answers of the first group scored variance from the English answers of the second group. Implicature seems to be language-specific strategy in terms of different uses of the maxims, as many of the participants, who answered the Arabic questionnaire, did not use the expected English implicatures. However, the participants, who answered the questionnaire in English, used many of the expected English implicatures.

Besides similarity to the expected English implicatures, proficiency of English may also, lead to flout certain maxims more. The maxim of quantity is flouted by the participants who are more exposed to English more than those who are less English exposed. This is normal in light of being more influenced by their proficient English stage. As those participants, who are more English exposed, have tendency to be less informative than what is required. This is partly due to the English influence. However, we cannot neglect the influence of age too. The study has discovered before that most of the older participants tend to be less informative. As well, younger people tend to be more informative. This means that people tend to be less informative as they are getting older. This makes the older people express their ideas briefly, unlike the younger whose speeches tend to prolixity.

4.5.2 Sex and Implicature Uses in the English Responses of the second group

Regarding sex, males and females generally used implicatures in English alike (50.1% vs. 49.9% respectively). This was not the case in Arabic. We have seen before that males' uses of implicature in Arabic exceeded females' (52% vs. 48%). This can be explained in terms that males tend to use implicatures in Arabic more than in English.

The results in English indicate that males flout the maxim of quantity more than females. The English responses reveal that males tend to be more informative than females. In other words, Females are less informative in their English responses. They could reply in short answers. And this is due their speedy influence of shortness in English as it seems to be a language that tends to be brief rather than redundant. On the other hand, Arabic, in most cases, is in the habit of being prolix and far from brevity. Females show some sort of advancement in acquiring English features more than males do. This is supported by Omara's work (1993). Although the sex of the speakers was not included in Omara's hypotheses, Arab females were found to grasp the cultural aspects of English conversation better than Arab males and that helps them improve their pragmatic competence.

In Arabic, the results found that females flouted the maxim of quantity more than males did. Moreover, females tend to be more informative than what is required in the present purpose of the exchange. This means that females are more redundant in Arabic in case of not speaking English.

Concerning the maxim of relevance, females flout it more than males do in English. Males tend to be more relevant than females in English. Females show little daring to meet critical situations in English than males. So they try to find resort in flouting the maxim of relevance. However, lack of courage to face the purpose of exchange is not the only reason for violating the maxim of relevance by females. Another important cause is politeness.

Females prefer to be polite rather than to challenge and resist others' views. They prefer to be polite rather than to observe the maxim of relevance.

In contrast, males prefer to challenge rather than to be polite especially in the situations, which require different personal views. They prefer being observant rather than being irrelevant in speaking about personal and private topics in particular. Therefore, they are more relevant than females in their English responses.

Regarding the maxim of quality, males flout it more than females in their English responses. This was the case in Arabic too. Males tend to flout the maxim, which says "don't tell untruths." Therefore, they tend to be less truthful either in English or in Arabic.

Concerning the maxim of Manner, females tend to be more obscure than males in their English responses. Females surpass males in flouting the maxim of manner in English. The reason is not clear why women tend to be more obscure than men in their English responses. It may be something in their nature. Men seem to be slightly straighter than women are. For instance, a woman, who did not like her colleague Agatha, asked about her feeling towards Agatha and Bill. The question was "we'll all miss Bill and Agatha, won't we?" She replied, "yes, you will." She did not say "yes, we will" nor did she say "I won't miss Agatha". Instead, she played with words and preferred to flout the maxim of manner as being ambiguous by uttering the word "you" instead of the word "we".

Females also, have a tendency towards flouting more than one maxim at a time. This may be explained as females show some sort of excellence in learning English before males. Flouting more than one maxim at the same time is a property of English rather than Arabic.

Table no. 17 shows the uses of implicatures and the maxims by males and females in English.

Maxims	Males	Females
Quantity	53%	47%
Relevance	47%	53%
Quality	52%	48%
Manner	45%	55%
Implicature	50.1%	49.9%

Table 17

4.6 Similarities and Differences in using Implicatures in English and Arabic

It is clear that both English and Arabic include implicatures. Though, Arabic involves implicatures more than English does. This is, perhaps, because Arabic is a native language, here in this research, and English is nonnative. The participants can use implicatures in Arabic more than in English, as they are more skillful in using their native language than in nonnative language. The fact that the more the participants are exposed to English, the more uses of implicature in their English are observed, proves that the use of implicature is related to mastering a language.

Likewise, the maxim of quantity is the most flouted maxim to raise implicature in English and Arabic. However, English tends to be less informative while Arabic tends to be more informative than what is required. For example, Arabic is rarely found to say just "it's in April" in response to "when is aunt Rose's birthday", when it is not known when aunt Rose's birthday is. The subjects mostly tend to express that, in their Arabic responses, explicitly rather than implicitly.

Implicatures that are raised as a result of flouting the maxims of relevance and quality are detected to appear more in Arabic than in English. However, the maxim of manner is flouted in English little bit more than it is used in Arabic. This is because; Arabic does not tend to use the strategy of spelling out words as a way to implicate something. However, English does.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter displayed the data of the study. It analyzed these data and exhibited the results. The study proved that Arabic involves implicatures. It also revealed that learning English has a positive influence in terms of the use of English implicatures as published in the English literature. Moreover, the study has proved that there are some similarities in the uses of implicatures in English and Arabic. These may be due to, at least, three factors; age and the

situations in which implicatures have to be used. Some situations are likely to apply similar implicatures whether in English or in Arabic. The third factor is that implicature itself is likely to be a universal strategy in speech.

Chapter Five

Conclusions and

Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

This chapter summarizes the findings of the present thesis. In addition, it gives recommendations for further research.

The present study attempted to explore the use of Conversational Implicature in English and in Arabic as spoken by Cairenes. It tried to deal with topics such as whether conversational implicature exists in Arabic or not, and how native Arabic speakers use both English and Arabic implicatures.

It, also, tries to tackle further issues such as the influence of age and sex on using implicatures in Arabic, and the effect of English proficiency on using implicatures in English.

The study is important because Arabic Conversational Implicature has not until now received a significant measure of attention. Therefore, the study contributes to the field of pragmatics. It fills a gap in pragmatics research since conversational implicatures in Arabic have not until now been seriously researched.

The study, also, is significant as it is considered of relevance to research in Contrastive Linguistics because it explores the presence and use of conversational implicatures in Arabic and contrasts these to the conversational implicatures in English as spoken by Cairenes. Therefore, the present study increases awareness of the different uses of Conversational Implicature in English and in Arabic.

The research, also, has a contribution to the study of the effective use of language in communication. It may help speakers use language skillfully for literary expression, or for public speaking in order to produce a particular effect in the mind of hearers.

In addition, the study contributes to the topic of inter-language or learner language. This discusses how nonnative speakers produce a speech act in a target language and how their pragmatic competence helps them grasp the target language features. The study, then, contributes to benefit second language learners.

The study found that implicatures exist in Arabic. Moreover, it revealed that Arabic exchanges involve implicature more than observance of the conversational maxims. There are implicatures in Arabic of percentage 62% of the total Arabic responses. However, observance of the maxims in Arabic is 38%.

The study, also, revealed that the English responses of the subjects included implicatures. Moreover, the implicature uses in English is more than observance of the maxims (59% vs. 41% respectively).

Therefore, it is clear that the Subjects use implicatures in their speech more than observance either in Arabic or in English. Consequently, the study of implicature is of real importance.

The participants did not largely tend to use implicatures out of mocking. They, also, did not tend to use implicature through spelling words out. The results revealed that there are some situations in which the participants use implicatures least. The subjects, in these situations, tended to explicate rather than implicate. These situations are mostly about topics such as: someone's feeling towards something, a discussion on an exact date or place, or a specified piece of information. These situations, perhaps, do not endure implicating. Or there may be no reason to implicate in such situations.

The results, also, revealed that there are some other situations where implicatures are mostly used. They are the same in English and in Arabic too.

In these situations, few of the participants observed the maxims and produced no implicature. Most of them implicated rather than explicated.

Generally, most of the participants tend to use implicatures mostly when they want to hide something (not doing homework for instance), to express bad feelings toward somebody (toward persons whom they do not like), to avoid impoliteness, to help people find places, to express their views about somebody's skill especially if he is not good, or to vindicate themselves.

In order to get accurate results, the subjects are divided into two groups. One of them is the participants who do not speak English. The other group is those who speak English.

As regards to the first group, the results reveal that most implicatures that are used by the subjects in Arabic are raised out of flouting the maxim of quantity. Most of these uses are due to over informativity. In other words, the subjects generally tend to give more information than what is required in their Arabic responses. Following the maxim of quantity, many of the participants tend to flout the maxim of relevance very much. The maxim of manner is the third most flouted maxim by the subjects. The least flouted maxim in order to raise conversational implicature in Arabic is the maxim of quality.

Regarding age, the results of the first group reveal that implicatures are used by younger participants more than by old participants. Younger participants tend to be less relevant, and more informative than the old participants do. However, older participants are relatively less informative, and more truthful in their Arabic responses. The cause of this may be that the old participants are more responsible than younger participants.

Younger participants flout the maxims of quantity, relevance, and quality more than the old participants do. The old participants tend to be less

informative rather than being more informative as they are linguistically more competent than the younger participants are. Older people express their ideas briefly, unlike the younger whose speeches tend to prolixity.

All participants flout the maxim of manner little. Young and old participants use the maxim of manner in Arabic likewise. They tend to be obvious and clear at most times.

Regarding sex, the study reveals that males generally use implicatures in Arabic more than females do at all ages. Females tend to be more talkative than males as they are more informative than what is required. However, males tend to be less relevant and less truthful in their Arabic responses than females do.

As regards to the second group, the results reveal that implicatures, that are used by the subjects in English, are raised out of flouting the maxims of quantity, relevance, manner, and quality in that order. This is the same order in the results in Arabic of the first group as stated before.

Therefore, the participants still flout the maxim of quantity more than the other maxims. Most of such infringements of the maxim of quantity in English tend to be less informative than what is required especially in the responses of the most English exposed participants. This may mean that English proficiency has influence on using implicatures in English, and that English tends to be less informative than Arabic.

Regarding English proficiency, the results exhibit that the more the participants are proficient in English, the more they use implicatures in their English responses. Moreover, the study reveals that most of the implicatures in English by the subjects, who are more exposed to English, are similar to those expected English implicatures as published in English literature. The study reveals that learning English has a positive influence in terms of the use

of expected English implicatures. The results disclose that the participants, who are exposed to English more than 20 years, respond in a way similar to English.

The results indicated that the participants, who are more exposed to English, tend to flout the maxim of quantity more than those participants, who are less exposed to English. However, most of the infringements of the maxim of quantity by the participants, who are more exposed to English, tend to be less informative than what is required. This is, perhaps, because of their relatively linguistic competence in English. However, the subjects, who are less exposed to English, tend to give more information than what is required to express their ideas.

The participants, who are less exposed to English, are less relevant than those who have a considerable amount of English. Ability of using cohesive devices and knowing variety of vocabulary might make the utterances of the participants, who are more exposed to English, more relevant than the other participants' are.

With regard to sex and the use of implicatures in English, males and females generally used implicatures in English alike. We have seen before that males used implicature in Arabic more than females. This can be explained in terms that males tend to use implicatures in Arabic more than in English.

In their English responses, males tend to be straighter, less truthful, and more informative than females. However, females are more obscure, less relevant and less informative in their English responses. Females tend to flout the maxim of relevance more than males. This is, perhaps, due that females prefer to be polite rather than to be relevant. Also, they prefer politeness over giving adequate information. Therefore, they are less relevant and less informative than males are. In contrast, males prefer being observant rather

than being irrelevant in speaking about personal and private topics in particular.

From the preceding results, it is clear that implicature extensively exists in Arabic and in English as spoken by Cairenes. It exists more in Arabic. This is, perhaps, because Arabic is the native language of the subjects. Or, it is just because the manifestation of implicature in Arabic is more than that in English.

The study proves that there are some similarities in the uses of implicatures in English and Arabic. These may be due to, at least, three factors; first, age and second, the situations in which implicatures have to be used. The third factor is that implicature itself is likely to be a universal strategy in speech.

Likewise, implicatures are used either in Arabic or in English out of flouting the maxims of quantity, relevance, manner, and quality in that order. The most flouted maxim either in Arabic or in English is the maxim of quantity. Manner and quality are the least flouted maxims.

However, there are some differences in the usage of implicature. Arabic answers of the first group are, sometimes, different from the English answers of the second group. E.g., Arabic responses tend to be more informative. On the contrary, the English responses tend to be less informative. The participants of the first group hardly choose some of the expected English answers. However, the participants of the first group, especially who are more exposed to English, frequently choose the expected English answers. For instance, the participants of the first group do not tend to spell the words out as it is adopted in English. English uses the strategy of "spelling words out", as a way to implicate, more than Arabic does.

Implicatures that are raised as a result of flouting the maxims of relevance and quality are detected to appear more in Arabic than in English. However, the maxim of manner is flouted in English little bit more than it is used in Arabic. Therefore, implicature is a universal strategy, but its manifestation in Arabic is different from that in English.

5.2 Recommendations for further research

The present study shows that there is a need for further research to tackle the issue of Conversational Implicature, especially the points that are not fully addressed until now. E.g. the study of conversational implicatures in Arabic as spoken by other speakers of Arabic, Upper Egyptians for example, Contrasting Arabic implicatures to implicatures in English as used by native English speakers, studying implicatures in written Arabic texts, addressing whether post questionnaires are useful in the study of conversational implicature or not, comprehending and interpreting Arabic conversational implicature, studying the factors that determine the primacy of observing the maxims in Arabic, and the reasons for generating conversational implicature e.g., conciseness, politeness, avoiding misconceptions? Finally, testing the influence of culture on using implicatures. All these topics need to be researched.

Bibliography

Bibliography

- Angermaier, Evi. 1998. "Pragmatic strategies in advertising implicatures".
[http:// www. anglistik. uni-muenchen. de/~ linguistics/ adpapers/ anger. htm.](http://www.anglistik.uni-muenchen.de/~linguistics/adpapers/anger.htm)
- Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bach, K. 1994. "Conversational implicature", *Mind & language*, 9: 2, 124-162.
- Bach, K. and R. M. Harnish. 1979. *linguistic lvcmmunication and speech acts*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- De Beaugrande, Robert, and Wolfgang Dressler. 1981. *Introduction to text linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Berg, Jonathan. 1991. "The relevant relevance" *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1991, 16: 5, 411-425
- Blakemore, Diane. 1992. *Understanding utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bouton, Lawrence F. 1994. "Can Nns' skill in interpreting implicature in American English be improved through explicit instruction?" *Pragmatics and language learning*, 5: 89–109.
- Bouton, Lawrence F. 1989. "So they got the message, but how did they get it?" *Issues and Developments in English and Applied Linguistics (IDEAL)*, 1989, 4: 119-148
- Bouton, Lawrence F. 1988. "A cross-cultural study of ability to interpret implicatures in English." *World English*, 7: 2, 183–96
- Brown, G. and G. Yule. 1983. *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

- Carston, Robyn. 2000. "The relationship between generative grammar and relevance." *Language Communication*, 2000, 20: 1, 87–103
- Carston, Robyn. 1995. "Quantity maxims and generalized implicature." *Lingua*, 1996, 4: 213–244.
- Carston, Robyn. 1988. "Implicature, explicature, and truth-theoretic semantics." In: Davis, ed., 1991, 33- 51
- Charezinska, Anna. 1984. "Conversational versus conventional implicature and some polarity items in Polish and English" in: *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 1984, 18: 101-110
- Clark, Billy. 1992. "Review Article: Pragmatics and natural language understanding." *Linguistics*, 30: 2, 389-397
- Clark, H. H. and Lucy, P. 1975. "Understanding what is meant from what is said: A study of conversationally conveyed requests." *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 14: 56-72
- Cole, Peter, ed. 1978. *Syntax and Semantics, 9: Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cole, Peter, and Jerry L. Morgan, eds. 1975. *Syntax and semantics, 3: Speech acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cole, peter. 1973. "*Conversational implicature and syntactic rules.*" University of Illinois Department of Linguistics Newsletter, 4: 2, 10-12
- Colston, Herbert L. 2000. "Dewey defeats truman: Interpreting ironic restatement" *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 19: 1, 46-65
- Cooper, Marilyn M. 1998. "Implicature, convention and the taming of the shrew." In Culpeper; Short, eds., *Exploring the language of drama: from text to context*. London and New York: Routledge. Pp. 54-66

- Coulthard, M. 1977. *An introduction to discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Croddy, W. Stephen. 1988. "Meaning and intention." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12: 1
- Crystal, D. and D. Davy. 1975. *Advanced conversational English*. London: Longman.
- Dale, Robert and Ehud Reiter. 1995. "Computational interpretations of the Gricean maxims in the generation of referring expressions." *Cognitive Science*, 19: 2, 233-263
- Dascal, Marcelo. 1977. "Conversational relevance" *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1: 4, 309-327
- Davis, S., ed., 1991. *Pragmatics: A reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Davison, Alice. 1980. "Peculiar passives." *Language*, 1980, 56: 1, 42-66
- El Menoufy, A. 1963. *A prosodic approach to Egyptian colloquial Arabic*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Edinburgh. School of Applied Linguistics.
- Francescotti, Robert M. 1995. "Even: the conventional implicature approach reconsidered." *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 1995, 18: 2, 153-173.
- Fraser, Bruce. 1990. "Perspectives on politeness." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1990, 14: 2, 219-236
- Galasinski, Dariusz. 1998. "Strategies of talking to each other." *Journal of Language & Social psychology*. 1998, 17: 2, 165-183
- Gauker, Christopher. 2001. "Situated inference versus conversational implicature." *Nous*, 35: 2, 163-189.

- Gauker, Christopher. 1999. "*The normative nature of conversational contexts.*" Presented at Pragma 99, Tel Aviv. [http://ucas www. mcm. uc. edu/ philosophy/ gauker/ conversational implic. html](http://ucas.www.mcm.uc.edu/philosophy/gauker/conversational_implic.html).
- Gauker, C. 1998. "Context versus conversational implicature." [http://ucas www.mcm.uc.edu/philosophy/ gauker/ conversational implic.html](http://ucas.www.mcm.uc.edu/philosophy/gauker/conversational_implic.html).
- Gazdar, Gerald. 1979. *Pragmatics: Implicature, presupposition, and logical form*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. 1999. "Interpreting what speakers say and implicate." *Brain and Language*. 68: 3, 466–485
- Gibbs, Raymond W. 1987. "Mutual knowledge and the psychology of conversational inference." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11: 5, 561–588.
- Giora, R., & Fein, O.1999. "On understanding familiar and less-familiar figurative language." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31: 1601–1618
- Grandy, Richard E. 1990. "On the foundations of conversational implicature" *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 16: 405-410
- Grandy, Richard E. 1989. "On Grice on language" *The Journal of Philosophy*. Vol. LXXXVI, No. 10. Pp. 514-525
- Green, Georgia M. 1989. *Pragmatics and natural language understanding*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Association.
- Green, Georgia M. 1987. "Some remarks on why there is implicature" *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 17: 2, 77-92
- Green, Mitchell S. 1999. "Illocutions, implicata, and what a conversation requires". *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 7: 1, 65–91
- Green, Mitchell S. 1998. "Direct reference and implicature." *Philosophical Studying*. 91: 1, 61–90

- Green, Nancy and Sandra Carberry. 1999 . “ Interpreting and generating indirect answers”. *Computational linguistics*, 25: 3, 389–435
- Green, Nancy and Sandra Carberry. 1993. "A discourse-plan-based approach to a class of particularized conversational implicature," *Proceedings - Eastern States Conference on Linguistics (ESCOL)*, 1993, 10: 117-128
- Grice, Herbert Paul. 1989. *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge: Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Grice, H.P. 1982. “Meaning revisited”. *Mutual Knowledge*. New York: Academic Press. 223-243.
- Grice, H. P. 1981. “Presupposition and conversational implicature.” *Radical Pragmatics*, New York: Academic Press. 183-198. Reprinted in *Syntax and Semantics*, 3: 41-58
- Grice, H. P. 1978, “Further notes on logic and conversation”. *Syntax and Semantics*, 9: 113 – 127
- Grice, H.P. 1975. "Logic and conversation." *Syntax and Semantics*, 3: 41-58. New York Academic Press. Reprinted in Davis (ed.) 1991, pp. 305-315.
- Grice, H.P. 1968. “Utterer’s meaning, sentence-meaning and word-meaning.” In: Davis, (ed.) 1991, pp. 65-76.
- Gordon, David and George Lakoff. 1975. “Conversational postulates.” *Syntax & Semantics*, 3: 83-106
- Grundy, P. 1995. *Doing pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Gumperz, J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Hafez, Ola. M. 1991. “Turn-taking in Egyptian Arabic: Spontaneous speech vs. drama dialogue.” *Journal of Pragmatics*, 15: 59- 81.

- Halliday, M. A. and R. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hancher, Michael. 1978. "Implicature and literary interpretation. background and preface." <http://mh.clauwn.edu/grice.html>. 1996.
- Harnish, Robert M. 1976. "Logical form and implicature." In Davis (ed.) 1991, pp. 316-364.
- Hatch, E. 1992. *Discourse and language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatch, E. 1982. "Analysis of spoken discourse." In *Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practice*. Proceedings of the Second National Symposium on Linguistics and English Language Teaching. CDELT. Ain Shams University.
- Hawkins, John A. 1991. "On (In)definite Articles: Implicatures and (un)grammaticality prediction. *Journal of Linguistics*, 27: 2,405-442.
- Huang, Yan. 1994. *The Syntax and pragmatics of anaphora: a study with special reference to Chinese*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huang, Yan. 1991. "A Neo-Gricean pragmatics theory of anaphora." *Journal of linguistics*, 27: 2, 301 – 35
- Hugly, Philip and Charles Sayward. 1979. "A problem about conversational implicature". *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 1979, 3: 1, 19-25
- Kalisz, Roman. 1992. "On the conversationality of implicatures". *pragmatic grammar components*, Dols (ed.) The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press, Pp. 135-142
- Kandolf, Cindy. 1993. "On the difference between explicatures and implicatures in relevance theory." *Journal of Linguistics*, 1993, 16: 1, 33-46

- Kasper, G. 1984. Pragmatic comprehension in reamer-native speaker discourse. *Language Learning*, 34: 4, 1-20.
- Kitao, S. Kathleen. 1990. "Linguistic pragmatics and English language learning." *Cross Currents*, 40: 1, 15-23.
- Kitis, Eliza 1999. "On relevance again: from philosophy of language across pragmatics and power to global relevance." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31: 5, 643–667.
- Kripke, Saul. 1979. "Speaker's reference and semantic reference." In: Davis, ed., 1991, pp. 77–96
- Kubota, Mikio. 1995. "Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners." *IRLT (Institute for Research in Language Teaching)*, 9: 35–67
- Lee, Ernest W. 1993. "Implicatures" *Notes on Linguistics*, 1993, 63: 4-26
- Lee, Sungbom. 1994. "A Study of non-logical inference structure: Q- and R-implicatures." *Language Research*, 1994, 30: 4, 741-759
- Leech, Geoffrey N. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey. 1977. "Toward a linguistic theory of speech acts." *Journal of Linguistics*, 13: 1, 133-145
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, Jacob L. 1993. *Pragmatics: an introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McCawley, James D. 1978. "Conversational implicature and the lexicon". *Syntax and Semantics*, 9: 9, 245–259
- Muikku-Werner, Pirkko. 1995. "Implicatures in formal and informal language learning." Kalin & Latomaa, (eds.,) 1995, pp 151-160

- Neale, Stephen. 1992. "Paul Grice and the philosophy of language." *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 15: 509 – 59
- Newstead, Stephen E. 1995. "Gricean implicature and syllogistic reasoning." *Journal of Memory & language*, 34: 5, 644–664.
- Noro, Ken. 1979. "Generalized conversational implicature." *Sophia Linguistica*, 5: 75–83
- Omara, Salma. 1993. The interpretation of implicature by native and nonnative speakers of English. Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis. Ball State University.
- Phillips, Barbara J. 1997. "Thinking into it: consumer interpretation of complex advertising images." *Journal of Advertising*, 26: 2, 77-88.
- Recanati, Francois. 1989 "The pragmatics of what is said" *Mind & Language*, 1989, 4: 4, 295-329. Reprinted in Davis, ed., 1991.
- Richards, J.C. 1980. "Conversation." *TESOL Quarterly*, 14: 413-432.
- Riley, Kathryn. 1988. "Conversational implicature and unstated meaning in professional communication." *Technical Writing Teacher*, 15: 2, 94–104
- Robinson, Douglas. 1986. "Meta pragmatics and its discontents." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10: 6, 651–671
- Rundle, Bede. 1990 "Review article: studies in the way of words" *Philosophical Investigations*, 1990, 13: 2, Apr, 169-180
- Rundquist, Suellen. 1992. "Indirectness: A gender study of flouting Grice's maxing." *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18: 5, 431–449
- Sadock, Jerrold M. 1978. "On testing for conversational implicature." *Syntax and Semantics*, 9: 281-297. Reprinted in Davis, ed., 1991, pp. 365–376.

- Sainsbury, Mark. 1991. *Logical forms. An Introduction to Philosophical Logic*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.
- Sainsbury, Mark. 1984. "Saying and conveying" *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 7: 4, 415-432
- Samara, Samira. 1988 "Relevance and logic in conversation" *Revista de Documentacao de Estudos em Linguistica Teorica e Aplicada* (D.E.L.T.A.), 4: 1, 21-40
- Saul, Jennifer M. 2000. "Implicature" (book Review). *Philosophical Quarterly*, 2000, 50: 201, 545-549
- Scotton, Carol Myers. 1982. "The possibility of code-switching: motivation for maintaining multilingualism." *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1982, 24: 4, 432-444
- Searle, John R. 1985. "What is a speech act?" In *The Philosophy of Language*, 1985, pp. 129-30
- Searle, J. R. 1979. *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. 1975. "Indirect speech acts." In *syntax and semantics, 3: speech acts*, 59–82. New York: Academic Press. Reprinted in Davis, ed., 1991, pp. 265–277.
- Sogge, Glenn R. 1997. "i.e., an irregular journal of industrial epistemology." <http://www.quietfire.com/ie/three.html>.
- Sperber, Dan and Deirdre Wilson. 1995. *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell
- Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson. 1986. *Relevance*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Stainton, Rob. 1993. "Literal meaning and implicatures"
<http://164.76.102.59/issues/414-994.html>
- Stubbs, Michael. 1983. *Discourse analysis: the sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press.
- Tan, Zhi. 1998. "Testing the interpretation of conversational implicature by Chinese learners of English" *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 1: 113, 42-46
- Tanaka, Hiroaki. 1997. "In other words and conversational implicature" *Pragmatics*, 7: 3, 367-387
- Tennen, D. 1989. *Talking voices: repetition, dialogue and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, J. 1995. *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Traugott, E. C. 1989. "Semantics-pragmatics and textual analysis." In *Language and Style: An International Journal*, 22: 1, 51-65.
- Tsohatzidis, S. L. 1993. "A paradox of cooperation in the conversational calculus" *Language and Communication*, 13: 4, 305-309
- Verschueren, Jef. 1999. *Understanding pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Welker, Katherine Alice. 1994. *Plans in the common ground: toward a generative account of conversational implicature*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. The Ohio State University.
- Wettstein, Howard K. 194. "How to bridge the gap between meaning and reference." In: Davis, ed., 1991. *Pragmatics: A Reader*, pp. 160–173

- Williams, Donna Glee. 1991. "The reconciliation of a stylistic dilemma: Hemingway's use of conversational implicature" *Language and Style*, 24: 3, 351-363
- Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber. 1986. "Inference and implicature." In: Steven Davis (ed.) 1991. *Pragmatics: A Reader*, pp. 377–393.
- Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber. 1981. "On Grice's theory of conversation." In: Werth (ed.) 1981. *Conversation and Discourse*, pp. 152-77.
- Wingate, J Douglas. 1991. "How pragmatic is pragmatics?" *Notes on Linguistics*, 55: 4-15
- Wright, Richard A. 1975. "Meaning and conversational implicature." *Syntax & Semantics*, 3: 363-382
- Xiong, Xueliang. 1997. "On the criteria for grouping implicatures" *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 2: 110, 1-7
- Yule, George, 1996. *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Yus, francisco. 1999. "Misunderstandings and explicit/implicit communication". *Pragmatics*, 9: 4, 487–517

Online Resources:

Conversational Inferences. [ei//A:\conversational_inferences.htm](http://A:\conversational_inferences.htm).

Conversational Implicature. 1999. <http://www.artisc.wustl.edu/~philos/MindDic/grice.html>.

Cooperative principle: <http://lees.cog.040298.htm>

Grice, Herbert Paul. <http://www.artsci.wustl.edu/~philos/MindDic/grice.html>

Grice's Implicature and Literary Interpretation: Background and Preface. <http://mn.cla.umu.edu/grice.htm>

Hollander. www.sourcetext.com/sharetext/ug/vol102.pdf

Logic & meaning: // A: \ plin M 102 – logic and Meaning B 2001. htm.

2004 SIL International

www.sil.org/LINGUISTICS/GlossaryOfLinguisticTerms/WhatIsConversationalImplicatur.htm

www.sil.org/Linguistics/GlossaryOfLinguisticTerms/WhatIsAnImplicature.htm

Appendices

Appendix 1

The Selected Situations

1) A friend asks about your mother's health. She is back but she is not well yet.

Friend: Is your mother back and well?

You: Well, she is back, yes. (Gazdar, 1979)

2) A mother says to her son who didn't do his homework:

Mother: "Did you do your homework and put away your books?"

Her son: I put away my books. (Kitao, 1990)

3) A friend asks you about your feeling toward your colleagues Bill and Agatha. You do not like Agatha.

Friend: We'll all miss Bill and Agatha, won't we? (Leech, 1983)

You: Well, we'll all miss Bill.

4) Your sister asks you about your aunt Rose's birthday. You don't know the exact day of her.

Your sister: When is Aunt Rose's birthday?

You: It's sometime in April. (Leech, 1983)

5) A student is asking a question, and he is absurdly incorrect.

Student: Teheran's in Turkey, isn't it teacher?

Teacher: And London is in America I suppose. (Levinson, 1983)

6) It is clear that the music you are hearing is horrendous.

Friend: What is your opinion about the melody?

You: What a lovely melody! (online)

7) A mother wants to remind her son Johnny that he may not yet be free to play.

Johnny: Hey Mamma, let's play marbles.

Mother: How is your homework getting along Johnny? (Levinson, 1983)

8) A person asks where he can get some gas, because his car is out of gas.

Person: I'm out of gas.

You: There is a gas station around the corner. (Grice, 1975)

9) John is not a good cook.

Brother: John is cooking dinner to night.

You: I'd better get out of the house (Williams, 1991)

10) A parent asks his child if he has eaten the icing off the cake.

Parent: Someone's eaten the icing off the cake.

Child: It wasn't ME. (Leech, 1983)

“Relevance: as if he was being directly accused of the crime”

11) When asked what she thinks of a new restaurant, a woman didn't like it and replied:

Friend: What do you think of this new restaurant? (Harnish 1976)

The woman: They have handsome carpets.

12) A husband is walking in the street with his wife and their kids. He asks his wife to get some thing for the kids. The wife does not want to get anything that may hurt them.

Husband: Let's get the kids something.

Wife: Okay, but I veto I-C-E C-R-E-A-M-S. (Levinson, 1983)

Appendix 2

The Questionnaire in English

This questionnaire tries to explore an important linguistic strategy in English and Cairene Arabic (called Conversational Implicature.) I appreciate your cooperation and contribution. You may have to fill in the blank spaces with what you believe that **actually happens**.

Sex: (male / female)

AGE: (under 20 / 20-40 / over 40)

EXPOSURE TO ENGLISH:years.

The following questions require choosing (1 or 2 or 3 or fill in number 4 if the three preceding choices do not appeal to you.) Neither of these choices is false, but please choose the **most likely** answer.

1) A friend asks about your mother. She is back. But she is not well yet.

Friend: Is your mother back and well?

You:

1. She is back, but she is not well yet. ()

2. Well, she is back, yes. ()

3. Last night, I called the doctor for her in the house. ()

4. (fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

2) A mother says to her son who didn't do his homework:

Mother: "Did you do your homework and put away your books?"

Her son:

1. I didn't do any homework yet. ()

2. Yes, I put away my books. ()

3. I won't sleep now. ()

4. (fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

3) A friend asks you about your feeling toward your colleagues Bill and Agatha. You do not like Agatha.

Friend: We'll all miss Bill and Agatha, won't we?

You:

1. Bill is ok. But I guess I won't miss Agatha. ()

2. Well, we'll all miss Bill. ()

3. It's good today, isn't it? ()

4. (fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

4) Your sister asks you about your Aunt Rose's birthday. You don't know the exact day of her.

Your sister: When is Aunt Rose's birthday?

You:

1. I don't know exactly. ()

2. It's sometime in April. ()

3. I don't remember what I've eaten today. ()

4. (fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

5) A student is asking a question, and he is absurdly incorrect.

Student: Teheran's in Turkey, isn't it teacher?

Teacher:

1. Of course, not. Teheran is in Iran. ()
2. And London is in America I suppose. ()
3. Tarablus is the capital of Libya. But the capital of Saudi Arabia is Arriyad. Did you get it? ()
4. (fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

6) It is clear that the music you are hearing is horrendous.

Friend: What is your opinion about the melody?

You:

1. It's horrendous. ()
2. What a lovely melody! ()
3. If it's running again, I'll get out. ()
4. (fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

7) A mother wants to remind her son Johnny that he may not yet be free to play.

Johnny: Hey Mamma, let's play marbles.

Mother:

1. I think you haven't time for playing marbles, Johnny! ()
2. How is your homework getting along Johnny? ()
3. Is this time for playing, Johnny? ()
4. (fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

8) A person asks you where he can get some gas, because his car is out of gas.

Person: I'm out of gas.

You:

1. You may find gas in the gas station just around the corner. ()
2. There is a gas station around the corner. ()
3. I can give you some till you find a gas station. ()
4.(fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

9) John is not a good cook.

Brother: John is cooking dinner to night.

You:

1. Oh, he isn't a good cook. ()
2. I'd better get out of the house. ()
3. Well, I won't eat. ()
4. (fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

10) A parent asks his child if he has eaten the icing off the cake.

Parent: Someone's eaten the icing off the cake.

Child:

1. What do mean, dad? ()
2. It wasn't ME. ()
3. I've just come from school. ()
4. (fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

11) When asked what she thinks of a new restaurant, a woman didn't like it and replied:

Friend: What do you think of this new restaurant?

The woman:

1. It isn't so good. ()
2. They have handsome carpets. ()
3. Yeah! ()
4. (fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

12) A husband is walking in the street with his wife and their kids. He asks his wife to get some thing for the kids. The wife does not want to get anything that may hurt them.

Husband: Let's get the kids something.

Wife:

1. Okay, but I veto ice creams. ()
2. Okay, but I veto I-C-E C-R-E-A-M-S. ()
3. Yeah, but I veto all things that may hurt their teeth. ()
4. (fill in here if the previous responses do not appeal to you.)

Appendix 3

The questionnaire in Arabic

هذا استبيان غرضه المساهمة في استكشاف الظواهر اللغوية و تحليلها 0 الباحث يشكر لك مشاركتك معه في اجراء هذا البحث. و ما عليك الا أن تملأ الفراغات التالية بما تراه مناسباً و بما تراه اكثر حدوثاً فعلاً في المجتمع المصري و خاصة بين متحدثي اللهجة القاهرية.

النوع: (ذكر / أنثى)

السن: (أقل من 20 سنة / 20-40 / أكبر من 40 سنة)

مدة التعرض للغة الإنجليزية:عام

1) صديقك يسأل عما إذا كانت والدتك عادت من رحلة للعلاج وهي بصحة جيدة أم لا حيث انها عادت ولكنها ليست بصحة جيدة.

الصديق : هي والدتك كويسة دلواتي ، ورجعت بالسلامة ولا لأ ؟

أنت :

1. والله هي رجعت لكن لسه تعبانه . ()

2. اه، هي رجعت أيوة . ()

3. امبارح جبت لها الدكتور ، والله . ()

4. (املأ هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة)

2) تسأل أم ابنها عن واجباته التي لم يقوم بعملها بعد:

الأم: "انت عملت الواجب بتاعك و رتبت كتبك؟"

الابن:

1. لأ، ما عملتش الواجب . ()

2. أنا رتبت الكتب . ()

3. هو انا هنام دلواتي، لسة بدري. ()

4.....(املأ هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة(0)

(3) يسألك صديقك عن شعورك تجاه رحيل زملاء : تامر وشيماء. وأنت لست على وفاق مع شيماء.

صديقك: حيعز علينا فراق تامر و شيماء. مش كده برضه؟

أنت:

1. تامر يمكن، .. بس شيماء ماعتقدش. ()

2. آه والله حيعز علينا فراق تامر. ()

3. إيه رأيك في الجو انهاردة؟ ()

4.....(املأ هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة)

(4) تسألك أختك عن ميعاد عيد ميلاد العممة نور. أنت لا تعرفه جيدا.

أختك: امتي عيد ميلاد عمتي نور؟

أنت:

1. مش عارف والله بالطبط امتي. ()

2. هو في أبريل باين. ()

3. هو أنا فاكر أكلت إيه انهاردة. ()

4.....(املأ هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة)

(5) يسأل طالب أستاذه سؤال ولكنه مخطئ بطريقة واضحة جدا .

الطالب : هي طرابلس في السعودية ، مش كده يا أستاذ ؟

الأستاذ :

1. طبعا لأ. ()

2. ومكة في ليبيا ، مش كدة برضه ؟ ()

3. سعودية ايه، طرابلس دي مدينة في ليبيا ، دي العاصمة كمان. أما السعودية فدي عاصمتها اسمها الرياض. عرفت كده إن طرابلس في السعودية و لا لأ؟ ()

4.....(املاً هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة)

(6) من الواضح أن الموسيقى التي تستمع إليها سيئة للغاية .

صديقك : ايه رأيك في الموسيقى دي ؟

أنت :

1.دي وحشة جدا . ()

2. يا سلام، فيه أجمل من كده! دي موسيقى رائعة ! ()

3. لو حتفضل شغالة، أنا حخرج من هنا . ()

4.....(املاً هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة)

(7) تريد والدة عمرو أن تذكره انه ربما يكون مشغولاً وليس لديه وقت للعب الآن .

عمرو: ايه رأيك يا ماما تلعب معايا شوية؟

الأم :

1.انت مش فاضي للعب دلواتي يا عمرو. ()

2. وايه أخبار الواجب بتاعك يا عمرو؟ ()

3. هو ده وقت اللعب يا عمرو؟ ()

4.....(املاً هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة)

(8) يسألك شخص عن مكان يجد فيه بنزين لسيارته التي نفذ منها البنزين وهو سائر في الطريق .

الشخص : خلصت بنزين.

أنت:

1. يمكن تلاقى في المحطة اللي بعد الناصية على طول . ()
2. آه هو فيه محطة بنزين بعد الناصية على طول . ()
3. ممكن تاخذ مني شوية لحد ما تلاقى محطة . ()
4.(املأ هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة)

(9) عبده ليس بطباخ ماهر .

أخوك : عبده هو اللي حيجهز الغدا النهارده .

أنت :

1. ياه دا أكله مش كويس . ()
2. يبقى احسن أتغدى بره . ()
3. مش هاكل ! ()
4.(املأ هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة)

(10) وجد الأب إن أحدا ما أكل الكريمة من على الكيك، وشك في ابنه .

الأب : فى حد أكل الكريمة من على الكيكة .

الابن :

1. حد زي مين يعنى ؟ ()
2. مش أنا . ()
3. أنا لسه جاى من المدرسة . ()
4.(املأ هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة)

(11) عندما سئلت سيدة عن رأيها في مطعم جديد . وكان المطعم لا يعجبها . قالت :

صديقتها : إيه رأيك في المطعم ده ؟

السيدة :

1. دا مطعم وحش . ()

2. السجاد عندهم كويس . ()

3. يعنى ! ()

4. (املأ هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة)

12) رجل يسير في الشارع و معه زوجته و أطفاله . و يسأل زوجته عن رأيها في شراء بعض المأكولات للأطفال . الزوجة لا تريد شراء أي شئ يطلبه الأطفال وفيه ضرر عليهم .

الزوج : ايه رأيك، نجيب حاجة للولاد؟

الزوجة :

1. ماشى بس بلاش أيس كريم. ()

2. ماشى بس بلاش نجيب أ-ي- س ك-ر-ي-م. ()

3. ماشى، بس أى حاجة تضر سنانهم، لأ. ()

4. (املأ هذا الفراغ إن لم ترق لك أي من الاختيارات السابقة)
