Investigating Iraqi EFL Learners' Recognition Of Conversational Implicature At The University Level

[1]Maryam Ethar Jaliel; [2] Asst.Prof. Hassan Kadim (Ph.D)

[1,2]Thi-Qar University/ College of Education for Humanities/ English Dept.
edhmaenm2@utq.edu.iq; dr.Hasan.Kadhim.Hasan@utq.edu.iq
Date of publication- 26 -05-2022

Abstract

Conversational implicature assessing has become one of the topics that have gained attention in the field of language teaching as an essential element of language proficiency, especially in the last decades. The ability to understand conversational implicature is an important aspect of EFL learners' competence and therefore essential for mastering English as a foreign language. The present study aims to examine Iraqi EFL learners' recognition of conversational implicature and its impact on their communication ability and language skills therefore its role in their language proficiency level. The study tool included a questionnaire that measures learners' ability to understand and recognize conversational implicature generation. The results showed that the learners' recognition level of implicature generation because of flouting the maxims was low, i.e. the learners are not able to distinguish all the cases of flouting the maxims. That might interpreted due the fact that learners' language proficiency allows them to understand the clear obvious meaning of linguistic expression in better way than the implied meaning of the same expression.

Key Words: Conversational Implicature, EFL Teaching, Iraqi EFL learners, Cooperative Principle, Language Proficiency.

Introduction

Pragmatics in the wheel of linguistics takes place in between semantics and other branches of macrolinguistics such as psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics as branches of linguistics that study language in use (Yule,2010). It is interested with the speaker chose from certain available choices in available situation, according to such opinion it can be said that pragmatics deals mainly with context rather than the joined words that represent language as Brown and Yule (1983) see. Pragmatics is a branch of study that puts the lights on the context as the main factor to study the meaning of an utterance. It is Morris (1934) the first to put pragmatics as a term in the realm of semiotic study or what is known as the science of signs. He distinguishes between three levels of investigation; syntactic (syntax) as" the formal relations of signs to one another", semantics as "the relation of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable" and pragmatics "the study of the relation of signs to interpreters"(1938:6).

Pragmatics as a linguistic term has attracted much attention since the mid-19th century to play a role among researchers and scholars in research and development fields. Linguistic and philosophical traditions regard pragmatics as the study of language use according to the context of its occurrence. According to Fasold (2006, P.137) pragmatics "concerns both the relationship between context of

use and sentence meaning, and the relationship among sentence meaning, context of use and speaker meaning".

The distinction between competence and performance that Chomsky produces during the mid-1980s leads many scholars to put pragmatics within the scope of performance which means dropping it out of linguistic investigations of competence (Chomsky,1957). It is tell 1990s when pragmatics was treated as a phenomena within the domain of competence. Kasher (1994) is the first to give the term "pragmatic competence".

After Kasher (1994) statement, Pragmatic competence takes the lights in the scope of language competence, i.e. the pragmatic knowledge to know how to talk, when, and in which way, is needed to be mastered side by side with the knowledge of the form to be talked. This realization that a good command of language skills is not sufficient for language competence has led to a change in the field of language teaching and thus created the need to further explore what can be achieved through pragmatic competence in language teaching. Pragmatic competence focuses on meaning as it occurs in a specific context under specific circumstances. For this reason, pragmatic knowledge is the cornerstone for driving intended meaning and keeping up with conversational exchanges. Rose and Casper (2001) state that when learning or interacting, "do not just need to get things done but must attend to their interpersonal relationships with other participants at the same time" (P.2).

Poor pragmatic knowledge which is found in some speeches has more ramification than pragmatic errors. Since those types of errors are understood according to different social and personal lines instead of errors that the learner or student is performing (Bardovi-Harlig &

Mahan- Tayler, 2003). pragmatic mistakes is one of the main reasons why communication between speakers fails because the speaker sometimes comes across as less polite, more formal, or even rude. For a successful conversation, the interlocutors depend on the cooperation that develops between them. Since cooperation is discussed, the importance of implicit conversation in the field of English as a foreign language must be emphasized. During communication since interlocutors do not follow always the rules, in this study the maxims, they are flouting the maxims for specific reasons i.e. being cooperative indirectly, which is the reason of generating conversational implicature (Grice, 1975; Yule, 2010). Conversational implicature is a hidden massage that the speaker wants to convey by not being stick to the literal linguistic meaning.

As a term, implicature implicitly refers to the functional aspect of language; it determines how people perceive meanings that are not clearly expressed in their language (Archer et al., 2012; Levinson, 1983). Indeed, the implicature arises as a result of the interpretations of interlocutors and conveys meaning that goes beyond the surface structure of the utterance (Archer et al., 2012). Understanding implied meanings is a major challenge for second and foreign language learners. In fact, factors such as cultural background, exposure to the second language, implied gender, and second language proficiency in general affect student comprehension. (Bouton, 1988, 1999; Keenan, 1976; Roever, 2001; Roever, 2009; Taguchi, 2007, 2008, 2012). Almost all studies that have addressed this problem agree that learners' ability to comprehend implicature needs to be improved. Most EFL teachers, as well as ESL teachers, have completely ignored implicature teaching. (Al-Hindawi & Mubarak, 2014; Bouton,1988;

Roever,2010). It can be said clearly from such statement that in EFL learning environments such as Iraqi EFL learning environment EFL learners tend to face difficulties in learning and therefore comprehending implicature, conversational implicature precisely, due to the lack of exposure and practice for such pragmatic notion due the lack of pragmatic instruments that are specialized for such purposes. And this by itself causes impacts on the behalf of EFL learners' pragmatic knowledge.

This study attempts to assess and see the Iraqi EFL learners' pragmatic competence level via assessing their recognition of conversational implicature that arose from the co-operation between interlocutors in certain situation. Hence the current study aims to achieve such a goal via identifying the extent to which the EFL learners recognize the generation of conversational implicature of the different conversational maxims.

EFL Learning and Pragmatic Teaching

EFL is a replacement for English as a foreign language. And it stands as a terminology that refers to the process of learning English as a foreign language. Shu Dingfang (1994)made a study that distinguish the differences between foreign language and second language according to the language environment, language input and the effective factors that impose on the learners and therefore effect on their learning process. In accordance EFL refers to learning English in non-English-speaking countries. Yoko Iwai(2011) stated that the audience of EFL are those people who their English is not the first language nor it is the official language of the country they are belonging to.

Generally it can be said that second language learning and foreign language learning both of them have their own methods and materials that are all given to provide a pragmatic command of the target language, but whereas L2 learners need the language for their own community the FL Learners need the language for contact with community other than his own therefore the EFL learners should learn to deal with the context of that language in order to know how to use it appropriately. Or as it illustrated by Wilkins;

> "The aim of teaching the language is to increase the ease of contact with foreign language speakers outside the country. Sometimes there is a prediction of the kind of contact that is anticipated. We have already seen how this prediction operates for the individual, but language teaching needs to cater for wider social needs too, and we read as a justification for language teaching that it is a necessary condition for the expansion of overseas trade. The provision of an adequate number of foreign language speakers is now thought necessary for a country's economy . In spite of this and other functional requirements that can be put upon the language being learned, few would quarrel with the traditional view that the learning of a foreign language itself

contributes to the education of the indivi. dual by giving him access to the culture of a group of people with whom he does not have daily contact ." (Wilkins, 1972: P.154).

Over the past five decades significant changes have been seen in the understanding of how languages are learned and therefore how should be taught (Usó-Juan & Martínez-Flor, 2008). Among the different approaches, "communicative language teaching CLT" has become the most used language teaching method. The main purpose of this method is to improve the quality of language learners' (Usó-Juan & Martínez-Flor, 2008). The concept of the CLT has become an interesting analytical topic in second language acquisition and foreign language teaching research. Therefore, many scientists in the field have tried to describe the structure of CLT by identifying its components. The various components of the CLT included numerous studies on pragmatic competence. So it can be said that the understanding of pragmatic competence has been strongly influenced by various CLT models (Taguchi, 2011).

Thomas (1983) describes pragmatic competence as both pragmatic and sociolinguistic knowledge. The first relates to "the language resources available to perform linguistic functions" (Tagouchi, 2011, p. 289), and the second to "the language user's assessment of the context in which these resources are implemented" (Taguchi, 2011, p. 289).

Complexity also increases when it comes to actual classroom practices in an EFL environment. Native speakers (NSs) learn the social rules of speech through social contact at home, at school, and in the community (LoCastro, 2012). However, learning adaptive grammar is very difficult

for EFL learners because there is almost no way to interact with NSs (LoCastro, 2012). On the other hand, EFL learners have little or no contact with English outside the classroom; therefore, they may be at a disadvantage for ESL students.

Until now, problems of language use have left traditional linguistic research, and moved to pragmatic research to increase the field of language teaching. Indeed pragmatics has recently embraced new solutions to these new problems (Mey, 2001). May writes that many of these problems have opened up "outside" pragmatic field and include: turn taking and conversation control (ethnomethodology); argumentation problems (philology); problems with language use in schools (applied linguistics); Problems of human interaction with computer programming and design, and so many problems. Pragmatic guidelines have been applied to "facilitate students' understanding of language ability that is socially appropriate to their situation" (Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor, 2003).

Clear pragmatic advice will fill the void even for qualified English users who want to reduce pragmatic interference with their L1. It will reveal the "secret rules" for the use of English. Since English users' pragmatic misinformation have far-reaching consequences for pragmatic errors, as they are often explained for social and personal reasons, rather than errors arising from the learning process (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan - Taylor, 2003).

Among other things pragmatic errors, failing to communicate between interlocutors, make the speaker do something impolite during social interaction and even be rude sometimes. For this reason, it has been argued that pragmatic skills are crucial for healthy communication, because their lack interferes with communication, which in

some cases can have serious consequences (Allami & Naeimi, 2011; Shi, 2014). The situation in which the language user is unable to maintain effective communication is described as the inability to use the language properly and the inability to understand the necessary meanings (Thomas, 1983).

The Gricean Model

The philosopher H.P Grice introduces a theory that is interested in human communication system called the co-operative principle. His theory is mainly interested in how people are implying while saying, making reference while stating or presupposition while asking.

Grice claims that during communication speaker S and hearer H tend to hold a matter of agreement that both of them are being cooperative while talking:

> "Our talk exchanges do not normally consist of a succession of disconnected remarks, be rational if they did. They are characteristically, to some degree at least, cooperative efforts; and each recognizes in them, to some extent, a common purpose of purposes, or at least a mutually accepted direction." (Grice 1975/1989, p. 26)

The main idea that stands behind Grice's theory that is speaker S and hearer H are aiming to maintain cooperation among them while communicating as in the following formulation:

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 1975/1989, p. 26)

Grice claims that interlocutors, while being cooperative with each other, are in fact give respect to various maxims. It can be said that there is a set of furniture that the CP theory stands on, this set contains four main maxims. And each maxim of these four maxims provides coverage to one aspect of linguistic interaction. These maxims describe how interactions suppose to go on and what is expected from the interlocutors to do or in such case to say in order to observe these maxims. These maxims are according to Grice (1975\1987, PP.26-7):

The maxims:

1. Quantity:
* 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.

2. Quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true.
* Do not say what you believe to be false.
* Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3. Relation: Be relevant.

4. Manner: Be perspicuous.
* Avoid obscurity of expression.
* Avoid ambiguity.
* Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
* Be orderly.

Grice formulation is a descriptive one, what he really means by his theory is that interlocutors(S and H) invariably make

their conversation suitable in appropriate context. so it is important to mention that these four maxims are not perspective ones, i.e. they are not a must that should be followed precisely, in order to a conversation to be successful (Birner, 2013). Indeed Levison writes about Grice idea:

> "It is not the case, he (Grice) will readily admit, that people follow these guidelines to the letter. Rather, 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 nevertheless being adhered to at some deeper level" (1983, P.102)

Grace, of course, admits that sometimes the speaker does not follow these principles. He names four cases of breaking the maxims, and stated that only one case is keep cooperation even though the maxims are not followed, this case is called flouting the maxims (1975/1989, p. 30). S can publicly Flout a maxim in clear way to H. Grace suggests that this latter case is the one that generally form the conversational implicature. By openly flout the maxims for what S says, but without stopping to look at the checkpoint, the speaker is indicating to his listener that he wants to convey another message that matches the checkpoint. As Grice puts it, S is exploiting the conversational maxims in order to generate a conversational implicature (1975/1989, p.36).

This can be illustrated in the following example (taken from Kasmirli, 2016):

1)   Ada: Do you like my new outfit?

Bea: You shouldn't be allowed to buy clothes.

Bea's words seem to violate the PC, particularly the quantity and relationship (and possibly quality as well) maxims. She must know from Ada's question that relevant information is required, and she must be able to provide it to Ada, because it is her personal opinion. But Ada has no reason to believe that Bea is not responding to her question. Ada can only assume in accordance to her friend response that Bea is trying to convey something else, that Ada's clothes are horrible, which is useful and relevant, but for some reason Bea didn't say it directly. Ada assumes that Bea believes that Ada is able to infer this and concludes that Bea is implicating that Ada's clothes are terrible. In this case   Bea answer is flouting the CP instead of violating it, since cooperation is still maintained.

Method

Population and Sample

The total number of the current study sample is 140 Iraqi learners of English as a foreign language in the Department of English Language, College of Education for Human Sciences, Dhi Qar University. All of them are fourth year students enrolled in the academic year (2022-2021). The reason for choosing this particular sample came from the fact that this sample was exposed to conversational implicature lectures in addition to mentioning the cooperative principle in their textbooks, respectively, in the third and fourth stages.

Description of the Test

In this study, which is used to asses learners' recognition of conversational implicature, the test is formulated as situations plus two main columns; the first column asks whether the current situation is observing or flouting the maxims, and the second column asks what maxim is used under the current situation. The learners are asked to point on each column to figure out whether the situation is observing or flouting the maxim, what type of maxim is being used in this situation by the two interlocutors and what type of implicature is generated in accordance to this situation. The situations are adapted from reliable authors like (Birner, 2013; Grice, 1975/1989; Levinson, 1983, Yule, 2006). Certain changes had been done for the situations to be suitable for the learners' language proficiency level that is why the context of the situations is college context that they are likely to face in every college day.

Participants who choose to take the test have one hour to respond, after being taught about Grice framework and clarification of aspects of the test, as well as definitions and examples of each language phenomenon in the test. Emphasizing that the exam is based on pure research and not related to grades, and urging them to answer all questions seriously and honestly.

Results and Data Analysis

In order to achieve the aim of the study, the test was designed so that the answers will show how far EFL Iraqi learners' recognize the conversational implicature. The target sample was the fourth stage EFL Iraqi learners. The number of the learners is 200 learners but the actual number of participation that could be reached was 126 participations. The full test is presented in appendix (1). So each column should receive 126 answers and table (1) shows the number of answers for each column. The percentage of answers for each column is what will be taken in consideration in the following.

Table (1) The Number of Repetition of the Answers

Situations	The case of situation		The maxim of situation				Type of Implicature	
	Observance	Flouting	Quantity	Quality	Manner	Relation	Generalized	Particularized
S1	57	69	59	34	22	11	84	42
S2	101	25	30	32	22	42	86	40
S3	48	78	20	62	33	11	61	65
S4	71	55	36	35	41	14	73	53
S5	101	25	20	35	25	46	84	42
S6	41	85	14	45	26	41	42	84
S7	89	37	29	68	22	7	94	32
S8	37	89	30	63	24	9	77	49
S9	54	72	29	44	48	5	57	69
S10	86	40	46	47	22	11	88	38
S11	68	58	38	33	36	19	72	54
S12	61	65	23	37	50	16	59	67
S13	35	91	47	37	30	12	69	57
S14	62	64	33	60	25	8	81	45
S15	92	34	31	31	54	10	95	31
S16	68	58	26	39	40	21	71	55

S17	85	41	23	37	31	35	83	43
S18	85	41	14	42	25	35	95	31
S19	56	70	24	37	28	37	63	63

In order to achieve the study aim which is "**To identify the extent to which the EFL learners recognize the generation of conversational implicature of the different conversational maxims",** the learners should be examined if they are able to distinguish between the observance and the flouting of the maxims, and then to be examined if they are able to distinguish between the different maxims in both cases of observance and flouting. The first and second column of the questionnaire is designed to achieve such aim by exposing the learners to the task of determining the case of the situations, which are short conversations, if they observe or flout the maxims, and then to the task of determining the type of maxim in the conversation under discussion, i.e. each column in the questionnaire holds a task.

The learners' recognition of the flouting for the different maxims and the implicature generated from these maxims is determined by their answers to these two columns. If the answers are consistent, this means that the learners are able to understand the maxims and understand the state of flouting which indicates that they recognize the implicature. But if there is a contradiction between the answers, this means that there is weakness or lack of understanding of the maxims. Weakness is seen when the learners are capable to figure out the difference between the observance\flouting cases but without being able to distinguish the maxims, i.e. they answered the first column correctly only. The lack of understanding is when the first column is answered incorrectly despite the second column answer.

For the purpose of clarifying the mechanism of verification of the first aim, the first four cases will be presented and analyzed according to their cases and the type of maxim used in them, and then the number of correct answers obtained from learners will be displayed and compared to verify the percentage of the number of learners who answered correctly in both columns.

Situation 1:
(Two students talk about their morning)
A: What did you have for breakfast this morning?
B: I had some toast and jam.

(A)'s question here demands a specific amount of information and (B)'s answer performs the right amount of information required to the question. So it can be said that (B)'s answers follows the maxims namely the quantity maxim. So the case of the situation is **observance** and the maxim is **the maxim of quantity**.

The percentage of answers that reached observance for this situation was 45.2% while the percentage of answers that reached the maxim of quantity was 46.8 %. By comparing the percentage of theses to columns the total percentage of correct answers reached 45.2%, i.e. 45.2% percentage of learners' answers correctly.

Situation 2:
(Two students introduce themselves)
A: My name in Ahmed, and you?
B: My name is Retha.

(A)here provides a specific information and demands (B) to provide the same information, and (B) response is as specific as it required and into the topic. So (B)'s

response it **observing** the maxim namely **the maxim of relation**, since his response is related to (A)'s question.

The percentage of answers that reached observance for this situation was 80.2% while the percentage of answers that reached the maxim of relation was 33.3 %. By comparing the percentage of theses to columns the total percentage of correct answers reached 33.3%, i.e. 33.3% percentage of learners' answer correctly.

Situation 3:
 (A student asks his teacher about some information during the class).
    A: Is Reno in Mexico?
    B: Sure, and Philadelphia is in Turkey.

(B) provides a false information in accordance to (A)'s question which perform a matter of sarcasm that indicates the fact that (A)'s information is a wrong one and the answer for his question is no. So (B)'s response is **flouting** the maxim namely the **maxim of quality** by providing false information.

The percentage of answers that reached flouting for this situation was 61.9% while the percentage of answers that reached maxim of quality was 49.2 %. By comparing the percentage of theses to columns the total percentage of correct answers reached 49.2%, i.e. 49.2% percentage of learners' answer correctly.

Situation 4:
(Two students discuss their plans for the next morning)
    A: Do you have school tomorrow?
    B: I have classes all day but I must go to the doctor when I'm finished.

(A)'s question here demands a specific amount of information and since his question is a yes/no questions so (B)'s respond should be either confirms or disconfirms the question. But (B) here provides more information than it is required so (B) is **flouting** the maxim namely the **maxim of quantity**.

The percentage of answers that reached flouting for this situation was 43.7% while the percentage of answers that reached maxim of quality was 28.6 %. By comparing the percentage of theses to columns the total percentage of correct answers reached 28.6%, i.e. 28.6% percentage of learners' answer correctly.

After presenting the analysis mechanism used for the purpose of understanding the short conversations, as well as how to determine the percentages of correct answers for the first four situations. The next two tables present the percentages of all the answers; table (2) shows the percentage of the learners' answers both the correct and wrong ones, and table (3) shows the percentage for the correct answers of each column and the total percentage of correct answer.

Table (2)The Percentage of the Answers

Situations	The case of situation		The maxim of situation			
	Observance	Flouting	Quantity	Quality	Manner	Relation
S1	45.2	54.8	46.8	27	17.5	8.7
S2	80.2	19.8	23.8	25.4	17.5	33.3
S3	38.1	61.9	15.9	49.2	26.2	8.7
S4	56.3	43.7	28.6	27.8	32.5	11.1
S5	80.2	19.8	15.9	27.8	19.8	36.5
S6	32.5	67.5	11.1	35.7	20.6	32.5
S7	70.6	29.4	23	54	17.5	5.6

S8	29.4	70.6	23.8	50	19	7.1
S9	42.9	57.1	23	34.9	38.1	4
S10	68.3	31.7	36.5	37.3	17.5	8.7
S11	54	46	30.2	26.2	28.6	15.1
S12	48.4	51.6	18.3	29.4	39.7	12.7
S13	27.8	72.2	37.3	29.4	23.8	9.5
S14	49.2	50.8	26.2	47.6	19.8	6.3
S15	73	27	24.6	24.6	42.9	7.9
S16	54	46	20.6	31	31.7	16.7
S17	67.5	32.5	18.3	29.4	24.6	27.8
S18	67.5	32.5	11.1	33.3	19.8	35.7
S19	44.4	55.6	19	29.4	22.9	29.4

Table (3) The Total Percentage of Correct Answers for the First Aim

Situations	The case of situation		The maxim of Situation		Total percentage
	Correct Answer	Percentage	Correct Answer	Percentage	
S1	Observance	45.2	Quantity	46.8	**45.2**
S2	Observance	80.2	Relation	33.3	**33.3**
S3	Flouting	61.9	Quality	49.2	**49.2**
S4	Flouting	43.7	Quantity	28.6	**28.6**
S5	Observance	80.2	Relation	36.5	**36.5**
S6	Flouting	67.5	Relation	32.5	**32.5**
S7	Observing	70.6	Quality	54	**54**
S8	Flouting	70.6	Quality	50	**50**
S9	Flouting	57.1	Manner	38.1	**38.1**
S10	Observing	68.3	Quantity	36.5	**36.5**
S11	Flouting	46	Quantity	30.2	**30.2**
S12	Flouting	51.6	Manner	39.7	**39.7**
S13	Flouting	72.2	Quantity	37.3	**37.3**
S14	Flouting	50.8	Quality	47.6	**47.6**
S15	Observing	73	Manner	42.9	**42.9**
S16	Flouting	46	Manner	37.7	**37.7**
S17	Flouting	32.5	Manner	24.6	**24.6**
S18	Observing	67.5	Relation	35.7	**35.7**
S19	Flouting	55.6	Relation	29.4	**29.4**

By taken the overall percentage for the correct answers (for both columns) it can be seen that only (38.4%) of learners were capable of reaching the right answers from the whole sample that was (126) learners. That means (38.4%) is the percentage of fourth stage EFL learners who recognize the flouting of the different conversational maxims.

Discussion of results

This Study is designed to investigate The EFL Iraqi learners' pragmatic competence via assessing their recognition to

conversational implicature. It is known from the previous studies that high level of language proficiency is associated with strong ability to understand implied meanings and indirect messages and this was the Cornerstone that this study is built around. And since the study is interested more in recognition level instead of production level of language So the study fest was designed to assess the recognition level of the EFL Iraqi learners since they are considered as advanced learners at their current stage. The study aims to investigate the learners' ability to understand the generation of conversational implicature via exposing them to a group of situations (small conversations) in order to measure the extent of their ability of understanding. This aim is chosen in order to determine the communicative competence level of proficiency the learners hold.

Interpretation of the learners' recognition of the implicature generation

This aim reaches the learners' ability to recognize the generation of implicature . It aims precisely to investigate the recognition of generating the implicature via flouting the maxim, which leads to a better understanding of the learners' recognition of implied meanings, since the implicature generation from observing the maxims is easier to gain because it is linked to the linguistic meaning of the expression under investigation.

Statistical analysis shows that the learners' recognition level of implicature generation because of flouting the maxims was low, i.e. the learners are not able to distinguish all the cases of flouting the maxims. At the same time the statistical analysis shows a high average of recognition for the case of observing the maxims, which indicates that the learners' ability to comprehend the implicature

generation is stronger when the maxim is generated in the case of observing the four maxims. That might interpreted due the fact that learners' language proficiency allows them to understand the clear obvious meaning of linguistic expression in better way than the implied meaning of the same expression.

The data analysis shows that even though the learners who recognized the case of observing/flouting the maxims; they face difficulty with distinguishing the four maxims. This might due the fact that the learners' language proficiency level allows them to understand the meaning of the linguistic expressions and to classify it in accordance to whether it is being related to the linguistic expression directly or not, but not to understand which maxim is being obeyed, i.e. the learners can recognize if what is said is referring directly to the linguistic meaning it holds or refers to a further meaning. Or due the lack of deep instructions for the notion of the maxims and clarifying their definitions and usage in every day conversations which means that the learners might recognize the usage of the maxim but do not know the maxim itself.

As for the maxims that are understood by the learners. The data analysis shows that the most recognized maxim was the maxim of quality comes after it the maxim of manner. These maxims were understood mostly by the learners. Generally speaking it can be said that fourth stage EFL learners are capable to figure out or recognize the generating of conversational implicature at a near average rate, but the rate of their knowledge and discrimination of the different types of maxim is low one.

Conclusion

The results of the present study demonstrated the role of conversational implicature in the development of language proficiency of EFL learners as one of the basic pragmatic phenomena of communication in EFL teaching field. They also showed a positive association between learners' perceptions of conversational implicature and language fluency. Research on the fertile field of pragmatics and its role in class pedagogy must continue. A further study can be established to examine the impact of pragmatic teaching on developing students' understanding of when, why, and with whom a person chooses to speak indirectly, sarcastically, or ironically.

Conversational implicature should be seen as an inseparable part of linguistic competence. Therefore, in language teaching, the pragmatic characteristics of the conversational implicature of the target language must be combined in addition to the linguistic characteristics which provide learners with basic pragmatic knowledge in the field of communication.

In short, conversational implicature is one of the pillars of language teaching. Especially when the aim of language teaching is to teach learners how to use language appropriately and effectively in different interactive contexts, it is important to develop learners' pragmatic and communicative awareness, which they need to maintain communication successfully in various contexts with different interlocutors.

References

1. Al-hindawi, Fareed & Mubarak, Ahmed. (2014). Pragmatic Failure in Iraqi EFL Contexts. Adab Al-Kufa. 20.

2. Allami, H. &Naeimi. A. (2011). A cross-linguistic study of refusals: An analysis of pragmatic competence development in Iranian EFL learners. Journal of Pragmatics, 43, 385-406.

3. Bardovi- Harlig, K. and Mahon – Taylor, R., (2003) TeachingPragmatics

4. Birner, Betty J. (2013). Introduction to Pragmatics. Southern Gate: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

5. Bouton, L. (1988). A cross-cultural study of the ability to interpret implicatures in English. World Englishes,7.2:183-97

6. Bouton, L. (1990) . The effective use of implicature in English: Why and how it should be taught in the ESL classroom. Pracrmatics and language learning, 1:43-51.

7. Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

8. Chomsky, N. (1957) Syntactic Structures, The Hague: Mouton. education: A Regulation On Textbook Approval and a History Textbook.

9. Fasold, R., (2006) An introduction to language and linguistics. Cambridge University Press:Cambridge.

10. Grice, H . P. (1975). 'Logic and conversation '. In P. Cole and J. Morgan. Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts (3). New York: Academic Press.

11. Grice, H.P., (1989) Studies in the way of words. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press:Cambridge.

12. Keenan, E. O. (1976). The universality of conversational

postulates. Language in Society, 5(1).

13. Levinson, S .(1983).Pragmatics .Oxford : Oxford University Press

14. Levinson, S.C., (1983) Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

15. LoCastro, V. (2012). Pragmatics for language educators: A Sociolinguistic perspective. Routledge.

16. Kumar, S. (2020). Relevance of Buddhist Philosophy in Modern Management Theory. Psychology and Education, Vol. 58, no.2, pp. 2104–2111.

17. Allugunti V.R (2022). A machine learning model for skin disease classification using

18. convolution neural network. International Journal of Computing, Programming and Database Management 3(1), 141-147

19. Mey, J. L. (2001) Pragmatics: An Introduction. Blackwell Publishing: Oxford.

20. Morris, C. W. (1938). Foundations of the theory of signs. In O. Neurath, R. Carnap & C. W. Morries (Eds.), International encyclopedia of unified science (Vol. 2, pp. 77-138). Chicago: University of Chicago.

21. Roever, C. (2001). A web-based test of interlanguage pragma linguistic knowledge: Speech acts, routines, and implicatures (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii, Manoa).

22. Roever, C. (2009). Teaching and Testing Pragmatics. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.),The Handbook of Language Teaching, (560-577). Oxford: Blackwell.

23. Roever, C. (2010). Effects of cultural background in a test of ESL pragmalinguistics: A DIF approach. Pragmatics and language learning, 12.

24. Rose, K., & Kasper, G., (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

25. Shi, X. (2014). On cross-cultural pragmatic failures in C/E interpretation. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 4 (5), p. 1033-1037.

26. Shu Dingfang(1994). Foreign Language, Second Language, Mother tongue and another language [J]. Foreign LanguageEducation,:15-19.

27. Taguchi, N. (2007). Development of speed and accuracy in pragmatic comprehension in English as a foreign language. Tesol Quarterly, 41(2), 313-338.

28. Taguchi, N. (2008). Pragmatic Comprehension in Japanese as a Foreign Language. The Modern Language Journal. 92. 558 - 576. 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2008.00787.x.

29. Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31, 289-310. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190511000018

30. Taguchi, N. (2012). Context, individual differences and pragmatic competence. In Context,

Individual Differences and Pragmatic Competence. Multilingual Matters.

31. Usó-Juan, E. & Martínez-Flor, A.(2008). Teaching Intercultural Communicative Competence through the Four Skills. Alicante Journal of English Studies. No. 21.ISSN 0214-4808, p. 157-170

32. Yuko Iwai (2011). The Effects of Metacognitive Reading Strategies: Pedagogical Implications for EFL/ESL Teachers [J].The Reading Matrix.:150-159

33. Yule, G. (2010). The Study of Language (4th ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511757754

Appendix (1)

The Test

Test formulation

This test is designed in order to assess conversational implicature recognition. It is formulated to include numbered situations and two columns; the first column is about the situation case and the second is about which conversational maxim is been used.

Each situation holds one case of maxims treatment. Either the situation observes (follows the maxim) or flouts (breaks the maxim). The task is to know the case that might be found in such a situation. For example, situation no. x follows the maxim, so a mark is put on the observance case in the first column.

Situation	The case of situation	
	Observance	Flouting
1.	✓	

The second column (the maxim type), refers to what maxim is found in the situation i.e. the maxim that is flouted or observed in the second column. This column holds four maxims, quantity, quality, relation and manner. The task is to know the used maxim in the situation under consideration and marking it.

The Maxim of Situation			
Quantity	Quality	Relation	Manner
		✓	

These maxims referring to the following;
1. **Quantity:**
- Give the right amount of information but not too much or too less.

The observance of such maxim can be seen in example like:
1) A: What did you have for lunch yesterday?
   B: I had some chicken and rice.

While the flouting of such maxim can be seen in example like:

2) A: What do you think about my new dress?
   B: The color is interesting.

2. **Quality:**
- Be truthful. Do not say what you do not have evidence for.

The observance of this maxim can be seen in example like:
3) A: Where are you going?
   B: I am going to my house.

The flouting of such maxim can be seen in examples like:

4)   A: Does   Australians   speak English?

   B: Sure, and Arabs speak French.

3. **Relation**: Be relevant.

The observance of such maxim can be seen in example like:

5)   A: How you doing today?

   B: I am doing well.

The flouting of such maxim can be seen in example like:

6)   A: Do you know where my glasses are?

   B: A boy there was acting strangely.

4. **Manner**:

• Be clear brief and orderly .Avoid ambiguity and obscurity

The observance of this maxim can be seen in example like:

7)   A: Do you know where the cinema is?

   B: yes, next to the mall. Turn lift from here and then go straight tell the mall will be on your left hand and right after it the cinema.

The flouting of such maxim can be seen in example like:

8)   A: How is Sarah today?

   B: Sarah is Sarah.

The Test

	Situations	The case of situations		The maxim of the situations			
		Observing	Flouting	Quantity Maxim	Quality Maxim	Manner Maxim	Relation Maxim
1	(Two students talk about their morning) A: What did you have for breakfast this morning? B: I had some toast and jam.						
2	(Two students introduce themselves) A: My name in Ahmed, and you? B: My name is Retha.						
3	(A student asks his teacher about some information during the class). A: Is Reno in Mexico? B: Sure, and Philadelphia is in Turkey.						
4	(Two students discuss their plans for the next morning) A: Do you have school tomorrow? B: I have classes all day but I must go to the doctor when I'm finished.						

5	(A student welcomes his friend). A: How are you today? B: I am doing just fine.						
6	(Two students find some of their stuff messing) A: Where is my book case? B: A girl with black jacket went out the class in hurry.						
7	(An instructor chats with his mate after they finished their work) A: Where are you going? B: I am going to a house?						
8	(An instructor checks one of his student's performances during the examinations). A: How do you do in your exams this course? B: I am going to pass some of them.						
9	Two instructors mark students examination's paper) A: These two papers have the same exact answer! What do you think about that? B: Students are students.						
10	(Two students talk about their schedule) A: Today is a full lectures day for me, I have only 15 minutes break! What about you? B: I have only two lectures today. I might go home early.						
11	(A student asks his instructor about his presentation during the lecture) A: What do you think about my new presentation, Sir? B: The title is interesting						
12	(Two men talk on the phone) A: Hi, Where are you now? I have been waiting for an hour. B: I. N. C. A. R.						
13	Two instructors check the students attendance to their seminar)						

	A: How many students attended the seminar? B: Only some of the students could not reach the seminar.						
14	(Two instructors figuring out a student's performance). A: It is not that easy task to evaluate his work; what do you think where to put his performance? B: Indeed, he sometimes produces really interesting participations.						
15	(A student asks about an instructor's room location) A: how can I get Prof. Ali's room? B: His is in the second floor. Go straight from here and then turn right after hall A 3 and you will find the stairs there, go up it. Mr. Ali's room in front of the stairs						
16	(A doctor asks his student about the play) A: I heard you went to our collage play yesterday. How was it? B: Well, the students produced a series of acts that closely matched the movement of a play called "Hamlet".						
17	(Two students chat about their friend) A: How is Noor today? B: She's the usual.						
18	Two students discussing their plans for the next morning) A: Since tomorrow is holiday I think I am going to play video-games tonight. What about you? B: I am going to study tonight.						
19	Two students talking in the hall, When a professor passes by) A: Dr.Noor's last lecture was terrible. I understood nothing from her. B: What a beautiful weather today.						