

**CROSS-CULTURAL VARIATION OF THE COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE:
A CASE OF NATIVE SPEAKERS OF TURKISH AND ENGLISH**

**ANADILİ TÜRKÇE VE İNGİLİZCE OLAN TOPLUMLARDA İŞBİRLİĞİ
İLKESİNİN KÜLTÜRLERARASI DEĞİŞİMİ ÜZERİNE BİR DURUM
SAPTAMASI**

Bahar SOYLU

**THESIS OF MASTER OF ARTS
Advisor: Associate Prof. Dr. Aynur BOYER**

**Eskişehir
Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
April 1999**

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÖZÜ

Bahar SOYLU
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
Danışman : Yrd.Doç.Dr.Aynur BOYER

Bu çalışma anadili Türkçe olan bir grup ve anadili İngilizce olan diğer bir grubun sözlü iletişimde Grice'in ortaya koymuş olduğu konuşma kurallarına uyup uymadığı noktasından yola çıkarak yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğretilen sınıflarda dilin sözlü iletişim açısından üzerinde durulması gereken konuların saptanmasını amaçlamaktadır.

Araştırmaya Mersin'de yaşayan 20 kişiden oluşan anadili Türkçe olan bir grup, 14 İngiliz ve 6 Amerikalı toplam 20 kişiden oluşan anadili İngilizce olan diğer bir grup katılmıştır. Eğitim seviyesi bağımlı değişken olarak alındığı için katılımcıların hepsi üniversite mezunudur. Çalışmada yer alan kişilerle kendi dillerinde sözlü görüşme yapılmıştır. Görüşmede çeşitli konulardaki (tatil, eğitim, konuk ağırlama...) sorulara cevap verilmesi istenmiştir. Araştırmada 2 çeşit veri toplanmıştır; (1) anadili Türkçe olan deneklerin verdikleri yanıtlardan oluşan Türkçe Veri Tabanı, (2) anadili İngilizce olan deneklerin verdikleri yanıtlardan oluşan İngilizce Veri Tabanı.

Verilen yanıtlar beklenen konuşma kurallarına uygunluk açısından incelenmiş, önce genel daha sonra soru bazında konuşma kurallarını ihlal açısından değerlendirilmiştir.

Verilerin değerlendirilmesinden elde edilen sonuca göre anadili Türkçe olan deneklerin verdikleri yanıtlar ile anadili İngilizce olan deneklerin verdikleri yanıtlar arasında konuşma kurallarını ihlal etmede benzerlik ve farklılıklar vardır. Anadili Türkçe olan denekler Manner, anadili İngilizce olan denekler Quantity ilkelerine diğer gruba göre daha az uygunluk sağlamışlar, dolayısıyla ihlal etmişlerdir. Türk denekler, verilen yanıtların bazılarında özet, sıralı veya ikilem yaratmayacak ifadeler kullanmamışlar, anadili İngilizce olan denekler de bazı yanıtlarda gerekli olandan uzun konuşmuşlardır. Ayrıca, kibar olma ve karşıdaki kişiyi kırmaktan kaçınmanın düşünceleri dolaysız ifade etmeye engel olduğu gözlenmiştir.

Genel olarak sonuçlara bakıldığında 3 durum dışında anlamlı farklar gözlenmemiştir. Toplumlar arasında kültür farkları olduğundan, bağıntılı olarak belli bir düzeyde fark vardır; fakat daha doğuda yer olan bir toplumla bir Batı toplumu arasındaki fark kadar değildir.

Konuşmadaki kurallara uygun olmanın, sözlü iletişimde mesajı algılama ve iletişim performansını olumlu yönde etkileyebileceği için çalışmanın sonucuna göre ve yabancı dil sınıflarında sorun olduğu gözlenmiş olan ihlal edilen konuşma kurallarını geliştirici çalışmalar yapmak sözlü iletişimde katkıya yardımcı olabilecektir.

Kültürel farkların konuşma kurallarını ihlale neden olduğu gözlenmiştir. Bu yüzden, öğrencilerin hedef dilin kültürüyle ilgili bilgilendirilmeleri, konuşma kurallarıyla ilgili örnekler sağlanması, dil öğreniminde önemli olan sosyo kültürel farkların algılanmasına, sözlü iletişim yetisinin gelişmesine yardımcı olacak ve öğrenme sürecini hızlandıracaktır.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to find out the subjects which need to be given importance in speaking skills in ELT classes by analysing to what extent Turkish native speakers and English native speakers obey Grice's Maxims of Conversation.

Participants in this study were a group of 20 native Turkish speakers and a group of 20 native English speakers which consist of 14 British and 6 American people who live in Mersin. All the subjects are university graduates since the education level is the dependent variable. Participants were interviewed in their native language and they were asked to respond to questions about a few different subjects like holiday, education, having guests.

Two types of data were collected. These were: (1) Turkish Baseline Data formed by the answers of Turkish native speakers and (2) English Baseline Data formed by the answers of English native speakers. The responses were analysed according to appropriateness for the expected answers and the conversational maxims for each question.

Some similarities and differences were observed in flouting Grice's Maxims between the groups after analysing the responses which formed the baseline data. Native speakers of Turkish were not able to follow the maxim of manner and native speakers of English were not able to follow the maxim of quantity. Thus, they flouted the maxims. Native speakers of Turkish were not brief and orderly in some questions and in some questions native speakers of English were as well. Native speakers of English gave more informative answers to some questions particularly about hospitality which is not a basic norm of their society. Politeness and trying to avoid hurting the hearer were observed to prevent being direct.

When the results were analysed as a whole significant statistical differences were not observed except in 3 situations. Although, there were some differences relevant to the cultural dissimilarities in the groups, the difference is not as significant as in the comparison between an Eastern society with a Western society.

Practising the use of flouted maxims (due to the results in the study) that were observed as problematic in EFL classes may provide contribution to communicative competence since being cooperative with the conversational maxims will help convey the message and raise the performance in communication.

Cultural differences were observed to cause flouting the maxims in conversation. Thus, giving information about culture of the target language and provide examples of conversational maxims may help learners be aware of sociocultural differences, achieve communicative competence, comprehend sociocultural rules which are important in learning a language and speed up the learning process.

JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI**İmza** _____

Üye (Tez Danışmanı) : Yrd.Doç.Dr.Aynur BOYER

Üye : Prof.Dr.Zülâl BALPINAR

Üye : Yrd.Doç.Dr.Işıl AÇIKALIN

Bahar SOYLU'nun "Cross-Cultural Variation of The Cooperative Principle: A Case of Native Speakers of Turkish and English" başlıklı tezi 18 Mayıs 1999 tarihinde, yukarıdaki jüri tarafından Lisansüstü Eğitim Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliğinin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalında yüksek lisans tezi olarak değerlendirilerek kabul edilmiştir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Associate Prof. Dr. Aynur Boyer, my thesis advisor, for giving me guidance and support for the preparation of this thesis.

I am grateful to Professor Dr. Zülal Balpınar for her invaluable criticism in reading my thesis.

I am also grateful to Associate Prof. Dr. Ayşe Azman and Associate Prof. Dr. Yaşar Erdem for their comments in preparing the interview.

I am also indebted to Associate Prof. Dr. Ertuğrul Gödelek who helped me with the statistical data analysis of the thesis.

I should express my gratitude to Vildan Özdemir who is the coordinator of the Foreign Languages Department at MEÜ for her support and understanding.

I must express my special thanks to my parents for their patience and understanding.

I would like to thank you to participants who answered the interview questions sincerely.

I should express my thanks to Sheila Hawkes for her help and support.

I wish to thank to Ebru Çoşkunfırat and Çetin Yalçın for typing my thesis.

I would like to thank to my friends for their support and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
ÖZ	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI	iv
ÖNSÖZ	v
ÖZGEÇMİŞ	vi
ÇİZELGELER LİSTESİ	vii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background and Purpose of the Study	1
1.1.1 Background	1
1.1.2 Purpose of the Study	4
1.2 Statement of the Research Questions	5
1.3 Aim and Scope	5
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
2.1 Introduction	6
2.2 Conversational Implicature	6
2.2.1 Grice's Maxims of Conversation	12
2.2.1.1 Quantity	14
2.2.1.2 Quality	17
2.2.1.3 Relevance	19
2.2.1.4 Manner	21
2.3. Flouting the Maxims	23
2.4 Crosscultural Variation of the Cooperative Principle: The Malagasy Case	26
2.5 Cultures of the Societies in the Study	28
2.5.1 What is Culture?	28
2.5.2 Native English Speaking Cultures	30
2.5.2.1 American Culture	30
2.5.2.2 British Culture	32
2.5.3 Turkish Culture	34
CHAPTER 3. METHOD	39
3.1 Introduction	39
3.2 Participants	39
3.3 Instrument and Data Collection Method	39
3.4 Data Analysis	40
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	42
4.1 Introduction	42
4.2 Quantity	42
4.3 Quality	48
4.4 Relevance	50

4.5 Manner	51
4.6 Discussion	53
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS	56
5.1 Introduction	56
5.2 Conclusions	56
5.3 Implications for Language Teaching	58
5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies	62
BIBLIOGRAPHY	63
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A	Interview Questions For Native Turkish Speakers Group 67
APPENDIX B	Interview Questions For Native English Speakers Group 68
APPENDIX C	Expected Answers for the Interview Questions. 69

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1

Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers in Maxim of Quantity.

TABLE 2

Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 2-a.

TABLE 3

Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 2-b.

TABLE 4

Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 3.

TABLE 5

Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 4-a.

TABLE 6

Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 4-b.

TABLE 7

Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 4-c.

TABLE 8

Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 4-d.

TABLE 9

Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 5.

TABLE 10

Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 6.

TABLE 11

Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers in Maxim of Quality.

TABLE 12

Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers in Maxim of Relevance.

TABLE 13

Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers in Maxim of Manner.

TABLE 14

Statistical Differences Between the Groups in Flouting Grice's Maxims.

TABLE 15

Statistical Differences Between the Groups in Flouting Grice's Maxims.

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

1.1.1. Background

People use language as a tool for doing things such as asking questions, requesting favors, reporting news, giving directions, offering greetings, making comments and performing hundreds of other verbal actions in daily life. These speech acts are part of speech events in communication.

Widdowson (1990) states the effective communication requires a sort of social contract involving adherence to what has been called the "Cooperative Principle". According to him, language can not symbolically indicate its own meaning, it has to be contextually connected to yield indexical meaning as well. He points out it follows some mutually agreed rules for co-operation which have to be assumed. He explains this saying that what somebody says to us will be relevant to the occasion or to what has just been said. It could be said people do not just issue utterances at random. According to him, it can be supposed that when somebody says something to us, it is meant to be informative, has some warrant and is not a deliberate confusion or untruth.

Chastain (1988) agrees with Widdowson stating that language users obey a cooperative principle (Grice 1975) as they participate in communication. According to Chastain, speaker and listener must cooperate with each other to make sure that each understands the other and adds to this by saying the cooperative principle requires the speaker to provide all the necessary information when needed to accomplish the purpose of the conversation. Chastain points out Grice outlined four maxims of this principle. First, speakers should provide the necessary amount of information, no more and no less. Second, speakers should not say anything that they believe may be inaccurate or about which they are unsure. The third maxim is labeled relation and it

underlines the need for the speaker to be sure that his/her comments are relevant as in the example;

“How about going to a movie tonight ?”

“Kim is coming over”

The first speaker assumes that the answer of the second is relevant to the question, the participants can interpret the exchange.

For the fourth maxim, speakers are expected to produce utterances that are clear, brief and orderly.

Richards and Schmidt (1983) state the philosopher Grice has described four maxims or principles of Cooperative Behaviour which are observed by speakers in conversation;

- 1- Maxim of Quantity : Make your contribution just as informative as required.
- 2- Maxim of Quality : Make your contribution one that is true.
- 3- Maxim of Relation: Make your contribution relevant.
- 4- Maxim of Manner : Avoid obscurity and ambiguity. Be brief and orderly (1983:120).

Fraser (cited in Richards and Schmidt, 1983) states that Grice argues a certain set of conversational rules what he referred to as ‘maxims’ govern ordinary conversations. The maxims proposed by Grice may be summarized as; saying no more or no less than is necessary (quantity), saying what you believe to be true (quality), being to the point (relevance), being clear and brief (manner).

Brown and Yule (1984) point out as Grice suggests, there is a general agreement of co-operation between participants in conversation, then each participant can expect the other to conform to certain conventions or maxims have to do with the quantity (informativeness), the quality (truthfulness), the manner (clearness) and relevance of conversational contributions. Brown (1980) points out that these maxims, H.P. Grice (1971) noted, enable the speaker to propose and carry on a topic of conversation. Such has been the acceptance of Grice’s Maxims that Robin Lakoff (1976) incorporated them into defining as rules of communicative competence, while Widdowson added a useful clarification to them by stating that we need to cooperate to communicate but that cooperation involves risks which could flout these maxims. Further difficulties in analysing conversation through Grice’s Maxims has been illustrated by Fraser who points out whenever there is a failure to observe a maxim, the hearer must determine

what the speaker is intending to convey and by Wardhaugh (1986) who point out everyday speech often happens in less than ideal conditions. Grice (cited in Wardhaugh 1986:290) states that speakers do not always follow the maxims he has described and consequently, something rather different from what they actually said may be implicated.

According to Fraser, Grice's major contribution is to point out how our understanding of what constitutes a normal view of conversational behaviour can, when violated, lead us to work on what might be indirectly intended by the speaker (1983:46).

Finegan (1994) states that people sometimes violate the maxims of the cooperative principle. According to him, not all speakers are completely truthful on all occasions; others, though truthful, have not observed that efficiency is the desired Western norm in conversational interaction. He thinks speakers are sometimes forced by competing cultural norms or other external factors to violate a maxim and adds to this by saying that you may feel constrained to say "What a lovely painting!" to a host who is apparently proud of some newly finished art work irrespective of your aesthetic judgment and the need to fulfil social customs of politeness sometimes invites people to violate maxims of the cooperative principle.

Richards and Schmidt state Grice refers to the idea that if a speaker has access to information required by the hearer, he or she is expected to communicate that information to the hearer as in the following example (p.121).

A: Where is your mother ?

B: She is either in the house or at the market.

According to them, as Keenan (1976) points out, B's utterance conversationally implies that the child does not know specifically where the mother is, but only that she is in one of two places. If the child did in fact know in which of the two places the mother was located, the maxim would have been violated by failing to provide the information required.

Richards and Schmidt state that it is clear that any language is dependent upon these conversational maxims the specific form they take may differ across cultures. They point out, according to Keenan, there may well be differences across cultures in the degree to which members of a society are expected to correspond to the Maxim of

Quantity. They state Keenan thinks in some cases meeting another's informational needs may be relatively unexpected or marked behaviour.

These maxims have an interesting and obvious application to the ELT environment. If interaction in ELT classes can be observed and classified according to Grice's criteria, then perhaps it will be easier to pinpoint where communication and linguistic failure occur. Differences which are related to culture in terms of Grice's Maxims in speech, violations of the maxims have caused lack of communication and the hearer can not interpret the message. In fact, observations have shown that maxims of quantity and manner, for example, are violated in ELT classes. The students violate the maxim of quantity by talking too much or too little. Because of their lack of communicative competence or linguistic knowledge, when they convey the message, they talk too much by circumlocution and this causes violation of the maxim of quantity. Some students do not talk due to the lack of knowledge or being of low motivation. As a result, the maxim is violated. In terms of maxim of manner, students are not brief and orderly, so the problem of lack of communication arises by violation of the maxim. Learners in ELT classes who are not aware of usage of conversational implicatures violate the maxims and this failure causes miscommunication.

The aim of this case study is to compare a group of 20 Turkish native speaking people and a group of 20 British and American people whose native language is English in terms of Grice's Maxims that Foley (1997), Hymes (1986) and Schiffrin (1994), Richards and Schmidt (1983), Keenan (1976) point out crosscultural variation might affect, to find the differences in maxims and transfer their application to students in ELT classes to raise the communicative competence.

1.1.2. The Purpose of the Study

A number of studies about maxims of conversation (Keenan, 1976; Virginia Hymes, 1975; Susan Philips, 1976; Besnier, 1989) have been carried out which give emphasis on a single culture. There are very few studies investigating Grice's Maxim's cross-culturally.

Grice's Maxims of conversation were chosen for the cross-cultural study for two reasons; First, there is no study investigating the use of maxims in a Turkish native speaking country comparing with Western countries whose native language is English.

The second reason is that the maxims' use is useful in ELT speaking classes in terms of learners' awareness. Being aware of the maxims in conversation may help increase communicative competence. By this case study, the aim is to find out the maxims flouted and to provide a contribution to communicative competence which is stated by Lakoff as its rules mean Grice's maxims.

1.2. Statement of the Research Questions

So the research questions of this study will be;

- 1- Is there a difference between university educated Turkish native speakers and university educated native speakers of English in flouting Grice's Maxims ?
- 2- How does the cultural difference affect flouting the maxims of conversation ?
- 3- Which maxim's or maxims' use must be practised sufficiently (due to the results) in order to provide contribution to communicative competence in ELT classes ?

In this study the above were investigated; to what extent Turkish native speakers and English native speakers obey the rules of cooperative principles ? or is there any flouting (violation) of the maxims ? Is there a difference in the use of them ? If so, how does the cultural difference affect the use of maxims ?

1.3. Aim and Scope

This study aims to compare Turkish people with British and American peoples as English-native speaking Western people in terms of Grice's maxims in Conversation and to find out the relation between the use of maxims and culture.

The study was carried out with people around Mersin in Turkey. All the subjects were interviewed with 10 questions. Education level was the dependent variable and gender and age differences were not taken into consideration during the study.

By analysing to what extent Turkish and English native speakers obey the rules of cooperative principle, the subjects to be given importance in ELT classes can be fixed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

This study investigates the use of maxims of conversation in speech acts cross-culturally. Thus, arguments in conversational implicatures, Grice's maxims, flouting the maxims and cross-cultural researches on maxims are summarized, ideas about cultures of the societies in the study are stated in this chapter.

2.2. Conversational Implicature

Horn (cited in Newmeyer, 1988) states that the pragmatic principle which has provided the most linguistic potential (in terms of its generality, explanatory power, and consequences for simplifying grammatical and lexical description) is Grice's first maxim of quantity. According to him, Grice's first shot at this principle (1961:132) is the dictum: One should not make a weaker statement rather than a stronger one unless there is a good reason for so doing (1988: 117). He says that the same principle is reformulated by Grice (1975:45) as the first submaxim of quantity in later work. 'Make your contribution as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).'

He states that Grice's contribution was fundamental in situating both the principle and concluding strategy within a general theory for defining the nature of pragmatic inference or implicature. According to him, this is a ground-breaking work on language use and the logic of conversation. Horn says that Grice (1967, 1975, 1978) suggests a procedure whereby participants in a conversation may compute what was meant (by a given speaker's contributing a given utterance at a given point in the interaction), (1988:118), it is as a function of what was said (by that speaker, in that utterance, at that point).

O'Grady states the setting, and the discourse context, there is at least one other major type of information that enters into the interpretation of utterances (1987:300). This is related to the 'rules for conversation', it means that how language is used in

particular circumstances to convey a message. According to him, speakers of a language are able to derive assumptions about what is meant but not actually said. He says information that is expressed in this way is called a conversational implicature. O'Grady points out the ease with which we recognize and interpret implicatures stems from our knowledge of how people in our linguistic community use language to communicate with each other (1987:300).

Eastman (1990) states that linguists concerned with discourse are in the process of making clear the principles people follow in conversations. According to her, this makes them arrive at a set of universals of the way in which social reality is designed through language use. She states that a number of these principles have been proposed by the philosopher H.P. Grice. Grice has the view that in conversation in any particular language people obey certain principles that impose certain maxims or rules of pragmatics. It could be explained "determine how our expectation about conversations, our knowledge about the world, and our ability to calculate the sense of expressions in our language all contribute to our understanding of sentences as they are used in everyday situations". (Bissantz and Johnson 1985:182 cited in Eastman).

Ladusaw (cited in Newmeyer) points out the utterance of a sentence in a certain context conveys information beyond what is conventionally associated with the elements of a sentence (1990:103). According to him, some parts of meaning fall under the rubric of 'conversational implicature' in the sense of Grice (1975) and given their nonconventional nature. Ladusaw points out they are best excluded from the domain of semantics proper. He says that there is a need for an account of 'presuppositional' meaning, truth conditions. These are conventionally reserved from focus in the claim or denial or questioning uses of a sentence (Gazdar 1975, 1979). Karttunen and Peters (1975, 1979) designed an account of this type of meaning within compositional truth-conditional semantics. This is an account of Gricean 'conventional implicature'.

Meulen (cited in Newmeyer, 1988) states pragmatics is characterized by a set of central research subjects forming a coherent scientific program of linguistic research. She points out it covers those theories of meaning and analysis which address to speakers/hearers, their knowledge of the world, context of use, and to linguistic acts or achievements and their effects. According to her, many of its current questions are rooted in early British ordinary language philosophy, and the influence of Austin and Grice on analytic philosophy.

Meulen states Grice (1957, 1968) stressed the conceptual relation between natural meaning in the external world, where, for example, smoke means fire, and non-natural, linguistic meaning of utterances (1988:440). According to her, he developed an analysis of utterance meaning based on irreducible intentional idiom: a speaker *s* means something by uttering *u* is analysed as: *s* intends *u* to produce an effect (belief or action). She says understanding an utterance means partly identifying the speaker's intentions. She states for Grice, utterance meaning is extremely important, sentence meaning is derivative. Meulen says Grice's effect in linguistics is primarily due to his account in Grice (1975) of conversational maxims. She states, these are social codes of communication, which involve additional, secondary aspects of utterance meaning and so called implicatures or invited assumptions which are not imposed by the sentence uttered.

Kempson (cited in Newmeyer, 1988) states Grice was the first to give an all-over account of how utterances succeed in putting across far more information than is explicitly expressed by the words used (Grice 1975). She gives the following conversation in which A and B are trying to decide where to go to eat (1988:140):

A: What is the new pizza House like ?

B: All the cooks there are Italian.

A: Let's go there then.

According to Kempson, if one is asking what a house which serves food is like, one is asking about the food served there, that people who cook a meal in particular combined with the country of their origin cook it well and that pizza is an Italian dish. She says that although none of this information is clearly expressed, its manipulation is essential to the flow of information in the conversation.

Kempson says that on Grice's view, there is a fundamental conversational principle which identifies the way in which all indirect information can be conveyed in utterances. She points out Grice thinks an utterance has the propositional content which means what the speaker said and this is identified by semantics as in the truth-conditional program. She says, according to Grice, the cooperative principle comes into play solely to control the additional information. This is implicatures which a hearer may derive from an utterance over and above such truth-conditional content. Grice says

this concerns the inferences that by large speakers do not say what is false, or irrelevant, or too much or too little -a set of assumptions -called maxims of conversation. Kempson states despite the extreme generalisation of these maxims, they composed a first step in expressing an all-over pragmatic framework and Grice's work is justly effective.

Hill (cited in Newmeyer, 1988) states speakers are component of many kinds of assumptions from the 'said' to the 'unsaid', including lexical inference or presupposition (Miller 1979), practical inference (Miller 1979), it is also known as assumption from conventional implicature (Grice 1975), and inference from conversational implicature (Grice 1975).

According to Hill, E.O. Keenan (1976) has investigated the universality in human speech communities of the Gricean maxims. She says they are the origin of conversational inference in Grice's theory and it may everywhere applicable.

Grice (cited in Geirsson, 1996) points out the concept of conversational implicature is identified as in this procedure, a man, who, by (in, when) saying (or making as if to say) that p has implicated that q, may be said to have conversationally implicated that q. According to him, these should be provided:

- 1) The speaker is to be assumed to be fulfilling the conversational maxims, or at least the cooperative principle.
- 2) The assumption that he is aware that, or thinks that, q is required in order to make his saying or making as if to say p (or doing so in those terms) constant with this assumption.
- 3) The speaker thinks that it is within the capability of the assumption mentioned in (2) is required.

Grice says if this is applied to the following example;

Suppose that A and B are talking about a mutual friend C who is now working in a bank. A asks B how C is getting on his job, and B replies, "Oh, quite well, I think; he likes his colleagues, and he hasn't been to prison yet" (Grice in Geirsson 1996:123).

To B's opinion that C has not yet been to prison. According to Grice, A might deduce as follow:

- 1) B has flouted the maxim 'Be relevant' and so may be considered as having violated one of the maxims conjoining perspicuity.
- 2) We can think that C is possibly dishonest through his irrelevant utterance.
- 3) B knows that I have the competence of working out step (2). Grice says that "So B implicates that C is potentially dishonest" (in Geirsson 1996:127).

According to Grice, a conversational implicature must be capable of being formulated, even if it can be intuitively followed. He says unless the perception is substituted by an argument, the implicature will not count as a conversational implicature; it will be a conventional implicature. So, to formulate that a particular conversational implicature is present, the hearer should rely on the following facts:

- 1) The conventional meaning of the words used, with the identity of any references that may be involved,
- 2) The Cooperative Principle and its maxims,
- 3) The linguistic context,
- 4) Other items of background knowledge,
- 5) The fact (or supposed fact) that all relevant items falling under the previous headings are available to both participants and both participants know or assume this to be the case (in Schiffren 1994:195, Geirsson 1996:127).

Wolfson (1989) states that philosophical concepts concerning the organization of conversation are related to the work of the speech act theorists. In particular, those were put forth by Grice (1975). He proposed a set of principles and termed "conversational maxims". He says that there is a code of cooperative behavior which organizes the way speakers understand each other's speech and these maxims give speakers the ability to understand each other's comments by means of "conversational implicatures".

If Grice's description of conversational organization is compared with what Keenan found in Malagasy society, Keenan (1976) states that in formulating their notions, the philosophers probably reflect on conversational control as it operates in their own society. However, they don't make this qualification clear and, in fact, present their principles as universal in application.

Wolfson states on the basis of her own work, and the others in different speech communities around the world, Keenan observes: "It is an empirical question as to

whether in all societies and in all situations, independent observers agree on the conversational implicature of a given utterance” (1988:59). According to Wolfson, Keenan thinks the implicature depends on how the speaker is expected to behave with respect to conversational maxims and these may change situationally and cross-culturally (Keenan 1976:68).

Fasold (1990) states that the basis of Grice’s Cooperative Principle means that people involved in conversation will say something suitable at that point in the progress of the talk.

Kempson (cited in Fasold, 1975:144) describes the characteristics of the cooperative principle and the conversational implicatures as following:

- 1) Conversational implicatures depend on everyone involved identifying the cooperative principle and its maxim.
- 2) The implicatures will not be part of the meaning of the words in the sentence. The sentence has to be possible to understand actually first and then to understand the implicature.
- 3) Using more than one implicature to put the stress on the cooperative principle is possible. As a result, the implicature produced is often indefinite.
- 4) Understanding an implicature depends on inference shared by the participants in a particular speech event. A particular implicature might be clearly generated by an exchange between one set of conversationalists. The same exchange in another conversation with different speakers may result in a completely different implicature.
- 5) Implicatures are cancelable. A following utterance that generates an implicature which denies the implicature without conflict can be possible. For example; if “Miss X produced a series of sounds that corresponded closely with the score of ‘Home sweet home’ was followed by ‘Yet her performance was so beautiful that it was difficult to believe she was singing such a familiar tune’, any inclination to draw the apparently obvious negative implicature would immediately evaporate.

Fasold points out since pragmatics is about making assumptions about meaning based on context, it can be regarded as a topic in the sociolinguistics of language.

According to him, it becomes clear when we consider a series of cases. These are the meanings that can be acquired from a truth -and logic –based semantics of sentences out of context. They are only a part of the meanings that are expressed if we imagine the same cases as utterances in context.

Fasold points out the philosopher of language H.Paul Grice has taken the position that natural languages are as precise as artificially created logic system, but only when the meanings that emerge in conversations are factored out (1990:144). He says to achieve this, he has proposed the cooperative principle and connected set of conversational maxims. These are the means of which conversational implicatures can be created in context which go beyond the exact meaning of sentences. According to Fasold, Grice's approach is fairly successful when it is applied to many of the problematic cases and moreover, his work has been enormously influential in the study of linguistic pragmatics.

Brown and Yule (1983) emphasizes the fact that implicatures are pragmatic aspects of meaning and have certain identifiable characteristics. They are partially derived from the conventional or literal meaning of an utterance, produced in a specific context which is shared by the speaker and the hearer of the Cooperative Principle and its maxims which derive from a supposition that the speaker has the intention of conveying meaning and of obeying the Cooperative Principle.

2.2.1 Grice's Maxims of Conversation

Schiffrin points out Grice(p.45) proposes a general principle which participants will be expected to observe in conversation. "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". This principle is called "the cooperative principle" and it consists of four more specific maxims(p.46):

Quantity :

- 1- Make your contribution as informative as is required.
- 2- Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Quality :

Try to make your contribution one that is true.

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

Relation : Be relevant.

Manner :

Be perspicuous.

- 1- Avoid obscurity of expression.
- 2- Avoid ambiguity.
- 3- Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
- 4- Be orderly (1994:194).

Finegan (1989) points out language users are bound by an inferred agreement which they attach to in most normal circumstances and expect others to do so. This cooperative principle consists of four maxims of quantity, quality, relevance and manner.

According to him, occasionally a speaker or a writer may violate a maxim to indicate that the exact interpretation of the utterance is not the intended one. People use patterns of conversational implicature based on knowledge of their language, their society, and the world around them (1989:358).

Gumperz (1982) states that Grice points out conversation is a cooperative activity involves interlocutors and they infer what is intended. According to him, they must compose what they hear with what they understand the immediate purpose of the activity to be. He says that what is conducted in any one circumstance therefore is a function of;

- a) Literal meaning
- b) A series of indirect inferences based on what is called by Grice the cooperative principle. Grice uses the term conversational implicature to refer to the assumptions a hearer must make to reinterpret messages to accord with the presumption that this conversational principle is observed. He lists four subcategories and related maxims in terms of which the cooperative principle is articulated in conversations:

Quantity-make your contribution as informative as necessary;

Quality- be truthful;

Relation- be relevant with reference to what is being talked about;

Manner- avoid obscurity and ambiguity and obey proper form (Gumperz, 1982:94).

2.2.1.1. Quantity

Wolfson (1989) states that related to the work of the speech act theorists are the philosophical notions. They concern the organization, in particular those stated by Grice (1975), who has proposed a set of principles which he has termed “Conversational maxims”. According to Wolfson, Grice says that there exists a code of cooperative behavior and it organizes the way interlocutors interpret each other’s speech since speakers expect their interlocutors to share this code, they interpret what others say on the basis of the assumption what Grice calls “The Cooperative Principle” (Grice 1975:45) which are being followed by their conversational partners.

The code or conversational behaviour which supports the “Cooperative Principle” is given in terms of a set of “Conversational Maxims” (Wolfson, 1989:58):

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 (Wolfson 1989; Fasold 1990; Bonvillain 1993; Horn 1988).

Fasold (1990) points out Grice has made the Cooperative Principle more categorial by subdividing it into a set of conversational maxims and submaxims.

The Maxim of Quantity ;

Submaxim: Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).

Submaxim: Do not make your contribution more informative than is required (1990:129).

Bonvillain (1993) states that Grice developed a set of maxims he believed account for and direct communicative interaction (ibid. 45-46). According to her, the first maxim “be informative”, indicates a minimum and maximum on quantity. It means giving much but no more information than is needed. She implies the second maxim,

“be truthful”, refers to the speaker’s sincerity and an obligation not to mislead the hearer (1993:119).

According to Bonvillain, speakers can use certain linguistic devices as prefaces to statements in order to signal or acknowledge their violations of presupposed maxims. The following examples illustrate such functions of *but* in English (Baker 1975:40-41):

Quantity : Do not give too much or too little information.

- a) You probably have enough examples by now, but _____
- b) This is just a minor point, but _____ (1993:120).

According to Grice, if he is being assisted in mending a car, he expects someone’s contribution to be neither more nor less than is required; if for example, at a particular stage he needs four screws, he expects someone to hand him four, rather than two or six (Grice in Geirsson and Lososky 1996:125, Wardhaugh 1986:290).

O’Grady (1987) states the maxim of quantity introduces some very fine-drawn guidelines into a conversation. If, for example, someone asks him where a famous English author lives, then naturally his response will depend in large part on how much information he believes to be well-suited for that point in the conversation. According to him, if he knows which part of the country the author lives in, it might suffice to respond ‘in Birmingham’. O’Grady states, on the other hand, if I know that the person wants to visit the author, then much more specific information (perhaps even an address) is appropriate (1987:301).

According to O’Grady, the maxim of quantity can be suspended in order to deceive a conversational partner. He gives the example; if Mary’s alienated partner asks me where Mary is and I know that Mary does not want to see this person, I might respond by saying ‘I think she moved to the south of England or something’ even though I know her precise address in London. In responding in this vague manner, I am not being untruthful since I have said nothing false, but by giving less information than is appropriate I am violating the maxim of quantity and hence being misleading (O’Grady, 1987:301).

Foley (1997) describes maxim of quantity as not giving too much or too little information for the current purposes of the interaction. He explains giving this example; if you are asked how your son is doing and you answer ‘Fine, he is in university and

doing well”, the information provided is about right and reflects an appropriate use of maxim of quantity. If, however, you answer “Alive” this is a clear violation of the maxim since too little information is provided. If you answer ‘Fine, he’s in the university now, got a new boyfriend and a great new haircut, bought a couple of new CDs yesterday, a new bed last week, and is planning a trip to Canberra next week”, this too is a clear violation of the maxim, because it provides too much information.

Horn (1988) states that Grice introduces four specific subprinciples within this basic guideline, the general and presumably universal maxims of conversation which he takes to govern and essentially define all rational interchange (Grice 1975:45-6 cited in Horn 1988:118).

Grice (in Geirsson and Losonsky 1996:124) states some implicatures are conventional, it is unlike the one with which he introduced this, discussion of implicature. He wishes to represent a certain subclass of nonconventional implicatures, these are essentially connected with certain general features of discourse.

According to him, the following may provide a first approach to a general principle. He says that our talk exchanges do not normally consist of a chain of disconnected remarks, and would not be rational if they did and they are characteristically, to some degree at least, cooperative efforts; and each participator recognizes in them, to some extent, a common purpose or set of purposes, or at least a mutually accepted direction. This purpose or direction may be fixed from the start (e.g., by an initial proposal of a question for discussion), or it may develop during the exchange; it may be fairly definite, or it may be so indefinite as to leave very considerable scope to the participants (as in a casual conversation).

Grice (in Geirsson and Losonsky 1996:124) states that some possible conversational moves would be omitted as conversationally unsuitable. A rough general principle which participants will be expected to observe might be formulated “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”. This might be labelled the cooperative principle.

According to Grice, on the notion that some such general principle as this is acceptable, it may be distinguished four categories under one or another of which will fall certain more specific maxims and submaxims, in general, they yield results in accordance with the cooperative principle. Grice calls these categories; quantity,

quality, relation and manner. The category of quantity relates to the quantity of information to be provided, and under it falls the following maxims mentioned above. According to him, the second maxim (Do not make your contribution more informative than is required) is disputable; it might be said to be overinformative is not a transgression of the cooperative principle but merely a waste of time (1996:124) and he says that; however, such overinformativeness may be confusing in that it is liable to raise side issues, and there may be an indirect effect, in that the hearers may be misled as a result of thinking that there is some particular point in the provision of the excess of information. He adds in saying that there is perhaps a different reason for doubt about the admission of this second maxim, namely, that its effect will be secured by a later maxim, which concerns relevance.

Grice has stated his maxims as if this purpose were a maximally effective exchange of information. According to him, this description is, surely, too narrow, and the scheme needs to be generalized to allow for such general purposes as influencing or directing the actions of others.

According to him, as one of his professed aims to see talking as a special case or variety of purposive, indeed rational, behavior, it may be worth noting that the specific expectations or beliefs connected with at least some of the foregoing maxims have their analogues in the sphere of occurrence that are not talk exchanges.

2.2.1.2. Quality

Wolfson states Grice (1975) suggests that a cooperative principle is followed in both forming and decoding discourse contributions. From this principle (actually a set of four maxims), it can be shown how nonliteral (but intended) meanings are accounted for (1989:45).

Grice (cited in Wolfson:p.45) states that maxim of quality means making your contribution as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

The maxim of quality : try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:

- a) do not say what you believe to be false.
- b) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. (Wolfson 1989, Horn 1988, Eastman 1990, Fasold 1990, Bonvillain 1993, Grice in Geirsson 1996).

According to Bonvillian, maxim of quality is not saying things you don't believe or adequate evidence for. The following examples illustrate such functions of *but* in English :

- a) This may just be my own intuition, but _____.
- b) I'm probably totally wrong on this, but _____.

Wardhaugh (1986) states that quality is; I expect your contribution to be genuine and not deceitful. If someone needs sugar as an ingredient in the cake the other is being assisted to make, that person does not expect someone to hand him salt; if he/she needs a spoon, does not expect a trick spoon made of rubber (Grice in Geirsson and Losonsky 1996).

Foley (1997) says the maxim of quality is not saying things you believe to be false or for which you lack adequate evidence. According to him, telling the truth is mandated by this maxim, and lies are clear violations and he says this maxim reflects the speaker's sincerity and responsibility not to mislead others.

Grice (in Geirsson 1996:125) says that the observance of some these maxims is a matter of less urgency than is the observance of others. According to him, a man who has expressed himself with undue prolixity would, in general, be open to milder comment than would a man who has said something he believes to be false. Grice states the importance of at least the first maxim of quality might be felt that it should not be included in a scheme of the kind I am constructing. According to him, other maxims come into operation only on the assumption that this maxim of quality is satisfied. He points out while this may be correct, so far as the generation of implicatures is concerned, it seems to play a role not totally different from the other maxims. He adds saying it will be convenient, for the present at least, to treat it as a member of the list of maxims.

O'Grady (1987) points out the maxim of quality requires that the statements used in conversations have some genuine basis. He gives this example; if, for example, I ask 'What's the weather like?' and someone responds "It is snowing", I'll normally assume that this statement provides reliable information about the current weather.

According to him, in order to achieve mockery or sarcasm, however, abandoning the maxim of quality and saying something that one knows to be false is sometimes possible. He gives this example about it; if two people live in the middle of a sweltering desert and one person insists on asking every morning "What is the weather like?" It

might be appropriate for the other person to respond sarcastically ‘Oh, today it is snowing, as usual’, perhaps with a particular facial expression or intonation to indicate that the statement was not intended as a true report of the facts (1987:301).

2.2.1.3. Relevance

Foley (1997) states that the Maxim of Relevance is not saying things which are not relevant to the topic under discussion. According to him, the maxim ensures that the conversation be coherent.

According to him, the example of response to his cries for help because his house is on fire reflects its operation well. He says that a response like “Okay, don’t panic, I’ll call the Fire Brigade” is appropriate, but “Do you think the grass needs cutting ?” is a clear violation.

The Maxim of Relation could be described as being relevant. (Horn 1988; Wolfson 1989; Eastman 1990; Fasold 1990; Bonvillain 1993).

Fasold (1990) states that the Maxim of Relevance is making your contributions relevant.

Bonvillain (1993) points out the maxim “be relevant” can be defined as involving the fact that discourse or conversation is coherent. According to her, speakers’ utterances should be topically, situationally, and interpersonally relevant. She points out relevance is sticking to the topic like,

- a) I don’t want to get too far off the topic, but _____
- b) I’m not sure if this is relevant, but _____ (1993:119).

Wardhaugh points out the relation is expecting a partner’s contribution to be befitting to immediate needs at each stage of the transaction. He gives this example; If I’m mixing ingredients for a cake, I do not expect to be handed a good book, or even an oven cloth (though this might be an appropriate contribution at a later stage) (1986:290, Grice in Geirsson and Losonsky 1996:125).

Grice states that under the category of Relation he places a single maxim, namely, “Be relevant”. According to him, although the maxim itself is brief, its formulation covers a number of problems that exercise him a good deal; questions about

what different kinds and focuses of relevance there may be, how these shift in the course of a talk exchange, how to allow for the fact that subjects of conversation are legitimately changed, and so on (Grice cited in Geirsson 1996). According to him, the treatment of such questions are exceedingly difficult, and he hopes to go back to them in a later work.

O'Grady (1987) states the Maxim of Relation is essential to evaluating the appropriateness of responses to the question "Would you like to go to the cinema tonight?". According to him, since we expect that the conversational contributions of others are relevant to the topic at hand, we are able to derive from the response 'I have to study for an exam' that the speaker is unable or unwilling to go to the movie. He says that, similarly, a connection between combing one's hair and being able to go to a movie is hard to see. The response 'I have to comb my hair' could be judged as irrelevant and as a consequence it is inappropriate.

According to O'Grady, the Maxim of Relation can sometimes be delayed by a speaker who wants to create a particular impression and he gives this example; If someone asks you "Have you finished that essay yet?" and you respond "It has been raining alot lately, hasn't it?", you violate the Maxim of Relevance by not responding in a relevant way. He points out, on the other hand, the speaker signals to the other person that he/she wants to move from the topic of conversation that has been raised by giving this response. How do we define utterances in context? O'Grady says that conversation that appears superficially disjointed may be quite well-ordered. He says that 'I have to study for an exam' can be an appropriate answer to 'Would you like to go to the cinema tonight?' and he asks that "How does the hearer draw from the addressee's response the inference that the invitation is being avoided?".

O'Grady points out that designation of Relevance Theory to address is problem in drawing inferences. According to him, focussing on information that is relevant, as seen from the addressee's position, in interpreting utterances is the principle of Relevance Theory.

According to O'Grady, the claim that the context in which utterances are defined is not prefabricated in advance, but rather is con continuously creation and modification of using linguistic and extra-linguistic clues present in the unfolding situation is an important aspect of Relevance Theory. To illustrate this, he gives the exchange in the example to consider;

Barbara : Did you enjoy the meal ?

Janet : The soup was lumpy, the steak was gristly, the vegetables were overcooked and the dessert was musty (1987:303).

He states that the implicature could be drawn from the information of the contextual effect in Jane's lists "No, I didn't enjoy the meal". According to him, Janet is being co-operative and providing relevant information although she is not answering directly. Since we know that the adjectives Janet used for the food are not anyone's idea of a lovely meal, the inference that Janet did not enjoy the meal is acceptable.

O'Grady says relevance is a cognitive principle that lies behind information processing. From the multitude of available pieces of information and potential inferences the hearer selects the optimally relevant ones (1987:305). According to him, Relevance Theory is not without its critics; some pragmaticists have criticized it as being too one-sided while not discounting its merits. Communication is thought to be a two-way street. O'Grady states that being oriented towards the listener at the expense of the speaker/writer's point of view, Relevance Theory doesn't seem to deal with the ways in which speakers go about the task of encoding their communicative intentions, which is a major part of communication.

2.2.1.4. Manner

Grice (cited in Geirsson 1996:124) states under the category of Manner, which he understands as relating not (like the previous categories) to what is said but, rather, to how what is said to be said and he includes the supermaxim "Be perspicuous" and various maxims or submaxims such as;

1. Avoid obscurity of expression.
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly.

(Fasold 1990, Wolfson 1989, Bonvillain 1993, Horn 1988)

Eastman (1990) describes manner as being perspicuous, avoiding obscurity, ambiguity and disorder.

Bonvillain (1993) points out Maxim of Manner means being brief, orderly and it refers to the use of a linguistic form that clearly and briefly encodes one's ideas, goals and so on. According to her, it is avoiding ambiguity and obscurity; being brief and orderly and she gives the following examples illustrate such functions of *but* in English. (Baker 1975:40-41 cited in Eastman).

Manner :

- a) I don't know if this makes any sense, but _____
- b) It is difficult to state this clearly, but _____

Grice (in Geirsson, 1996) and Wardhaugh (1986) point out manner is expecting a partner to make it clear what contribution he is making and to achieve his performance with reasonable express.

Foley (1997) states that the Maxim of Manner is not being ambiguous or obscure, long-winded or incoherent. According to him, this maxim refers to the form of the contribution to the conversation and it should be brief and clear in expressing one's ideas. He gives an example about a written review of a performance of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, if someone writes "Ms. X provides a less than inspired characterization of lady Macbeth", he/she has obeyed the Maxim of Manner, if, on the other hand, he/she writes "Ms X enunciated fairly distinctly the lines written by Shakespeare for his character Lady Macbeth, he/she has violated the Maxim".

O'Grady (1987) states that several limitations are imposed on language use by the Maxim of Manner and he gives following examples to exemplify: First, imagine that I refer to a particular person as the man whom Mary lives with. According to him, a listener would be justified in concluding that the man in question is not Mary's husband (1987:302). He states that because of a briefer and less obscure usage of the Maxim of Manner, Mary's husband, would have been used if it could have correctly described Mary's companion.

He gives the following example for second limitation. "Imagine that I am writing a letter of recommendation to an employer and, choosing my words carefully, I would say about a former student of mine "You will be fortunate indeed if you can get Henry to work for you" (1987:302).

According to him, two dramatically different meanings could be interpreted if that sentence was used deliberately. He says that (“You will be glad to have Henry on your staff” versus “It is not easy to get Henry to do any work”) (1987:302). He states by using a confusing structure the Maxim of Manner is violated. According to him, the person to whom the letter is written would be justified in concluding that his choice of language represents a disguised warning about Henry since the maxims are flouted only for specific purposes (as when the Maxim of Quality is delayed to yield sarcasm).

2.3. Flouting the Maxims

Wardhaugh (1986) points out everyday speech often happens in less than ideal conditions. Grice (cited in Wardhaugh 1986:290) states that speakers do not always follow the maxims he has described and consequence, something rather different from what they actually said may be implicated. According to him, one of the maxims may be violated, exploited or opted out, or two of the maxims may conflict in a particular instance. Grice offers the following examples (pp. 51-3). In the first set he says that no maxim is violated, for B’s response in each case is an adequate response to A’s remark.

A: I’m out of petrol.

B: There is a garage round the corner.

A: Smith doesn’t seem to have a girlfriend these days.

B: He has been paying a lot of visits to New York lately.

He gives further examples, however, in which there is an intentional exploitation of a maxim. For example, a commendation letter praising a candidate’s minor qualities an entirely ignoring those might be relevant to the position for which the candidate is being considered violates the maxim of quantity, just as does protesting your trustfulness too strongly. According to Wardhaugh, other examples are ironic, metaphoric, or hyperbolic in nature (1986:290); “You are a fine friend” said to someone who has just let you down; “You’re the cream in my coffee”, and “Every nice girl loves a sailor”.

Wardhaugh states that the thing to be done in understanding an utterance is to ask ourselves what is appropriate with regards to these maxims in a particular set of circumstances. According to him, the literal content of the utterance is assessed and some kind of fit between it and the maxim is trying to be achieved. Consequently, the answer to the question, "Why is X telling me in this way?" is part of reaching a decision about what exactly X is telling me.

According to Wardhaugh, the theory of implicature describes how, when A says something to B, B will understand A's remarks in a certain way because B will recognize that A said more than was required, or gave an irrelevant reply, or intentionally confused the topic B will interpret what A says as a cooperative act of a particular kind in the conversation between A and B, but that cooperation may be shown somewhat indirectly. The way in which A's utterance to be fitted into their conversation will have to be figured out by B. Moreover, B's operating assumption will be that the utterance is coherent, that sense can be made of it, and that the principles necessary to do so are available. So, the task is not an unprincipled one. Wardhaugh says that the necessary interpretive structure within which to form the relevance of utterances to each other is provided by Grice's maxims.

However, in application to try any set of principles, no matter what kind they are, to show how utterances work when sequenced into what is called conversations, we meet a variety of difficulties. He states that ordinary informal conversation is possibly the most common of all language activities. We are constantly talking to one another about this or that. Sometimes a close friend is the person addressed, at other times a more casual acquaintance, and at other times a complete stranger. But conversation is still managed. Above all, conversation can be said a cooperative activity in the Gricean sense. It depends on speakers and listeners sharing a set of inferences about what is happening.

Wardhaugh says the whole activity would be entirely unpredictable and there would be too much uncertainty to make conversations either worthwhile or pleasant. (1986:292). Not anything goes; indeed, many things do not occur and can not occur, because the unconscious agreement that hold between speakers and listeners would be violated and only certain kinds of things will happen in a normal conversation and that both speakers and listeners will hold to that agreement.

According to him, cooperative principles are made use of by conversation. Considerations of quantity, quality, and so on, guide speakers and listeners, and the process of implicature which enables them to figure out relations between the said and the unsaid. So, it can be said that a basic part of any understanding of conversation as a cooperative activity is formed by Grice's principles. If we think about the response "Do you think the grass needs cutting?" to someone's cries of help because his/her house is on fire the reasons for violating the Maxim of Manner may be that the neighbor does not want to help him/her, either he/she is a selfish person or the person whose house is on fire has offended him/her seriously in the past, or perhaps because he/she is mentally ill.

Flouting Grice's Maxims is a very common way of politely performing face-threatening acts "off the record" (Brown and Levinson 1987:214). Hints may flout the Maxim of Relevance. A polite request to close the window through "Gee, don't you find it's a bit cold and drafty in here?" achieves its purpose by generating an implicature through violating the Maxim of Relevance.

Understatement as a way of being polite is a flouting of the Maxim of Quantity, too little information has been provided, thus; generating implicatures in the hearer as to why the flouting has occurred. A good example might be a statement by a house guest to a host "Oh, the house needs a little bit of work, doesn't it?" (Wardhaugh 1986:288).

Polite "off record" face-threatening acts are effectively performed by the floutings of the Maxim of Manner. Direct violations by obscurity or ambiguity of expression are specially thought common when making particular face-threatening acts like requests or accusations, for example, "Look like someone partied a bit too much last night.." said to a partner suffering a severe morning hangover. The vagueness of the utterance violates the Maxim of Manner and leads us to ask why. The implicature, of course, is criticism of the partner's behavior last night, but, as this is a particularly convincing FTA against one's positive face, the criticism is gentle and stated indirectly through violating the maxim.

Grice (in Geirsson and Losonsky 1996:126) states that a participator in a talk exchange may fail to accomplish a maxim in various ways;

- 1) He/She may quietly and unostentatiously flout a maxim; if so, in some cases he/she will be liable to mislead.

- 2) He/She may opt out from the operation both of the maxim and of the Cooperative Principle; he/she may say, indicate, or allow it to become plain that he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires.
- 3) He/She may be faced by a conflict. He may be unable to accomplish the first maxim of Quantity (Be as informative as is required) without violating the second maxim of Quality. (Have adequate evidence for what you say).
- 4) He/She may violate a maxim; that is, he/she may glaringly fail to fulfill it. On the assumption that the speaker is able to accomplish the maxim and to do so without flouting another maxim (because of a clash), is not opting out, and is not, in view of the glare of his performance, trying to mislead, the hearer is faced with a minor problem: How can his saying what he did say be accepted with the supposition that he is observing the overall Cooperative Principle ?

2.4. Crosscultural Variation Of The Cooperative Principle: The Malagasy Case

Foley (1997) states that Grice's articulation of the Cooperative Principle was ambiguous enough to follow for significant variation. According to him, the four maxims were an attempt to set down more explicit sub-principles, but evidence from other cultures tentatively suggests that these reflect more an ethnographic description of conversational behaviour in Western European derived cultures than absolute universal constraints (Foley 1997:278). According to him, the crosscultural variation is so marked and generally so unknown in discussion of Grice's Maxims that Hymes (1986:78) has been led to criticize their "ethnocentric enormity". He states that areas where there is crosscultural variation might include the nature and amount of information expected in conversations in particular cultures and who or what affects the conversation's purpose and direction. The Maxim of Quantity regulates the kind and amount of information expected in conversations, shortly, being properly informative. But what counts as properly informative is clearly culturally determined, as Keenan (1976) splendidly described by a study of conversational practices among Malagasy peasants.

According to Foley, Malagasy peasants, especially men, are typically much less informative in their information as a valuable product something which consults prestige within the context of the largely egalitarian village, and, so they are unwilling to share it freely. He states they live in 'close-knit' or in Bonvillain's words 'kin-

ordered' small villages. So, there is little contact with the outside world and there are few secrets and less privacy. As a result, when you ask someone a question, the information required by the questioner may not be fully-provided; it may be rather ambiguous, limited answers are usual, so, if someone is asked where they are going, he may answer "Oh, may be, just a little to the north", instead of "to the store to buy some beer; we're planning a party this evening". It is hardly an informative answer since the questioner can work out for himself the direction of the person's walk.

Bonvillain (1993) states that if one in Malagasy manages to gain access to 'new' information, one is unwilling to show it. As long as it is known that one has that information and others do not, one has prestige over them (Keenan 1976:70).

O'Grady (1987) says that maxims represent limitations on conversation in language use in all cultures. He means that the maxims may not be employed in exactly the same way in all linguistic communities, however. According to him, it is known that the circumstances under which it is appropriate to delay a maxim can differ. He states that there is a good example of this contains the Maxim of Quantity as it is used in rural areas of the Malagasy Republic. He points out that new information is rare and it gives prestige to it's holder, so that person is unwilling to impart it to anyone. As a result, when asked about specific event, they may avoid mentioning of the information being required by their conversational partner. So, someone may describe a visit to the market as "There were many people there" rather than giving any exact details. He points out that this suggests not only that the Maxim of Quantity may be disregarded but the conditions under which this happens may be interwoven with the cultural practices of a particular society.

2.5. Cultures of the Societies in the Study

2.5.1. What is Culture ?

Light, Keller and Calhoun (1989) describe culture as all the learned traditions, beliefs, values, knowledge and symbols conveyed continuously among a set of people who share a common way of life. According to them, this definition proposes several important characteristics of culture. In their opinion, first, culture is learned; people are

not born with culture as they are born with green eyes or blond hair (1989:71). Second, culture is learned through contacts with others. Third, culture is the totality of learned components that are shared by the fellows of a society.

According to them, for sociologists, the term culture does not mention the expression of any specific belief or value (like fine art or, alternatively, graffiti art) but the totality of learned elements.

Robinson, in his survey, asked participants, over 350 educators; foreign language, bilingual, English as a second language and special educators, "What does culture mean to you ?" and the most common responses formed the following categories:

<u>Ideas</u>	<u>behaviors</u>	<u>products</u>
beliefs	language	literature
values	gestures	folklore
institutions	customs/habit	art
	foods	music
		artifacts

Often, less frequently, they also mentioned world view and way of life (1987:7).

According to Robinson, two basic separations can be made in the three above categories of answers;

1. The categories of behaviors and products reflect a notion of culture as observable phenomena,
2. The category of ideas reflects a notion of culture as not observable; something which is internal but which can also be explicitly described (1988:8).

Robinson points out an analysis of behaviorist, functionalist, cognitive and symbolic descriptions of culture helps explain these distinctions and their relevance to teaching/learning crosscultural understanding. According to him, from the behaviorist point of view, culture consists of distinct behaviors or sets of behaviors, e.g., traditions, habits or customs, as in marriage or leisure. Culture is shared and observable.

He says that from the functionalist point of view, culture is an attempt at making sense out of social behaviors. The function or rules emphasizing the behavior can not be

directly observed, they are derived from the behavior and may be explicitly defined. So, he thinks that the description depends on observations of the behavior.

According to him, the cognitive description shifts attention from the observable aspects of what is shared to what is shared “inside” the “cultural actor”(1988:10). He thinks the idea of culture as world view is related to this description. According to this approach, culture is not a material phenomenon.

Goodenough (cited in Robinson, 1964) says that culture is the forms of things that people have in mind, their models for perceiving, relating, and otherwise interpreting them.

Robinson says that while cognitive antropologists focus on the mechanism for processing, i.e., the cognitive map, symbolic antropologists focus on the product of processing, i.e., the meanings derived. According to symbolic antropologists, culture is a system of symbols and meanings. They are concerned with the dynamic inter-relationship between meaning, experience and reality. He points out past experience affects meaning, which in turn affects future experience.

Edward Hall (cited in Robinson, 1959) suggests that culture is the sum total of a way of life of a people.

Light, Keller and Calhoun (1989) think that there is a relationship between culture and behavior and it has two sides. According to them, on one hand, culture supplies customs and rules that lead how we think, feel, and behave, and how we evaluate the thoughts, feelings and behaviors of others. According to them, preferred or expected behaviors and attitudes are defined by culture; it separates right from wrong, true from false, beautiful from ugly. They point out in this sense culture is outside us and constraints or shapes our thoughts and actions. On the other hand, culture is something people use, develop and occasionally change (1989:71). In their opinion, we work with our cultural beliefs and values to make sense of the world and as we work with others to get things carried out. So, culture is continuously being created and recreated, but history or tradition of cultural elements in a particular society shape or influence those creations.

Light, Keller and Calhoun point out that values, norms, symbols, language and knowledge are the elements of culture. They think values are general ideas about what is good, acceptable while norms are more specific and typically refer to behavior and attitudes in a particular setting.

According to them, symbols, language and knowledge are the other elements of culture. Each is essential to human societies since they allow us to create meaning and abstract ideas, to communicate them to others and record them for succeeding generations (1989:73).

2.5.2. Native English Speaking Cultures

2.5.2.1. American Culture

Gastil (cited in Luedtke, 1987) points out the United States is divided into four major regions: Northeast, South, Midwest (North Central) and West. He says that this subdivision is used by journalists, the United States Census Bureau, and polling organizations searching for variations in attitudes or opinions.

Warner (cited in Luedtke, 1987) states that today the United States is a thoroughly urbanized nation, only 3.4 percent of population still farms and everyone is employed in urban-type jobs. According to him, new urban forms have always assisted in the development of new economies, and in recent decades the scattered metropolitan area of many dispersed centers has been the host to the bureaucratic economy.

De Crevecoeur (cited in Queen, 1988) states America is not composed, as in Europe, of great lords who possess everything and a crowd of people who have nothing. According to him, there are no aristocratical families, no kings, no bishops, no great manufacturers employing thousands, no great refinements of luxury (1988:1). He adds by saying that the rich and the poor are not so far removed from each other as they are in Europe. He thinks that Americans are a mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, French, Dutch, Germans and Swedes (1988:2).

According to him, the individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men there. He thinks that their labours and posterity will one day cause great change in the world. He says that Americans are the Western pilgrims who are carrying along with them that great mass of arts, sciences, vigour, industry which began long since in the east. In his opinion, the American is a new man who acts upon new principles and therefore he must entertain new ideas and form new opinions (1988:4).

Harris in Luedtke says American manners have both a broad and a narrow meaning. According to him, on the one hand, manners can refer to form representing

politeness and cultivation. On the other hand, they contain ordinary usages, customs and characteristic ways of doing things. According to him, Americans are simultaneously distinctive and polite. He thinks that resembled purified or decayed versions of mother cultures of the colonial societies in the United States have existed in American life manners and it is a problem.

Harris points out in America as in Europe etiquette soon entered religious and civic instruction and its texts devoured by the socially ambitious and the economically mobile (1987:140).

Hareven in Luedtke points out a more balanced perspective on family life in modern America is provided by understanding historical changes over the past century. According to her, the decrease in the birth-rate, earlier age at marriage, and change in the timing of life transitions are all part of a process covering the past century and a half. She thinks there is a suspension from adult responsibilities that teenagers now experience. There is also an increasing isolation of older people on the other end of the cycle and these are the result of long-term historical changes.

Pessen in Luedtke thinks disbelief in class existence in America is one of the most striking features. In Woodrow Wilson's observation (1912) Americans think that "this is the country where there is no distinction of class and social status". Pessen thinks from the responses to modern sociologists' questionnaires American attitudes toward class have not changed during the past two generations (1987:270). He points out Americans either insist that classes are almost totally nonexistent in the country or they think they belong to the great middle class.

According to Pessen, class has played a highly significant role in the lives and thinking of Americans (1987:272). He thinks class has controlled the quality and the quantity of the food they eat, the clothes they wear, furnishings and other possessions. He says it determines their social universe, the quality of their marriages and their fertility. He thinks it affects the quality of education and the "socialization experiences" of children and these result in different characteristics in children and different positions in adult society. He claims that if class is a marked element in present American life, that is because of its being a significant element in American life.

2.5.2.2. British Culture

Storry and Childs state that forty-five years ago, T.S. Eliot famously said that “culture” was something which included “all the characteristic activities and interests of a people” (1997:3).

According to Storry and Childs, English and British identity conceptions have changed forty-five years on and they give this example; few people attribute any significance to “the twelfth of August”, the opening day of the grouse-shooting season. Previously, it was a day fixed in the national consciousness, such as Christmas Day.

They think that contemporary British culture is a mixture of all cultures of the past that people are influenced by. According to them, certain figures, symbols and narratives control over the ways they imagine themselves to be and to have been. A recent book on Britain has claimed that “Television” is clearly the basic component of the national culture. According to a survey, the topics of conversation “television”, “the cost of living”, “ children” and “sport” are the most important subjects to most people.

Storry and Childs think regional and local identities are strong in Britain and there is an enormous dissimilarity of beliefs, practices, loyalties and accents.

The connection between national culture and identity is; while culture may be seen as “lived experience” shared by a community of people, identity is concerned with how people see themselves, or are seen, in relation to others; as northerners or southerners, football enthusiasts, opera fans and so on. They think that national and personal identity are complex issues in Britain.

Storry and Childs think British people are often thought to be quiet and reserved. They point out, stereotypically, the people are supposed to undertake their tasks out of duty, without thought of personal gain and their aims are minimized. Across all classes, few people shake hands, they shake hands not routinely on meeting one another, but usually when they are introduced to a stranger whether at home or at work and such behavior is part of a rejection and dislike of formality. According to the authors, the British have been considered as an “island race” partly because of their imperialism, cultural isolation and international policies (1997:15). Compared with most European countries, Britain’s ethnic mix did not greatly change between the eleventh and the twentieth centuries. Today, Britain has sizeable populations from Australia, Bangladesh, Poland, Vietnam and West Africa. The second generation in these communities has had

a great effect on British culture but has also been faced with divided loyalties and opposing cultural pulls (1997:16).

The British image has been defined repeatedly in terms of certain strong individuals who stand for single aspects of Britain (1997:18). For example, the following people have been symbolic individuals who have been considered to be quintessentially British : Florence Nightingale and the Queen Mother (powerful, supportive English womanhood), Winston Churchill and Lord Kitchener (boys of the bulldog breed; from a popular Victorian music-hall song called "Sons of the Sea, All British Born"), Joyce Grenfell or Margot Fonteyn (the well-mannered, charming English performer) (1997:18).

According to Storry and Childs, the most enduring characteristic of Britain is the idea of monarchy. It is an institution that has been both popular and deeply unpopular at different times in its history. They think Britain's traditional culture of castles, cathedrals and village greens that is described elsewhere as 'Theme Park Britain' attracts many tourists.

In addition; events such as Reading Music Festival, the Notting Hill Carnival and the Edinburgh Fringe are attractive for tourists and a focus for local counter-culture as well.

Childs (1997) says that culture varies for Welsh, Scottish or English people depending on which region of their country they come from. He states that in Wales, three-quarters of the population live in the valleys and coal regions of the south; while in England it is the heavily populated metropolitan areas. He thinks that these different areas are connected with specific names and local characteristics. According to him, the differences between north and south have changed over the last two centuries and are more cultural than simply industrial or economic. He says that there are regional differences in sport, food and housing, speech forms as accent, vocabulary and idioms. He points out that tens of thousands of people still speak Welsh, Irish is still spoken in Ireland, while Gaelic is spoken in Scotland and the Isle of Man.

McDonough (cited in Storry and Childs) says that despite the talk of a classless society, British society is possibly divided into three broad classes -upper, middle and working. However, the nature and composition of each class have undergone change (1997:208).

McDonough says that there have been communities like Black, Chinese, Indian, West Africa, the Caribbean, Hong Kong, India, Pakistan and so on, countries known as the “New Commonwealth” and “exotic culture” was brought by these nations; for example, from India and Pakistan ‘colorful’ or ‘alternative’ practices; food, clothes, music, religion and philosophy. According to him, it can be said that each society brings its own assumptions, cultural values, beliefs to the relationship with British identity and this web covers every area of modern British life; religion, politics, work, leisure, culture and education.

Dawson (cited in Storry and Child) states that the rest of the world thinks the English are “proud”, “civilised”, “cultured”, “arrogant”, and “cold”. He says that Britain today is a very complex society made up of people from numerous backgrounds and traditions with hugely diverse interests (1997:327). He points out that many things have not changed.

Dawson describes Britain as post-industrial, multicultural and made up of many conflicting elements; stately homes and homeless youths, settled suburban people and New Age travellers, young Christians and old conservatives in religion and so on. According to him, it could be said ‘identities in Britain’. As a conclusion, he says that there is not a single British character or personality, but a variety of welcomingly different and potentially combined cultural identities.

2.5.3. Turkish Culture

Tezcan (1974) points out that some positive qualities of Turkish people are courage, patriotism, charity, hospitality which is one of the most important.

He says that in J. Pardeo’s book published in 1837, Pardeo mentions Turkish hospitality giving this example; whether they are rich or poor they always welcome their guests even at meal time. They say “Buyrun” which means “Welcome” with a warm and loud voice.

According to Tezcan, they love animals and nature. He says they are tolerant, honest, serious, respectful, loving, affectionate and disciplined and he adds to this by saying that adults and elderly people are always respected by younger people in Turkish society and this is effective in bringing up the children. He says that they are, generally

speaking, both modest and clean. He thinks that all classes of society are clean and house-proud.

He mentions about a research Turkey took part entitled "How do we think of ourselves?" and school children were asked a wide range of questions in a survey which was carried out in 10 other countries. The children were primary and secondary school students in İstanbul. There were 100 students from 3 different age groups totalling 300 students. The ages groups were 6, 10, 14. When they were asked "How Turkish people are" the majority of them insisted on positive characteristics. The students at the age of 6 answered that Turks have good characteristics, the students at the age of 10 described their society as; religious, peaceful, eager and patriotic. The students of 14 years old described Turkish people as eager, patriotic, peaceful, religious and clean.

In another survey among a group of workers in İzmir; characteristics of Turkish people are described as being those of courage, hospitality, patriotism, religious piety and honesty. The same workers described Turkish people as "lazy" in another survey. In Lerner's survey a traditional group described themselves as brave and faithful.

Yörükoğlu (cited in Tezcan), in one of his pieces of research defines the Turkish national character as; brave, enduring, charitable, faithful, respectful, fatalist, contented but negatively as not enterprising, not very hardworking, not very flexible for the new conditions (p.75). Yörükoğlu thinks that Turkish people who have been brought up in a traditional way have these characteristics and he claims that people living in big areas (cities, etc.) may well be different.

According to Tezcan, hospitality is perhaps the most well-known Turkish characteristic, and it is still a characteristic of Turkish people. He thinks that hospitality knows no geography either and can be observed both in villages and cities. He says that it is possible to observe it in all steps of Turkish life and visits in spare time, chats etc. show that hospitality is given importance. Visiting neighbours is considered an important free time activity.

He points out entertaining guests is important and guests are offered food, drinks to a great extent. Even in a group or any kind of communal setting, offering a cigarette to the person next to you when someone smokes is typical Turkish behaviour. In an interview, that took place in Urfa, an author says guests are given a great deal of importance and respect and gives this example; if a guest likes something very much and says 'Oh! How nice!' many times the host will give it to that person.

Tezcan points out a survey has been applied to all of the under-graduate students in the Education Faculty of Ankara University. It was field research. A questionnaire which consisted of 195 questions was given as the technique. There were 200 students. It was carried out in the first semester of 1972-73 academic year.

He claims that the result has been useful in finding the tendency in description of Turkish people although it wasn't given to all the students of the university. Moreover, the results' being parallel with the results of the other students' survey makes it valid.

Most of the students had spent most of their lives in big cities and most of the students' fathers were educated, half of the mothers were not. Most of the students were from a lower socio-economical class. This is important because it shows the education's progressive role in social status. Students were given a list of sixty adjectives that contained descriptions of Turkish people and they were asked to mark which twenty described the Turkish people best. The students were divided into two groups; 'modern' those who came from big cities and metropolitans and 'traditional' those who came from towns and villages. According to this division; 150 of the students were in traditional, 50 of them were in modern groups.

At first, the modern group expressed their ideas about Turkish people as; traditional, hospitable, patriotic, brave, faithful and as having close relationships within the family. The same group, secondly, described the Turks as; honest, charitable, freedom-loving, respectful, contented, faithful, friendly, peaceful, generous.

The traditional group thought that Turkish people are traditional, brave, honest, hospitable, patriotic, charitable and respectful. In the second category they described the Turkish people as; heroic, having close family ties, freedom-loving, trustworthy, friendly, peaceful and in the last category they defined Turkish people as faithful, contented, generous, religious, clever and proud.

To the question of spending their free time answers were as following :

Reading books	39.5 %
Reading newspapers	24.5 %
Going to the cinema	9.5 %
Watching TV	7 %
Going out with friends	7.5 %

The most popular free time activity was reading books and newspapers.

Tezcan points out as a result we can see that there is a process of change taking place in society in both modern and traditional groups. He says that Turkish people are a transitional society which has both modern and traditional values.

Tezcan says that the findings show that the character and the values of Turkish people are a mixture of Eastern and Western societies. According to him, it is possible to say that it is closer to the Eastern character and he says that according to the results of the study, some of the traditional values in the society have changed.

Hotham (1972) who stayed for 8 years in Turkey and researched Turkish people points out that the character of the Turks is influenced by their origin in the deserts of Asia, a thousand years of Islam and six centuries of being half-in, half-out of Europe. According to him, this makes them an interesting race. He thinks that the Turkish should not be lumped together with any other group of peoples. He says that although they live in the Middle East, they are completely different to the Arabs. Most people think they are not Asiatics; but they are not (yet) Europeans either.

According to Hotham, the Turks have many excellent qualities such as; dignity, nobility, honesty, sincerity, kindness, hospitality, great physical courage and endurance (1972:136). He says that the Turks like to consider themselves as a Mediterranean people, but this is not quite their nature.

Hotham points out the typical Turk does not share the mercurial temperament of the Mediterranean people, but has a rather more volcanic nature-i.e. long periods of peaceful calm and inactivity, punctuated by occasional violent eruptions when everything is 'discharged' in a matter of second before. "... the waves subside [and] perfect calm is restored" (1972:137).

Hotham states that the Turkish people's human qualities would be of value to Europe. According to him, this may be because of their still being in part an oriental people and having that instinctive intelligence and deep understanding of the basic facts of the human situation which the orientals have (He thinks that orientals are less blinded by materialism). He points out that the Eastern point of view the Turks could bring into Europe would be an interesting and valuable contribution to rather fixed and structured Western ideas.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

3.1. Introduction

As presented in the introduction, the purpose of this study is to find out whether there is difference between the native speakers of Turkish and native speakers of English (British, American) in flouting Grice's Maxims.

3.2. Participants

Baseline data was collected from 20 Turkish people and 20 native speakers of English (14 British, 6 American). They are all university graduates who live in Mersin, 3 of the British people were just on a business trip who were chosen on purpose because of their not being affected by the Turkish culture and the majority of English native speakers work in the Turkish education. The subjects were asked to fill out a short background questionnaire before they were interviewed. Subjects were interviewed one by one to provide a setting where the questions would not be heard before the interview.

3.3. Instrument and Data Collection Method

The instrument is recorded interview which was prepared with the assistance of 2 Associate Professors in the Sociology Department of Mersin University. The questions were prepared according to the cultural domains of societies like education, having a holiday as a free time activity, and some of them were prepared according to the specific characteristics of societies like hospitality and fairness. Some of the questions were adapted as it is explained in the following paragraph.

The interview questions consist of 10 questions and included 5 different situations. The first question of the instrument was adapted from (Thomas 1983) and

Irvine (1974, cited in Wolfson 1989) and it is a pre-interview question and for motivation as well. The most highly expected maxim is quantity. The second question consists of two parts and common for societies (there are searches about having a holiday, travelling as a free time activity in Tezcan's book). Having a holiday is a way of life and shows a cultural attitude. In the first part quantity and in the second part of the second question manner are the most highly expected maxims. The third question was designed according to subjects' being closely involved in Turkish education and education is regarded as one of the most important factors which define a culture. The most highly expected maxims are quantity and relevance.

The fourth question consists of four parts which are about welcoming guests as the most cultural characteristic of the Turkish people and the most highly expected maxims are quantity and manner. The third part of the question was adapted from (Thomas, 1983; Jamaluddin, et al.1986; Rubin, 1983 cited in Wolfson 1989). The fourth part of the question was adapted from (Finegan 1994, p. 341), the most highly expected maxim is manner. The second and the third parts of the question are situational.

The fifth and the sixth questions are situational and the most highly expected maxim is the maxim of quality. They were designed according to the characteristic of fairness of the Western societies in the study which are known to be truthful.

A pilot study was carried out by interviewing 10 Turkish people before it was applied to the groups and it was realized that there were no problems in the application of the instrument. The English translation of the interview was approved by a native English speaker teacher who has been living and working in Turkey for a long time.

3.4. Data Analysis

Data was analysed according to the maxims and expected answers (see appendix 3, p.69). Appropriateness of the answers for the maxims to the expected answers was taken into consideration. Each question was evaluated in terms of four maxims and flouting answers were discovered and a total number was obtained in each group.

A good example of an answer fitting the Maxim of Quantity from the Native Speakers of English group would be (to the fifth question); "I would be honest. I would say that I didn't like the film at all." A flouting example of the Maxim of Quantity would be; "Eee, I'd probably try not to say that I didn't like it but I'd try to be honest

on things like that. ‘Yes, it was very interesting’ or choose some parts of the film that, you know, you’d comment on. And may be, if my friends know me well, they’d guess that I didn’t like it but I wouldn’t probably not say that - Oh, that was terrible.”

A good example of an answer fitting the Maxim of Manner from the Native Speakers of Turkish group would be (to the question 4-b); “ Hoşgeldin”. A flouting example of the Maxim of Manner would be; “ Öncelikle merak ederim, eee, yani geç vakitte gelindiği için, eee, nedenini anladıktan sonra seve seve konuğumu, yani konuk ağırlamayı sevdiğim gibi ,eee, nedenini anladıktan sonra, rahatladıktan sonra, eee, çok daha hoş bir şekilde daha bir iyi ağırlarım demek istiyorum. ‘ Hayrola’ derim herhalde.”

A fitting answer for the Maxim of Quality would be (to the fifth question); “Yes, if she asks me, then I’d tell the truth. I’d say that I didn’t like them.” A flouting answer would be; “If it was a female, I wouldn’t say anything, I’d say – Yes, it is nice.”

A proper answer for the Maxim of Relevance would be (to the question 4-d); “ Mesela çayın yanında yapılabilecek bir krep tarifi vereyim, sabah kahvaltıda yapmıştım. 2 bardak süt, 2 bardağa yakın un ve 3 tane yumurta, bunları güzel karıştırıp, bulamaç yapıp, yağsız tavaya çok az yağ sürüp, ondan bir kepçeyle alıp ocakta ters yüz ederek altlı üstlü yapıp içine ister peynirli, ister tatlı bir marmelat sürüp çayın yanında servis yapabilirsiniz. A flouting answer to the same question would be; “ yemek olarak mı, fast food türünde mi? Çin yemeğini seviyorum, Türk yemeklerini seviyorum, genelde iştahlıyım yani, sevmediğim şey azdır.” Then, each flouting answer was given cardinal numbers, answers which are not flouting were not given numbers.

Firstly, the flouting answers were compared in terms of percentage and then z scores for each maxim. Secondly, each question was evaluated in terms of flouting each maxim and flouting answers were compared in percentage and scores for each maxim and all the results were shown in tables.(The percentage of total flouting answers, the remaining percentage means appropriate answers). The answers which were not flouted in both groups were not taken into consideration for statistically evaluation.

The answers were evaluated once more 5 months later after the first evaluation and then with my advisor again, reader interreliability was also provided.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the results of statistical analysis of interview with native speakers of Turkish and native speakers of English. The results will be discussed with respect to four maxims of each question and then their relations with the cultural aspects of the societies in the study.

The analysis of the results revealed some similarities and differences between the two groups. The results were compared in terms of Maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relevance and Manner.

4.2. Quantity

11.5 % of Turkish native subjects' and 20.5 % of English native subjects' answers were flouting answers in the maxim of quantity (See table 1).

Table 1. Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers in Maxim of Quantity.

Questions	1	2a	2b	3	4a	4b	4c	4d	5	6	Total	Percent
Turkish Native Speakers	0	0	5	1	2	5	3	2	1	4	23	11.5
English Native Speakers	0	3	3	1	2	7	9	5	4	7	41	20.5

In question 2-a, 15 % of English native speakers gave flouting answers, 2 of them were more informative than necessary and one asks a question “for me or my students?”. In that part of the question in the Turkish group there were no flouting answers (See table 2).

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers’ Flouting Answers for Question 2-a.

Maxims	Native Turkish Speakers		Native English Speakers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Quantity	----	----	3	15
Quality	----	----	----	----
Relevance	----	----	----	----
Manner	----	----	----	----
Total	----	----	3	15

In question 2-b; 25 % of Turkish native speakers answers were flouting; 3 people talked about a past holiday, 2 of them described the places very detailed, unnecessarily. 15 % of English native speakers flouted the maxim of quantity; 1 did not answer and 2 of them answered longer than informative (See Table 3).

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speaker’s Flouting Answers for Question 2-b.

Maxims	Native Turkish Speakers		Native English Speakers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Quantity	5	25	3	15
Quality	1	5	1	5
Relevance	3	15	----	----
Manner	4	20	1	5
Total	13	65	5	25

In question 3; about the education in Turkey 40 % of Turkish native speakers and 55 % of English native speakers agree about the solution to educational problems, 35 % of Turkish native speakers and 20 % of English native speakers disagree, 25 % of English native speakers partly agree and 1 British did not comment.

In Turkish native speakers; there was one response (5 %) that was too long, in English native speakers; there was 1 person (5 %) who gave a flouting answer that is very detailed; some unnecessary repetitions, by repeating the same things the speaker violated the principle of quantity.

What is interesting in question 3 is the concurrence between native Turkish speakers and native English speakers on educational solutions. (though it should be made clear that the majority of native speakers of English being interviewed work in education) (See Table 4).

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 3.

Maxims	Native Turkish Speakers		Native English Speakers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Quantity	1	5	1	5
Quality	----	----	1	5
Relevance	----	----	1	5
Manner	----	----	----	----
Total	1	5	3	15

In question 4; about having guests 85 % of native Turkish speakers and 65 % of native English speakers liked welcoming guests, only 5 % of each group disliked it and 10 % of native Turkish speakers, 30 % of native English speakers liked having guests depending who they were. 10 % of each group gave flouting answers (See table 5). 20 % of native Turkish speakers and 10 % of native English speakers insist on offering food to their guests. A British woman insisted on offering food if the guests were Turkish since she thought Turkish people were used to insisting on offering food. In native English speakers there were 9 answers that were too long. 45 % of native English

speakers violated the maxim of quantity by talking about their cooking habits unnecessarily (See Table 7).

Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 4-a.

Maxims	Native Turkish Speakers		Native English Speakers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Quantity	2	10	2	10
Quality	----	----	----	----
Relevance	----	----	----	----
Manner	2	10	1	5
Total	4	20	3	15

As to be expected, more Turks than Westerners enjoy welcoming guests as an activity itself, independent of who the guests are, while 30 % of Westerners were affected by who the guest would be. In question 4b, 4c, 4d native English speakers gave more flouting answers; (25 %-35 %, 15 %-45 %, 10 %- 25 %) (See tables 6, 7, 8).

Table 6. Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 4-b.

Maxims	Native Turkish Speakers		Native English Speakers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Quantity	5	25	7	35
Quality	----	----	----	----
Relevance	----	----	----	----
Manner	4	20	4	20
Total	9	45	11	55

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 4-c.

Maxims	Native Turkish Speakers		Native English Speakers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Quantity	3	15	9	45
Quality	----	----	----	----
Relevance	----	----	----	----
Manner	4	20	----	----
Total	7	35	9	45

Table 8. Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 4-d.

Maxims	Native Turkish Speakers		Native English Speakers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Quantity	2	10	5	25
Quality	----	----	----	----
Relevance	1	5	1	5
Manner	5	25	2	10
Total	8	40	8	40

In question 5; 85 % of native Turkish speakers and 90 % of native English speakers told their ideas directly if they did not like the film which their friend highly recommended. 15 % of native Turkish speakers and 10 % of native English speakers told their ideas indirectly; their reason is not to hurt people. There was 1 (5 %) in native Turkish speakers and 4 (20 %) answers in native English speakers which were flouting; they were more informative, they can be based on an apparent violation of the maxim of quantity (See table 9). In question 5; 17 native Turkish speakers and 18 native English speakers told a friend directly that they did not like her highly recommended film. The percentage is at a parallel rate in both groups .

Table 9. Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 5.

Maxims	Native Turkish Speakers		Native English Speakers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Quantity	1	5	4	20
Quality	3	15	----	----
Relevance	----	----	----	----
Manner	1	5	----	----
Total	5	25	4	20

In question 6; 35 % of native Turkish speakers and 15 % of native English speakers told their ideas directly if they did not like their friend's new clothes or hair style. 65 % of people in each group told their ideas indirectly and the Turkish people prefer utterances like; "Not bad" , "The former style was better", 2 (10 %) people thought that "Not bad" meant "I don' t like ". 1 male and 1 female native Turkish speakers said if she/he was a close friend of theirs, they would say "the former was better". In native English speaking group; they said " I prefer the previous style ", " This is not your usual style ". In native Turkish group 4 (20%) answers and in native English group 7 (35 %) answers were more than informative (See table 10).

Table 10. Frequency Distribution of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers for Question 6.

Maxims	Native Turkish Speakers		Native English Speakers	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Quantity	4	20	7	35
Quality	3	15	7	35
Relevance	----	----	1	5
Manner	7	35	1	5
Total	14	70	16	80

When informing a friend that they did not like their new clothes etc. though the numbers balance out with 13 (65 %) in each group preferring to offer their opinion indirectly , 20 % of native English speakers prefer “ white lies ”. Gender also plays a role with most of the British males saying that if the friend was female they would directly “ lie” rather than hurt her feelings.

For the maxim of quantity, typical flouting responses included answers such as;
For question 2-b:

“ Məsela şəhir içi mi? Şehir dışında bir tatil mi? Çok güzel, pazar sabahı uyanıyorum, kahvaltımı yapıyorum, eşim ve çocuklarımla birlikte havuza giriyorum ve çok dinlendiriyor beni, bizim yazlığımızın belki havası, atmosferi çok güzel, sakın bir yazlık, denizimiz bir harika, denize girdim mi, zaten insan sanki dünyaya yeniden gelmiş gibi oluyor, o pırıl pırıl mis gibi bir su var o Altın Portakal’ ın orda.”

For question 3:

“ Yes, but not in the near future, later lot of years. Because I think that what’s happening is you have the society that’ s changing and with change I believe that there is becoming a middle class, your society has a lot of changes and it will be a lot of years before your society comes to some sort of equilibrium and with that equilibrium I think you’ ll come to some sort of educational system that works for your country. But, now, I think you’ re using an older educational system for some things and I think that that needs to change as well. I think that in Turkey, there is a lot of corruption and with that corruption, your education system is the way it is and I think you will not change the educational system until that corruption changes.”

4.3. Quality

7 (3.5 %) answers in native Turkish speakers and 9 (45 %) answers in native English speakers were flouting. There was not a significant difference (See table 11).

Table 11. Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers in Maxim of Quality.

Questions	1	2a	2b	3	4a	4b	4c	4d	5	6	Total	Percent
Turkish Native Speakers	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	3.5
English Native Speakers	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.5

In question 2; about talking on holiday; a native English speaker did not give an answer since he does not like having holidays and a native Turkish speaker gave a flouting answer talking about she dreamt the people who lived in Ephesus many years ago and felt herself as if she were living then.

In question 3; there was a flouting (5%) answer in native English speakers. The answer was not truthful and it was too general (See table 4).

In question 5; there were 3 people (15 %) in native Turkish speakers who flouted the maxim of quality. They said that they would not tell the truth about the film they did not like which is highly recommended by their friends; they say "It wasn't bad." or "It did not attract me much."; 17 (85 %) people in the Turkish group would tell the truth. All the answers in native English speakers were truthful; so they were not flouting (See table 9).

In question 6; 6 (30 %) people in native Turkish speakers and 4 (20 %) native English speakers told their ideas directly if they did not like their friend's newly bought clothes or new hair style. 11 (55 %) native Turkish speakers and 9 (45 %) native English speakers told their ideas indirectly like "It's not bad", "The previous style was better"; the reason for them was not to hurt people. 3 (15 %) native Turkish speakers and 7 (35 %) native English speakers told their ideas neither directly nor indirectly; they told "white lies". Most of British males said they would never tell their ideas truthfully if the friend who asked their ideas were female, they would definitely say "Oh, it is nice" although they did not like it. It can be said 3 (15 %) answers in the Turkish group and 7 (35 %) answers in the other group were flouting (See table 11).

Subjects flouted the maxim with these typical responses:

For question 6;

“İşin doğrusu, eğer kendisi çok beğendiyse güzel olmuş derim veya “ güzel ” derim. Kendisini kırmak istemem.

“Mmm, I would try not to say anything. I try not to make any comment. But if she asks me I’ d probably make a white lie, but I would not be so enthusiastic about it. I say “ Ha, it is OK or it’ s nice”, or something but, I would not say “ Oh, it is really really nice”.

4.4. Relevance

In the maxim of relevance, 4 (2 %) answers in native Turkish speakers and 3 (1.5 %) answers in native English speakers were flouting, they were nearly at the same rate in both groups (See table12).

Table 12. Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers’ Flouting Answers in Maxim of Relevance.

Questions	1	2a	2b	3	4a	4b	4c	4d	5	6	Total	Percent
Turkish Native Speakers	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	2
English Native Speakers	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	1.5

In question 2b; 3 (15%) answers in native Turkish speakers were irrelevant; they talked about their past holiday. In the native English speakers, 1 did not answer since he does not like holidays. In question 3, one of the native English speakers did not make a comment saying he does not know enough about Turkish education, and there was 1 (5%) flouting answer which is not relevant.

In question 4-a; there was an indirect answer in native English speakers. In 4-d; a Turkish person said that he liked Chinese and Turkish food although he was asked to give a recipe. So, it was irrelevant. One in native English speakers did not give a recipe since he does not cook, one talked about how he prefers cooking saying it was something that took a long time, but did not give a recipe, it was irrelevant. In native

Turkish speakers 2 (10 %) did not give a recipe; one said he could only prepare a drink or snack service (See table 8).

In question 6; some parts of a native English speaker's answer were unnecessary; his questions and friend's answer and his knowledge about clothes and fashion. So, the answer may be partly irrelevant. All the answers for question 6 in the Turkish group were relevant (See table 10).

4.5 Manner

In the Maxim of Manner; 27 (13.5 %) answers in native Turkish speakers, 9 (4.5 %) answers in native English speakers were flouting in all the answers (See table 13).

Table 13. Frequency Distribution and Percentage of Native Turkish and Native English Speakers' Flouting Answers in Maxim of Manner.

Questions	1	2a	2b	3	4a	4b	4c	4d	5	6	Total	Percent
Turkish Native Speakers	0	0	4	0	2	4	4	5	1	7	27	13.5
English Native Speakers	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	2	0	1	9	4.5

In question 2-b, 4(20 %) answers in native Turkish speakers were not clear. 2 of them talked about a past holiday; how they felt while they were visiting some historical places. One of those 4 people did not talk briefly. There were some unnecessary statements like "Because I don't like housework particularly in that hot weather" ...

"What I know as holiday, I'd like to have a program out of my daily life" ... The other person was not clear enough; while she was talking about what she did on holiday, she started talking about how clean the sea and their summer site was so beautiful. One native English speaker did not give an answer because he does not like holidays (See table 3).

In question 4-a; 2 (10 %) answers in native Turkish speakers were not brief, in native English speakers there was 1(5 %) ambiguous answer. In 4-b; 4 (20 %) answers

in native Turkish speakers were not brief. Instead of what they would say in case they had an unexpected guest at a late time, they made comments and tried to explain how they felt, the same result was obtained in native English speakers as well; there were 4 (20 %) answers which were not brief (See tables 5, 6).

In 4-c; in native Turkish speakers there were 4 (20 %) flouting answers; they were not brief because they contained comments about insisting on food to the guests, there were not flouting answers in native English speakers. In 4-d; 5 (25%) answers in native Turkish speakers and 2 (10 %) of native English speakers' answers were flouting. In the Turkish group 2 of them did not give a recipe, 2 answers were not brief and 1 misunderstood the question. In native English speakers; 1 did not give a recipe and 1 gave a partly confusing answer (See table 8).

In question 5, there was one flouting answer in native Turkish group; it was not brief, in native English group, there were not flouting answers (See table 9).

In question 6; in native Turkish speakers 7 (35 %) answers were not brief; they all talked about they could not criticize people directly, but they did indirectly. Explaining why they did so, i.e. trying to avoid hurting people caused them to speak. So, instead of giving their statement in the situation, they preferred talking more, so they were not brief. In native English speakers, there was 1 (5%) answer which was not brief but partly confusing (See table 10).

Some typical flouting responses for the Maxim of Manner:

For question 4-b;

“12 p.m. Well it nearly happened 2 days ago. Of course out of politeness, you'd say “Hello, how are you?”, “Welcome”, but I mean the idea they, they come at 12 p.m. means that there is some kind of emergency. However, I have had occasion when relatives have visited without saying why they come. They just come, especially in Turkey”.

For question 2-b;

“Tatilde tipik bir günüm evde geçirdiğim tatil mi, yoksa bir tatil yerinde geçirdiğim? O zaman ikisini de anlatayım veya. Evdeki günüm, eee, normal ev işlerini yaptıktan sonra, çünkü öğleden sonra iş yapmayı sevmiyorum., hele bu sıcakta, ee. Eğer sevdiğim, izlemeyi düşündüğüm bir program varsa onu izleyerek TV' de, kitap okuyarak veyahut birşeyler yaratarak, kendi el becerilerime dayalı birşeyler yaparak

geçiyor; yemek yapmak günlük işler. Eğer tatil yerindeysem, yüzmek çok hoşuma giden birşey, onun için fazla güneşte kalmadan daha çok denizde vaktimi geçirerek, yani tatilden anladığım, eğer bir yere gittiysen tatil yerine, evde yapmadığım birtakım şeyleri, günlük hayatımın dışında, eee, programım olsun isterim, dolayısıyla dışarda yemek yemek veya gidip bir yerde oturmak gibi şeyleri yapmaktan hoşlanırım, yaparım”.

4.6. Discussion

The significant differences between native Turkish speakers and native English speakers were in the Maxims of Quantity and Manner (See table 14).

Table 14. Statistical Differences Between the Groups in Flouting Grice’s Maxims for all Questions.

Questions	Quantity	Quality	Relevance	Manner
1	0	0	0	0
2a	1.80	0	0	0
2b	0.79	0	1.80	1.43
3	0	1.01	1.01	0
4a	0	0	0	0.60
4b	0.69	0	0	0
4c	2.07*	0	0	2.10*
4d	1.24	0	0	1.24
5	1.43	1.80	0	1.01
6	1.06	1.46	1.01	2.37*

*P<.05

Twice as many native English speakers as native Turkish speakers gave more informative answers than necessary flouting the Maxim of Quantity. Native English speakers talked longer in some questions than native Turkish speakers particularly in question 4-c about insisting on offering food to their guests. The results supported the assumption that the Turkish group would give the expected answers or would not violate the maxims since hospitality and offering and insisting on offering food to their guests are characteristics of the Turkish people. This idea is supported by Tezcan. He says (1974), Pardeo points out Turkish people always welcome their guest even at meal time whether they are rich or poor. According to Tezcan, hospitality is still the most

well known Turkish characteristic and adds to this by pointing out entertaining guests is important and guests are offered food, drink to a great extent. Hotham (1972) states that hospitality is one of the excellent qualities of the Turkish people. The reason why the Western group violated the maxims might be due to welcoming guests and offering food as much as the Turks is not an important aspect of their culture and this caused them to make comments on the subject and talk longer. If the British and the American people are compared within native English speakers in terms of flouting the Maxim of Quantity it was observed that 33.3 % of the British people, 50 % of the American people flouted the maxim.

Another striking difference between the Turks and native English speakers was observed in the Maxim of Manner. In all the questions nearly three times as many native Turkish speakers as native speakers of English flouted the Maxim of Manner giving lengthy and obscure answers mostly in questions 4-c, 4-d and 6, and in that maxim, surprisingly the Turkish people were not brief, particularly in question 6. These results are consistent with the results of İstifçi (1998) who found out that Turkish compliment responses are much longer than the English.

In the maxim of quality, the assumption about the fairness, directness norms of the Western societies were not supported by the results of question 6. 35 % of native English speakers flouted the maxim being untruthful, one of 7 people was American, so it can be said that the results did not substantiate the directness norm of the British society, however the British males' explanation about their avoidance of telling the truth when it comes to the point that they were asked their ideas about a friend' s hair style or clothes could be affected by the norm of politeness in their society. It could be stated that the American people are more truthful in that sort of situation than the British since only 1 American violated the maxim, when it is compared with the Turkish society nearly the same results could be observed with the percentages of American people 16.6%, Turkish people 15%.

In question 5, the results supported the assumptions about the Turkish people would violate the maxim of quality since it is known they are not direct much. It could be relevant to the characteristic of kindness of their society that Hotham states it was one of qualities of the Turks in his book published 1972. In all the questions, when the average was calculated it was seen that native Turkish speakers were slightly more truthful than native English speakers. (The average percentage is native Turkish

speakers 3.5 % native English speakers 4.5 %), the difference is not significant (See table 15).

Although this percentage is small in degree, it still supports Tezcan's and Hotham' s agreement about the honesty of the Turkish people. In the maxim of relevance, flouting was nearly at a parallel rate in both groups (Native Turkish speakers 2 %, native English speakers 1.5 %).

In the previous studies by Keenan (1976) in Malagasy and Besnier (1989) in a small island in the central Pacific among the Nukulaelae as it was mentioned in Chapter 2; the differences were significant when they were compared with the Western people and they point out that stems from the different values of cultures. Keenan observed that especially men in Malagasy are much less informative than women since they think they have prestige by not sharing the information.

In this case study, the native Turkish speaking people were compared with the English native-speaking peoples in terms of Grice' s maxims in Conversation. When it is calculated in the base of total questions, there is no significant difference; however, when the questions were taken as the base, 3 significant differences were seen (See tables 14, 15).

Table 15. Statistical Differences Between the Groups in Flouting Grice's Maxims.

Quantity	0.77
Quality	0.16
Relevance	0.12
Manner	0.99

*P<.05

This means that there is not a significant difference between the societies taking part in the study except 3 groups of answers. The difference is not so marked as in Malagasy or other Eastern people. This finding supports the idea that Turkish people are a transitional society which has both modern and traditional values as stated by Tezcan. It could be assumed that being closer to the West means less difference in flouting

maxims of conversation. It could be said less obvious sociocultural influences are found in the use of conversational implicatures as Chambers stated (1995).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the conclusions of the study, implications for language teaching and suggestions for further research.

This study aimed to investigate Grice' s Maxims' in native Turkish speakers and native English speakers.

5.2. Conclusions

This study tried to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a difference between university educated Turkish native speakers and university educated native speakers of English in flouting Grice' s maxims?
2. How does the cultural difference affect flouting the maxims of conversation?
3. Which maxim' s or maxims' use must be practised sufficiently (due to the results) in order to provide contribution to communicative competence in ELT classes?

In order to answer these questions 20 native speakers of Turkish and 20 native speakers of English were interviewed with 10 questions in their own languages. The answers were evaluated in term of Grice' s maxims in conversation; quantity, quality, relevance, manner. The differences were obtained by analyzing the flouted answers. Because flouting the maxims depends an cultural factors. The answer to the first research question could be stated as the major differences were in the maxims of quantity and manner.

The first major difference is in the maxim of quantity. The native English speakers group taking part in the study gave more informative answers than needed. The percentage of the flouting answers in the native English speakers was twice as much as in the Turkish group. The following explanation may indicate the sociocultural

factors causing the floutings which are involved in the second research question; the Westerners' giving longer answers could be due to the fact that welcoming guests is not a remarkable aspect of their culture since the fourth question is about hospitality (See Appendix B,p.68).

Another outstanding difference between the Turks and native speakers of English was observed in the maxim of manner. In all the questions except 4-b, the Turkish people flouted the maxim by giving lengthy and obscure answers, they were not brief, they flouted the maxim by commenting about insisting on food to the guests, such as; "It is an aspect of our culture", "as a member of this society, I should do it". Some people in the Turkish group violated the maxim in question 6, by explaining why they do not tell the truth when they do not like their friend's new clothes or hair style. Explaining the reason caused them to give lengthy answers rather than brief ones. They said they try to avoid hurting people.

The results in the maxim of quantity supported the assumption that the Turkish group would give the expected answers since the question is about hospitality which is the most well known characteristic of Turkish people.

In the maxim of quality, there was not a significant difference. Fairness and directness norms of the Western people were not supported by the results of question 6.

In the maxim of relevance, there was not a significant difference either, since the rate is nearly the same and at a low level. The percentage of the flouting answers was (2 %) in the Turkish group and it was (1.5 %) in the other group. It could be said that most of the answers were relevant to the question.

In the previous cross-cultural studies in maxims of conversation the differences were more noticeable with the Western society if it is compared with the Turkish society's differences. This finding is supported by Tezcan's idea about the Turkish people's being a transitional society which has both modern and traditional values.

Sperber and Wilson (cited in Geirsson and Losonsky: 1996) point out that Grice's maxims are norms which interlocutors must know in order to communicate sufficiently.

Coulthard (1985) states a basis for the listener to infer what is conversationally implicated is provided by the conversational maxims. These statements support the idea that the conversational maxims regulate the conversation and this contributes the communicative competence which Wolfson (1989) states; ability to interact

successfully in a foreign language speech community depends on. Avoiding flouting the maxims in conversation provides conveying the message more easily and improves the interpretation between the speakers. This is a valuable contribution to be competent in speaking and to raise communicative competence for language learners. This can be supplied by practising the maxims' use, particularly the maxims of quantity and manner due to the results of the case study in language teaching classes and this could be stated as the answer to the third research question.

The results of the case study supported the problematic maxims in EFL classes as it was stated in the Introduction.

Communicative competence could be improved by practising these maxims' use giving examples of questions and answers and then applying them with relevant tasks in English language teaching classes. Students' being aware of the use of these maxims and practising them sufficiently and appropriately may improve their communicative competence and performance. Moreover, students' having knowledge of culture of the native speakers of English will contribute to their using the target language and communicating with native speakers.

5.3. Implications for Language Teaching

A concept that seems to have come through during the course of this survey and its subsequent analysis is a very clear relationship between sociocultural and crosscultural factors and their influence on competency and effective communication in an ELT classroom in the target language. For example;

Communicative competence provides a successful interaction in a language community. As Wolfson (1989) points out that the implications of what has been said are extremely important from the point of view of language teaching in general and of TESOL in particular. According to her, ability to interact successfully in a foreign language speech community depends on communicative competence, of which sociolinguistic rules are an important aspect. Brown (1987) states that a number of important theoretical principles of language behaviour underlie the communicative language teaching movement and communicative competence is the foremost of which is a definition of what is now in second language research and teaching. He points out, in the 1970s, research on communicative competence distinguished between linguistic

and communicative competence (Hymes 1961, Paulston 1974). The aim was to highlight the difference between “knowledge” about language rules and forms and knowledge enabling a person to communicate functionally and interactively (Brown 1987:199). Wolfson adds to this by saying that Paulston’s suggestion is important in application the theoretical principles of communicative competence to language instruction and recognizing the importance of these principles to the field of TESOL.

Communicative competence should be a goal of Foreign Language Teaching. Loveday agrees, stating that the reason communicative competence should be a goal of L2 teaching is that without such knowledge and ability varying degrees of dissatisfaction in transactions for both native and non-native is sure to occur. Then, the purpose of teaching communicative competence which he defines as the knowledge and the ability to construct meaning in a way that is socioculturally appropriate in all contexts of communication is to avert and overcome this possible frustration. Freeman and Long (1991) support this by stating that Cummins’ (1980) contribution by the term cognitive/academic language proficiency (CALP) to sociolinguistic competence reminds us that it is common these days to speak of students’ developing communicative competence rather than linguistic proficiency. Hoekje and Williams(1992) state Widdowson (1978) stresses that in language teaching, linguistic skills and communicative abilities must be seen as distinct. Savignon (1983) rejects a distinction between competence and performance stating that the only way of determining the level of speakers’ communicative competence is through performance.

Learners’ sociocultural information contributes to being competent in the target language. Wolfson supports this by stating that language learners need much of the sociocultural information to become communicatively competent in the target language and suggests these be learned by exposure and by actual interactions with native speakers. In her own view, sociolinguistic rules’ acquisition can be greatly facilitated by teachers who have necessary information and sensitivity to use their knowledge to guide students. This helps them interpret values and patterns which they would otherwise have difficulty in interpreting. According to Wolfson, what is needed is for learners to come to understand what is meant by the words and expressions they hear, and to be able to respond to them appropriately so that unnecessary miscommunication can be avoided.

Crosscultural study of language gives information about the ethnography of speech acts. Kinsella supports this by stating that the ethnography of speaking has been

concerned with the cross-cultural study of language usage (1982:35) (e.g. the papers in Baunman and Sherzer, 1974). She points out that by its considerable application to the issues, the theory of speech acts is given rise (e.g. Gumperz, 1979; Levinson, 1979) as pointed by researchers in second language learning (e.g. munby,1978). Valdes (1988) states that foreign and second language teachers should recognize the disturbance their students experience and to assist in bringing them through it to the point that culture becomes an aid to language learning. Dunnet, Dubin and Lezberg (cited in Valdes, 1988) add to this by saying that the modern EFL teacher requires a complete background in comparative/contrastive analysis and cultural antropology in order to deal with today's students.

Sociolinguistic and ethnic studies are important in ELT. Watson-Gegeo (1988) points out in both educational and ESL research ethnographic methods have become fashionable recently. According to her, peoples' behavior in groups and on cultural patterns in that behavior are focused on by ethnography which is an important alternative to other forms of educational research due to its allowing us to address very basic questions of theory and practice. According to Watson-Gegeo, it contributes to second language teaching and learning by reminding of the important role of culture and gives us a way of addressing this issue. Boxer and Pickering (1995) support the importance of sociolinguistic research by stating that on the speech behavior of native speakers of English is important for two reasons; First, descriptions of how verbally interactions are performed with other native speakers can be set up. Second, according to them, making use of this baseline information is a purpose in educational situations. They think that there is a serious need for the application of sociolinguistic findings to English Language Teaching and this may be realized through authentic materials that mirror spontaneous speech behavior.

Grice's Maxims of Conversation are general principles that regulates the conversation. Schiffrin supports this by saying that maxims are general principles of communication; the quantity maxim leads the hearer to search for information, i.e. the amount in a text, the maxim of relation leads hearers to use information in a certain way. Sperber and Wilson (cited in Geirsson and Losonsky; 1996) argue that the Principle of Relevance defines how the production of an ostensive stimulus can make the communicator's informative intention. According to them, the principle of relevance has great clarity with the work of Grice's maxims and they describe these cooperative

principles and maxims as norms which interlocutors must know in order to communicate sufficiently. Blakemore (cited in Newmeyer, 1988) adds this by stating that Grice's basic idea was that in communicating, speakers aim to meet certain general standards and that the hearers understand utterances with these standards in mind. So the communicative competence of Turkish native speakers and English native speakers should be able to match.

As Schiffrin states Gricean pragmatics provides a set of principles that constrains speakers' sequential choices in a text and allows hearers to recognize speakers' intention by helping to relate what speakers "say" to its text and context (1994:227). She says conversational principles are a set of general principles that tell speakers and hearers how to organize and use information offered in a text, along with background knowledge of the world, to convey more than what is said – in brief- to communicate and adds saying that what Gricean pragmatics offers is a view of how participant assumptions about what comprises a cooperative context for communication. She thinks that rather than relying on constructed sentences that are treated as if they are contextualized, actual utterances that have been produced by speakers in contexts must be used. Such a shift in data can have far-reaching effects on Gricean pragmatics itself (1994:203). According to her, an interpretive basis for the various referential possibilities that can be inferred is provided by Gricean principles. She adds to this by saying that the use of actual utterances forces us to attend to the actual situations in which language is used. These situations include speakers and hearers, whose needs, goals and wants are adjusted to a particular socially and culturally defined communicative situation.

Coulthard states for someone, being as specific as he ought to be, still saying nothing for which he lacks adequate evidence, or because he has chosen to flout a maxim, that is to say he may glaringly fail to carry out it (1985:31). A basis for the listener to infer what is being conversationally implicated is provided by the conversational maxims in such situations.

Moreover, giving information about culture of the target language and providing relevant tasks of conversational maxims may help learners be aware of sociocultural differences and achieve communicative competence. It, therefore, stands to reason that in so-called "conversational classes", if language instructors and language teaching

materials writers could be more aware of the cooperative principles then the communicative competence of students could be greatly enhanced.

Following the cooperative principle, particularly the Maxims of Quantity and Manner could be useful in writing classes. For example, when teachers are evaluating a specific task, they could analyse the students' work within these maxims and assess according to any flouting that occurs. For instance, answers that are too long, contain irrelevant information or lack coherence would obviously flout the maxims of Quantity and Manner. If students could be made aware of these maxims and write within their confinements, their competence, particularly in academic writing, would surely be enhanced.

5.4. Suggestions For Futher Studies

This research was carried out with people who have university education. This study can be replicated collecting data from people with different education levels to find out how they flout the maxims as their level of education increases.

A further study can be carried out among men and women from different age groups to find out gender differences on the maxims of conversation.

A study can be carried out with people from different regions of the country to find out if there is a difference in maxims as regional.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bonvillain, Nancy. **Language, Culture and Communication : the meaning of messages**. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall 1993.

Boxer, Diana and Luch Pickering. "Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT materials: the case of complaints". *ELT Journal* V.49, N,1 P.44, 1995.

Brown, Douglas H. **Principles of Language Learning and Teaching**. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.; Prentice Hall, 1980.

_____. **Principles of Language Learning and Teaching**. 2nd edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1987.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. **Discourse Analysis**. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Chambers, J.K. **Sociolinguistic Theory**. Oxford: Basic Blackwell Ltd., 1995.

Chastain, Kenneth. **Developing Second – Language Skills: Theory and Practice**. Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc., 1988.

Coulthard, Malcolm. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. In C.N. Candlin (Ed.). **Applied Linguistics and Language Study**. New York : Longman Inc, 1985.

Eastman, Carol M. **Aspects of Language and Culture**. Novato: Chandler and Sharp Inc., 1990.

Finegan, Edward. **Language : Its structure and use**. Orlando: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1994.

- Foley, William A. **Antropological Linguistics : An Introduction**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1997.
- Fasold, Ralph. **The Sociolinguistics of Language**. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Grice, H.P. "Logic and Conversation". In Geirsson Heimir and Michael Losonsky. (Eds.) **Readings in Language and Mind**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.
- Gumperz, John J. **Discourse Strategies**. New York : Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Hoekje, Barbara and Jessica Williams. (Eds.) "Communicative Competence and Dilemma of International Teaching Assistant Educative". *TESOL Quarterly*, V.26, N.2, pp. 246-247, 1992.
- Hotham, David. **The Turks**. London : Cox and Wyman Ltd., 1972.
- İstifçi, İlknur. "An Interlanguage Study of Compliment Responses : A Case of Turkish Learners of English". *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Anadolu Üniversitesi SBE, 1998.
- Larsen-Freeman and H.Long. **An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research**. Essex : Longman, 1991.
- Levinson, Stephen C. "Speech Act Theory". In Kinsella Valerie (Ed.). **Surveys 2: eight state-of- the art articles on key areas in language teaching**. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Light, Donalt, Suzanne Keller and Craig Calhoun. **Readings and Review for Sociology**. U.S.A. : McGraw-Hill, 1989.
- Loveday, Leo. **The Sociolinguistics of Learning and Using a Non-native Language**. Exeter: A. Wheaton & Co. Ltd., 1982

- Luedtke, Luther S. (Ed.). **Making America : The Society and Culture of the United States**. Washington, D.C.: United States Information Agency, 1988.
- Newmeyer, Frederich J. (Ed.). **Linguistic Theory : Foundations**. Volume I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- _____. **Linguistic Theory : Extension and Implications**. Volume II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- _____. **Language: The Socio- cultural Context**. Volume IV. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- O'Grady, Michael Dobrovolsky and Francis Katamba. **Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction**. London: London: Longman, 1997.
- Queen, David (Ed.). **Reflections on America and Americans**. Washington, D.C.: United States Information Agency, 1988.
- Richards, Jack C. and Richard W.Schmidt. **Language and Communication**. Essex: Longman, 1983.
- Robinson, Gail L.Nemetz. **Crosscultural Understanding**. Cambridge : Prentice Hall, 1988.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. **Approaches to Discourse**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1997.
- Storry Mike and Peter Childs. **British Cultural Identities**. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Tezcan, Mahmut. **Türklerle ilgili Stereotipler (Kalıp Yargılar) ve Türk Değerleri Üzerine Bir Deneme**. Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1974.

Valdes, Joyce Merrill. **Culture Bound: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. **An Introduction to Sociolinguistics**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992.

Watson. Gegeo, Karen Ann. "Ethnography in ESL: Defining the Essentials". *TESOL Quarterly*. V.22, N.4, pp.575-588, 1988.

Widdowson, H.G. "The Negotiation of Meaning". **Aspects of Language**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Wolfson, Nessa. **Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL**. New York: Newbury House Publishers, 1989.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR NATIVE TURKISH SPEAKERS

Size farklı birkaç konu üzerinde sorular yöneltilecektir. Bu sorulara içtenlikle yanıt vermeniz, çalışmanın amacına ulaşması açısından son derece önemlidir. Elde edilen veriler sadece bilimsel bir araştırma için kullanılacaktır. Teşekkür ederiz

Öğrenim Durumu :

1. Nasılsın(ız) ?

2. a) Tatil yapmayı sever misiniz ?

b) Evet ise bir tatil gününüzü anlatabilir misiniz ?

3. Türkiye'deki eğitim sorunlarının gelecekte çözümleneceğini düşünüyoruz. Siz buna katılıyor musunuz ?

Evet..... Neden ?

Hayır..... Neden ?

4. a) Konuk ağırlamayı sever misiniz ?

b) Gece saat 12'de beklenmedik bir şekilde bir akrabanız evinize gelse ilk söyleyeceğiniz şey ne olur?

c) Misafirlerinize ikram ettiğiniz yiyecek tabağında bittiği zaman yeniden alması için ısrar eder misiniz ?

Evet

Hayır

Evet ise bunu nasıl ifade edersiniz ?

d) Sevdiğiniz bir konuğunuza yapacağınız herhangi bir yiyeceğin tarifini yapabilir misiniz ?

5. Arkadaşınızın size çok övgüyle bahsettiği bir filme gittiniz. Fakat filmi beğenmediniz. Arkadaşınız film hakkındaki fikrinizi sorduğunda ne dersiniz ?

6. Bir arkadaşınızın yeni saç modelini, ya da yeni aldığı bir giysiyi pek beğenmediniz. Bunu ona açıkça söyler misiniz ?

Evet

Hayır.....

Evet ise ne ifade kullanırsınız ?

Hayır ise ne ifade kullanırsınız ?

APPENDIX B.

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS

You are going to be asked some questions on a few different subjects. I would like you to answer the questions as truthfully as possible, because it is very important in achieving the aims of the study. The data received will be used only for a research project. Thank you.

Nationality :

Education :

1. How are you ?
2. a) Do you like having holidays ?
b) If yes, could you tell me about a typical day you generally spend on a holiday ?
3. It is believed that the education problems in Turkey will be solved in the future. Do you agree ?
Yes Why ?
No Why ?
4. a) Do you like having guests ?
b) If one your relatives comes to visit you unexpectedly at 12.00 p.m., what would be the first thing you would say to him/her ?
c) When your guests finish eating the food on their plates, would you insist on them eating more ?
d) Could you give me a recipe of any dish/meal you would prepare for a friend ?
5. Imagine that you went to see a film that your friend recommended highly. However, you did not like the film at all. When your friend asks your idea about the film, what would you say ?
6. Imagine that you did not like your friend's new hair style or new clothes he/she has just bought. Do you tell the truth ?

Yes.

No.

If yes, what would you say ?

If no, what would you say ?

APPENDIX C.

EXPECTED ANSWERS FOR THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS :

1. İyiyim, teşekkürler.
2. a) Evet,
b) Genelde sabah
daha sonra
3. Evet.
Hayır.
Konuyla ilgili nedenler
4. a) Evet
Hayır.
b) Aa.... hoşgeldin
Merhaba.....
Vb.....
c) Evet.
Hayır
Konuyla ilgili kısa bir açıklama olabilir.
d) Evet ilkönce sonra.....
Tabii... daha sonra.....
Pek bilmem.....
5. Evet
Hayır
İfade ve bağlantılı bir neden belirtilebilir.
6. Evet İfade
Hayır İfade
Bağlantılı bir neden belirtilebilir.