People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

Mentouri University Constantine

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of English

Flouting Grice's Maxims

_ A Pragmatic Study_

Case Study; Mentouri University, Constantine

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the "Master" Degree in Applied Language Studies.

Board of Examiners

President: Dr. Saleh KAOUACHE   **University of Constantine**

Supervisor: Dr. Riad BELOUAHEM   **University of Constantine**

Presented by   **Supervised by**

Miss: Khalida BOULKROUNE   **Dr. Riad BELOUAHEM**

2009-2010

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to:

My MOTHER the dearest person to my heart

My dear BROTHER Yacine

My dear SISTERS Sabrina and Soumia

My AUNTS Nora and Farida

Mallem Rym, the most faithful friend in this universe

Mouissat Hadjer, the kindest friend I have ever met

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

ABSTRACT

Theoretically, in communication, people apply the cooperative principle reflected in the four maxims of conversation they are: the maxims of quality; quantity; relevance and manner. Grice (1975), who proposed those maxims of conversation, argued that people should obey them in order to achieve an effective communication. In fact, people often flout the maxims deliberately without failing to communicate. In flouting the maxims, they mostly have reasons behind that. Therefore, the area of study investigated, here, has to do with how students in Mentouri University, Constantine, flout the maxims in their Arabic conversations. The research aims at identifying the most flouted maxim, and the reasons behind that. Students' conversations were chosen because we believe that peer groups conversations contain more maxim flouting. In analysing our data, Grice's theory of pragmatics: Grice's maxims were used. The data were collected by recording students conversations; listening to them many times; identifying the conversations that contain instances of flouting maxims, finding the reasons of flouting and, eventually, presenting a table to show the findings.

As a result, we found out that the most flouted maxim is the quality maxim (44.8%). The reasons for flouting this maxim are to strengthen opinion, to be sarcastic and other cultural reasons.

LIST OF ABBRIVIATIONS

1. D: Daughter

2. M: Mother

3. S: Student

4. N: The number of flouting.

5. %: The percentage of the occurrence of flouting.

LIST OF TABLES

READING CONVERSATIONS

The following IPA _International Phonetic Alphabet_ symbols are used for the representation of the pronunciation of Arabic examples of the conversations through the research and the following appendix.

Consonants Arabic characters	Phonetic Transcription	Phonetic Identification
أ	/ʔ/	Glottal stop
ب	/b/	Voiced bilabial plosive
ت	/t/	Voiceless alveolar plosive
ج	/ʒ/	Voiced palate alveolar fricative
ح	/ħ/	Voiceless pharyngeal fricative
خ	/x/	Voiceless velar fricative
د	/d/	Voiced alveolar plosive
ذ	/ð/	Voiced dental fricative
ر	/r/	Voiceless alveolar rolled
ز	/z/	Voiced alveolar fricative
س	/s/	Voiceless alveolar fricative
ش	/ʃ/	Voiceless palate-alveolar fricative
ع	/ʕ/	Voiced pharyngeal fricative
غ	/ʁ/	Voiced uvular fricative

ف	/f/	Voiceless labio-dental fricative
ق	/q/	Voiceless uvular plosive
ك	/k/	Voiceless velar plosive
ل	/l/	Voiced lateral fricative
م	/m/	Voiced bi-labial nasal
ن	/n/	Voiced alveolar nasal
ه	/h/	Voiceless glottal fricative
ي	/j/	Voiced palatal fricative

VOWELS

In written Arabic, and when indicated, vowels are represented by diacritics above or below the consonant, as for example:

بَ: /ba/

بُ: /bu/

بِ: /bi/

In Algerian Arabic, the following vowels are used, the same with their longer counterparts:

-/i/: Front, close, spread.

-/e/: Front, half close, spread.

-/a/: Front, open, spread.

-/ɒ/: Back, open, rounded.

-/ɔ/: Back, half open, rounded.

-/u/: Back, close, rounded.

-/∂/: Central, between close and half open, neutral.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Statement of the Problem

Conversation is one way of communicating. Grice (1975) argues that for a conversation to take place, all the participants in a conversation have to cooperate with one another. He summarises his theory in the cooperative principle and the four maxims. The majority of students at Mentouri University, Constantine, interact successfully with each other. In our study, we want to identify what goes on in their conversations, to be able to find out whether they observe or do they adhere the maxims to achieve that successful interactions.

2. Research Questions

To tackle the matter, the following questions are worth-asking:

1- Do Mentouri University students flout Grice's maxims?

2- Which maxim is most flouted?

3-What implicatures are generated?

4-What are the reasons or motivations for flouting the maxims?

3. Aim of the Study

The aim behind this study is to prove that although students of Mentouri University flout Grice's four maxims, they still produce smooth interactions. In such a case, we want to determine if their conversations reflect an observation of quality, quantity, relevance and manner. More importantly, we will check whether Grice's theory about conversation really accounts for Algerian contexts. Hence, the research centers around finding out the most flouted maxim by the students and the reasons behind that.

4. Hypothesis

-Mentouri University students flout Grice's four maxims because of some reasons.

5. Means of the Research

In order to test our hypothesis, and obtain the conversations required from our informants recording, as a tool for conducting our research, will be used. Recording students authentic conversations will prove to what extent our participants flout the maxims. In addition, it will help us to draw conclusions about the reasons for flouting. The sample consists of 20 conversations, where 40 students are interacting in Algerian Arabic. It is a random sample where no student has the chance to be selected. Because of time constraints, the study will be confined to students of Mentouri University, Constantine, who provide a good example of conversations that take place among peer groups. Sex in the present research is an unwanted variable; it will not be taken into consideration.

6. Outline of the Study

This research is divided into two main chapters, a theoretical chapter which is the review of the related literature about Grice's theory of pragmatics with examples of observant and non-observant of the maxims.

Chapter two is a quantitative and a qualitative analyses of students' conversations to identify instances of flouting maxims.

CHAPTER ONE

GRICE'S THEORY OF PRAGMATICS

1.1 Introduction

In very general terms, the understanding of how people communicate effectively has increased since pragmatics has become part of linguistics. Grice (1975) is one of those who has been interested in identifying the reasons behind successful conversations. He assumes that there are principles which govern human interactions. These principles are the cooperative principle and the four maxims. They are used to understand how people communicate and to see why and when they are uncooperative. He argues that a generated implicature is one result of non observances of the cooperative principle and the four maxims. Therefore, this chapter deals with those notions in detail, and provides concrete examples of how people manage their conversations in relation to them.

1.2 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a field of inquiry that deals with how language can be used to do things in real world situations. The first who introduces the term pragmatics is the linguist Morris (1938). He defines it as the study of relationship between signs and their interpreters (cited in Yule, 1996). Pragmatics is the study of speaker ''meaning''; it studies the communicated meaning by the speaker which is interpreted by the listener. It is concerned with what people want to mean by their utterances rather than the literal meaning of words in those utterances (Yule, 1996). Yule (2006) gives another definition to the term pragmatics in his book ''The Study of Language'', where he says that pragmatics is the study of the ''invisible meaning'', or how hearers understand what is meant when it is not actually said or written. Understanding the meaning relies on many "assumptions" and ''expectations'' when

communicating. Those assumptions give hearers ''insights'' into how it happens that more is communicated than it is said (112). Pragmatics goes beyond the conception of meaning and concentrates on what is meant. That is to say, it concentrates on utterance meaning and on speaker intended meaning (Levinson, 1983). Thus, distinguishing between what is meant and what is said is needed. Finegan (2008) provides the following examples to illustrate possible differences between to say, which is the sentence meaning, and to mean which is the utterance meaning. For instance, it is not appropriate to answer the question 'can you shut the window?' By just saying 'yes I can and do not do anything', but rather the right answer is an action 'to go and shut the window' (179). According to Aitchison (2003), pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies how speakers use language to achieve their goals and how hearers interpret the meaning the speaker wishes to convey.

Pragmatics is influenced by the context of the interaction; where, when, and why the conversation takes place. And because pragmatics is the study that produces the notion of implicature, it is interested in how hearers get the meaning across from the unsaid. In addition, what makes pragmatics appealing is that it takes into account the kind of relation between the speaker and hearers in interpreting the utterances (Yule, 1996).

1.3 The Cooperative Principle

Conversations are not just a set of unrelated utterances produced randomly. In fact, there are rules that govern them (Cruse, 2000). Grice (1975) expects that people follow certain rules, called principles, when communicating with each other. He goes on to argue that these principles make meaningful conversations. He puts his assumption under the concept of the cooperative principle and says that when people interact a cooperative principle is put into practice (cited in Yule 38). The cooperative principle is a theory which explains how people correctly interpret what others are implying, and this is by universal conventions

in human interactions (Cutting, 2002). It enables one participant in a conversation to communicate with the other participants, assuming that they are cooperative. In addition, it explains and regulates what people say to contribute in conversations (Widdowson, 2007). Grice formulates the cooperative principle as follows:

"Make your conversational contribution such is required at the stage in which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of talk exchange in which you are engaged" (cited in Jaszczolt, 2002, p. 210).

In other words, speakers try to contribute meaningful productive utterances in conversation. It then follows that listeners assume that their conversational partners are doing the same.

Cook (1989) compares the cooperative principle with grammar rules. He says that when talking, people observe the cooperative principle but they cannot prepare to do so intentionally just like the rules of grammar. In other words, both the cooperative principle and the grammar rules are known by people, but nobody can formulate them completely when talking. According to Plag, Braun, Lappe, & Schramm (2007), the cooperative principle answers two questions. First, how do hearers know that speakers want to convey a certain pragmatic meaning? Second, how do hearers know that they should draw inferences?

The cooperative principle is divided into four maxims: quantity, quality, relation and manner. Although Grice puts them in the imperative form, these four maxims are not rules that interlocutors are required to obey. Rather, they are principles to be observed for ''coherent'' and efficient communication of meaning. By cooperation between speakers and hearers, Grice is only referring to what people need to make sense of each other's contributions (Thomas, 1995).

1.4 The Conversational Maxims

In order to illustrate how speakers interpret meaning Grice presented, in addition to the cooperative principle, four maxims. Thanks to his maxims, people can interpret; understand the implying implication of each other's utterances. Thus, they can communicate effectively with each other (Thomas, 1995).

Grice conversational maxims are rules of conversation assumed to be followed (Yule, 1996). According to Griffiths (2006), ''a maxim is a pithy piece of widely applicable advice.'' (p.135). He goes on to say that Grice's maxims play as ''if'' role because Grice does not put them as advice to show people how to talk, but he says that communication through conversations proceeds as if speakers are generally guided by these maxims (2006).

1.4.1 The Maxim of Quantity

The first maxim of the cooperative principle is the maxim of quantity. It is about the amount of information the speaker gives in an utterance in conversations. In other words, the maxim of quantity requires speakers to give the right amount of information when they speak. This means not to be too brief or to give more information than is required (Cutting, 2002). Grice (1975) puts it as follows:

1- Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange).
2- Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
(Cited in Yule, 1996, p.37)

In fact, Grice puts the maxim of quantity on the assumption that if the speaker and the hearer already share some knowledge, they do not need to give too much information by using many words. Then, what they say will be heard as ''wordy'' or ''verbose''. On the other hand, if the speaker and the hearer are strangers or from different cultures, then giving

less information is not appropriate. Hence, they must avoid short utterances, otherwise what they say will be heard as ''obscure'' (Widdowson, 2007).

There are two things to remember about this maxim. First, if something is said, there is a reason for it. In other words, following this maxim depends on the situation and the purpose of the conversation. Second, if something is left out, participants are already supposed to know it and here people prefer not to observe it (Cutting, 2002). Cruse (2002) illustrates this in the following conversation between a mother and her daughter:

M: What did you have for lunch today?
D1: Backed beans on toast.
D2: Food.
D3: I had 87 warmed up backed beans (although eight of them were slightly crushed) served on slice of toast 12.7cm which had been unevenly toasted…

No doubt, the only adequate response to the mother's question is the utterance D1 of the daughter, because it is clear and it conveys the meaning wanted. In utterance D2, the daughter gives too little information, so that her answer is too ambiguous, and she does not cooperate with her mother. Whereas, in "D3" the daughter gives too much information than is required. So, she risks being boring (p.356).

The best way for speakers to show that they care about following the quantity maxim is by using certain expressions when interacting. For example, English speakers may use ''I won't bother you with the details'', ''to cut a long story short,'' etc. (Neddar, 2004). Yule (1996) provides the following examples to illustrate how speakers use those expressions in their utterances. In the following utterances speakers are talking about their vacation:

-As probably know' I am terrified of bugs.
-So, to cut a long story short, we gabbed our stuff and ran.
-I won't bother you with all the details, but it was an exciting trip (p.38).

1.4.2 The Maxim of Quality

The second maxim that Grice talks about is the quality maxim. It is about the truthfulness of the information given in conversations (Cruse, 2000). According to Thomas (1995), the maxim of quality is a matter of giving the right information. Therefore, speakers should say nothing that they know to be false, or which they lack sufficient evidence. That is to say, it requires speakers to provide true information when communicating. In other words, they must avoid lying. Thus, people can only talk, when they are sure of the truthfulness of what they are saying (Cutting, 2002). Grice (1975) puts it as follows:

1-Try to make your contribution one that is true
2-Do not say what you believe to be false.
3-Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence (cited in Yule 37).

What can be observed from this maxim is that the second sub maxim (a) includes the first (b); there is nothing that corresponds something in the real world and is false at the same time (Cruse, 2000). Cruse (2000) paraphrases this maxim as ''do not make unsupported statements.'' (p.355). Thus, keeping silent is better than saying things which you are not sure about.

Another thing about the quality maxim is that it is often ''breached'' than it is ''observed''. However, if people cannot match what is said with certain things which they can imagine in the world, they would never learn the language (Cruse, 2000). What must be remembered about this maxim is that whether observed or breached there is a reason behind (Mey, 2001).

The best way that puts speakers in safety from not observing the quality maxim is by using certain expressions. For example, in the English language people use the following: ''as far as I know'' ''for the best of my knowledge'', ''I may be mistaken'', ''I'm not sure if this

is true (right)'', ''I guess'', etc. (Yule, 1996). To illustrate this Cutting (2002) gives the following example:

A: I'll ring you tomorrow afternoon then.
B: Erm, I shall be there as far as I know, and in the meantime have a word with Mum and Dad if they are free. Right, bye-bye, then sweetheart.
C: Bye-bye, bye.

In this exchange, B ''uses as far as I know'' which means ''I cannot be totally sure if this is true'' to show that she is uncertain if she could talk to him on the time he mentions (tomorrow afternoon). So, by using this expression as far as "I know" in her response, B cannot be accused for lying if she cannot be at home when he calls her (p.35).

Horn (2006), considers that the quality maxim is the most important maxim. He sees that it is hard to identify how many maxims are satisfied without the observation of the quality maxim.

As the quantity maxim, quality is applied or violated depending on the situation of the conversations. For Widdowson (2007), in some situations it is more appropriate not to tell the truth. We shall see this in the coming points.

1.4.3 The Maxim of Relation

The third maxim is that of relation, which says that speakers are required to be relevant to what has been said before (Cutting, 2002). In other words, what speakers say ought to be relevant to the ''topic'' or the ''purpose'' of communication (Widdowson, 2007). According to Cruse (2000) this maxim is based on the assumption that for a conversation to be meaningful and acceptable, it is not enough to be true. Hence, utterances in conversations require being relevant as well as being true and informative. In other words, informative and true utterances in conversation can be meaningless if they are irrelevant ones. Leech (1983),

formulates the relevant maxims as follows ''an utterance U is relevant to the speech situation to the extent that U can be interpreted as contributing to the conversational goals of S or H'' (cited in Cruse, 2000, p.357). Cutting (2002) provides the following exchange to illustrate how people observe the relation maxim:

A: There's somebody at the door.
B: I'm in the bath.

From the above exchange, one can understand that B's utterance is relevant to A's one. It can be understood that B cannot open the door because he is in the bathroom taking a bath. He expects that B could infer that easily (p.35).

Grice formulates it as ''be relevant'' (cited in Yule, 1996, 37). Another example is given by Widdowson (2007) to illustrate the observance of the relation maxim:

Wife: How do like my new hat?
Husband: Very much.
Or: Looks nice.
Or: Well not sure, it is quite your colour.

Taking into consideration that the husband is cooperating with his wife, he produces relevant utterances. All the three utterances are relevant, because all of them can be relevant answers to the wife's question (p.61).

Speakers can make relevant utterances if they are afraid of misleading the hearers, by using specific markers like ''oh by the way'', ''anyway'', ''well''. They can use them too, when they want to change the topic under discussion. The following utterances which are taken from Yule (1996) show the use of those markers:

-I don't know if this is important, but some of the files are missing.
-This may sound like a dumb question, but whose hand writing is this?
-Not to change the subject, but is this related to the budget? (p.39)

Cutting (2002) provides the following exchange to show how speakers use markers:

-I mean, just going back to your point, I mean to me an order, from is a contract. If we are going to push something in then let's keep it as general as possible. (p.35)

1.4.4 The Maxim of Manner

The last maxim is that of manner, which is regarded as less important than the three previous ones. It says that speakers' utterances should be clear and easily understood (Cruse, 2000). According to Cutting (2002), speakers should be ''brief'', ''orderly'' and they should avoid ''obscurity'' and ''ambiguity'' (35). Widdowson (2007) says that to apply the manner maxim speakers must be ''clear'' and must avoid ''ambiguity'' and ''obscurity'' (p.62).

Grice suggests the following:

-Be perspicuous.
-Avoid obscurity of expression.
-Avoid ambiguity
-Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)
-Be orderly (cited in Yule, 1996, p.37).

According to Cruse, this maxim explains itself except that not everyone knows what is meant by prolixity and being orderly. He goes on to say that avoiding unnecessary prolixity means avoiding lengthy utterances. In addition, being orderly means to talk about incidents according to their order of occurrence for the sake of providing relevant and meaningful utterances. Otherwise, hearers could not match the speakers' utterances; for example, ''the ranger rode off into the sunset and jumped on his horse.'' In this example, the speaker should use ''after'' instead of ''and'', or begin his utterance as follows: the lone ranger jumped on his horse and rode off into the sunset (2000). Just as the previous maxims, manner maxim can be marked by using: "I may be a bit confused", "I'm not sure if this makes sense", "I don't know if this clear at all" (Yule, 1996). To illustrate this, an exchange is put by Cutting from a committee:

Thank you chariman.jus.just to clarify one point. There is a meeting of the police committee on Monday and there is an item on their budget for prevision of their camera (2002, p.35)

So by using 'just to clarify one point', the speaker indicates that he cares about the application of this maxim.

1.5 Non-observances

Any failure to observe a maxim may be referred to as 'breaking' a maxim. When speakers break a maxim, the hearers look for the implicature since they assume that the cooperative principle is in operation. Non observances of maxims are often used in operation and are often used intentionally in order to evoke humour or to avoid discomfort. Grice discussed four ways of conveying elicit meaning (Grundy, 1995).

1.5.1 Flouting

When flouting a maxim, the speaker does not intend to mislead the hearer but wants the hearer to look for the conversational implicature, that is the meaning of utterance not directly stated in the words uttered. Therefore, when the speaker intentionally fails to observe a maxim, the purpose may be to effectively communicate a message (Thomas, 1995). Accordingly, if working under the cooperative principle, the hearer will interpret the meaning and fill in the missing information relying on the context. In other words, flouting the maxims is the direct reason for the occurrence of implicatures. But, this can be only applied in specific situations: (a) when the hearers can infer that maxims are flouted (b) if the speaker expects that the maxims are being flouted, and (c) when the speaker has no intention to mislead the hearer (Cruse, 2000). Plag et al. (2007) say that flouting is a complex task for hearers, because they should look for what is meant from the unsaid.

According to Chapman (2000), flouting is when speakers contribute in interactions although they appear to be uncooperative.

It is the task of hearers to interpret these contributions to the present conversation. In other words, hearers must infer that speakers are exploiting a maxim for communicative purposes. Another definition of flouting is given by Paltridge (2006); speakers purposely fail to observe the cooperative principle because they assume that hearers are aware of this.

1.5.1.1 Flouting Quantity

According to Cutting (2002), when people give too much or too little information, they flout the quantity maxim for instance in:

A: Well, how do I look?
B: Your shoes are nice.

In this exchange, B flouts the quantity maxim, because she does not provide the information required for A. When A asks B about her opinion concerning her appearance, she expects an answer about her whole appearance. B then, makes an incomplete utterance. For more illustration of flouting this maxim, Yule (1996) provides the following example about two women discussing about the taste of the hamburger they are eating:

-A hamburger is a hamburger.

In this example, the woman flouts the quantity maxim because she gives too little information. However, following the cooperative principle, the hearer assumes that the speaker is intending to communicate something. Hence, she fails to observe the quantity maxim for the purpose of flouting it, and an implication is generated. In other words, when being asked about the hamburger, B implicates that the hamburger is not worth evaluating; all hamburgers are delicious. The second implication could be that she has no opinion either good or bad. Griffiths (2006) illustrates the flouting of the quantity maxim in the following example:

A: Are you from America?
B: No followed by silence.

In this case, B's answer 'no' is not sufficient for the question that has been asked. As a result, she flouts the quantity maxim. But assuming that B is following the cooperative principle, A can interpret B's implied meaning. In fact, A can infer the implication generated which is that B does not want to tell A where she is from. Hence, by flouting the quantity maxim, B indicates that she does not want to tell A where she is from.

There are two reasons that motivate speakers to flout the quantity maxim. First, when they do not want to cooperate with others. Second, when they assume that hearers can understand them without providing the information required.

The previous examples discussed about flouting quantity, are all about giving too little information than is needed. But the quantity maxim can be flouted too, when too much information is provided than what is needed. For example:

-What did you do?
-With exaggerated patience.
elaborates a long list of totally uninteresting details.

This exchange is between a mother and her daughter. In this situation, the daughter flouts the quantity maxim by giving too much information. Thus, an implicature is that the mother is too curious to know how her daughter is doing (Cruse, 2000).

1.5.1.2 Flouting Quality

Quality can be flouted in many ways. First, it can be flouted to express exaggeration; as the following example might suggest:

-I'm starving
-These bags weigh a ton.
-The drink costs a fortune.

14

In this example, speakers do not want their utterances to be understood literally. For instance, in 'I'm starving' the speaker wants simply to convey that she is very hungry (Widdowson, 2007)

Second, speakers can flout the quality maxim by using metaphors as in 'my house is a refrigerator in January', or 'my brother is a pig'. The first utterance can be interpreted as my house is very cold in January and it seems as if the speaker were in a refrigerator. Similarly, irony is another way of flouting the quality maxim. In irony, the speaker expresses a positive statement and implies a negative one (Cutting, 2002). The last way of flouting the quality maxim is banter. In contrast with irony, in banter, speakers say something negative implying a positive one. Such as:

-You're nasty, mean and stingy. How can you give me only one kiss? (Cutting, 2002)

According to (Cruse, 2000), when flouting the quality maxim, people do not want their utterances to be taken literally, at the same time they do not want to mislead the hearers. In fact, people flout this maxim mainly for creating humour and irony.

1.5.1.3 Flouting Relation

When speakers flout the relation maxim they intend to communicate more than what is said. In other words, speakers expect that listeners will be able to infer the right meaning, although the utterances sound odd, by relating the utterances to the preceding one (s). As a result, hearers must make irrelevant utterances relevant to get the meaning (Cutting 2002). To clearly show this, here is an example from Cruse (2000).

A: I say, did you hear about Mary's…
B: Yes well, it rained the whole time we were there.

Following Gricean analysis, we can say that B's utterance is completely irrelevant to A's one. A is talking about a colleague Mary, and B is describing how was her day. The reason is that she sees Mary approaching them, but A does not. Thus, B implicates the utterance 'look Mary is coming'. (p.39)

Plag et al. (2007) give the following example to illustrate how people flout the relation maxim.

A: Do you know what time it is, I've left my watch at home, and we're going to have a meeting at eight thirty.
B: The church bells are ringing.
A: Great, half an hour left.

What can be observed from this exchange is that there is no relevance between what A and B are saying. However, A's reply shows that she is not confused, or lost. On the contrary, she says 'Great, half an hour left', which means that she understands the utterance, and she finds no problem in inferring the meaning, although on its surface B's utterance seems irrelevant.

1.5.1.4 Flouting Manner

In order to exclude a third part, people often flout the manner maxim. In other words, when two people do not want a third person to understand what they are talking about, they flout the manner maxim. By doing so, they produce ambiguous utterances (Cutting 2002). The following exchange, illustrates this kind of flouting

A: I'll look after Samantha for you, don't worry we'll have a lovely time. Won't we, Sam?
B: Great, but if you don't mind, you don't post her any post prandicle concotions involving super cooled oxide of hydrogen. It usually gives rise to convulsive nausea.

In this exchange, B speaks in an ambiguous way when he said 'her'; 'post prandial concotions'; 'super cooled oxide of hydrogen, 'convulsive nausea' because she does not want Sam to know what they are talking about (Cruse, 2000, p. 361)

Chapman (2000) provides another example to illustrate how this maxim is actually flouted by people, and how implicatures are generated from this flouting:

-I found your lecture unhelpful.
-I found your lecture not helpful.

In the first utterance, the speaker flouts the third sub maxim of manner which states: be 'brief'. In the first utterance, the speaker implicates that the lecture is not wholly helpful.

1.5.2 Violating

In contrast to flouting, when violating a maxim, speakers intend to mislead the hearers. Speakers seem as if they are cooperating, but with the intention to lead the hearers to infer a misleading implicature (Thomas, 1995). According to Davis (1998) violating a maxim is quietly deceiving, the speaker gives insufficient information, says something false, and provides irrelevant or ambiguous utterances with the purpose of misleading hearers. The speaker can achieve this because the hearers assume that she is cooperating with them. Cutting (2002, p.40) provides the following example to illustrate how maxims are violated:

Husband: How much did that dress cost, darling?
Wife: Less than the last one.
Or: Thirty five pound
Or: I know let's go out tonight.
Or: A tiny fraction of my salary, though probably a bigger fraction of the salary of the woman sold it to me.

From the above exchange, we can say that in the first reply the wife violates the quantity maxim; she is not informative as required. In her second reply, the wife violates the quality maxim because she is lying. In the third reply she violates the relation maxim because she changes the topic and her utterance is not relevant to her husband's one. The last reply is an ambiguous utterance; thus, the wife violates the manner maxim.

A good example, concerning violating maxims, is that exchange between a man and a woman:

Man: Does your dog bite?
Woman: No.
Man: (The man reaches down to pet the dog. The dog bites his hand). Ouch! Hey! You said that your dog doesn't bite.
Woman: He doesn't. But that is not my dog.

In this exchange the woman violates the quantity maxim. She does not give enough information to the man, and at the same time she is not implying anything. She knows that the man is asking about the dog in front of her, and not her dog at home. Yet, she intends not to give the right amount of information. Regarding to the man, he assumes that the woman is cooperating with him, and he understands more than what is said (Yule, 1996).

What is important to remember is that violations are very hard to be detected because they cannot be known, for example, it is hard to predict whether the speaker is lying or not (Cutting, 2002).

1.5.3 Opting out

Opting out is the third way in failing to fulfil a maxim. In opting out a maxim, speakers do not imply anything, and what is intended is said by the words. When opting out a maxim, speakers are not unwilling to cooperate and reveal more than they already have. Speakers choose not to observe the maxim and state an unwillingness to do so. (Thomas, 1995).

An example of opting out maxims is provided by Cutting in the following:

-I'm afraid I can't give you that information.

In this example the speaker clearly states that he does not want to cooperate, and he really means that (Thomas, 1995).

1.5.4 Infringing a maxim

Just like opting out, in infringing speakers do not imply anything too. The difference between the two is that infringing occurs when interlocutors misunderstand each other because of culture differences (Cutting, 2002).

1.6 Implicature

Kempeson (1979) defines implicature as ''assumption over and above the meaning of a sentence used which the speaker knows and intends that the hearer will make'' (p.217). In many verbal exchanges, hearers need to look for an implicature, that is to say, implication of the utterances is not clearly stated in words but implied for the hearers to interpret. In other words, in some situations people do not fully cooperate with each other, but keep behaving on the same assumptions about communication. In some other situations, interactants may decide to flout some of Grice's four maxims; to be ''uninformative'', ''evasive'', ''irrelevant'' or ''obscure''. However, they still produce meaningful utterances or if we can say inferred by recipient as meaningful. This has been referred to by Grice as ''implicature''. This latter, is actually used to refer to what is implied, what the speakers mean rather than what they say (Davis, 1998). Thus, it is the speakers' responsibility for making clear meaning. In fact, the maxims themselves focus on speakers' behaviour rather on hearers'. In addition, the cooperative principle and the four maxims give hearers an active role for predicting the meaning. That is to say, in some interactions speakers implicate meaning, when communicating and it is the task of the listeners to infer those implicated messages. This can be achieved on the assumption of the cooperative principle (Livenson, 1983). Davis (1998)

defines implicature as ''the act of meaning implying something by saying something else''
(p.5).

Grice distinguishes between two types of implicatures. The distinction is in fact
between what is said and what is implicated. Grice puts them in conversational and
conventional implicatures.

A conversational implicature is based on the assumption that hearers assume that
speakers are cooperative. Hence, hearers can draw conclusions about what a speaker is
implicating. Grice (1975) puts it as follows:

What is conversationally implicated is what is required that one assumes a speaker to
think in order to preserve the assumption that he is observing the cooperative principle (and
perhaps some conversational maxims as well).

(As cited in Bendjelloul, 2008, p.57)

First, the conversational implicature depends on what is said; what is implicated is
calculated by the hearer from what is said, in addition to the context and other features of
utterances. Moreover, for conversational implicature to be generated, the speaker must believe
that hearers are in the position to recognize the implicature (Levinson, 1983).

In Grice own words:

The presence of conversational implicature must be capable of being worked out; for even

if it can in fact be intuitively grasped, unless the intuition is replaced by an argument, the

implicature (if present at all) will not count as conversational implicature; it will be a

conventional implicature. (Cited in Bendjelloul, 2008, p.58)

According to Cruse (2000), there are two conditions on conversational implicature. First, it is the result of flouting the cooperative principle or the maxims. Second, it depends on the context. The following exchange is taken from Davis (1998) to illustrate how implicatures are generated:

A: I've just run out of petrol.
B: There's a garage just around the corner.

What can be said from this exchange is that, B implicates that in the garage there is petrol. But if B knows that the garage is closed or sold out of petrol, then he is less cooperative. Anyway in both cases an implicature is generated.

Conventional implicature, on the other hand, has nothing to do with the cooperative principle or the four maxims, and it almost has to do with particular words in conversations (Grundy, 1995). For instance, English speakers use 'but', 'therefore', 'manage', 'yet', in utterances as:

-He is smart but not at all boring.

The implicature in this utterance, depending on 'but', is that most people who are smart are boring. The implicature 'but' shows the contrast between what comes before and after it.

The difference between conversational and conventional implicatures is explained and clarified in the following way:

The difference between conversational and conventional implicatures at the level of sentences lies in the nature of the conventions involved. Both are semantic conventions. The

contrastive implication is no part of the meaning of ''but''. The nonuniversal implication is no part of the meaning of ''some'' (Davis, 1998, p. 157).

The context, and knowing the cooperative principle and the four maxims are not the only conditions for generating implicatures, there is another important condition which is that the shared background knowledge between interlocutors (Levinson, 1983).

1.7 Conclusion

As it has been said so far, Grices's four maxims play an important role in making smooth conversations. That is to say, following Grice's theory, speakers must produce truthful (quality), relevant (relevance), clear (manner) utterances that contain the adequate amount of information (quantity), for conveying the message they want to the hearers. However, they frequently fail to observe them. In other words, they flout; violate; opt out; or infringe one or more maxims. Consequently, an implicature is generated and more is communicated than it is said.

CHAPTER TWO

THE ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' CONVERSATIONS IN RELATION TO GRICE'S THEORY

2.1 Introduction

This chapter aims at examining Grice's theory in Algerian Arabic interactions; checking different kinds of flouting, and the factors motivating them. In other words, this chapter is provided to check whether Grice's theory and all its aspects dealt with in the preceding chapter will be applied and how to communication takes place in Algerian contexts. Thus, it constitutes the empirical study that forms an important part of this research and justifies its theoretical framework. Both the quantitative and the qualitative analyses are provided to analyse the informants' conversations. The quantitative analysis is presented to examine which of Grice's maxims quality, quantity, relevance or manner is most flouted, when Mentouri University students, Constantine, interact with each other. The qualitative analysis, on the other hand, is provided to find out the reasons that motivate our participants to flout the four maxims. Consequently, the present chapter focuses on testing our hypothesis.

2.2 Method Adopted for the Data Collection

2.2.1 Informants

To collect and analyse data from natural conversations, students from Mentouri University, Constantine, of both sexes and from different fields of study were randomly selected. In the present study sex is not taken as a factor when analysing our data to avoid other research problems which are not of our main concern. The selection of participants using Algerian Arabic in their conversations aims at investigating possible flouting of Grice's four maxims quality, quantity, relevance and manner. More importantly, it investigates the

possible reasons that lead the concerned students to do so. Forty (40) participants were randomly selected, and their conversations were recorded. We chose to take conversations between only two students in order to avoid misunderstandings of the recordings. That is to say, it is hard to consider the number of students involved in the conversations.

2.2.2 Corpus

The corpus of our study consists of twenty 20 conversations in which forty students were discussing different topics in Algerian Arabic. They were males and females, from different faculties: Arts: English; Arabic; and French and Science Biology and Computing. Utterances that contain flouting were selected for identifying the type of the maxim flouted. After analysing our data quantitatively, they were analysed qualitatively for discovering the reasons that motivate the informants to flout the maxims. It should just be pointed out that the meaning of the utterances where the flouting occurred could be predicted from the context of the conversations.

2.2.3 Procedure

As far as the presentation of the collected data is concerned, it should be pointed out that it includes forty students. In each conversation only two students were interacting. We were concerned with taking those conversations that were produced in Algerian Arabic. To meet the aims of the study, we did not follow a specific method while translating the utterances into English. Sometimes, word for word translation was adopted. In other words, since the study seeks to identify cases of flouting maxims in Algerian Arabic conversations, the adequate way of translating our data varied from one context to another. Actually, they were translated according to the flouted maxim.

Only instances where flouting occurred were analysed and not all the non observances of the maxims (violating, opting out and infringing). The purpose behind this is to easily predict the reasons for flouting.

24

The method used in answering our research questions was tape recording authentic students' conversations, as an adequate tool that can be used to meet our aims. Recording conversations in real contexts was conducted during the first week of May. The recordings vary in length and the mean duration of the recorded conversation was about 5 minutes. The main focus was on identifying cases of flouting Grice's maxims among peer group interactions within the speech community. This was justified by the fact that there would be more instances of flouting maxims when students were talking to fellow students or friends than non peer interactions. Randomly, forty Mentouri University students were recorded through segments of natural conversations. Recording students' conversations was from a distance for the sake of reliability. Thus, our informants were not told about our study.

2.3 Method for Data Analysis

As a primary measure, the recorded conversations were split into utterances. For the analysis of flouting, utterances were chosen as the basic unit of the analysis. The reason for this is that in one conversation many maxims were flouted; consequently, it was necessary to take just the utterances where the flouting occurred and not the whole conversation. To achieve the ultimate goal, the following steps were taken into account:

1_ Select the utterances that contained flouting. Here, utterances where flouting occurred were taken separately. In other words, utterances contained flouting were distinguished from those that fulfilled the maxims.

2_ Decide which of the four maxims were flouted, whether it was quality, quantity, relevance or manner. In deciding on the kind of the flouted maxim, we referred to the criteria of the flouting below:

Maxim of quantity

- When the speaker gives too much or too little information than the situation required.

- When the speaker uses insufficient words.

Maxim of quality

- When the speaker lies or says something that is believed to be false

- When the speaker be ironic or sarcastic.

- Where the speaker denies something true.

Maxim of relevance

- When the speaker produces an irrelevant utterance.

- When the speaker uses wrong causality.

Maxim of manner

- When the speaker is ambiguous or uses ambiguous language.

- When the speaker is unclear.

- When the speaker uses idioms.

3_ Determine the reasons of the flouting. Here, we tried to find why the participants flouted the maxims.

4_ Classify the flouting of the maxims in a table as follows:

Through the table below, we tried to calculate the number and the percentage of the occurrence of the maxims

Maxims	Day1	Day2	Day3	Day4	Day5	Total	
	N	N	N	N	N	N	%
Quality						Na	Xa
Quantity						Nb	Xb
Relevance						Nc	Xc
Manner						Nd	Xd
Total	N1	N2	N3	N4	N5	∑N	∑X

Table 1: the flouting of maxims in the first five days of May.

The quantitative analysis adopted the following formulae:

Na, b, c, d/ ∑N*100% = Xa,b,c,d

∑N= N1+N2+N3+N4+N5 or ∑N=Na +Nb+ Nc +Nd

∑X= Xa +Xb+ Xc +Xd.

Na, b, c, d: the number of flouting of one maxim during the five days when the data were collected.

N1: The total number of flouting the maxims in the first day.

N2: The total number of flouting the maxims in the second day.

N3: The total number of flouting the maxim in the third day.

N4: The total number of flouting the maxim in the fourth day.

N5: The total number of flouting the maxim in the fifth day.

∑N: The total number of flouting the maxims.

∑X: The total percentage of flouting the maxims.

5_ Identify the reasons of flouting the maxims of conversations. We analysed the reasons of flouting from the context of conversations.

2.4 Findings and Analyses

2.4.1The Quantitative Analysis

The absolute number and percentage of flouting the maxims per day were calculated using the formulas stated above. They are presented in the following table:

The number of each flouting and also the percentage of the occurrence of flouting are included. The symbol N represents the number of flouting, while the percentage of the occurrence is presented by the symbol %:

Maxims	Day1	Day2	Day3	Day4	Day5	Total	
	N	N	N	N	N	N	%
Quality	25	19	27	21	16	108	44.8%
Quantity	6	8	3	2	2	21	8.7%
Relevance	16	21	14	7	7	65	27%
Manner	12	6	8	7	14	47	19.5%
Total	N1=59	N2=54	N3=52	N4=37	N5=39	241	100%

Table 1: the number and the percentage of flouting the maxims during five days.

Table1 above displays the total number and the percentage of flouting the maxims of quality, quantity, relevance and manner in the twenty conversations, which were recorded in Mentouri University, Constantine, during five days. It clearly shows that the maxim of quality was flouted 108 times (44.8%), being the most flouted maxim in our data. The maxim of relevance was flouted 65 times (27%), followed by the maxim of manner 47 times (19.5%). And the least flouted maxim was the maxim of quantity, which is 21 times (8.7%). Through

this table we can answer the second research question of our study and conclude that the most flouted maxim is the quality maxim.

2.4.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

Many of the quantitative findings presented above were significant to draw conclusions about how our participants flouted the four maxims. A total of 241 instances of flouting maxims was detected. The maxim of quality was the most flouted, and then relevant, manner, the least flouted was the quantity maxim. The cases, where flouting was found, were classified for finding the reasons behind flouting the four maxims. Our analysis is based on the assumption that our participants were cooperative with each other.

2.4.2.1 Flouting Quality

Quality is the most flouted maxim in our data. It was flouted for many reasons: to strengthen opinion, to be sarcastic, and for cultural reasons:

2.4.2.1.1 To Strengthen Opinion

An important reason for flouting quality is to strengthen opinion. For this purpose participants used metaphors in many utterances. Actually, the students exaggerated when describing things to each other for the sake of strengthening the meaning they want to convey. As a matter of fact, they did not want the words in their utterances to be understood literally. Following this reason, many examples were selected from our data:

S5:∕ Яir rɒħi ʕend etbib∕(it is better for you to go to the doctor's)

S6:∕eh maʕendiʃ ∂lweqt wekteʃ rajħa nrɒħ ∂xtini∕(eh, I don't have time to go).

S5:∕∂w kajen waħed tbib f elxruub kamel jeʃɒkru fih∕(there is a good doctor in el elkhroub).

S6:∕Weʃ jeddini lxru:b∕(oh! I can't go to Elkhroub).

S5:⁄ja weʃbik ∂lxru:b xatwa, lakan tħabi nroħ mʕak⁄(What's the matter with you! elkhroub is very near).

(In fact S5, shorten the distance between the place they were in and Elkhroub by comparing it to a step).

S6:⁄Χalli lakan bqawli haka smena l3aja nrɒħ⁄(If I don't recover next week, I'll go then).

S7: /jexi sa va bark⁄(are you okay!).

S8:/digutad3 rah dajer da:l/ (I'm fed up. Here, the S7 made boredom as a human shadow to show that he was fed up, and not satisfied).

S9:⁄weʃbik raged nɒd⁄(why are you sleeping? wake up!).

S10: ⁄ej taħetli el batri u raħetli l coneksion⁄ (I'm lost. In the Algerian Arabic utterance S10 said that the battery was dead and there was no network to show that he was worn out).

S17: /sa va/ (are you okay?).

S18: /rawda matdɒreʃ/ (I'm very annoyed in the original utterance S18 used the example of someone whose car's wheels are broken to show how much he was annoyed).

S23: /weʃ mdajra fiha m3a l memwaЯ raki maʃjia ʃwija/ (how well are you doing in your memoir?).

S24: /wallah rani naħbu f Ɵijuяi/ (I swear I'm not doing much, I'm very slow like a baby in doing the theoretical part).

From the above utterances, two noticeable facts were identified. First, the students flouted the quality maxim. Second, they did so in order to make their conversations more powerful. For example in the first interaction S6 said that 'xru:b xatwa', and wanted to say to

her friend that she would neither make efforts nor lose time if she accepted to go to 'ϑl xru:b'. Moreover, by using the word 'xatwa' (step), S6 wanted to show how near 'ϑl xru:b' was. Hence, her friend's freedom of choice not to go to the doctor's decreased. As a result, S5 hesitated in refusing her friend's suggestion for going to the doctor's when she said 'xalli lakan bqawli haka smena l3eja nrʊħ' (if I don't recover next week, I'll go then). In other words, S5 wanted to oblige her friend to go to the doctor's in an indirect way. In the example, 'digutad3 rah dajer dal', S8 compared the boredom to a shadow, following him wherever he went. Without any doubt, he wanted to say that the boredom and he are inseparable. Wherever he went, whatever he did he could not get over it. The conveyed communicative meaning, using this expression, became stronger than just saying 'ϑlqolqa' (I'm fed up). In the following example, that between S9 and S10, both students flouted the quality maxim; when S9 criticized his friend for being sleepy. However, he did not really mean that he was actually sleeping but because he kept silent and made no comments. Further, he might ask S9 to give him his opinion about an important matter, and expected an answer but S10 said nothing. Then, when he replied to S10 critics by using 'my battery is dead' and 'there is no connexion', which are metaphors, S9 compared himself to an object, whose battery is low. He meant that he was worn out, and he could not concentrate on anything. He went on to give another expression which was about a 'computer without a network'. In both cases, that is to say using the two metaphors, S10 showed that he could not concentrate on doing anything. He was just helpless as a mobile whose battery is no longer operating. When he said that 'he lost connexion', he neither wanted to say that he would not answer any question nor made any comments about what was going on. The same explanation could be applied to the interaction between S17 and S18. In order to describe his state at the present moment, S18 provided an example of someone who was in a hurry to go to an important meeting, and suddenly his car broke down because the bad state of the car's wheels. Consequently, he could make much

effect on the hearer and conveyed the message that he 'was not okay'. The last interaction about S23 and the way she was proceeding with her work, she answered by comparing her speed in doing her research to the speed of a baby who has not started walking yet. Thus, the implicated meaning that S24 understood was that she was not doing well, and she was very slow in finding ideas or information about her research. It is noteworthy that many other instances of flouting quality for strengthening the meaning were found in utterances like: 'I waited you for a decade', 'I'm starving' and many others.

2.4.2.1.2 To Be Sarcastic

The obviousness of the untruth of participants' replies lead to the flouting of quality maxim to create sarcasm. This can be observed in the following examples:

S3: /ʒiti/ (did you come?).
S4: /∂ha ma3iteʃ/ (no I didn't).

S7: ⁄wajnak hada saħbi hadi Яejba, wajnak hada⁄ (where have you been my friend? we really missed you). In the Algerian Arabic utterance where have you been was said as where are you?)
S8: ⁄ani mˤak⁄ (I'm with you).

S15: /sbaħ elixir, jexi matʊwelteʃ/ (good morning, I'm not late. Am I?).
S16: /matʊweltiʃ xlas koun Яir zedti ʃwija/ (you are not late at all, it would be better if you come later).

S21: /weʃ ˤendak hada ma3itiʃ xlas mliħa/ (you are not okay today, what's going on?).

In their utterances; S4, S16, S 21 meant just the opposite of the literal meaning. For example S4 made an unreasonable remark when he asked S3 whether she came or did not. In such a situation, the speaker and the hearer were together. Hence, S3 found it unworthy to answer her friend's unreasonable remark. Indeed, S3 replied in a sarcastic way, to ask her friend to stop mocking at her. The same situation in the utterance given by when S15 asked S16 whether she was late or not, in her reply S16 used irony. As a result, two implicatures were generated. First, that her friend was very late. Second, since she already knew that she was late what was the point in asking the question then? Whereas in S8 the student pretended that he did not understand his friend's question 'where have you been?' His friend wanted merely to know the reason behind not seeing him for a long time. S7 utterance was an easy expression to be understood in the Algerian society in such contexts. However, S8 answered literally by saying 'I'm with you' to create some kind of humour.

2.4.2.1.3 Cultural Reasons

S6: /∂ benti ∂ni gutlek roħi ltbib.../ (my daughter I told you to go to the doctor's).

S9: /rabi jefera3 ʕlik xɒ / (may allah help you brother).

S12: /xti ʕlah weʃ galuulak ʕlija/ (what they told you about me sister).

Other instances of flouting quality were by using kinship terms when addressing their friends. The non use of sibling forms was when they were interacting with their friends. This is due to mainly cultural reasons. In fact, from the selected examples it was noticed that their use was to show solidarity among peer groups. They were often followed by advice like in S6 or a complaint about the addressee as in S12. For example, in S12 the message was clear since what follows the term ⁄xti⁄ was a kind of gentle criticism to the addressee.

What can be said about this kind of flouting is that, in Algerian Arabic, originally kin terms corresponding to 'brother', 'sister', 'daughter', and 'son' easily happen to refer to friends and classmates throughout our data.

2.4.2.2 Flouting Relevance

Relevance is the second most flouted maxim through our data. Many reasons were detected like: to change the conversation topic, to give additional information, and to avoid talking about something.

2.4.2.2.1 To Change the Conversation Topic

An important reason for flouting relevance is to change the conversation topic. Regarding this reason, some concrete examples to describe the situation were presented:

S2: /ʕliha welit manʃufakʃ, aki karja f l bibjɔtek/ (that's why I haven't seen you, you spend your time in the library)

S1: /eh kun ʒew jexaliwni nbat wallah ndirha. ey raki mpijeʃa eljuum/ (I swear if they let me pass the night here I'll be pleased. Your clothes are so nice).

S9: /maʃi Яir xalsa ʕlija/ (I'm not okay at all).

S10: aweh ∂ saħbi blaʕqel ʕla saħtek bark, Rabi jefared3 ʕlik xɔ. ʃeft la list taʕ li joueurs..../ (Oh my friend to worry is not good for your health. May Allah help you. Have you seen the players' list?).

S17: /ja xuuja weʃ rajeħ ndir nkajel etriq wella nkali elħajt/ (what shall I do? Keep coming and going or just stand by the wall).

S16: /win raħu lʒmaʕa/ (where are our friends?).

In the first interaction, the interlocutors started talking about how S1 was managing her studies. Then, S1 shifted to another subject. This was either because she did not want to keep talking about studies, or because she found it more important and interesting to pay a compliment to her friend's appearance. Moreover, the following example was chosen to lend support to our idea about flouting relevance for changing the topic of conversation. When S10 was asking about the matters that made his friend absent- minded but then he changed to another completely different topic about the national football team and the new players. Here, S10 shifted to another topic, because he wanted to make his friend happy by talking about something that might be interesting and worth discussing. The utterance given by S16 is another good example; when S17 said that he had nothing to do except coming and going, S17 made no comments about this. Moreover, he shifted to a new topic. He might see that his friend is right and he agreed with him. Or, he perhaps was curious to know the place of his friends.

2.4.2.2.2 To Give Additional Information

The second reason for flouting relevance has to do with giving additional information as such without reference to what has been said before. As a result, different kinds of implications can be derived. In other words, the students added irrelevant information to what had been said before when interacting with each other, but still there was no possibility of communicative misunderstanding. These are interesting examples to clarify this:

S3: /aha maʒiteʃ, eeh hada win ʒit men lablad, ʕadit la poste teʒerfi elʁaʃi joqtel/ (no, I didn't I've just come from downtown, and I went to the post office it was crowded)

S4: /ʕlah dɒxlet la burs/ (did they send the bursary?).

S9: /rabi jeferdʒ ʕlik xɒ ʃeft la list taʕ l ʒuweur galek mbu:lħi hareb xlas dorka tir blaset ʃawʃi/

(May God help you brother, have you seen the list of the players, mboulhi is a very good player, he would replace chaouchi).

S10: /am galu meʁni mazal mrid ʃwija/ (meghni is still ill).

S11: /ʕandek l kridi/ (do you have cedit in your phone?).

S12: /ʕlah/ (why?).

S13: /ʃeft ∂lbareħ ∂lbarsa/ (did you barça yesterday?).

S14: /eh raħet ʕliha xlas manaʕref weʃbihom/ (they did not play well I do not know what the matter with them was).

S13: / ja xuja maraħet ʕlihom mawelu: larbitre xrɒdʒ konterhom/ (no, they played well but the referee was unfair).

S29: /wallah mankdeb ʕlik maderna fiha walu: ʒit nahder mʕah malgiteʃ weʃ nahder kraht/ (I'm not lying I didn't do anything, I didn't find what to tell him I'm fed up).

S30: /aw xlɒs elʕam/ (the year has finished).

S29: /saħ dajem rabi/ (everything ends but Allah).

In the first example, S4 found it an opportunity to ask about the bursary when her friend S3 said that she had just come from the post office. By doing so, she was irrelevant. In the following interaction, S9 provided irrelevant utterances. For instance, he started speaking about the list of players. Then, he gave his intention about a new player for the same reason, that is, adding information. In the interaction between S11 and S12, S12 by asking the question 'why?' to her friend, she expected her either to say 'yes' and give her the mobile or 'no'. Hence, S12 implied that she was curious to know why her friend was asking about the

credit. Finally, in order to cheer her friend up, S30 gave her the information that the year is about to finish, so there is no need to worry.

2.4.2.2.3 To Avoid Talking about Something

In this case the students gave answers which did not collocate with what has been said before to avoid talking about something:

S7: /ʕlah waʃ jexɒsak/ (why? what do you need?)

S8: /waʃ majxɒsniʃ xalliha lrabi/ (what I don't need? God decides)

S7: /∂h, nta waʕer/ (you are not easy)

S8: /∂l waʕer rabi subħanu/ (Allah is the greatest)

S12: /lamen rajħa tˤajti/ (who will you call?)

S11: /wallah maneskɒn ∂hna/ (I swear I don't live here)

S8 did not want to talk about what made him worried. In fact, S7 asked a question that needed an answer. Whereas, S8 in return produced an irrelevant utterance implying that he did not want to talk about anything. The same explanation can be used to explain S8 utterance '∂l waʕer rabi subħanu' he emphasized, that he did not want to share his problems with S7. In the following example, by saying 'wallah man∂skɒn ∂hna', S11 was irrelevant and she explicitly revealed that she did not want to reply her friend's question.

2.4.2.3 Flouting Manner

2.4.2.3.1 The Use of Idioms

After analysing our data, we found that the manner maxim was often flouted when students used idioms. Actually, the use of idioms summarised in a few words a whole situation. By using idioms our participants seemed ambiguous like in:

S4: /Swared jdiru ∂triq f ∂lbħar/ (money talks).

S8: /∂na naħfarlu fi qber mʊ w huwa harebli b∂lfas/ (help those who help themselves).

S26: /baraħ mejʒibak fi qsida/ (people turn a blind eye of you).

The above well-known Algerian idioms can be given the following interpretations or meanings: the first one means that if one has money, everything would be possible for him. He showed how important is money in life. So, one will not find any difficulty in achieving what he wants. Through this idiom S4 stated clearly that she found it possible that the girl they were talking about felt better after she got a job. She wanted to say that she earned enough money to do everything in order to be more beautiful. The second idiom was about ungrateful people who never thank if someone did something good for them. Besides, they do not do any efforts to help themselves, nor let people help them. S8 wanted to say to her friend why she showed worry about her friend who seemed hopeless and helpless. The third one is about someone who is ignored by his society. So, S26 wanted to say that they would never get over the obstacles, and the problems they are suffering from, because nothing would change and no one would care about them. That is to say, it is no sense to keep trying to ameliorate their living conditions, because they would gain nothing and no one would care.

2.4.2.3.2 To Save Time

 S2: /weʃ mdeijra fiha/. (How are you doing?).

S1:/Wallah rana/. (I swear we are...).

S2: /ʕlah/ (why?).

S1: /taʕerfi kraht mʕa l memware/ (you know I hate doing the research).

In all the above utterances, the students made ambiguous utterances by using ambiguous language. For example, when S2 said 'weʃ mdeijra fiha' (how are you doing?), she

38

did not express clearly what she meant by asking such an ambiguous question. What can be observed from S1 reply was ambiguous too. She did not say something after 'wallah rana'. But from her intonation, S2 understood that she was not okay. That is why she said 'why'. We can understand that both students inferred the meaning of the messages they wanted to convey to each other. One reason might be that S2 was eager to know about how were her friend's matters and she had no time to specify about what she was asking. Concerning S2 ambiguous reply, she found it enough to use the expression 'rana' with an intonation that clearly showed her anxiousness. There is no doubt here that S1 and S2 shared previous knowledge and because language is economic (save time and energy); they found no need to provide details.

2.4.2.4 Flouting Quantity

It was interesting to observe that our participants never flouted the quantity maxim by giving too much information than the situation required. All the instances of flouting this maxim were due to providing too little information. The main reason for flouting was to save time.

2.4.2.4.1 To Talk about Many Topics

Through our analysis we identified that quantity and manner are integrated. Needless to say that flouting quantity automatically leads to flouting manner. In other words, when someone gives too little information and uses so few words when talking about something, he risks being ambiguous. Thus, when analysing our data we found that both manner and quantity were flouted because of the same reason mainly to talk about many topics: the following examples illustrate this phenomenon:

S13: /ʃeft ∂lbareħ ∂lbarsa/ (did you barça yesterday?).

S14: /eh raħet ʕliha xlas manaʕref weʃbihom/ (they did not play well I do not know what the matter with them was).

S20: /ʁir lakan tesalkili ʁda eljum/ (only if you invite me to dinner).

S19: /haja bark besaħ maʕendiʃ/. (Let's go but I don't have).

S20: /ja ↄ mwin guli maʃ xsara fik/ (at least say you are welcome).

Omission of an understood element in the above conversation can be noticed, therefore, quantity maxim was flouted. This was due to using words syntactically meant by the speaker and understood by the hearer. In the utterance said by S13, for example, S13 did not provide the needed information; he mentioned neither the time nor the place where the football team played. He did so to save time because he was sure that his friend could easily understand the message. This can be proved by S14 answer. In fact, S14 showed that he inferred the message conveyed. The second interaction is another example that clearly explained the phenomenon when S13 said 'maʕandiʃ' (I don't have). She did not restrict her utterance to something that she did not have. Thus, S19 did not use many words to explain the situation. As a result, she risked being ambiguous. However, if we took the topic of conversation into consideration, it can be easily understood that she was talking about money.

2.5 Conclusion

To sum up, the maxims can be classified according to their flouting degree by students in Mentouri University, Constantine, as follows: the maxim of quality, followed by the maxim of relevance and the maxim of manner. The least flouted maxim is the maxim of quantity. Then, we have analysed the most important reasons that can be derived from flouting the maxims. As a result we found that flouting the maxims is due to various reasons, for example, to strengthen opinion, to be sarcastic, and cultural reasons for the maxim of quality. To change a conversation topic, to add information and to avoid talking about something are

reasons for flouting the maxim of relevance. To be clear using idiomatic expressions, and to save time are motivations for flouting the maxim of manner. For the maxim of quantity to be flouted students want to talk about many topics.

General Conclusion

To begin with, it is important to explain the interest and the usefulness of the present study in the field of research; then, summarize it and specify its purposes. After that, mention the problems and limitations that face us when collecting and analysing our data. Finally, recommendations for future research are made.

The present research is an attempt to study how Algerian students in general and in Mentouri University, Constantine, in particular manage their conversations in Algerian Arabic in relation to Grice's maxims. Such a study is interesting because of the lack of studies carried in the field of pragmatics in Algeria. It should be pointed out that the conversations in the data we have analysed might not be in exactly the same way in the future. They correspond to a very specific period of the history of Algeria, where the influence of the new technology on people takes place like: 'cell phones', 'internet', etc. This is apparent in the various utterances where the students used expressions like 'antivirus', 'connexion', 'flexi', etc, for describing things that have nothing to do with the literal meaning of those words.

The second important issue is to stress that successful interaction is valid in Algerian contexts among students in Mentouri University, Constantine, though flouting Grice's maxims. From the findings and the analysis, it can be said that our participants frequently feel the necessity to flout the maxims for certain reasons. For instance, they need to flout quality in order to strengthen their opinions, notably, when they believe that obeying the maxims would not have the same effect on their messages. Furthermore, our findings show that flouting maxims through our sample does not prevent students from interacting. The point is that, conversations still run well without miscommunication. In this case, flouting maxims does not break down conversations between the interlocutors. However, it does not mean that participants can flout the maxims of conversation without having strong reasons for doing so.

The third point is about the problems we encountered throughout our study. One of our major problems was recording students' conversations. In fact, it was not an easy task. To obtain significant data, it is vital to be very close to the students and try as possible as we can to keep them unaware about the recording in order to have authentic conversations. Secondly, the students generally move when they talk. This made it impossible for us to keep following them. So, we were obliged to stop recording when they change their places. Hence, we could not record as many conversations as possible. Thirdly, when we started recording we took all the conversations. However, when we started to analyse them we could not detect how many students were participating in the conversations. Thus, we preferred to change our method and just took those conversations involving two students only. Finally, the problem that faced us while analysing our data was that informants do not only flout one maxim per utterance but several at the same time. We have decided to disregard that and rather look at the maxim which has most clearly been flouted although in some cases it was not possible to do so as we have seen with quantity and manner maxims.

As it has been stated before, our research has first shed light on how Algerians manage their conversations in relation to Grice's theory in real life contexts. Furthermore, it has opened the doors for other interesting research. One interesting idea might be to look whether breaking the maxims differ between sexes. In addition, an interesting topic, to see whether young and old people in Algeria flout the same maxims of conversation, may be carried out.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aitchison, J. (2003). *Teach Yourself Linguistics.* London: Hodder and Stroughton
   Education.

2. Bendjelloul, A. (2008). *Social Norms and Individual Strategy in Conversation
   Opening, Maintaining and Closing in Algerian Arabic: a Pragmatic Study.*
   Mentouri University of Constantine: Unpublished.

3. Chapman, S. (2000). *Philosophy for Linguistics: An Introduction.* London: Routledge.

4. Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

5. Cruse, A. (2000). *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics.*
   Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

6. Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Routledge.

7. Davis, W. A. (1998). *Implicature: Intention, Convention, and Principles in the Failure of
   Gricean Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

8. Finegan, E. (2008). *Language: Its Structure and Use.* Stamford: Cengage Learning

9. Griffiths, P. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics.* Edinburgh:
   Edinburgh University Press.

10. Grundy, P. (1995). *Doing Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

11. Horn. L. (2006). Implicature. In L., Horn & G., Ward (Ed.), *The Handbook of
    Pragmatics* (pp. 3-28). Oxford: Blackwell.

12. Jaszezolt, K. M. (2002). *Semantics and Pragmatics: Meaning in Language and Discourse*.
    UK: Pearson Education.

13. Kempson, R. M. (1979*). Presupposition and the Delimitation of Semantics.* Cambridge:
    Cambridge University Press.

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

15. Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics.* London: Longman.

16. Mey, J. C. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell.

17. Neddar, B. A. (2004). *Schema Discourse and Foreign Language Teaching: An Introduction*. Oran: Ibn Khaldoun.

18. Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction.* London: YHT.

19. Plag, I., Brawn, M., Lappe, S., & Schramm, M. (2007). *Introduction to English Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton Gruyter.

20. Thomas, J. (19995). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

21. Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

22. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

23. ---------. (2006). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX

Transcriptions of Sample Conversations

Conversation one

The following are extracts from the conversations that took place in the first day where

 students flouted the four maxims:

S1: /sbaħ ∂lxir, sa va ?/

(Good morning, how are you?)

S2: /labas ∂lħmd, weʃ mdeijra fiha ntija/

(Fine thanks God, how are you doing?)

S1: /wallah rana taʕrfi kraht mʕa l memwar/

(I swear we are! You know I hate doing the research)

S2: /ʕlah?/

(Why?)

S1: /melgiteʃ rɒħi. Kul jum w ana f l bibljɒtek keʃ mandir ħadʒa tosloħ mais wallah welu/

(I can't find what to do, everyday I stay in the library perhapse I can do something good but I

do nothing)

S2:/ ʕliha ʕudt manʃufakeʃ aki karja fi bibljɒtek/

(That's why I don't see you these days you are in the library all the time)

S1: /eh ku:n ʒaw jexaliwni nbat wallah ndirha, raki mpejʃa eljum/

(If they let me pass the night there I will do it, your clothes are so nice)

Conversation two

S3: /salam/.

(Peace with you)

S4: /ʒiti? /

(Did you come?)

S3: /aha maʒiteʃ, e hada win ʒit leblad ʕadit la poste taʕerfi ∂lʁaʃi ∂lʁaʃi jɔqtel /

(No, I didn't'. I just came from downtown, I was at the post office, and it was very crowded)

S4:/ ʕlah dexlet la burs?/

(Did they send the bursary?)

S3: /∂ni gutlak ∂lʁaʃi weʃbik wajnak hada? /

(I told you the post office was really crowded, where are you?)

Conversation three

S5:⁄Яir rɔħi ʕend etbib⁄

(It is better for you to go to the doctor's)

S6:⁄eh maʕendiʃ ∂lweqt wekteʃ rajħa nrɔħ ∂xtini⁄

(Eh, I don't have time to go).

S5:⁄∂w kajen waħed tbib f Elxru:b kamel jeʃɔkru fih⁄

(There is a good doctor in el Elkhroub).

S6:⁄Weʃ jeddini lxru:b! ⁄

(Oh! I can't go to Elkhroub).

S5:⁄ja weʃbik ∂lxru:b xatwa, lakan tħabi nrɔħ mʕak⁄

(What's the matter with you? Elkhroub is very near).

(In fact S5, shorten the distance between the place they were in and Elkhroub by comparing it to a step).

S6:⁄Xalli lakan bqawli haka smena lʒaja nrɔħ⁄

(If I don't recover next week, I'll go then).