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ABSTRACT

Grice, in "Logic and Conversation," formulated a Cooperative Principle (CP) which he believed underlies language use. Under the CP there are four maxims: quality, quantity, relation and manner. When people violate any of these four maxims, a conversational implicature occurs. For example, if I say "He's a real genius" as a response to the statement "Tom failed all his classes.", I am violating Grice's maxim of quality (be truthful), thereby introducing an implicature: I actually mean that Tom is really dumb (1975).

Pfaff stated that speakers have an "extensive reliance on the Gricean cooperative principle, assuming that hearers will be able to interpret their utterances in terms of conversational maxims" (1979). Non native speakers (NNS) of English have difficulty interpreting implicature because of their limited linguistic and cultural knowledge of English and thus are lacking an important part of communicative competence (Bouton 1990). One standard of measuring English competency is the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) administered by the Educational Testing Service. In part one of the TOEFL, prospective undergraduate and graduate international students listen to and answer multiple choice questions about dialogs which frequently use implicature. For example, in one dialog speaker A asks "Do you want any
dessert," and speaker B replies "I'm on a diet," thereby violating Grice's maxim of relevancy (be relevant). Then speaker C asks, "What did (B) mean?" to see if the listener can interpret the implied utterance as a decline to accept the dessert that speaker A offers.

Bouton determined that NNS can improve their ability to interpret these kinds of implied utterances through immersion in the target culture providing they spend at least eighteen months to four years in that culture. The longer the stay, the more improvement takes place (1988). ESL instruction which does not focus on implicature does not seem to help a student interpret implicature, although it does seem to help with overall linguistic competence (Chen and Harris 1993). While the current research suggests a need to teach implicature (Chen and Harris 1994, Bouton 1992), to date relatively little is known about the impact of instruction on students' ability to interpret implicature. I propose to determine whether or not this kind of explicit instruction in implicature will help students increase their listening comprehension skills as measured by the TOEFL. The first chapter will provide an overview of Grice's theories. Specifically, the CP and the maxims will be discussed to show that they have explanatory power in describing human behavior cross culturally. The second chapter will review literature on ESL learners' ability to interpret implicature and the
teaching of implicature in the ESL classroom. I will use studies by Bouton and Chen and Harris (cited above) to show that non native speakers may interpret implicature differently because of cultural interference. In addition, the research will argue that implicature can and should be taught in the ESL classroom. The third chapter will describe the methodology of the study including the hypothesis, the subjects, the teaching practices used in the experimental and control groups, the measurement instruments, and the procedures for the analysis of the study. The fourth chapter will discuss the results which suggest that the explicit teaching of implicature had a significant effect on increasing a student's listening comprehension score on the TOEFL. The fifth chapter will focus on the pedagogical implications of the findings. The findings suggest that ESL instructors play a pivotal role in facilitating listening comprehension by the explicit teaching of implicature. Furthermore, the results of this study point to a need to produce more function-based ESL textbooks that use implicature-based conversations as a teaching tool in the ESL classroom.
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Chapter 1 - CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE

The Philosopher HP Grice, in his article "Logic and Conversation," formulated a Cooperative Principle (CP) underlying language use. This principle is based on the fact that talk exchanges are, in part, cooperative efforts. Grice writes this about the CP:

Make your conversation 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 (45).

The CP is more of a general principle rather than a strict guideline, suggesting that talk exchanges are often cooperative efforts. Each speaker recognizes the contribution requirements, purposes and reasons for initiating the talk exchange. These understandings may occur at the beginning of the conversation or may evolve during the talk exchange itself. Under the CP there are four maxims:

Quantity

1). Make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purposes of the talk exchange).

2). Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Note the following example:

A: Who broke the vase?
B: Sandy did. She wasn't wearing her glasses. (B is giving too much information thus violating the first maxim of quantity. By saying that Sandy wasn't wearing her glasses, speaker B implicates that she did not break the vase on purpose. She implicates that her poor vision caused her not to see the vase and consequently resulted in a mishap).

Quality

1) Do not say what you believe to be false.

Note the following example:

A: Jeff just borrowed your new Lexus.
B: I like that. (B violates the maxim of quality by expressing satisfaction upon learning that Jeff has just borrowed B's new Lexus when really he is upset upon learning the news.)

2) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Relation: Be relevant

Note the following example:

A: Where is my chocolate?
B: John was in your room this morning. (B's utterance is not relevant to A's question but implicates John as the culprit,
violating Grice's maxim of relation.)

Manner

Be perspicuous.

1). Avoid obscurity of expression.

2). Avoid ambiguity.

3). Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).

4). Be orderly.

Note the following example:

A: You still feel the same toward him?

B: I just don't trust that guy.

A: Why he's a great trouble shooter.

B: Trouble. Period. (B's use of the word period is abnormal. We do not usually punctuate in spoken English. Therefore, B violates the maxim of manner.

(45-46)

As long as the participants engaged in a conversation are following the CP, the response by speaker A "He's a real genius" to the statement by speaker B "Tom failed all his classes," results in an implied meaning because one or more of the maxims may be violated. The violation of one of these maxims leads to an implied statement that may be more than or the opposite to what was actually said. Here, speaker A violates the maxim of quality (be truthful) thereby introducing a conversational implicature (C.I.) Speaker A means Tom is really dumb.

In talking about Grice's theories on conversational
implicature, Green states, in her book, *Pragmatics and Natural Language understanding:*

The special cases, which he called maxims, tend to strike the naive reader variously as common sense, wishful thinking, or composition teachers' futile rules, but the attraction of Grice's theory is its ability to explain how in being honored as much in the (apparent) breach as in the observance, the maxims provide explanations for otherwise puzzling phenomena.

(88)

To the field of pragmatics, which studies the contribution of context to meaning (Department of linguistics, Ohio State University p. 223), Grice's theories enable one to explain how native speakers work out the implied meanings of their interlocutors.

Grice foregrounded his theory of conversational implicature by first talking about context, showing how speakers interpret meanings of utterances that involve idiomatic/figurative expressions. I will use Grice's example because it shows utterances that are context dependent. If someone says, "He is in the grip of a vice," literal and figurative interpretations may be attached to this statement. If one understands standard English but has no knowledge of the circumstances of this utterance, one might literally come to understand that X has some
particular body part caught in a type of tool or instrument. If interpreted figuratively, X has a character flaw or bad habit of which he is unable to rid himself. Nevertheless, for one to make a choice between the literal and figurative interpretations, one will need to know the context in which the statement was uttered. Consider the following questions:

1). Who is the speaker?
2). When was the phrase “in the grip of a vice” uttered?
3). What is the meaning of “in the grip of a vice” on the particular occasion of the utterance? (44)

Native speakers of English (NS) must have a mutually shared knowledge of who is speaking, when it is being spoken, and what is means when it is spoken when working out context dependent utterances. As a result of this knowledge, NS will come to understand that “in the grip of a vice” has the figurative meaning of “a character flaw.” The benefit of this brief discussion on context enables one to understand that NS rely on the context to work out the meaning of their interlocutors when they use idiomatic and figurative expressions. Similarly, the context influences the meaning of conversational implicature as it is interpreted in similar ways.

Let us turn back to C.I. and specifically its characteristics. Grice contends that C.I. has the
features of cancelability, non-detachability, and calculability.

First, conversational implicatures can be canceled. If A says to B:

A: What do you want for Christmas?
B: Well, my TV is broken.

B is implying "I want a TV for Christmas" and can cancel this implicature by saying "Well, my TV is broken but my Dad is going to buy me one. Why not buy me a microwave?" The implicature, "I want a TV for Christmas," is canceled by "adding some additional premises to the original ones" (Levinson 114). Speaker A is likely to infer that speaker B no longer needs a microwave since B has canceled that by saying his/her dad will buy it. Speaker A will then infer that a microwave is the best choice for a gift based on the last utterance by B.

Another important aspect of conversational implicature is its non-detachability. This means that the implicature cannot be detached if certain words are changed. In other words, B can change the linguistic structure of the utterance by saying "I hear that Sony has put out a new model" in B's response to A's question "What do you want for Christmas" without detaching the implicature. The implicature is attached to the semantics of what is said. It is not attached to the linguistic form of the utterance. The implicature cannot be detached
simply by changing the utterance with synonyms.

The last part of Grice's theory on conversational implicature deals with calculability. The implicature can be worked out by the hearer. Had this calculability not been possible a communication breakdown would occur between the speaker and the hearer. If that occurs, there is no reason for the existence of an implicature. In working out the meaning of an implicature, the hearer will go through several steps:

1). A speaker utters a sentence that violates one or more of Grice's maxims.

2). A hearer assumes that the speaker is cooperating; therefore, the speaker must have meant something else.

3). Both the speaker and the hearer share the same contextual knowledge. Since the speaker is cooperating during the conversational exchange, he/she must have meant P by saying Q.

4). The speaker has done nothing to stop the hearer from interpreting P to have really meant Q.

5). The speaker intends the hearer to think Q, and in saying P has really implicated Q.

Pfaff, in *Constraints on Language Mixing*, contends that speakers rely heavily on the cooperative principle when interpreting utterances that involve implicature. When the speaker says P but wants the
listener to think Q, the speaker assumes that the listener can probably calculate the meaning implicated. Thus, the speaker assumes that the listener can work out the implied meaning as to Grice's maxims (291).

In a similar way to NS, nonnative speakers (NNS) speakers must also learn to rely on Grice's CP and the maxims to interpret implicature in English. Adamson argues, in his book on Academic Competence, that this reliance on the CP and its maxims is a strategy that must be learned by NNS if they are to be "discourse competent". Discourse competence is part of the larger aspect of communicative competence which loosely defined is a NNS's knowledge not only of the linguistic forms of English but also of how to use these forms appropriately and effectively (26). I will focus on this issue in chapter two, but it is necessary now at least to pose some questions. Should implicature be taught to NNS of English? If so, will the teaching of implicature increase the communicative competence of NNS? I will argue in chapter five that students must be taught how to work out utterances involving implicature and/or idiomatic/figurative expressions by direct application of Grice's cooperative principle if they are to answer the short and extended conversations of the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) with any degree of success.
One of the purposes of this thesis is to establish that implicature is an important part of the English language. But what role does implicature play in other languages? Do all cultures follow the cooperative principle of conversation and the maxims governing this process? Did Grice make the claim of the universality of conversational implicature? Green contends:

Grice hinted that he takes it and the maxims to represent values universally assumed in human society. Grice does not actually claim universality for the cooperative principle and the maxims (which he takes to be special cases of the cooperative principle), but it is clear that the value of the cooperative principle and the maxims in explaining linguistic phenomena is much greater if they are universal (and hence potentially a consequence of some property of human nature or human society) than if they are not. (96)

In other words, if the CP and the maxims are universal, it will open the door for explaining linguistic phenomenon related to discourse pragmatics across the cultures. If this can be done cross culturally, there lies in wait potentially useful pedagogical tools in which the ESL teacher can describe implied utterances.

In addressing the question of the universality of
C.I., Keenan examined Grice's maxims and cooperative principle theories by studying the Malagasy culture to see if the Malagasans followed Grice's maxims. He found that in their culture, new information is scarce since a village consists of a group or groups of families with which the genealogical backgrounds and family lives are public knowledge. The speakers in the Malagasy culture regularly withhold information during a conversational exchange in an effort to gain status. They also reveal less information because they do not want to commit themselves explicitly to a particular claim less they risk undue guilt or loss of face among the group. Based on these observations, Keenan contends that the manner maxims, "Be brief", and "Be orderly", and the quantity maxim, "Make your contribution as informative as required", do not apply to this culture. She problematizes the assumption that implicature is universal. She suggests that Grice's maxims may not apply to human talk exchanges in all cultures. Keenan further argues that Grice's maxims can be reduced to a principle of relevance. If the maxims are reduced to one maxim of relevance, Keenan contends that one can make more accurate predictions about human talk exchange cross-culturally (67-80).

However, Green disagrees with Keenan by turning his argument upside down. Green uses Keenan's example of the question by (A): "Where is your mother," accompanied by
(B): "She is either in the house or at the market," to show that while the respondent (B) could give a more precise answer, (B) chooses not to for some of the reasons outlined in the aforementioned argument by Keenan. Green contends that if (B) knows where his mother is, and if giving this information would not bring guilt or unwanted accountability, the exchange used would involve either opting out of the first maxim of quantity, to preserve one's status, or flouting the maxim, to flaunt it. Whatever the case, the maxim of quantity exists among the Malagasy by being entailed; the maxim could not be exploited if it didn't exist (95-96). In other words, the maxims are being exploited demonstrating that the maxim of quantity does exist in the Malagasy culture. Green further refutes Keenan by saying:

Thus, the Malagasy speakers are just like western Europeans in abiding by the cooperative principle and observing even the questioned first maxim, although it is readily sacrificed to Quality II, and to a Malagasy prohibition against assigning blame. Indeed they exploit it when maintaining membership in an information elite is valued more highly than other interpersonal goals. (96)

Grice's CP and the maxims are observed in the Malagasy culture but in different degrees. This also is true with
other cultures.

When I served a two year ecclesiastical mission in the greater Sacramento area working with the Hispanic non English speaking people, I noticed that they readily exploit the maxim of quality (be truthful) when faced with an unsolicited request to commit. For example, when a vacuum salesperson asks a Hispanic if he can come over for a demonstration, he might very well hear the response "Otra dia" which loosely translated means "another day". If the salesperson is a NNS of Spanish, he may interpret the response literally as "please come on another day" when really the response means "no, I am not interested." What has happened here is that the Hispanic is faced with a clash of maxims. On the one hand, the Hispanic is making his conversational contribution as required while needing to be truthful so that he does not unostentatiously mislead the salesperson, while on the other hand, politeness in Hispanic culture does not allow for a person to be too direct when rejecting an invitation. The maxim of quality is readily sacrificed to the maxim of politeness. Adamson claims that NNS are sometimes even able to communicate even though the two speakers are using two separate languages. This form of "dilingual" communication is based on Grice's universal cooperative principle that governs the negotiation of meaning whatever the linguistic code (66). I have observed this when
beginning level ESL students attempt to communicate with students who do not share the same language. While each student may be speaking in his her own language, i.e., a Japanese student talking with an Arab student dilingually, he or she can communicate successfully (at least in a basic sense) by exploiting the cooperative principle while using gestures, universal level concepts, and various forms of image schema.

Every culture abides [at least to some degree] by the cooperative principle and its maxims accompanied with similar strategies for performing them. At times, these strategies result in an implicature being used for a particular purpose. As in the example "another day," a Hispanic strategically violates the maxim of quality in order to abide by the maxim of politeness. While a NNS of Spanish may misinterpret this response, a NS of Spanish can work out the implied meaning as an indirect refusal of the invitation. Thus, since it is calculable, it qualifies as an implicature as defined by Grice. But cultures might very well differ with respect to both when an implicature will or will not be used and with what strategies. There exists, for example, similar speech acts that are used cross-culturally such as requesting, apologizing, declaring, and promising, which may result in a universal implicature (i.e., irony, satire, & sarcasm). But there are also speech acts which are culturally
specific, such as baptizing and excommunicating, which may result in culturally specific implicature (Fraser, Rindell, and Walters 77-78). The differences may lie in how a culture uses and interprets implicature because of its values, customs, and traditions. This helps explain the seemingly contradictory notion that implicature is both culture specific and universal. Different cultures uphold the CP and the maxims but not necessarily in the same way.

Harris explored this topic in his thesis, The Teaching of Conversational Implicature to ESL Learners. Harris discovered when he began teaching Japanese students implicature that they were unconsciously aware that implicature already existed in Japanese. He had students translate utterances involving implicature into Japanese. He noted that similar forms of irony used in English were also used by his students in Japanese. Besides these observations, Harris also learned that his students would sometimes derive multiple interpretations of an introduced implicature in Japanese because of the culturally specific nature of implicature. Consider the following implicature taken from Japanese, "Do you want to go swimming with us?" B's response is "I gained weight." The question was how would the Japanese students interpret B's utterance? Would they interpret it as an acceptance or a refusal of the invitation (8-9)? Some students reported that the
implicature was ambiguous. To them, it had two possible meanings: 1). "No, I won't go because I don't want to be seen in a bathing suit." or 2). Yes, I will go because swimming is good exercise and it will do me good." (9-10). Americans on the other hand (native speakers of English) would probably interpret this implicature as a refusal of the invitation. Most importantly, American and Japanese speakers recognize B's response as an implicature. Both cultures consider B's response relevant to A's question but they differ in their cultural interpretation of the implicature itself.

Grice's explanations of implicature, the cooperative principle and the maxims enable one to explain logically how speakers can work out the implied meanings of their interlocutors. This knowledge can be an efficient explanatory tool in the ESL classroom because it allows the teachers explicitly to teach students strategies and skills for making meaning out of what might be meaningless utterances (Chen and Harris 1993). And if implicature is universal (which I contend it is to at least some degree), it seems that it can and should be taught (Bouton 1990, Harris and Chen 1994). Chapter two will present a review of the literature on implicature elaborating in more depth of what effect implicature has on the communicative competency of NNS.
2.0 - Introduction

The first chapter has established that implicature is an important part of the language. This chapter will examine how NNS interpret implicature as compared with NS. In addition, this chapter will find out if NNS of different languages interpret the same implicature with similar or different interpretations. These issues pose serious cross-cultural methodological concerns for it can implicate culture as a reason for language interference that prevents NNS from interpreting implicature accurately. Consider the following two questions:

1. How long does it take for a student to learn implicature?
2. Is there a way to short cut the process of helping a student learn to understand implicature through explicit instruction?

The following articles by Bouton (1988, 1990, and 1994), and Chen and Harris (1993 and 1994) attempt to shed light on both questions.


Bouton in his 1988 study, *A Cross Cultural Ability to Interpret Implicature in English*, looked at how nonnative speakers work out the implied meanings of their interlocutors. He conducted a survey examining how native
and nonnative speakers interpret implicature. He found that the two groups of speakers interpreted implicature differently 27% of the time. Bouton then compared the scores of the speakers from different countries and argued that cultural background is a factor that underlies a person's ability to interpret implicature. The conclusions of the study suggest that a student's unfamiliarity with the second language may cause the student to derive different interpretations of culture-specific implicature.

The 1994 Bouton study, The Interpretation of Implicature in English by NNS: Does It Come Automatically without Being Explicitly Taught, reports on two longitudinal studies in which he examined nonnative speakers' ability to interpret implicature. The first study was done from 1986-1991. Using a questionnaire, he tested a group of international students when they arrived at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. He then tested the same group of students four and a half years later. In addition, he tested some native speakers. The results of the implicature questionnaire were compared to see how much the nonnative speakers differed in their interpretation of implicature before and after the four and half years of living in the US. He found that the nonnative speakers chose the same interpretation as the native speakers upon arrival in 1986 79.5% of the time and
91.5% of the time in 1981. After 4.5 years in the target culture, the nonnative speakers' ability almost matched the native speakers' ability to interpret implicature.

The second study found that nonnative speakers can interpret implicature better after 17 and 33 months in the US. Because the second group who stayed in the US for 33 months only scored slightly higher than the first group who stayed in the US for 17 months, Bouton concluded that the students seem to reach their level of proficiency in interpreting implicature by 17 months. In addition to this, Bouton describes a six-week pilot study in which he gave explicit instruction of implicature to one group with no explicit instruction of implicature to the other group. After testing both groups with the same type of pretest and post test measurements used earlier in his study, Bouton determined that the group who had six hours of explicit instruction of implicature improved more than the other group that had received no instruction of implicature.

The 1990 study, The Effective Use of Implicature in English: Why and How it Should Be Taught in the ESL Classroom, was conducted to find out if implicature is taught in the classroom. A survey of ESL books was conducted. Bouton found that almost no attention at all is spent on raising the students' awareness of implicature. He contended that implicature can and should
be taught in the classroom. Since the textbooks did not include such instruction, he suggested that it be the responsibility of the instructor to develop suitable materials. Then, he suggested some innovative ways in which teachers can teach implicature.

2.2 - CHEN AND HARRIS (1993,1994)

The 1993 study, *Is Life Better After This Course? Understanding Implicature and the ESL Program*, examines the question of whether or not implicature can be learned in an ESL classroom without explicit instruction of implicature. After testing a group of Japanese students with an implicature questionnaire and the Michigan Test, Chen and Harris found no connection between the students' ability to interpret implicature and their overall linguistic competence in a five-month intensive English program. This finding suggests that ESL instruction without explicit instruction of implicature does not help a student in his or her ability to interpret implicature. However, it does seem to help in a student's overall linguistic competence as measured by the Michigan Test.

Because their previous 1993 study found that an ESL program without explicit instruction of implicature does not seem to help students improve in their ability to interpret implicature, Chen and Harris in their 1994 study, *Teaching Implicature in the ESL Program*, now
focused on examining to what extent implicature was teachable. To answer this question, similar methodology was used as in the 1993 study, except that this time explicit instruction of implicature was used during the five months of instruction in the intensive English program. The results of this test showed that the explicit instruction of implicature did seem to help the students in their interpretations of implicature, though not all of the students improved equally. The students who were the most limited in their overall English competency at the beginning of the quarter seemed to make the most improvements in their abilities to interpret implicature by the end of the quarter. This study also found that the "quality" and "manner" implicatures were easier to teach than the "quantity" and "relation" implicatures.

This study confirms Bouton's findings in his pilot study. These two series of studies thus seem to suggest that explicit instruction of implicature may help in improving a student's pragmatic competence.
Chapter 3 - THE PRESENT STUDY: RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

3.0 – INTRODUCTION

Before beginning the introduction into this study, I want to review several points made in chapters one and two. Implicature is pervasive in language use (Harris 1995). Native speakers rely on Grice's cooperative principle and the maxims to work out the implied meanings of their interlocutors (Pfaff 1979). NNS must also learn how to do this if they want to be communicatively competent (Bouton 1990). The maxims can be a useful explanatory tool for the ESL teacher in helping the students to better understand and communicate in the target language. It has been shown in chapter two that implicature can and should be taught (Bouton 1992, Chen and Harris 1993). Implicature is, in part, universal in nature (Green 1989, Adamson 1993). Thus, explicit teaching of implicature may increase a NNS's ability to interpret it by making a NNS consciously aware of implicature since NNS have already learned how to do this unconsciously in their own language (Harris 1995). Previous research has suggested that the teacher has a responsibility to teach the culture of the language so that students may make sense of implicature that is culture specific in nature (Bouton 1988). Grice's theories, if tailored effectively to the ESL classroom,
can work as effective tools for increasing the communicative competence of a student (Bouton 1990). In this chapter, I will first describe why I have been using Grice's theories in an attempt to improve the students' listening TOEFL scores. Second, I will describe the hypothesis, the subjects, the treatment, the measures, the procedures, and the analyses of my study.

Each year, to become linguistically and communicatively competent, many international students come to the US to study English. Others study English as an international language in their own country. Because English is not their first language, these students demonstrate their competency in listening, grammar, and reading by taking the TOEFL test. The test is administered by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey. Bruce Rogers writes, in his book The Complete Guide to TOEFL, that nearly three quarters of a million people from all over the world took the TOEFL test in 1990-1991. A high score on this test "is an essential step in being admitted to graduate or undergraduate programs at almost all colleges and universities in North America" (p. ix).

In the intensive English programs I have taught, and in which I am currently teaching, I have had many opportunities to teach TOEFL preparation. My purpose has been twofold:
1). To prepare students with skills & test taking strategies so they can successfully take the TOEFL.

2). To prepare students with a general knowledge of English.

Most of the students that I have worked with are of Asian origin (i.e., South Korea, Thailand, Indonesia, Japan, Taiwan, Cambodia, and Vietnam). A smaller number have come from Russia, Brazil, Germany, Mexico, Guatemala, Columbia, Argentina, Peru, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. I confine my observations to students from these countries. After having administered hundreds of diagnostic practice tests, I have noticed that the listening section is consistently the most difficult part of the test for a majority of the students. While the students also have trouble on the grammar, written expression, and reading sections of the TOEFL, it is the listening section in which most of my students score the lowest. This may be the case for the following reasons:

1). Many students have had more instruction in the grammar and reading areas of English in their own countries. Some have told me that they have had eight or more years of grammar and reading instruction before coming to the US. Many told me that the instruction given to them was in their
native language and not in English.

2). These students have had little instruction with listening to and learning how to respond to spoken English before coming to the US.

3). Many students still use the "grammar translation" approach to working out the meaning of language, and when this strategy is applied to the listening section of the TOEFL, the students are unable to answer the question in the allotted twelve-second pause between questions. Bruce Rogers says that this problem may also occur because students are unable to think in English (xxiv).

4). Identification with the target culture and the similarity between L1 & L2 can also affect a student's progress in listening comprehension (Svanes 1987).

5). Language interference may affect a student's listening ability (Ellis 39-39). For example, many Thai students have sound discrimination difficulties because of the tonal differences between English and Thai. These problems can be a source of great frustration.
In addressing these problems, this study explored ways to help students improve their listening comprehension skills. My goal was to examine how to help students learn how to think like a native speaker by learning how to exploit Grice's cooperative principle and its maxims, thus increasing their pragmatic awareness. I have been explicitly teaching implicature to ESL students for several years, but I have not conducted a study on its effectiveness as applied to the TOEFL. While the current research suggests a need to teach implicature (Chen and Harris 1994, Bouton 1992), to date little is known about the impact of instruction on students' ability to interpret implicature. Virtually no research has been conducted on how the instruction might affect students' listening scores on the TOEFL. The present study was thus undertaken in order to examine the impact of explicit instruction in implicature on students' listening TOEFL scores.

3.1 - HYPOTHESIS

It was hypothesized that:

The experimental group receiving the explicit instruction of implicature would improve significantly more (P<.05) on the TOEFL than the control group that received no such instruction.
3.2 - SUBJECTS

The subjects were 25 foreign students enrolled at the American Culture and Language Program at Cal State San Bernardino for the 1996 Spring and Summer Quarters. All were NNS of English and came from a variety of backgrounds, predominantly Asian. Table 1.0 shows the number of students categorized by their country of citizenship.

Table 1.0 Number of students and country of citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. Korea</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>UAE</th>
<th>Thailand and Indonesia</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Mexico</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for three students, all had been placed into the level three (intermediate) intensive ACLP program according to their performance on the Michigan Test, a five minute oral interview, a writing placement test followed by a final evaluation by the faculty placement committee. The pretest TOEFL, which I administered to both the experimental and control groups, indicated that the students' scores were between 346 and 470. Three of the students, however, had scores ranging from 530 to 580. These students were continuing their studies in the ACLP.
and were currently placed into level five advanced ESL classes, but they had decided to take intermediate TOEFL Preparation since the class was not an elective at their level.

While the students were taking 25 hours of ESL instruction in the ACLP, each student was also taking my level three TOEFL Preparation class at the time they participated in the study. The TOEFL Preparation class met for four hours a week for ten weeks for the two consecutive quarters in which the study was conducted. The students previously had varying amounts of formal ESL instruction in the United States and in their own countries, and an average of approximately four years of informal exposure to English. Students ranged in ages from 17 to 34, with most of the students in their late teens or early twenties. The gender makeup consisted of 18 women and 7 men.

3.3 - TREATMENT

A level three TOEFL preparation class was taught for two consecutive quarters, using information from the Complete Guide to TOEFL (Rogers 1993), and the Longman Preparation for the TOEFL Test: Skills and Strategies (Phillips 1996). The class for the Spring quarter was designated as the experimental group while the Summer quarter class was designated as the control group. Both
the control and experimental groups, taught by myself, took the same TOEFL practice test [which was used as the dependent variable] at the beginning and end of each quarter. The students in both sections did not see the results of this test until the end of the quarter. After the first practice test, I used seven hours — which was spread out over six class sessions — of explicit instruction of Grice's theories, including the cooperative principle and its maxims, showing the students how implicature is created and interpreted by native speakers. I also adapted Searle's theories of direct and indirect speech acts (McManis, C. et al. 225-231) in addition to the regular TOEFL Preparation curriculum as the independent variable within the experimental group. The control group only received the regular TOEFL curriculum instruction without the seven hours of instruction on implicature. The next several paragraphs will explain in more detail how I taught implicature to the experimental group.

For the first hour of explicit instruction, I gave the students a general introduction into pragmatics. We talked about how the context influences the meaning in a conversation. The lesson specifically focused on the physical, epistemic, linguistic, and social contexts of conversations. I did this so that the students would be more consciously aware about the following four questions
when listening to NS dialogs:

1). Where does the conversation take place, what objects are present, and what actions are taking place?

2). What is the background knowledge shared by the speaker and the hearer? Are there any assumptions that one speaker may have about another speaker?

3). What are the utterances previous to the utterances under consideration?

4). What is the social relationship and setting of the speaker and the hearer?

At the end of the lesson, we read examples of sample conversations and practiced answering these four questions about the speakers. Finally, a direct application of skills for TOEFL listening was explained. Then the students listened and answered questions to TOEFL style dialogs. The dialogs I used contained idioms and two and three part verbs. The focus was to encourage students to work out the meaning of unfamiliar idiomatic language by using the context of the dialogs as cues for understanding.

The next two hours of explicit instruction focused on an adaptation of Searle's direct and indirect speech acts. The purpose of this instruction was to set the groundwork for later work on implicature. For direct speech acts, we
discussed how speakers in a conversation can perform speech acts in the form of warnings, suggestions, requests, bets, requests for information, orders, threats, advice, and conveyance of information. We examined direct speech acts by dividing them into declarative, interrogative, and imperative sentence types. These exercises were done so that the students would be able to recognize the purpose of the speech act and its function. Then we talked about the felicity conditions that must be satisfied before a speech act can be correctly performed. Felicity conditions refer to conditions which have to be met so that a particular speech act can be successfully performed. The question by John illustrates the felicity conditions of making questions. John asks Mary, "What happened to Susan?" By asking this question, John does not know the truth about Susan, John wants to know the truth about Susan, and finally John believes that Mary can supply the information about Susan. The next example illustrates the felicity conditions of requests. Bob requests that Frank go to the store, "Frank, please go to the store." By making this request, Bob believes that no one has gone to the store yet. Bob believes that Frank can go to the store, and Bob believes that Frank is willing to go to the store and perhaps do other things for Bob if asked; and finally Bob wants someone to go to the store because he needs something. We discussed how these
two conversations illustrate the felicity conditions for asking questions and making requests. Afterwards, the class broke into groups and practiced creating dialogs that involved the eight types of sentences previously mentioned. After the explicit instruction of speech acts was taught to the students, we practiced TOEFL listening comprehension. As the students read four sample conversations, they practiced underlining the direct speech acts of warnings, suggestions, requests, bets, requests for information, orders, threats, advice, and conveyance of information found in the second speaker's statement. Then they read the questions and attempted to choose the best answer that was a restatement of the speech act used by the second speaker. Finally, the students listened and answered questions to ten TOEFL style dialogs.

After laying the groundwork for direct speech acts, we then talked about how speakers can perform these acts indirectly. We compared and contrasted conversations involving direct and indirect speech acts. After that discussion, we discussed how to identify whether a speech act is indirect or direct. The class then broke into groups and read dialogs that involved either direct or indirect speech acts. The purpose of the collaborative exercise was to give students practice identifying the sentence type, speech act, and the direct or indirectness
of the statement itself. Finally, the students read TOEFL conversations involving direct and indirect speech acts of agreements, disagreements, uncertainties, suggestions, and requests. The students attempted to identify the speech act used in the TOEFL conversation by underlining it. Then they identified the speech act as being indirect or direct. Then the students attempted to choose the best answer that was a restatement of the second speaker's utterance. At the end of the lesson, the students listened and answered questions to ten TOEFL style dialogs.

Following the lesson on indirect speech acts, I spent two hours introducing Grice's CP and his three maxims of quantity, quality, and relation. I did not mention the manner maxim because the Educational Testing Service does not exploit that maxim when they design sample TOEFL dialog questions. We read conversations and we talked about whether or not they were following the CP. In addition, we practiced reading sample conversations that used implicature. The students used the CP framework to work out the meaning of what was meant in a given dialog. Finally, the students performed TOEFL listening exercises as they read conversations that used implicature. A very important TOEFL listening skill was introduced: focus on the second speaker. I also admonished the students to avoid picking answers that represented a literal meaning of the conversation. I explained that it was very
important to look at how the second speaker is cooperating with the first speaker because 90 per cent of the TOEFL listening questions are about the second speaker. Then the students listened and answered questions to TOEFL style dialogs that contained examples of implicature.

The last two hours of explicit instruction included more detailed separate mini lessons on quality, quantity, and relation type implicatures. I focused on the quality and relation implicatures because they occur more frequently on the TOEFL than the quantity ones. In each lesson, examples of implicature were presented. The class divided into groups and each group read examples of conversations that used implicature. When they finished reading the dialogs, we discussed why the speaker used the implicature in a given situation. We also talked about what was meant by the speaker.

Finally, we discussed how to recognize implicature and how the implicature can be worked out by the hearer. The students again read, and then listened and answered questions to TOEFL style dialogs that contained examples of implicature. I encouraged the students to understand that the second speaker would use the implicature and that the TOEFL question would ask about what the second speaker meant. The students practiced eliminating distractors on the multiple-choice items that contained literal interpretations of what the speaker said.
The appendices A1, A2, A3 and A4 present a more detailed description of the seven hours of explicit instruction in implicature and pragmatics that the experimental group received. These appendices outline the handouts, overheads, lectures, and discussions about implicature given to the experimental group. It is important to note that the number of hours spent in each area were not preplanned. It may take more or less time in each area depending on the intermediate ESL students' familiarity with NS conversations. I do not recommend teaching implicature to students with less than an intermediate level of English.

Both classes were given the same instruction relating to listening, grammar, and reading TOEFL exercises. See appendix A5 for an example of the syllabus given to both classes. The books used to teach the classes assumed that the students had or were acquiring a basic knowledge of English. Deborah Phillips alludes to this in her book:

An understanding of the TOEFL strategies and skills presented in this text can improve your TOEFL score. However, skills and strategies alone will not make you successful; a good basic knowledge of the English language is also necessary. Therefore do not forget the general study of the English language as you work to
prepare for the TOEFL test. (xv)

Bruce Rogers states in his book that the best way to increase a general knowledge of English is to use English as much as possible. He says:

You can't learn all the English you'll need to do well on TOEFL from this guide or in a TOEFL preparation class. Other classes will be useful, as will any opportunities to speak, read, write or listen to English. Some people who are preparing for TOEFL think that conversation classes and practice are a waste of time because speaking skills are not tested on the exam. In fact, one of the best ways to get ready for the exam is to speak English whenever you can. Not only will you improve your ability to listen to everyday English, but you will learn to think in English....(xxiv)

The TOEFL preparation books are designed to give a student strategies and skills by which to take the test based on the assumption that the students have already developed a basic knowledge of English. Instead of addressing any instruction on implicature or any other pragmatic issues, the books presented the test-taking skills only. For example, the first skill presented in Longman Preparation Course for the TOEFL Test is to focus on the second speaker (Phillips 12). This skill presupposes that the
students already understand the dynamics of conversation. It presupposes that the NNS understand how to work out the meaning of his/her interlocutors when faced with implicature, functions of language such as direct and indirect speech acts, and idioms/figurative expressions.

The treatment of the experimental group with seven hours of explicit instruction of implicature was done as a preface to the listening exercises mentioned in the above TOEFL workbook. When I taught the experimental group, I first talked about focusing on the second speaker in the dialog. Then I talked about Grice's cooperative principle. With the control group, I only talked about focusing on the second speaker. The explicit instruction of implicature to the experimental group was done before introducing the listening exercises in the TOEFL workbooks.

3.4 - MEASURES

A fifty-item multiple choice listening comprehension test was used to measure the ability of students in the control and experimental groups to understand spoken English before and after the course instruction. The listening comprehension test was taken from The Complete Guide to TOEFL by Bruce Rogers (1993). Part A of the listening section consisted of 20 spoken statements and 20 questions, each of which were followed by a 12-second
pause; part B consisted of 15 short conversations and fifteen questions, each of which were followed by a 12-second pause; and part C consisted of four talks and 15 questions, each of which were followed by a 12-second pause. In part C, the talks ranged from 30 to 90 seconds in length. Two of the talks from part C were short lectures while the other two were extended conversations between two speakers. The speakers of the exchanges were usually between a man and a woman.

On the TOEFL and on this practice test, the multiple choice items on the listening section consist of a stem and four answer choices. The stem in the listening section is spoken. Following the stem, there are three distractors, and one key. One of the three distractors is a main distractor. After listening to the stem, the students have twelve seconds to pick the answer that describes what one of the speakers meant. The following example was taken from Cambridge Preparation for the TOEFL TEST by Jolene Gear:

The student hears
Woman: Shall we have dessert?
Man: I'm on a diet.
Narrator: What does the man mean?

The student reads
A. The man wants to have dessert.
B. The man does not understand
the question.
C. The man is declining the
invitation to have dessert.
D. The man wants the woman to go
on a diet.

(69,522)

This example represents the kinds of questions on the
TOEFL listening comprehension practice test given as a
pretest and post test to the experimental and control
groups. Neither group saw the results of this test until
the end of the quarter, nor did either group know that the
results were being used for a study.

3.5 - ANALYSES

Several statistical analyses were conducted on the
test data. Two comparisons were made. First, the amount
of increase in scores (i.e., from the pretest to the post
test) of both groups in parts A, B and C of the listening
comprehension was calculated. This included all fifty
questions of the test. Second, similar comparisons were
made on each section of the test. The additional
statistical comparisons showed significance on part A
(i.e., the first twenty questions of the test) on the test
but no statistical significance on parts B, and C.
Consequently, the statistical measurements used for the
entire test and part A of the test will be described.
The students used the general purpose NCS answer sheet (TRANS-OPTIC MB30423: 90) in completing the pre- and post tests. Upon completion of the two quarters of the study, the pre- and post tests of the experimental and control groups were scored by the Administrative Computing and Telecommunications Operations center at CSUSB. The computer operations technicians scored all four of the tests and calculated a statistical summary of the two groups by describing the high score, low score, median score, mean score, mean change, high mode, split halves reliability, standard deviation, and number at mode. These statistics were used to get an idea of the central tendency and dispersion of the test scores of both groups. In addition, the summary statistics provided the data necessary for the next analysis, probability statistics.

Probability statistics were used to determine if the findings were the result of random fluctuations or of experimental error or whether the findings showed that the variation of the independent variable (explicit teaching of Grice's theories) was effective. To compare the two groups as to the amount of increase in scores from the pre- to post tests, the F test was used since it would be an effective one factor analysis of the variance. The output from ANOVA was used to get the value of the F statistic. SPSS, a popular software package used for statistical analyses, was used to calculate this measure.
Once the value of F was obtained, the F value was matched with its probability value counterpart to see if null hypothesis would be confirmed or rejected at the P<.05 level.

Finally, standard deviation comparisons were conducted on the scores of the two groups. This was done to see if the standard deviation reflected the dispersion of most of the students. One or two extreme high or low scores on a test will not reflect the deviations of most of the students from the mean. Chapter 4 will present the statistical results of these measures and comparisons.
Chapter 4  - THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

In this chapter, I will present the statistical results of the study. First, I will show the statistical summaries of all the students scores. Second, I will present the statistical results of the study showing the value of the F test. Third, I will discuss the statistical concerns associated with this study. Finally, I will draw conclusions about the results of this study.

4.0  - STATISTICAL SUMMARIES OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP PRE AND POST TESTS

Table 2.0 is a statistical summary of the pre- and post test scores of the students. The results were calculated after the experimental and control groups participated in the study. I include this set of findings first since it served as the basis for the probability statistics to be discussed in section 4.1 of this chapter.
Table 2.0 Statistical summary of the overall pre- and post TOEFL listening test scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex. Group</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>POST</th>
<th>Con. Group</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tests Scored</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tests Scored</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Score</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>High Score</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Score</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Low Score</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Median Score</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>27.67</td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>24.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean change</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Change</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Mode</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>High Mode</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split Halves reliability</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>Split Halves reliability</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number at Mode</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number at Mode</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table indicates that the Split halves reliability, which compares the even number answers with the odd numbered answers for reliability, was similar at 79% and 80% for the experimental group pre and post tests and 82% and 80% for the control group pre- and post tests. This data suggests that the fifty item multiple choice test was a fairly reliable instrument for measuring the linguistic competency of the students.

Note the median scores of 20 and 18 and the mean scores of 20.58 and 20.46 for the experimental and control group pretests. The range of these scores was narrow, which indicates that the students in both groups, as a whole, had approximately similar competencies in English. It is not surprising that the table shows a mean increase
in the scores of both groups. That suggests that both groups improved in their scores as a result of TOEFL English language instruction. However, the amount of mean change between the pre and post test of 7.09 and 3.69 is not similar. Although both groups started with similar mean and median test scores, they finished with contrasting median scores of 27 and 22 and mean scores of 27.67 and 24.15 respectively. The experimental group seemed to improve more in their English language competency. The next analysis will analyze the mean increases of the two groups to determine if the improvement of the experimental groups is significant.

4.1 - ANALYSIS OF OVERALL PRETEST AND POST TEST SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Because my study has a pre and post test for an experimental and control group, the appropriate analysis will now look at the amount of change from the pre and post tests of each group. The purpose is to determine what the probability is that the explicit instruction of implicature had a significant effect on the students who took the test. Table 3.0 represents the results of the F test. As I mentioned in chapter three, the F-test is the appropriate analysis for such a determination.
Table 3.0 Analysis of variance of the overall pre- and post test TOEFL listening scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN+RESIDUAL</td>
<td>383.61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPOST TEST</td>
<td>331.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP BY PREPOST</td>
<td>46.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After comparing the means of both groups, the F test indicated that there was a strong relationship between the pre and post test scores such that $F=19.90$, $df = 1$, and $p<.000$. The relevant statistics for the two groups shown in table 3.0 are: $F$ for group was 2.78, $df = 1$, and $p<.109$. $P<.109$ suggests that there was no significant difference in the amount of increase of the pre to post test scores between the two groups. $P<.109$ does not rule out, however, the possibility that the treatment of the implicature instruction may have helped the experimental group increase more in their listening scores than the control group. There was a change in the amount of increase in the scores between the experimental and control groups and there is a statistical probability of 90 per cent that the explicit instruction of implicature caused an effect on the experimental groups' listening TOEFL scores. However, since I did not find significance
at the .05 level, I am reluctant to make any bold claims about a direct relationship between the implicature instruction and the score improvements. The next table will show part A of the listening section TOEFL results.

4.2 - ANALYSIS OF TOEFL LISTENING SECTION A PRETEST AND POST TEST SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

As I mentioned in chapter three, I decided to statistically examine the results of the statements, short conversations, extended conversations and mini talks sections to see if the students improved on any one section more significantly than another. What I found is that the experimental group seemed to improve more than the control group on part A of the listening section than on any other section. Table 4.0 is a statistical summary of these findings.
### Table 4.0

**Statistical summary of the pre- and post test scores of part A of the TOEFL listening section**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>POST</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>POST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.2500</td>
<td>9.6667</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.8462</td>
<td>7.7692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean change</td>
<td>3.417</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean change</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Dev.</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>3.749</td>
<td>Std Dev.</td>
<td>4.180</td>
<td>3.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of possible of twenty questions, the mean was 6.250 and 9.6667 for the experimental group pre and post tests. The control group mean was 6.8462 and 7.7692 on the pre and post tests. These statistics are different from the statistics presented in table 2.0. Table 4.0 shows a proportionately larger increase in the amount of change between the experimental and control group pre and post tests than does table 2.0. On this section, the experimental group has a higher score of almost of six and one-half times to that of the control group. The standard deviations of 2.3012 and 3.7497 (PREPOST) and 4.1802 and 3.6550 (PREPOST) for the experimental and control groups are much lower this time. This is probably due to the fewer number of questions analyzed. Table 5.0 will show the results of an analysis of variance done on the amount of change between the mean scores of the two groups on
section A.

Table 5.0 Analysis of variance of the pre- and post test scores of part A of the TOEFL listening section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>FSig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN+RESIDUAL</td>
<td>112.92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPOST TEST</td>
<td>58.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.76</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP BY PREPOST</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The F test in table 5.0 indicates, as does table 3.0, that there was a strong relationship between the pre and post test scores such that F=11.97, df = 1, and p<.002. The relevant statistics for the two groups using table 5.0 are: F for group was 3.95, df= 1, and p=.059. When compared to the F score of P=.109 for the entire test, the probability value of .059 suggests that the explicit instruction of implicature had a more powerful effect on the amount of change from the pre to post tests in section A of the listening section of the TOEFL than on the test as a whole. On the other hand, P=.059 is close to but not less than the ideal P<.05. Thus statistically, it is hard to reject the null hypothesis which says that there was no difference between the two groups.
4.3 - STATISTICAL CONCERNS

The small sample size combined with the variation in the amount of change between the students in their listening scores in the groups made it difficult to achieve significance at the .05 level.

The standard deviations in the experimental group, i.e., 5.712 to 7.620, dramatically changed from the pretest to the post test. This is problematic because extreme high and low scores can distort the value of the standard deviation. If the standard deviation value is distorted, then it may not be an accurate representation of most of the students' listening scores. As a result, one will not be able to make general statistical inferences about the international student population with a high degree of certainty. Table 6.0 represents the raw data of the overall TOEFL listening scores out of a possible fifty points. The chart will illustrate the variation of the scores between the students in both groups.
Table 6.0  
Raw data student pre- and post test scores on the TOEFL listening section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>PRE TEST</th>
<th>POST TEST</th>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>PRE TEST</th>
<th>POST TEST</th>
<th>INCREASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>32</em></td>
<td><em>13</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><em>17</em></td>
<td><em>-3</em></td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>9</em></td>
<td><em>-5</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indon.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td><em>42</em></td>
<td><em>21</em></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students in both groups improved their scores but they did not all improve at the same rate. Table 6.0 shows the large variation of improvements among the students in both the experimental and control groups. For the experimental group, the post test scores 42 and 17 are examples of extreme values in that data set. The increase in the amount of change between those two students is 24 points. In the control group, the post test scores of 32 and 9 represent distorted values in that data set. The increase in the amount of change between these two high and low scores is 18 points. This means that other
factors other than the treatment of the implicature to the experimental group may have caused some of this distortion. In addition, other factors other than the absence of the explicit instruction of implicature might have caused some of the variation of the scores in the control group. Although the same books were used for both groups, along with the same methodology, each student did not improve at roughly the same rate. The effects of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, previous knowledge and experience with native speaker conversation, and similarities and differences between L1 and L2 could all be factors influencing the scores to some extent. It was assumed that the random sample selection of students into this study would help control for these factors, but the small sample size may not be adequate to represent the international student population as a whole. Although there is a trend of improvement with the experimental group, it is still difficult to quantify just how much improvement is due to the treatment and how much is due to random fluctuations or to experimental error. Future research using a larger sample size will be needed in order to raise the confidence scale on whether or not the teaching of implicature instruction helps in significantly increasing a student's listening comprehension score on the TOEFL test.

Directly related to the sample size of a study is its
statistical power. Generally, if the sample size of a study is small, the power of the study is weak. The independent variable will have to powerfully effect the dependent variable in order to reject the null hypothesis. Conversely, if the sample size is large, then the statistical power is much stronger. The effect of the independent variable will not need to be as strong in order to reject the null hypothesis. Table 7.0 represents the power of the measure (TOEFL listening test) and the power of the test by group.

Table 7.0  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical power of the TOEFL listening section test; statistical power of the test by group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tests of Significance for T2 using UNIQUE sums of squares</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN CELLS</td>
<td>423.17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEST</td>
<td>374.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>374.08</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td><strong>.000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP BY TEST</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td><strong>.109</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**.000**

**.109**
Table 7.0 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Noncentrality</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEST</td>
<td>19.448</td>
<td><strong>.988</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP BY TEST</td>
<td>1.911</td>
<td><strong>.262</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates — Individual univariate .9500 confidence intervals

--- two-tailed observed power taken at .0500 level

Group by Test in table 7.0 represents the effect of the special treatment on increase in the students' post test scores (p=.109). However, the power for this effect was very low (.262). With additional subjects, a stronger effect might be found for the special treatment. In other words, more significant results may be found if additional students were used. Twenty-five additional subjects would add more statistical power to this study.
4.4 - CONCLUSIONS

In short, this study has examined the effects of the explicit instruction of implicature to ESL students. Specifically, the study measured the impact of this instruction on the students' listening TOEFL scores. Results from this study suggest that the implicature instruction seem to have had the most effect on part A of the TOEFL. Overall, the effect of the instruction was less significant, though a positive trend of improvement was still shown. Statistically, the study is limited in how much it can attribute the independent variable as having a significant effect on the dependent variable. On the one hand, p=.109 suggests that there was no significant difference in the overall scores of both groups. However, after an examination of the increase of scores between the experimental and control groups in part A of the listening section of the TOEFL, the null hypothesis comes closer to being rejected because p=.059. In the last chapter of this thesis, I will explain the pedagogical implications of the findings.
Chapter 5  - PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

5.0  - RELEVANT FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Despite some statistical concerns mentioned in chapter four, this study contributes to the field of ESL. An understanding of how explicit instruction in implicature impacts a student's listening comprehension abilities is provided. After seven hours of explicit teaching in implicature, the students in the experimental group increased their TOEFL listening scores on average 7.09 points during the ten weeks of instruction. In contrast, the control group improved 3.69 points higher on the post test than on the pretest. The fact that the experimental students increased their scores 7.09 points is encouraging. It suggests that the mean can be seen as an approximate gauge of the success of the improvements of a class as a whole.

This study is attempting to fill the gap in ESL between theory and practice. As I mentioned in chapter three, I have been teaching implicature to ESL students but I had not empirically tested the impact of such instruction. In order to not fall under the criticism of researchers like Rose, I decided to conduct the study. Rose in his article, Pragmatic Consciousness-Raising in an EFL Context, argues that although the theoretical and empirical basis for communicative competence is not well
established, there is still a large production of teaching materials developed to teach pragmatics (53). Many unanswered questions exist regarding language use and more research needs to be done in this area. Contributions have been made but most of them are theoretical in nature. To better address Rose's concerns, my study is attempting to empirically establish that implicature instruction, a necessary part of communicative competence, is a useful teaching tool in the ESL classroom. Furthermore, since the instruction serves to improve the communicative competence of the students, it is not surprising that the study shows that the students TOEFL scores benefited.

My study indirectly coincides with Hymes (1971) who pointed out that understanding a language involves much more than understanding the syntax and phonology of a language. It also involves understanding how to use the language appropriately. In addition to that, this study is extending the work of Bouton (1990) and Chen and Harris (1993, 1994) by statistically quantifying the explicit teaching of implicature by looking at its effects on students listening TOEFL scores. For the remainder of this chapter, I will move from research to its implications for pedagogy. Specifically, I will discuss some classroom tasks of teaching implicature that will help students become "pragmatically conscious" (Rose 1994).
5.1 - HELP THE STUDENTS DEVELOP AN AWARENESS OF THINKING ON TWO LEVELS OF MEANING

Pragmatic instruction has its place in the ESL classroom. Explaining the cooperative principle theory of Grice along with its maxims to ESL students is a very effective way to heighten a student's awareness of how speakers talk to each other on the TOEFL test. Consider the following example taken from the Longman TOEFL Workbook:

The students hear

(Woman) Did you hear that Abbie won the art scholarship?

(Man) You could have knocked me down with a feather.

(Narrator) What does the man mean?

The students read

A. Abbie used a feather in his art project.
B. He was knocked down.
C. He was really surprised.
D. Abbie's father knocked on the door

Twelve second pause
That the student read these conversations first before listening to them on the tape is important. The instructor should go through the process of working out the meaning with the students. This can be done with several conversations that reflect idioms, direct or indirect speech acts, or implicatures. Point out the following to the students:

1). The man has said "you could have knocked me down with a feather" which is a violation of one of Grice's maxims.

2). Since the woman assumes that the speaker is cooperating, the woman believes that the man must have meant something else. After all, the woman is asking the man a question about Abbie and specifically if the man knew what Abbie had won.

3). Because the man is cooperating, accompanied by the fact that both speakers know who Abbie is, he must have meant that "he was really surprised" when he said "you could have knocked me down with a feather."

4). Therefore the man has done nothing to stop the woman from interpreting that "you could have knocked me down with a feather" really meant "he was really surprised."

I will use an adapted excerpt from Steven Davis' book, *Pragmatics: A Reader*, to illustrate the goal of helping students understand idioms, direct or indirect speech.
acts, or implicatures. (106-107).

Table 8.0 Meaning and context in implied statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is communicated?</th>
<th>What is said</th>
<th>What is conversationally implicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Meaning</td>
<td>The contextual ingredients of what is said</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students can be instructed to observe the four answer choices. They should notice how three of the distractors reflect the literal meaning of words that may "sound correct" but are not correct according to what was meant. This exercise helps students use the contexts and as indicated by table 8.0, the students should use the context to work out the meanings that are conversationally implicated. The students can focus better when choosing an answer on the TOEFL test by looking for the answer that is a restatement of the idea instead of a literal translation. The students should be shown how to think on both a literal and figurative level of meaning when faced when these kinds of exchanges. The positive effects of the awareness of thinking on two levels of meaning are that it encourages negotiation of meaning.
5.2 - TEACHING STUDENTS TO NEGOTIATE MEANING WITH IMPLICATURE

It is important that students negotiate meaning on both the literal and implied levels. The explicit instruction of implicature allows students to try to work out implied/figurative meanings and as my study suggests, their listening comprehension improves. Teaching the students to do this is an effective tool for developing strategic competence which will encourage students to negotiate meaning with English. Strategic competence involves how NNS "cope in an authentic communicative situation and how to keep the communicative channel open" (Ellis 182). The words "keep" and "cope" imply that NNS are conscious of this strategy. A conscious knowledge of the CP along with the maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner can be used by students as a strategy for solving language problems when working out the meaning of their interlocutors, thus keeping the "communication line open." When the students are presented with implicature-based conversations, they will often experience considerable difficulty due to their limited English abilities. They have serious difficulty with the TOEFL listening exercises that involve implicature, indirect speech acts, figurative and idiomatic expressions. This places responsibility on the instructor to provide interactional efforts that allow the students
to understand that what was said is not necessarily what was meant. If teachers are wholly dependent on a TOEFL book, they will find that these books are missing an essential step in the teaching of listening. The books do not provide explicit teaching of strategies that will create a strong foundation of pragmatic language awareness for the NNS. As I pointed out in chapter 3, these TOEFL books assume that the students already have this language awareness. To compensate for TOEFL workbook limitations, the explicit teaching of implicature and other pragmatic forms of language including direct and indirect speech acts should be presented before a student begins working on the TOEFL workbook listening exercises. Consequently, the student will be better prepared and will get more out of the TOEFL listening exercises. My study confirms this, by pointing to the fact that the explicit teaching of implicature is an effective way to promote increased language awareness. Brumfit advocates in his book, *Communicative methodology in language teaching: The roles of fluency and accuracy*, that conscious learning is a prerequisite for the operation of Grice's CP. In other words, a second language learner must be a conscious learner to some extent or he/she will not be able to understand and use Grice's CP effectively. He states:

> Monitoring is characteristic of mother tongue speech as well as foreign language speech.
Indeed, some degree of self consciousness is necessary for any self regulating activity, and some natural monitoring will be a prerequisite for the operation of Grice's cooperative principle to occur...

(48)

Activities that will allow a conscious effort on how to work out the implied meanings of their interlocutors should thus be carried out in the ESL classroom.

5.3 - CLASSROOM TASKS FOR TEACHING IMPLICATURE

As I mentioned in chapter three, an important strategy in understanding implicature and improving listening comprehension is for the student to focus on the second speaker. Most of the TOEFL listening questions come from the second speaker while the first speaker is used for context purposes. Bublitz, in his book, Supportive Fellow Speakers and Cooperative Conversations, points out that in understanding a talk one must take into consideration the linguistic actions of the participants addressed on the one hand, and the "exchange of ideas" within the talk, together with the orientation of every linguistic action toward the interlocutor (2). To the TOEFL student, the participant addressed in the conversations of parts A and B exerts a strong influence on the development of the conversation. The second
speaker often defines to a considerable extent the course of the conversation to follow. The addressee may direct the conversation by declining, doubting, questioning, or changing the topic. The next example shows how strong this influence is:

(Woman) Hi, Jack. It's good to see you again. Are you ready to get down to business again after spring break?

(Man) Not really, but I guess I don't really have much choice, do I? And it's going to be particularly hard to get back to work since I had the most fantastic vacation ever.

(Narrator) What are the speakers probably going to talk about next?

(Phillips 65)

Notice how the TOEFL question focuses on the influence that the second speaker has on the conversation. NNS need to notice how at first, the man has cooperated in the conversation by making his required contribution but then changes the topic by saying "And it's going to be particularly hard to get back to work since I had the most fantastic vacation ever." The man is now able to change the topic and begin talking about his vacation since the first speaker is likely to ask him "Really, what did you do?" Giving students questions such as "what are the
speakers probably going to talk about next?" is useful because it encourages the students to pay attention to the development of the conversational exchange. As a result, the students are learning how to manage Grice's cooperative principle thus helping them to improve their interpretation of implicature and overall listening comprehension abilities. Being able to predict the topic is especially useful if the quality or relation implicatures are used. If the students can identify the topic, then they can probably interpret quality or relation implicatures by using Grice's CP framework. A conscious knowledge of Grice's CP framework will help students look for meaning even if the utterances are the opposite to or not seemingly relevant to the topic being discussed.

In addition to focusing on the second speaker, the students need to focus on the end of the second speaker's statement. Usually, the "weightier" or more important information in the talks on the TOEFL test is found near the end of the sentence. In the advanced TOEFL classes that I have taught, I have seen improvements on the TOEFL test when a student focuses on the end of the second speaker's statement.

The use of video is an effective way in which the teacher can present students with implicature-based conversations. The teacher can show parts of a movie and
then stop the tape asking the students questions about the dialogue. This exercise generates much discussion and it provides an avenue in which to teach culture while explaining implicature-based conversations. An implicature questionnaire can be given to the students. One that has 10 to fifteen conversations involving implicature can be used by the students to interview native speakers. Observe the following example:

Mother: Who ate the chicken?
Son: Well, the dog certainly looks satisfied right now.

What is the son saying?
A. The dog looks content
B. The dog probably ate the chicken
C. The son doesn't know who ate the chicken
D. The son ate the chicken

The students are instructed to ask the NS which answer sounds best to them. In addition, the students can ask how the NS has arrived at that interpretation. The example listed above will be seen as humorous by most native speakers and it can serve as an ice breaker starting a lively conversation about avoiding blame. As an alternative to this idea, the teacher may direct intermediate students (TOEFL 380-460) to interview higher level students (TOEFL 500-600) in an ESL program using
the same questionnaire. My experience concerning a NNS ability to interpret implicature coincides with Bouton's (1994) observations in that it takes most ESL students about 1-2 years of living in the US in order to reach a high level of competency in interpreting implicature. These are the students to whom the lower language students can talk.

Students also need to be instructed how at times one of Grice's maxims may clash with other maxims or the maxim may not be fulfilled at all. This helps the students understand when someone says something that results in a failure to live up to expectations or when the speaker and the hearer have misunderstandings between intended acts and expectations. Mura outlined Grice's four classes of a maxim violation:

1). One could violate a maxim "quietly" with an intent to mislead.

2). One can opt out of a situation by withdrawing from the interaction when one is unwilling to cooperate.

3). One may be faced with a clash of maxims such that the choice of one maxim violates other maxims.

4). One may flout a maxim by blatantly violating it with an intent for strategic or artful
Mura further contends that in order to prevent misunderstandings among the four classes of a maxim violation, cues or indicators are needed in order to identify the four classes of maxim violations. The students can be taught to identify cues or indicators that may introduce an implicature in a conversation. A knowledge of implicature is necessary in order to make an educated guess concerning what the speaker's intentions are. These intentions are based on certain cues given in the conversation. The cues function in sidestepping the interpretation suggested by common expectation by redirecting it according to the desires of the speaker. This process reduces the chances for misunderstanding. The cues are useful tools and can help NNS learn how to recognize that certain kinds of cues may signal an upcoming implicature. That is, these cues serve as a "license" for a violation. Qualifiers are examples of cues which serve to qualify potential or perceived failures to meet the CP and its maxims. For example, the statement "Well, actually I changed my mind and I do want to go to the movies after all" starts with the qualifier "well" that allows the speaker to change his plans while not being seen as a liar. NNS should focus on qualifiers since they soften or explain statements and request cooperation.

(103-104)
forbearance and understanding. Moreover, qualifiers announce a perceived failure to comply with the quality maxim. Disclaimers are another example of cues that serve to place contingencies upon the qualifications of the speaker or the validity or propriety of the message. "I'm not a psychologist but you should consider changing your mind about him," is an example of a cue that serves to soften the advice given; the speaker does not want to be seen as too direct. As with qualifiers, disclaimers also announce a possible failure to meet the quality maxim. These cues can serve as useful tools for the NNS by showing them how to recognize or use the language in appropriate social contexts.

Understanding implicature goes beyond improving listening comprehension. It can enhance second language acquisition as a whole. These classroom activities are designed to help students improve their listening comprehension by learning how to make meaning out of both universal and culture specific implicatures. It seems reasonable that if a student is actively negotiating the meaning of English, this will as Ellis states "make input comprehensible, and.....in this way promote second language acquisition" (142). Further, it will make input involving implicature more comprehensible which in turn will make input from the TOEFL dialogues more comprehensible and help students increase their scores on
the listening section of the TOEFL. This is a tool that will facilitate rapid development in second language acquisition but unfortunately a tool that has not been used extensively in the ESL classroom.

ESL teachers who want to build the communicative competence of students should consider the following three assumptions regarding language use. First, every language makes available to the user the same basic set of speech acts such as requesting, apologizing, declaring and promising. Second, every language often makes available similar sets of strategies for performing a given speech act. Third, language will differ significantly with respect to both when a particular speech act will or will not be performed, and with what strategy (Larsen 78). I found these assumptions to be true as I explained implicature. Grice's CP and its maxims already exist to explain basic human behavior in general in all the ESL students' languages (Blackwell 1988, Green 1989, and Harris 1995). I was not teaching students anything that they did not already do or were not unconsciously aware of except the third assumption. The explicit teaching of implicature is useful because it shows the students how implicature is used and with what strategies students can use to work out the implied meanings of their interlocutors.

In closing this section on classroom tasks for
teaching implicature, a summary of the principles guiding the teaching of implicature will now be discussed. I will use an adapted excerpt from Ellis that illustrates the principles that are helpful in developing a faster rate of the interpretation of implicature and overall language development. The following eight ideas have strong theoretical grounds. If the learning setting is rich in these areas, it will likely lead to a highly successful rate of development in communicative competence (i.e., implicature, speech acts). They are:

1). A high quantity of implicature is directed at the learner.

2). The learner becomes motivated and sees a need to communicate by interpreting implicature in the target language. The teacher may stress that understanding implicature, inferences, figurative, and idiomatic expressions are crucial to the listening section of the TOEFL.

3). The learner develops independent control of implicature.

4). The learner relies on Grice's CP and its maxims in order to interpret implicatures that he or she has not heard before.

5). The learner is allowed to listen to quality, quantity, manner, and relation implicatures. In addition, the learner is given chances by way of
collaborative exercises to produce language involving implicatures along with other pragmatic forms of speech functions.

6). The student is exposed to a high quantity of directives in order to give the student task oriented activities involving implicature.

7). The student is exposed to a high quantity of requests for clarification and confirmation, paraphrases and expansions. This is done to try to address any questions the students might have with implicatures. Harris pointed out in his thesis that quality and relation implicatures are the most difficult to understand and consequently the ones that students will have the most questions about (1995).

8). The students are provided opportunities for uninhibited practice with implicature. At this point, the students attempt to generate new forms of implicature.

(161)

These eight guidelines can be seen as effective in sequencing activities in the classroom for the explicit instruction of implicature.
5.4 - UNDERSTANDING THE REVISED LISTENING PROCESS

The classroom tasks presented in the last section suggest effective ways of teaching implicature and pragmatic listening comprehension instruction in the classroom. If an instructor approaches teaching from this perspective, then it is important to revise his/her model of the listening process. The revised listening process will more accurately take into account the overall communicative competence of the speaker. Consider the process of listening as outlined by Richards (Listening Comprehension Approach, Design, Procedure, p. 162). He revised these steps in the listening process in addressing speech act theory, conversational analysis, and discourse analysis:

1. The type of interactional act or speech act in which the student is involved is determined (conversation, lecture, discussion, debate).
2. Scripts relevant to the particular situation are recalled.
3. The goals of the speaker are inferred through reference to the situation, the script, and the sequential position of the utterance.
4. The propositional meaning of the utterance is determined.
5. An illocutionary meaning is assigned to the message.
6. The information is retained and acted upon, and the form in which it was originally received is deleted (164).

The sixth step of the listening process is important because the form in which the message was originally received is deleted. NNS have to be able to interpret the meaning and not simply memorize the message. This idea needs to be pointed out to the students since, as I indicated earlier in this chapter, the answer to the TOEFL listening questions is most often a restatement of the speaker's utterance. The implications of understanding this process are that it is first important to teach students how to identify statements involving implicature and second to be able to identify answers that are a restatement to the implicature they just heard. So when students hear "I gained weight," as a response to the question "Do you want to go to the beach?" they need to understand that the answer to "What did the woman mean?" is that she is declining the invitation to go to the beach.

The challenges I face in teaching implicature are to enable the students to engage in the six steps of the Richard's model. At times, students can identify the interaction, and scripts of the conversation, but then they may have difficulty inferring the goals of the speakers. As a result, students will not be able to complete steps four, five and six according to the
Richard's model. To see if students are having difficulty with the "revised" listening comprehension process, the students could practice finding coherence in listening even when there are no cohesive devices. I used an example from Adamson in teaching my class to see if the students could use Grice's CP as a medium for completing the Richard's model listening process. The end result was for the students to make meaning out of a message that did not have any cohesive devices at all.

A: That's the telephone.

B: I'm in the bath:

A: OK

(27)

The implicature created in this conversational exchange is a violation of Grice's maxim of relevancy. An implicature (B) and an indirect speech act (A) exists in the speakers' statements. Speaker A is indirectly asking speaker B to answer the telephone. Speaker B declines the request by implying he/she cannot answer the telephone because he/she is in the bath. My experience in presenting students with this conversation, is that the students have problems finding coherence. This occurs because the students are not very aware of indirect type statements or implicature, thus preventing them from completing steps four and five of the Richard's model. They are not used to listening to these types of
conversations. The students have limited knowledge of how language is used in appropriate social contexts. Adamson suggests that if a student learns to be discourse competent, he or she may make use of coherence assuming that the speakers are following the cooperative principle (27). Teaching implicature to the students is an effective way to build the discourse competence of the students, which in turn will better enable the students to complete the six steps in listening comprehension according to Richards.

5.5 - APPROPRIATE LEVELS FOR TEACHING IMPLICATURE AND THE NATURE OF INSTRUCTOR FEEDBACK

This section will discuss how the instructor can structure and organize listening activities in order to provide appropriate tasks tailored to the language abilities of the students. In addition, this section will discuss the nature of positive encouragement and feedback that should be given to the students as they work on listening activities that involve implicature.

Mary Underwood in her book *Teaching Listening* stressed that teachers need to make sure that they plan and organize listening activities appropriately for students (111). Listening exercises involving implicature should not be presented to beginning and lower level students. Hicks explained in her study that linguistic
competence is necessary for pragmatic competence, but that it is not sufficient for it (77).

The intermediate level of ESL ability is the ideal stage at which an instructor can begin teaching listening exercises involving implicature. At this stage, the students have a managed control of grammatical structures and vocabulary. As a result, they make sense of their message intuitively which is a prerequisite for pragmatic competence.

Instructor feedback should provide encouragement by focusing on what the students understand. Students should not worry if they do not understand every word to which they listen. ESL instructors should avoid the temptation to ask the students to list the words from the conversation they do not know. Students should learn to accept that the listening task can often be completed even when they miss some words. In this way, the students learn to appreciate that comprehension of implicature can occur with less than complete understanding of all that is said.

5.6 - FINAL COMMENTS

This study has shown that implicature can be effectively taught to NNS through the presentation of Grice's theories and his maxims. This explicit instruction affects students listening comprehension.
scores on the TOEFL, having the most powerful effect on part A (p=.059). In short, the explicit instruction of implicature seems to help NNS become pragmatically conscious as they learn to use Grice's CP and the maxims in working out the meaning of TOEFL dialogs involving implicature. My study has demonstrated that ESL instructors play a pivotal role in facilitating listening comprehension through the explicit teaching of implicature.

I hope that the research questions and the implications of my study will cause more empirical studies to be done in this area. Science has a way of correcting itself, and we as professionals of ESL have every right to be a skeptical lot when confronted with new ideas. But we must increase the making of knowledge in ESL by encouraging more studies with implicature. As Bouton (1990) found out in one of his studies, there few books designed to teach implicature. He writes:

The importance of implicature as an element of communicative competence and the extent to which NNS have difficulty using it---make it necessary to include the development of skills in using implicature in any ESL program. Some dialogues which learners can be brought into contact with implicature can be found, but for the most part, developing materials to meet this need is up to
the imagination and sensitivity of the teacher.

(50)

Bouton also mentioned that when he surveyed ESL textbooks he found that almost no attention at all is given to the instruction of implicature in ESL textbooks (1990).

As stated earlier, the implications of my study extend the conclusions of Bouton (1988, 1989, 1990, 1992) and Chen and Harris (1993, 1994). The teaching of implicature is an effective and an integral part of communicative competence. My study suggests that the explicit instruction of implicature may significantly increase a student's listening score on the TOEFL. These results point to the need to produce more function-based ESL textbooks that use implicature-based conversations. Explicit instruction should be given to the teacher on how to interpret the implicature along with explanations of how to teach it. This instruction would prove especially useful to NNS EFL instructors who commonly are at a loss when attempting to answer difficult language questions. This may eventually better equip international students with knowledge of the pragmatic aspects of the language before coming to the US for further study.
APPENDIX A 1: MEANING AND CONTEXT

Meaning in conversation involves much more than just understanding the meanings of words spoken by the speaker. We must understand the context in which it was spoken.

The context fills in the details and allows for full understanding. Context is divided into four subparts:

1. Physical context: Where the conversation takes place, what objects are present, and what actions are taking place.
2. Epistemic context: Background knowledge shared by the speaker and the hearer.
3. Linguistic context: The utterances previous to the utterances under consideration.
4. Social context: The social relationship and setting of the speakers and the hearers.

Practice Activity 1

Suppose that two people, talking loudly, walk into an individual study section of the library. They sit down, still talking loudly, but no one says anything to them. After about five minutes, a person across the table from them says: "Talk a little louder, won't you? I missed what you said." Certain contextual facts enable the hearers to interpret this statement as a request to be silent. Identify the physical, epistemic, linguistic, and social contexts to the following "facts" about his conversation.

A. The utterance interrupts their conversation and breaks the silence between them and others.
B. The request is made in sarcastic tone.
C. People usually don't talk to strangers.
D. Libraries are quiet places.
E. The people involved are in the library at the time of this conversation.
Practice Activity 2

Read each sentence and according to the context of that sentence or group of sentences, answer each question.

1. He kicked the ball into the net. What kind of "ball" is the speaker talking about?

2. She dribbled the ball down the court and shot a basket. What kind of "ball" is the speaker talking about?

3. He putted the ball in from two feet away. What kind of "ball" is the speaker talking about?

4. She hit the ball over the fence. What kind of "ball" is the speaker talking about?

5. He served the ball into the net. What kind of "ball" is the speaker talking about?

Note: This exercise serves as a good introduction to the TOEFL listening inference questions involving what, where, why and how questions.
APPENDIX A 2: DIRECT SPEECH ACTS

Just as people can perform physical acts, such as hitting a baseball, they can also perform mental acts such as imagining hitting a baseball. People can also perform another kind of act simply by using language; these are called speech acts. Language can do an extraordinarily wide range of activities. Observe the following eight sentences:

1. John Jones has bad breath.________________________
2. Who ate my porridge? _____________________________
3. Shut up._______________________________________
4. Please scratch my nose. ___________________________
5. Do that again, and I'll punch your lights out. ______

6. There is a snake in the back seat of your car.____
7. Five bucks says that the Buckeyes will beat the Wolverines this year.______________
8. You ought to go to class at least once a quarter.________________________

Match the eight language activities to the above eight sentences: give warning, make a request, make a bet, request information, give order, make a threat, to give advice, and convey information.
For direct speech acts we have a **declarative** sentence type which makes assertions, an **interrogative** sentence type which is dedicated to questions, and an **imperative** sentence type which is dedicated to orders and requests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Type</th>
<th>Speech Act</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>assertion</td>
<td>conveys information,</td>
<td>John Jones has bad breath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is true or false.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>question</td>
<td>elicits information</td>
<td>Who is he talking to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>orders and</td>
<td>causes others to behave in</td>
<td>Please leave me alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requests</td>
<td>certain ways</td>
<td>Leave me alone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first eight sentences could be rewritten by embedding in the sentences complements of verbs which directly state the speech act. This more directly shows that "speech action" is just as real as any other kind of physical action that occurs. Observe sentences 9-16 and compare them to sentences 1-8.

9. I assert that John has bad breath.
10. I ask who ate my porridge.
11. I order you to shut up.
12. I request that you scratch my nose.
13. I threaten you that if you do that again, I'll punch your lights out.

14. I warn you that there is a snake in the back of your car.

15. I bet you five bucks that the buckeyes will beat the Wolverines this year.

16. I advise you to go to class at least once a quarter.

In order for a speech act to be correctly performed, certain conditions must be satisfied. We call these felicity conditions. Note the following conditions when asking questions and making requests.

A. John asks Mary, "What happened to Susan?"
   1. John does not know the truth about Susan.
   2. John wants to know the truth about Susan.
   3. John believes that Mary can supply the information about Susan.

Rules to asking questions:

- We do not ask questions when we know that it cannot be answered. John asks his dog, "What do you think of President Clinton?"

- And except in certain situations, we do not ask questions when we already know the answer. A man asks his wife, "Are you a woman?"
B. Bob requests that Frank go to the store, "Frank, please go to the store."

1. Bob believes that no one has gone to the store yet.
2. Bob believes that Frank can go to the store.
3. Bob believes that Frank is willing to go to the store and perhaps do other things for Bob if asked.
4. Bob wants someone to go to the store because he needs something.

Rules to making requests:

• Normally, we do not want people to do things that have already been done.

• We do not ask people to do things that they ordinarily cannot do. It may be considered cruel or a joke.

• If we do not want to get into trouble socially, we will be careful not to ask people who have higher social standing than we do to do things for us unless the circumstances are quite special.

• We do not usually request things that we do not want done.
Homework Assignment

Part One: Write sentences with the intent to convey information, to request information, to give an order, to make a threat, to give a warning, and to give advice. See examples on page one if you need ideas.

Part Two: Answer the following questions:

1. What is a speech act? Give 1 example

2. Give an example of a social situation that would be considered inappropriate in making a request. Tell why it would get the speaker into trouble.

3. Why do we have to be careful when we "order" someone to do something?

4. John walks up to a stranger in the Phau library and says, "Please get me a Webster's dictionary." According to part B on page two of my handout, why is this not a valid request?
APPENDIX A 3: INDIRECT SPEECH ACTS

One of the most interesting things about speech acts is that we very commonly perform speech acts indirectly. In the last handout, we talked about two ways in which speech acts can be performed: (1) by making a direct literal utterance, or (2) by using a performative verb that names the speech act. In addition to these direct speech acts, we can use the felicity conditions to make indirect speech acts. Remember felicity conditions means that certain conditions on the acts of questioning and requesting must be performed before it is considered valid (direct speech acts handout page 2). Look at the speech acts questions and requests again:

C. Questions

1. Direct
   a. Did John Marry Helen?
   b. I ask you whether John Married Helen.

2. Indirect
   a. I don't know if John married Helen. (A.1)
   b. I would like to know if John Married Helen. (A.2)
   c. Do you know if John married Helen? (A.3)

D. Requests

1. Direct
   a. Please take out the garbage.
   b. I request you to take out the garbage.
2. Indirect
   a. The garbage isn't out yet. (B.2)
   b. Could you take out the garbage? (B.2)
   c. Would you mind taking out the garbage? (B.3)
   d. I would like for you to take out the garbage. (B.4)

   There is something up front about the (C1) questions and the (D1) requests. Sentence (C1a) taken literally is a request for information about John's marrying Helen. The same is true of (C1b). Notice, however, that (C2a) taken literally is not a question at all. It is an assertion about the speaker's knowledge. (C2b) is also an assertion. (C2c), in contrast, is a question, but a question which literally asks whether the hearer knows something. (C2) and (D2) show that indirect speech acts have a close connection with the same felicity conditions as speech acts. In other words, you use the same rules when giving an indirect speech act as you would with a direct speech act. In fact, in order to perform a speech act indirectly, you need to formulate a question, an assertion, or a request or order that evokes a felicity condition on that speech act. In general, if the felicity condition concerns the best interests of the hearer, a question is used. So instead of assuming the felicity condition of "John believes that Tom is willing to do some
type of action" on the request holds, the speaker might ask if it does as in "Would you mind taking me to work?" This type of indirect speech act serves to make the request polite since it serves the best interest of the hearer.

Identifying Indirect Speech Acts

Sentences that perform indirect speech acts are not direct, literal statements of various acts to be performed. Typically, with an indirect speech act, what the speaker actually means is different from what she or he literally says. Indirect speech acts are determined by the following rules:

1. Check to see if there is a performative verb in the sentence since only direct speech acts are accomplished using performative verbs, never indirect speech acts.

   Note the following sentences: I ask you whether John married Helen; I request you to take out the garbage.

2. If there is no performative verb in the sentence, check the sentence type to see if it corresponds to the sentence type typically used to perform a certain speech act.

   For example, an assertion is typically performed with a declarative sentence, a question is typically performed with an interrogative, and a
request or command is typically performed with an imperative.

But in the following example of "I don't know if John married Helen," a declarative sentence type is used to ask a question. Therefore, this sentence has performed an indirect speech act.

3. Also, check to see if any felicity conditions are violated for the literal meaning but not for its intended meaning.

If there are violations for the literal but not intended meaning, then the sentence must be an indirect speech act. For example, the literal meaning of Could you take out the garbage is a question asking whether the hearer could (was able to) take out the garbage. In order for this to be a felicitous question, the felicity conditions must be satisfied.

In other words:

√ the speaker does not know the truth about x(something or someone)

√ speaker wants to know the truth

√ speaker believes that the hearer may be able to supply the information about x that the speaker wants.

In this situation, the speaker clearly knows the answer to this question. On the other hand, for the intended meaning of the speaker requesting the hearer to
take out the garbage, the following felicity conditions have been satisfied:

- √ speaker believes that no one has taken out the garbage yet
- √ speaker believes that the hearer is capable of taking out the garbage
- √ speaker believes that the hearer is willing to take out the garbage if asked
- √ the speaker wants the hearer to take out the garbage

4. Consider the context of the speech act and how you would normally respond to it.

*Could you lift 200 pounds* is a yes/no question and an appropriate answer is *Yes, I can* or *No, I can't*.

*But in the question* *Can you pass the salt* it would not be appropriate to answer *Yes, I can* or *No I can't* since the speaker is actually requesting the hearer to pass the salt (a physical action).

*Because the normal response of yes or no to* *Can you pass the salt* is not appropriate, it qualifies it to be an indirect speech act requiring the hearer not simply to answer yes or no, but to perform the action of physically transporting the salt to the hearer.
Homework

For each of the following sentences, identify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Type:</th>
<th>Speech Act: What type of speech act is it?</th>
<th>Direct or Indirect: Does the sentence have a direct and literal meaning or does it have an indirect and intended meaning that differs from its literal interpretation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A). Declarative: We live in San Bernardino.</td>
<td>A). Assertion: Conveys information that is either true or false. Su Jin is a student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B). Interrogative: Do we live in San Bernardino?</td>
<td>B). Question: Elicits information. Who is that man over there?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: How many times do I have to tell you to clean your room?

1). Interrogative
2). Directive
3). Indirect

A. Can you pick me up at the airport?

1).
2).
3).

B. I declare, under penalty of perjury, to state the whole truth.

1).
2).
3).

C. There shouldn't be any talking in here right now.

1).
2).
3).

D. Don't walk away.

1).
2).
3).
E. Is that a Monarch butterfly?
   1).
   2).
   3).

F. Can you empty the dishwasher for me?
   1).
   2).
   3).

G. Gee, it's cold in here. (Wife says to husband upon entering house)
   1).
   2).
   3).

H. Gee, it's cold in here. (Friend to friend in public swimming pool)
   1).
   2).
   3).
APPENDIX A 4: RULES OF CONVERSATION

Note: I included the maxims of quality, quantity, and relation because they have the most relevance to the TOEFL TEST.

The use of language, like most forms of social behavior, is governed by social rules. Some rules are designed to protect people's feelings by showing respect (e.g., rules governing whether or not you can use a first name in addressing someone or must use a title and a last name).

Other rules are designed to protect the integrity of the English language. If people were to decide to tell lies in some random way, listeners would have no way of determining when speakers were lying and when they were telling the truth. Language would cease to be of value to us. To prevent this from happening, society has settled on a set of conventions governing language use that preserves its integrity by requiring us to:

- Be honest in language use
- Have evidence for what we say
- Make what we say relevant to the speech context

These rules were never voted on by a government nor were they ever officially recognized anywhere. We learn these rules much the same way as we learn most social rules—by trial and error. A philosopher named H.P. Grice formulated a Cooperative Principle which he believed
underlies language use. This principle states that two people in a conversation will mutually cooperate. The cooperation principle ensures or requires that we make sure that what we say in conversation further the purposes of these conversations. Note the following situations:

In a business meeting, one is normally expected to keep one's remarks confined to the topic at hand unless it is changed in some approved way.

Mr. Rogers: I think that if we can get the Johnston account, we can increase our cash flow in the company.

Mr. Thompson: I agree. The Johnston account is of primary importance to our company.

Ms. Jones: Sorry to change the topic but did you all see the OJ Simpson trial today.

Close friends having a few beers at a bar would not be governed by tight rules of this sort. Nevertheless, even in casual conversation, the conversation will normally have one or more purposes and each party can be expected by the rest to behave in ways that further these purposes.

Kim: How are you today?

Sandy: Oh, Harrisburg is the capital of Pennsylvania.
Gail: Really? I thought the weather would be warmer.

Mike: Well, in my opinion, the soup could have used a little more salt.

Grice went on to argue that there are some conversational rules or *maxims* that regulate conversation by making us comply with the cooperative principle. Note the first of four rules to be discussed in this TOEFL class:

**Maxims of Quality:**

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

The first one is simple. Don't lie. The second rule is more interesting for it is only when we believe we have adequate evidence for some claim that we can have much confidence that we are observing this first maxim of quality. Nevertheless, people differ strikingly in what they think is good evidence for their views, especially in religion and politics (which is why these topics are so often off limits as topics of conversation).

In language, we may normally assume that speakers are obeying the Cooperative Principle. Because of this assumption, we sometimes draw inferences from what people say. Note the following conversations:

Laura: I don't believe any men are coming to visit today, Mother.
Amanda: What? Not one? You must be joking! Not one man? It can't be true! There must be a flood! There must have been a tornado! (Williams 1949)

The literal interpretation here is not true but despite this fact, Amanda is still following the cooperation principle. It is obvious to Laura that Amanda's use of the word "flood" and "tornado" are intentional exaggerations which overstate the severity of the situation. The inference that Laura draws from Amanda's statement is one of foolishness and cruelty. Amanda is afraid that no men will ever come to visit her daughter. She ultimately fears that she will be left with the responsibility to care for her daughter.

Read literature and you will have lots of fun experimenting with this maxim.

When a maxim such as the maxim of quality is broken in a conversation, something is implied in the statement that may be more than or the opposite to what was actually said. These violations enable us to use irony and satire in language.

Tom says to Bob in an argument:

Tom: Are you crazy?!
Bob: Yes I am, a complete lunatic.
Is Bob really crazy?
Carlos sarcastically says to Raquel after taking the international TOEFL:

Carlos: Sure was an easy test.
Raquel: Yeah, a piece of cake.

What is implied here? Was the TOEFL exam easy?

A husband says to his wife:

Husband: Sweetie, you are the most beautiful woman in the world.
Wife: I know honey. Thank you.

Is his wife the most beautiful woman in the world? If not, how can he make this claim and not be seen as a liar by his wife?

Tom and Frank engage in a discussion about politics:

Tom: President Clinton is the worst President in the entire history of the United States. I wouldn't trust him if my life depended on it.

Frank: How can you say that?! Talk about Clinton will you...What about Ronald Reagan? He had the intelligence of a seven-year-old kid. He couldn't find his way out of a paper bag.

How do Tom and Frank make these claims when clearly they don't have adequate evidence to support them? Do
they really mean what they say? If not, why do we sometimes say things in conversation that we don't mean? Would conversation be boring if we always followed the rules?

Homework: Answer the following questions after each conversational exchange. Be sure to focus on the context of each conversation.

I. A husband says to his wife as he is preparing for work:

Tom: I am not going to work today because it is your birthday!

Mary: OK. That's good. We can go shopping!

A. How does Mary know that Tom is not going to go shopping but instead is actually going to go to work?

B. If she knows that he is going to work, why does she suggest that they go shopping?

II. John and Steve engage in a conversation about football:

John: What about those Cowboys!

Steve: What about them?

John: Pure luck is all I saw

Steve: What? You think the Cowboys were lucky?
John: Yeah, I do, so what?
Steve: You don't know your football then, 'cuz Aikman is the greatest quarterback that ever lived and he is all skill. There's not a lucky bone in his body.
John: Ah, be quiet, the Raiders made the mistakes and the Cowboys took advantage of them. They would have never won the game had it not been for those two fumbles and an interception.
Steve: Yeah, but it was the Cowboys defense that forced those mistakes.

A. Are these two speakers following the cooperative principle?
B. Apply the maxim of quality to this conversation and explain why these two friends are or are not likely to agree.

III. A mother and her son get into an argument
Mom: Johnny, it's time to clean your room.
John: Again? I just cleaned it.
Mom: No, you didn't, it's a pigpen. Look how dirty it is.
John: No, it isn't. My floor is clean enough to eat off of.
Mom: Why do we always fight when I try to
get you to do work around the house?

John: Why do you worry so much about me cleaning my room? I'll clean my room when I think it's dirty.

Mom: No, you won't. You'll clean your room when I tell you to. This is my house and I give the orders around here.

John: Shut up, I'll do whatever I want and when I want. Who made you the drill sergeant around here? You know what, other Moms don't act like this. In fact, you are the worst Mother in the whole world! I hate you!

Mom: And you Johnny, are the most ungrateful son in the whole world. You're a spoiled brat. If I were to sell you at an auction, I wouldn't be able to get $.25 for you.

A. How does the violation of the maxim of quality enable the mother and the son to get into an argument?

B. Is Johnny room really as dirty as a pigpen?

C. Is Johnny serious when he says his floor is clean enough to eat off of?

D. Is Mother a drill sergeant in the army?

E. Does Johnny really think that his mother is the
worst mother in the world?

F. Is the mother going to sell her son at an auction?

G. Why do we sometimes say things that we don't mean?

Maxim of Relation/Relevance

This rule says that you must be relevant in the conversation. This rule is central to the orderliness of conversation—it limits the random topic shifts like the one below:

A: How are you today?
B: Florida is having a recession this year.
C: Really, I thought that the Bruins would win that basketball game.
D: Well, I hope that we don't have an earthquake today.

In this conversation, we can see that there is no orderliness. Speaker B's response does not relate to speaker A's question. Speaker C and D statements have no relation whatever. Clearly, there is no relation here because these speakers are not following the cooperative principle. We know as speakers of English (nonnative speakers) that we don't have conversations such as these. And if we did, we would consider ourselves crazy in some way. The most important reason I mention this maxim of relation/relevance is that understanding how we draw
conversational inferences is important. An inference is when a speaker passes from one proposition, statement, or judgement considered as true to another whose truth is believed to follow that of the former. For example, let us say that speaker A has knowledge or reason to believe that speaker C is dating someone. Speaker A has knowledge that speaker B can probably answer speaker A's question. Speaker A is Sandy, speaker B is Tom and person C is Gail.

Sandy: Is Gail dating anyone these days?

Tom: Well, she goes to Cleveland every weekend.

In this case, Sandy will likely draw the inference that Gail is dating someone because she will assume that what Tom has said is relevant to what she has said. In fact, if Tom knew that Gail goes to Cleveland every weekend because she has a job there, what she said would have been very misleading. Let us practice some examples:

A. A mother says to her son:

Mother: Who took the cookies?!

Son: I saw John running out of the house in a hurry.

What can be inferred about John?

B. Two friends talk about the appearance of a girl in their high school:

Carey: Do you think Mary is pretty?

Jeff: Let us just say that I wouldn't vote for her in the local beauty
contest.

What can be inferred about Jeff's opinion of Mary?

Homework Exercises: What can be inferred from the following conversations?

1. Susan: Are you coming to the movies tonight?
   Elizabeth: Do I look like I have any free time?
   Is Elizabeth likely to go to the movies with Susan?

2. James: Do I look fat?
   Leslie: Have you thought about working out or joining a health spa?
   What is Leslie's opinion of James? In other words, does she think that he is fat?

3. Frank: What am I...stupid?
   Sue: You're no genius, that's for sure.
   What does Sue think about Frank? Does she think he is smart or dumb?

4. Mothers: Who ate the chicken?
   Son: Well, the dog certainly looks satisfied right now?
   What is the son saying about the dog?

5. Randy: Did you think the exam was hard?
   Rob: Well, it certainly was no piece of cake.
   Does Randy think that the exam was easy or difficult?
Maxim of Quantity

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

A: How are you today?
B: I'm fine, thank you.

Or

A: How are you today?
B: Well, my car is not working too good right now and to tell you the truth, I don't have very much money. In fact, I don't know how I'm going to pay my bills this month.

What is the difference between these two conversations? Hint...could B be asking A for something?

By making your contribution as required, you can insure that you make as strong a claim as is warranted in any given circumstance. And by not making your contribution more informative than is required, it is insuring that you do not make a stronger claim than is warranted in that circumstance. The following conversation illustrates an inference that might be drawn on the assumption that the speaker is obeying the first of Quantity.

Gail: How far can you run without stopping?
Kim: Twenty-four miles.
Gail:  I guess you can't run a whole marathon without stopping.

Kim:  Nonsense, I've done it a number of times. Notice that what Kim first says must be true if what she says next is true. Certainly, if someone can run over twenty-six miles without stopping, then they can run twenty-four miles without stopping. However, Gail quite naturally was assuming that Kim was obeying the Maxim of Quantity.
APPENDIX A 5: SAMPLE TOEFL SYLLABUS EXTRACT
TOEFL Preparation

Instructor: Michael Buckhoff

Materials
- Three ring binder/notebook, 200 sheets loose leaf college ruled notebook paper, and five reinforced index dividers
- Longman Preparation Course for the TOEFL Test "Skills and Strategies" by Deborah Phillips
- Longman Preparation Course for the TOEFL Test "Practice Tests" by Deborah Phillips

Goals

Each year, many international students come to the US to study English. Others study English as an international language in their own country. Because English is not their first language, these students try to demonstrate their competency in listening, grammar, and reading by taking the TOEFL test. The test is administered by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey. Bruce Rogers writes in his book, The Complete Guide to TOEFL, that nearly three quarters of a million people from all over the world took the TOEFL test in 1990-1991. A high score on this test "is an essential step in being admitted to graduate or undergraduate programs at almost all colleges and universities in North America" (p. ix).

The purpose of this class is two fold:

1). To prepare you with skills & test taking strategies so you can successfully take the TOEFL.
2). To prepare you with a general knowledge of English

We will work on polishing your language skills while at the same time help you be a smarter test taker. To help you polish these skills, we will focus on listening comprehension, structure and written expression, and vocabulary and reading comprehension.
Requirements

TOEFL Practice Tests
You will take five practice tests in this class. The first and fifth test will serve as a diagnostic to measure your progress from the first week of the quarter until the tenth week of the quarter. You will be given a score by which you can begin to mark your progress. Work hard to improve your TOEFL test scores.

You must be present to take these tests. After taking practice tests 2, 3, & 4, we will have a review in which we will discuss the incorrect answers as well as the correct answers. Please calculate your practice test score and submit the score to me so that I may assess your progress.

We will also discuss how we are using the TOEFL test strategies to determine correct and incorrect answers. Because of time constraints, we will not discuss all the incorrect answers on the test. It is your responsibility to review the entire test at home focusing on the areas of the test that are the most difficult. Concentrate on the TOEFL exercises covering your weaknesses as indicated by the diagnostic and practice tests.

SRA Extended Reading for 45 minutes
Reading is a critical skill needed by second language students not only for TOEFL but for academic success. Extensive reading (reading large amounts of English only texts) provides ESL students the means for developing the background knowledge necessary for more speculative thinking. In a survey obtained by Ostler, ESL students considered reading the most important skill for future academic success (Ellis, 1985).

Reading is not a skill that you just get or understand. You must do large amounts of extensive reading in order to develop and learn the skill. Timing and concentration are extremely important skills for the reading section of the TOEFL. As you work in class on the extended readings, I want you to be aware of the following "bad habits" that you may have as a non native reader of English which may prevent you from learning to read the same way we do as native readers. Some of these "bad habits" are:

• The best way to read is to translate all the words from English into your own language.
• In order to understand what you read, you use the dictionary to look up all the words you don't understand.
• In order to understand what you read, you look closely at each word and translate it.
• In order to read well, you think that you need
to understand all the words on a page.

② In order to concentrate well when reading, you read slowly and carefully. You also write the meanings of all the words on the page.

③ You believe that there is only one way to read. As a result, you read the newspaper the same way as you would read a textbook.

*If you do any of these "bad habits" when you read, you might not be able to finish the reading comprehension section of the TOEFL. In addition, you may have poor reading comprehension.*

Many of you have been reading for 10 years or more and you have your own reading habits. Habits are very difficult to change. Ten weeks is a short time to learn new reading habits. But you will begin to learn how to read more quickly and easily during this term. Read, read and read some more! That's how you get better.

**Increase your knowledge of everyday English**

Deborah Phillips says in her book, *Longman Preparation Course for the TOEFL Test Skills and Strategies*:

An understanding of the TOEFL strategies and skills presented in this text can improve your TOEFL score. However, skills and strategies alone will not make you successful; a good basic knowledge of the English Language is also necessary. Therefore do not forget the general study of the English language as you work to prepare for the TOEFL test (xv).

Bruce Rogers states in his book that the best way to increase your general knowledge of English is to use English as much as you can. He says:

You can't learn all the English you'll need to do well on TOEFL from this guide or in a TOEFL preparation class. Other classes will be useful, as will any opportunities to speak, read, write or listen to English. Some people who are preparing for TOEFL think that conversation classes and practice are a waste of time because speaking skills are not tested on the exam. In fact, one of the best ways to get ready for the exam is to speak English whenever you can. Not only will you improve your ability to listen to everyday English, but you will learn to think in English....(xxiv)
Late Work

Practice tests scores submitted after the due date will not be accepted. In other words, you will receive no points. I will only allow you to make up missed work if you have a written documented excuse from someone stating the urgency of the situation (e.g. Doctor's note, CHP accident report, etc.).

Attendance

Your attendance is required at all class meetings. Only written documented excuses for an absence may result in your making up an assignment or graded daily work. Absences endanger your grade simply because you are missing out in the learning process. **Three absences will result in an overall reduction of one full letter grade and five absences will result in a failing grade for this class.** Come to class on time. Three tardies will be counted as an absence. If you arrive fifteen minutes late or more, you will be counted absent for that class period. If you do come late to class, please enter quietly so as not to distract the other students. Do not explain to me why you are late.

Optional Requirement: Does not have to be handed in

TOEFL Success Journal

Though the TOEFL success journal is not an assignment, it is an individual exercise in which you consciously think about your TOEFL language solving progress. In order to help you mark your progress, I recommend that you keep a personal TOEFL Success Journal. By keeping a personal journal, you will encourage yourself to think about your learning. And hopefully, you will make your thoughts become actions as you do specific things that will help you increase your TOEFL score.

You should write the journal based on your experiences with the TOEFL test taking strategies/exercises that you read and study in my class. Include in the journal how you are doing on the TOEFL practice tests as well as what kinds of "out of class" preparations you are doing to help build your listening, grammar and reading language skills. Which of the test taking strategies are/or are not working for you? Ask yourself the following questions about TOEFL:

• What magazines have you read this week?
• What have you done this week to improve your listening comprehension?
• What have you done this week to improve your structure and written expression skills?
• What have you done this week to improve your reading comprehension skills?
• What parts are the most difficult for you with the listening section of the TOEFL (i.e. short, extended conversations, or mini-talks)?
• What test taking strategies can you apply that will help you improve your listening skills for the TOEFL?
• What parts are the most difficult for you with the structure and written expression section of the TOEFL (i.e. word forms, word order, adjective clauses, complements)?
• What test taking strategies can you apply that will help you improve your structure and written expression skills (i.e. intuitive, analytical, reading out loud)?
• How many native speakers do you talk to every day?
• What parts are the most difficult for you with the reading comprehension part of the TOEFL (i.e. language, inference, main idea, or detail questions)?
• What test taking strategies can you apply that will help you improve your reading comprehension skills?
• How many words can you read in a minute? Is this faster or slower than your reading speed last week?
• How many hours do you spend a week reading? Do you enjoy it? Do you translate into your native language when you read or do you use vocabulary in context?

The weekly journal will give you a complete record of your language and TOEFL preparation progress.  

Homework Assignments
After we discuss TOEFL listening, grammar, and reading skill building and test-taking strategies in class, I will assign homework so that you can reinforce and build your skills sufficiently to answer TOEFL test questions correctly.  After you finish your homework assignments, use the answer key to check your answers.  
It is probably not necessary for you to complete all of the homework exercises outlined in my syllabus.  Moreover, you do not need to complete every exercise in this book in preparation for the TOEFL.  Concentrate on the exercises covering your weaknesses as indicated by the diagnostic and practice tests that we will take in this class.  
In addition, you may find that an exercise is too easy for you.  If that is the case, go on to an exercise that will be more challenging.
Grading

The number letter grading scale is set as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>95-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>84-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>76-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>70-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>69&amp; below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring Grade

Your final grade will be calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance and Participation</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Pretest</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Test Two</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Test Three</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Test Four</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Test Diagnostic Post-test</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Tests Improvement</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The practice test scores will not have an adverse effect on your grade for this class since I will have scores ranging from the 400s to the mid 500s depending on the English language abilities of the students in this class. However, your grade will be adversely effected by your failure to take the test. In other words, if you fail to complete practice test two and consequently you do not turn in a score to me, your overall grade for this class will be deducted by 10%.
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