Current Topics in Language and Literature

Current Topics in Language and Literature:

An International Perspective

Edited by

Nataša Bakić-Mirić,
Mirjana Lončar-Vujnović
and Mladen Jakovljević

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Current Topics in Language and Literature: An International Perspective

Edited by Nataša Bakić-Mirić, Mirjana Lončar-Vujnović
and Mladen Jakovljević

This book first published 2019

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-3140-6
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-3140-6

It is not our differences that divide us. It is our inability to recognize, accept and celebrate those differences.

Audre Lorde (1934-1992)
American writer, poet, feminist and civil rights activist

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We want to express our deep appreciation and gratitude to our colleagues from around the globe. Without your commitment, we doubt that we would have been able to complete this book. We value the knowledge and insight you have shared with us and the rest of the world, and we credit you for the success of this project.

Our sincere thanks also go to our colleague Niall Ardill for his help in proofreading this book and the whole Cambridge Scholars Publishing team.

Finally, we are indebted to our families whose patience and support were invaluable during the time we were busy with this book.

The Editors.

INTRODUCTION

This book comprises a collection of 15 peer-reviewed papers written by scholars from around the globe who came together with a shared interest to offer new and innovative approaches to current topics in language and literature. The book offers new perspectives on topics such as cross-cultural communication, linguistics, teaching methods, ICT in post-secondary education, promotional and business discourse, gender studies and literature studies. Offering a diverse range of topics, the book will be a valuable contribution to all educators, researchers and students who want to view current topics from a completely different perspective.

The purpose of this book is to bring forward current topics in language and literature. The book synthesizes current practical topics in post-secondary education written by active researchers and practitioners in their respective areas. It is comprehensive in dealing with issues facing educators such as changing perceptions of topics in the fields of language and literature.

Using contemporary approaches to research such as mixed methods research, case study research, discourse analysis, grounded theory and the repertory grid the authors offer insights into the ways in which higher education continuously changes, evolves and rises to face constant challenges resulting from new instructional practices and current research investigations. Taking this into consideration, this book will serve as a bedrock to help educators, researchers and students alike to keep up with these changes and stay current in all areas relating to post-secondary education.

The emphasis in this book is on promoting an understanding of and appreciation for the rich and varied current theoretical assumptions surrounding language and literature. Thus, the papers in this volume offer a fresh outlook, and rigor and relevance in discussion of numerous aspects in scientific discourse and lexis.

These illuminating essays highlight that contemporary scholars look upon these issues through a dynamic global prism and beyond any strict set of rules, which would otherwise lead them to ignore the ever-shifting changes in language and literature and the accompanying cultural spaces and realities.

Lastly, the complexity and novelty of these 15 essays offer fresh views to the topic postulated in the title of this book. Therefore, the editors believe that they will stimulate intellectual curiosity of the diverse readership across the scientific fields and further develop ideas for future research.

The Editors.

PART I

LANGUAGE

CHAPTER ONE

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY SEQUENCES IN AN INTERACTION TASK ENVIRONMENT

BRENT M. DAVIS

Outline

Once the interactions have been established in a curriculum, it is time to refine the objectives for each interaction into instructional activity sequences for lesson planning purposes (Davis, A Communicative-Competence Syllabus Organized According to Social Institutions, 2016). Such sequences must meet several criteria: relevance, engagement, and, crucially, use of the contrast between pedagogical content knowledge and expert knowledge to pose problems which will help students to inductively (with minimal teacher intervention) arrive at deeper understandings of an interaction's functions and forms (Davis, Addressing Grammar in the Interaction Task-Based Learning Environment, 2017); (Lemov, 2015) (Lamonica, 2018) (Schwartz, Tsang, & Blair, 2016). A typical sequence involves posing the communication problem which the interaction is expected to resolve, setting roles, key vocabulary and situational parameters, eliciting interaction turns in group or pair work, and then observing expert (native-speaker) turns.

Attention should be directed to identifying formal differences between learner and proficient turns. Learners should then collaborate to determine the differences and how their turns could be improved. Finally, the teacher highlights revisions which are more proficient and provides engaging practice activities. Examples from the author's classes will be provided.

Introduction

Never forget that your task is to develop people who are self-directed, who are disciplined, who do what they do because they choose to do it (Hendricks, 1987, p. 48). This is best accomplished in a learning

community. By that, I mean a group dedicated to the learning task, but even more to interacting with each other in a caring and challenging environment. When purpose, environment, content, activities, individual abilities and social scaffolding are all aligned the learner is in the zone of optimal learning. Secondarily the teacher is seeking to develop the English skills of his/her students. Perhaps the best way to do this is with meaningful tasks that emphasize communication.

In Figure 1 we see the factors that make for optimal learning. In this diagram the teacher combines expert knowledge of the interaction and pedagogical knowledge to generate an interaction task for the learners to collaborate on. If the learner's state is in the zone of proximal development (Doolittle, 1995) (with the support of other learners and the teacher), the task is well-matched to the learner's abilities, and if the structural-functional feedback is successful then the learner's knowledge base is altered to become more like the expert knowledge base. This is shown by the curving arrow which shows the knowledge being filtered through all these learning influences. The colored area in the background represents the physical environment including sound, lighting, space and temperature.

Let us briefly consider the environment and learner states before considering the details of the interaction activity sequence. First, the environment, any teacher knows that surroundings have a significant impact upon learning (Graetz, 2006). More importantly the learner's state is critical to the success of the activity sequence. If the learner is too tired, depressed, anxious or even too relaxed, optimal learning will not occur. Teachers need to consider the environment and learner's individual characteristics before crafting the interaction task, or adapt flexibly at the time of the lesson.

Goals for Interactive Task-Based Learning

Language is not a static structure, but the result of dynamic interaction among members of a society, and learning is also a social activity. Our first language learning takes place in the context of human interaction during the socialization process. This being the case, the most natural approach to language learning is through social interaction. The goal of interaction task-based learning is to provide a supportive learning community and meaningful interactions with elaborated feedback. More specifically, it is to give a meaningful, collaborative interaction task with elaborated feedback leading to improved future interactions in an upward spiral of gradually more complex interactions. Our example in this article will be a common interaction for language learners: an IELTS practice

speaking exercise. Since many learners will need this test, it is meaningful, and there are many pedagogical elements readily available to illustrate the parts of the activity sequence.

Learner Needs Assessment

As noted earlier, teachers must study their learners' individual characteristics. Learners are not peas in a pod. Each of them is unique, shaped by their life history, biology and culture. It is not enough for the teacher to know the subject; knowledge of the learner is extremely necessary for the activity to be in the zone of proximal development. Needs assessments can be done to discover some elements of the learner's current knowledge base (with respect to the target interaction) through asking what they know about the topic prior to initiating the task. Also learning styles and disabilities can be identified through testing.

The interaction task will ideally include elements that bring out knowledge gaps and misunderstandings as compared with an experts' knowledge of the interaction. This should definitely include vocabulary. Vocabulary is fundamental (along with prosodics and turn taking behavior). Also, the task should consider relative abilities of the learner's which may shape pairings and groupings, as well as crafting the activity to be more active for kinesthetic learners or providing songs for the musically intelligent as part of structural feedback, for example. These factors will be discussed in the following description of the activity sequence.

Effort should also be made in identifying any physical or psychological problems, such as hearing loss or depression which may affect optimal learning and corrective measures taken.

Motivational Activity

If the learners are connected members of a learning community (see for example Cox (2015) and, from a business perspective Blanchard and Bowles (1998), on creating community), motivation will not, normally, be extremely difficult, but will be enhanced by attention to the following:

Setting Goals

Before students can be motivated to master an activity, they need to understand the goals of the activity. The goals for an IELTS speaking test are to assess the learner's ability in the areas of:

fluency and coherence
lexical resource
grammatical range and accuracy
pronunciation (Cambridge IELTS, 2015)

The goal for the day can be written on the board at the beginning of class to focus the students. For this lesson the goal might look like this: "To learn vocabulary and other language structures related to discussing one's hometown and use this knowledge to answer questions in a practice IELTS test."

Why

Explaining why can be inspiring and motivating (Sinek, 2009). Taking the IELTS test is a very likely activity for language learners. Doing well could allow them to pursue higher education or find better employment, both good extrinsic motivators. As noted above, state the lesson goal/objective in advance and connect it with the assessment rubric. Goals should answer the question why and perhaps how and what as well.

Who and How

In control of a doable path to the goal. If the goal seems unachievable or the path seems too unclear, learners may give up. Learners, especially adults, need to be respected with having some control over finding the path (House & Mitchell, 1975). Engage the learners in finding the path through dialogue (Vella, 2002). This can be done as a small group exercise with each group reporting and having someone record the suggestions. If there is confusion, identify the problem, give feedback and iterate. When learners become comfortable with taking over some control of the process they will be more motivated. Obviously, the teacher will have to set some parameters, especially if some learners have very little motivation in the beginning. "… tell the learner nothing—and do nothing for him—that he can learn or do for himself" (Hendricks, 1987, p. 39).

Gamification

Teachers can learn a great deal about motivation from video game designers. One such designer has a very interesting taxonomy of motivation called octalysis (Chou, 2017). Gamification is related to old-fashioned behavior modification which I used with a class of refugee

children. In the beginning, they were rather rowdy, but after we instituted a system of awarding points for good behavior and gave them prizes (toys, coloring books) after a certain number of points were earned, our behavior problems went almost to zero.

Time limits can also provide a certain amount of motivation to achieve the goal by setting a challenging, but achievable time. Physical activity and caffeine also help (Schwartz, Tsang, & Blair, 2016, p. X).

Vocabulary Activity

As noted earlier, vocabulary is fundamental to language communication (Willis & Willis, 2007, p. sec. 1.3). A baby's first words are eagerly awaited by the parents. This activity should use elaboration (Schwartz, Tsang, & Blair, 2016, p. E). For example, I have had my students write a sentence using a vocabulary item and a paraphrase (Avaliable at http://www.ldonline.org/article/5759, Accessed June 15th, 2018). Learners take the word "interaction" and write a sentence such as "During the interaction the two students engaged in dialogue." Through elaboration the mind uses context to learn vocabulary.

Learners also enjoy and are motivated by online games like Kahoots (Plump & LaRosa, 2017). Teachers can create their own vocabulary or other lists for these games.

To illustrate this activity sequence we will use the IELTS 'hometown' question. There are a number of resources for this such as: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lAgFE9QBtag.

A possible vocabulary word for this interaction could be "museum." First learners could create an elaborated, definition-containing sentence: "The Museum of Folk Art has exhibits showing national arts and crafts." Then learners can share their sentences and, further, quiz each other to reinforce the vocabulary items: Q: "What has exhibits of national arts and crafts?" A: "The Museum of Folk Art."

Interaction Activity

Learners will need to know purpose (introduced in the motivation activity), statuses, roles (these are explained in the sociology of interaction (Sociology: Understanding and Changing the Social World, 2010) and various contextual parameters such as setting, emotional tone, time constraints, and medium. Conversation analysis also suggests other points to consider such as social identity (Thornbury, 2006). A general action

sequence may be provided by the teacher, or the learners may generate this as they perform the activity.

In our example, the learner has the status of a student and whatever ascribed statuses he/she normally has. The roles are interviewer and interviewee. The tone will be somewhat formal as the interactants are strangers and there is a power mismatch. Consequently, a somewhat formal register (Derewianka & Jones, 2010) should be used.

The activity should involve learners interacting with each other in creating the text of the conversation. Typical questions can be obtained from IELTS websites while the answers will vary with each learner.

Collaboration

A conversation activity should be structured so that both participants have relatively equal speaking time (Kagan & Kagan, 2009). For this activity a Kagan Inside-Outside Circle structure might be appropriate. An example of this technique can be observed on Youtube (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8thtYN3ydM): if there is an odd number, then the teacher can join in. Otherwise, the teacher should be listening to the learners and taking notes on structural misunderstandings to address in the feedback section. A timer can be used to mark the time to change questions. Learners should close each interaction with a word of encouragement to their partner.

Rubric

A rubric should be given to the learners to allow them to evaluate their efforts and form a framework for noticing the improvements in the model interaction to be presented later. IELTS already has a rubric prepared which makes this exercise easier to prepare for (see for example: https://takeielts.britishcouncil.org/find-out-about-results/ielts-assessment-criteria). Learners should critique each other's efforts using this rubric. This can be done in pairs. If learners do not recall what their partner said from the circle, they can briefly practice a question or two with each other as a basis for assessment.

Model Comparison Activity

Noticing

After the peer review exercise, it is time to look at the expert model. By examining the product of the expert knowledge base, the learner can modify his/her knowledge base to become more like the expert's. Again,

the rubric is used to drive the noticing exercise. Returning to the IELTS 'hometown' question video we can play the suggestions mentioned in the vocabulary section or one of the videos where a high-level speaker answers this question. This can be played back slowly or stopped to allow time for the learner to notice structural differences. In this example, the expert model will, of course, have some different vocabulary as each hometown will be different. Alternatively, the teacher can put corrected sentences on the board based on observations during the interaction activity.

Feedback

Feedback is the hinge that connects teaching and learning (Pollock, 2012). By providing feedback regarding the activity, the learner is able to adjust her/his knowledge base concerning this interaction.

Structural-functional Development Activity

The feedback should range over the spectrum of language components, lexis, rhetorical devices, cohesive devices and prosodic devices, but it is expected by most learners that there will be a particular emphasis upon syntax, or grammar. The interaction naturally grounds this grammar lesson in a usage context so that the function of the structures discussed is clear. The grammar points used here are taken from a transcript of the hometown question (https://www.ielts.org//media/pdfs/115045_speaking_sample_task_-_part_1_transcript.ashx?la=en). The teacher should endeavor to explain or elicit explanations of any unusual usage points. The emphasis is on structure in use.

For beginners, we might note simple present tense plus adjective combinations. Examples: "It is quiet. They are friendly."

For intermediate learners we could introduce the function of emphasis with cleft sentences: "What I like about our town is that it is quiet. It's the friendliness of our town that strikes most visitors."

For advanced learners one could introduce adverb clauses and other adverbs: "When visitors come to our town, they are often struck by the friendliness of our people. There are two shops in the village where people can buy groceries and sundries; otherwise, it is necessary to go to Zurich for any major purchases." Learners should be aware that complexity leads to higher scores on the IELTS test.

These examples could be supplemented by additional grammar points or activities that address multiple intelligences. For example, the grammar

of politeness features in the questions could be highlighted, such as: "would like," "Okay?" and "Let us." Additionally, activities can address multiple intelligences by providing songs, doing kinesthetic activities (like moving cards with words on them into correct word order), or having mathematically oriented learners calculate average band score improvement after the interaction is revised.

The rationale for giving grammar as feedback rather than presenting it before the learner interaction is discussed in Willis and Willis (2007, p. Sec. 1.6). Briefly, there are two points discussed there: the learner will be overloaded if trying to focus on meaning and, at the same time, use a newly introduced structure, and secondly, language acquisition research does not support this order. We might also add a third point, putting the learner production first helps us to analyze the learner's knowledge base and provide feedback that specifically addresses discrepancies between that knowledge base and the expert knowledge base.

Further Practice

The learners should now be given a chance to rewrite the interaction using the target structures, and again practice collaboratively. Have the students work in a different collaborative structure (for the sake of variety use a different Kagan structure like Mix-Pair-Share) to expand their communicative competence by generating some new sentences using the new grammar. Students could also submit their corrected written answers for assessment and written feedback.

Reflective Assessment Activity

At this point it is time to wrap up the activity sequence with a time of reflection. What did learners learn? What is still bothering them? How was the pace? The teacher should also reflect on the level of engagement and assess the degree of mastery of the interaction task. Very importantly, progress should be celebrated. Formal assessments would presumably follow upon completing a certain number of these sequences.

Conclusion

By creating a learning community, we have done more than helped learners develop language skills, we have helped them to develop life skills. By building on a supportive community we have made motivation and engagement easier. By setting clear, meaningful goals we have

increased motivation and understanding. By paying attention to learner's states and existing knowledge base we have crafted interaction tasks and feedback that make use of social scaffolding, multiple intelligences and identification of learner misunderstandings. Finally, by reflecting and celebrating we give learners honest assessment with hope and encouragement, what the Scriptures call: "speaking the truth in love" (Epistle to the Ephesians, p. 4:15).

What did you learn from these activities? Take a moment to reflect on your reading of this article. If you have questions or comments, please, contact me at bmdavis@outlook.com.

References

Blanchard, K., & Bowles, S. (1998). *Gung Ho.* New York: William Morrow & Co.

Cambridge IELTS. (2015, December 22). *IELTS Speaking Band Descriptors.* Pobrano August 15, 2018 z lokalizacji takeielts.britishcouncil.org: https://takeielts.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/IELTS_Speaking_band_descriptors.pdf

Chou, Y.-k. (2017). *Actionable Gamification: Beyond Points, Badges and Leaderboards.* n.p.: yukaichou.com.

Cox, C. (2015, February 18). Creating Community in Your Classroom. *youtube.com*. Truckee: Truckee Mountain Community College.

Davis, B. (2016). A Communicative-Competence Syllabus Organized According to Social Institutions. W N. a. Bakić-Mirić, *Going Forward: Recent Developments in Higher Education* (strony 31-46). Newcastle-on-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Davis, B. (2017). Addressing Grammar in the Interaction Task-Based Learning Environment. *Collection of Papers of the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Priština* , 101-108.

Derewianka, B., & Jones, P. (2010). From traditional grammar to functional grammar: bridging the divide. *NALDIC Quarterly* , 6-17.

Doolittle, P. E. (1995, June 2-4). *Understanding Cooperative Learning through Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development.* Pobrano August 17, 2018 z lokalizacji archive.org: https://archive.org/details/ERIC_ED384575

Graetz, K. A. (2006). Chapter 6: The Psychology of Learning Environments. W D. G. Oblingerr, *Learning Spaces* (str. n.p.). Louisville, Colorado, USA: EDUCAUSE.

Hendricks, H. (1987). *Teaching to Change Lives: Seven Proven Ways to Make Your Teaching Come Alive.* Portland, Oregon: Multnomah Books.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1975). *Path-Goal Theory of Leadership.* Springfield, VA: National Technical Information Service.

Kagan, S., & Kagan, M. (2009). *Kagan Cooperative Learning.* Pobrano August 11, 2018 z lokalizacji Kaganonline.com: https://www.kaganonline.com/free_articles/research_and_rationale/309/Cooperative-Learning-Frequent-Questions

Lamonica, C. (2018). *Module 7: Selecting Effective Instructional Strategies.* Pobrano March 5, 2018 z lokalizacji Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology Illinois State University: https://ctlt.illinoisstate.edu/pedagogy/modules/design/module7.shtml

Lemov, D. (2015). *Teach Like a Champion 2.0.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Paul, S. (brak daty). Epistle to the Ephesians. 4:15.

Plump, C. M., & LaRosa, J. (2017). Using Kahoot! in the Classroom to Create Engagement and Active Learning: A Game-Based Technology Solution for eLearning Novices. *Management Teaching Review* , 151-158.

Pollock, J. E. (2012). *Feedback: the Hinge that Joins Teaching and Learning.* Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin.

Schwartz, D. L., Tsang, J. M., & Blair, K. P. (2016). *The ABCs of How We Learn.* New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.

Sinek, S. (2009). *Start with Why?* London: Penguin Books.

Sociology: Understanding and Changing the Social World. (2010). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Libraries Publishing.

Thornbury, S. a. (2006). *Conversation: from Description to Pedagogy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vella, J. (2002). *Learning to Listen, Learning to Teach: The Poser of Dialgue in Educating Adults* (wyd. rev.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing Task-based Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CHAPTER TWO

COMPLIANCE WITH GRICE'S *MAXIM OF MANNER* DURING CAE AND CPE CAMBRIDGE MOCK EXAMS OF ENGLISH

NATASHA KOCHOVA
AND ANA LAZAROVA-NIKOVSKA

Outline

The chapter is grounded in two areas of applied linguistics: pragmatics and second language acquisition (SLA). From a pragmatics point of view, the research is based on Grice's *cooperative principle* (Grice 1989), an essential tacit principle which enables effective communication among interlocutors. In regards to the field of second language acquisition, the research focuses on the language skill 'speaking', which unfairly receives less attention during class instruction time in comparison to other skills such as acquisition of the grammatical form of the language and the lexis. Such classroom practice may lead to the achievement of a lower level of communicative competence, particularly expected under examination conditions, when a candidate has limited time to perform the speaking task.

The research attempts to analyse the individual speaking task during the Cambridge English language CAE (advanced level – C1) and CPE (proficiency level – C2) mock speaking examinations through the prism of Grice's maxims of speech, specifically the *maxim of manner*. The testing was carried out at a private language centre in Skopje, Republic of Macedonia where two groups were tested: candidates taking the CAE Speaking Paper and candidates taking the CPE Speaking Paper.

The results gathered from the research will be of benefit to the instructors who hold preparatory classes for the above mentioned examinations, the assessors of the Speaking Paper as well as the candidates

themselves in regards to the expectations for the examination involving their level of performance based on the specific assessment criteria. Taking into consideration the global presence and popularity of the Cambridge English exams, it is our hope that the results from the research find applicability outside of the Macedonian context.

1. Introduction

Language learning is multi-faceted: the form of a language is undoubtedly regarded as one of the essential components in any language acquisition process; nevertheless, it does not hold exclusivity. Instead, it is in a harmonious and constructive relationship with the function of the language, to communicate effectively. *Communicative competence*, a term originally coined by Dell Hymes (1966) is becoming more widely accepted as one of the essential goals of language education since it incorporates at least three main aspects of language knowledge: grammatical competence, pragmatic competence and strategic competence. One of the most notable contributions in the field of pragmatics arose from the linguistic philosopher Herbert Paul Grice, who in 1967 formally proposed the notion of *conversational implicature* (CI). The basic assumption of conversation is the *cooperative principle* (CP) which enables participants to engage in speech by means of mutual aim: in order to achieve fruitful conversation participants must cooperate and converse in a sincere, adequate, relevant and lucid manner. By doing so, they observe the co-operative principle and the four *maxims of speech* which are in a symbiotic relationship.

The idea behind the current chapter arose from the prevailing assumption that speaking, as a skill for non-native speakers of English (EFL), tends to receive less attention during instruction in comparison to studying the grammatical form of the language, for example. Consequently, this may translate into lower levels of communicative competence among EFL learners.

Such a situation is even more accentuated in times of examinations; students and candidates of English language exams have a predetermined time, precisely a limited time during which they are expected to perform the speaking task(s). To add another layer of difficultly is the fact that the examination environment in which candidates are in is perceived as stressful. This scenario is of particular relevance to private language schools, which offer preparatory examination classes, where the performance level of candidates is examined and graded.

The current research analyses the Speaking parts of the *Cambridge Certificate of Advanced English* (*CAE*) and *Cambridge Certificate of Proficiency English* (*CPE*), language examinations offered on a global level. Annually eight million Cambridge Assessment examinations are taken in over 130 countries. The exams are structured based on a concrete framework; they have a specific format and there are detailed requirements and expectations which are assumed to be met by the candidates at each level of examination. Of particular interest to the current chapter are analyses of the individual stretches of speech within the Speaking part (Task 2 for the CAE and Task 3 for the CPE), which will be examined from the prism of Grice's conversational maxims: precisely the *maxim of manner*.

The research is envisioned to provide information on the manner Cambridge CAE and CPE Speaking Paper examinations are designed and how this translates in practical terms, during mock exams in EFL contexts, in the Republic of Macedonia, although we hope that the research results may also find relevance beyond the Macedonian context.

The reason behind choosing the 'advanced' and 'proficiency' level of examination is mainly due to the fact that these two levels demonstrate the highest obtained knowledge and competencies of the language. The candidates' individual responses to these tasks where they need to follow certain instructions during the mock CAE and CPE Speaking Papers, respectively, are analysed through the use of specific tokens to test the use of cohesive devices and discourse markers.

Indeed, the original research also included analysis of the *maxim of relation*, analysis of the relevant information included in the official Cambridge Handbooks for the CAE and the CPE exams, as well as qualitative analysis of a questionnaire carried out among the tested EFL learners regarding their views of pragmatics and Grice's maxims. In the current chapter, we focus on part of the entire research, presented below. The following hypothesis (H) and a research question (RQ) are addressed in the chapter: Firstly, the assumption is made that since candidates are already at advanced stages of L2A, there will be compliance towards the *maxim of manner* (H). The research question which naturally follows from the hypothesis and the one we shall address in the current chapter can be formulated as follows: How do the candidates apply the *maxim of manner* (the nature of application, i.e. the features and linguistic devices used) (RQ)?

The research approach adopted in this study combines descriptive (qualitative) and statistical (quantitative) analyses.

The chapter is organised as follows: following the Introduction, in Section 2 we offer literature review in the realm of pragmatics, looking at key pragmatic and discourse terms and markers relevant for the topic and the analysis of the Gricean maxims of speech. In Section 3, the link is discussed between pragmatics and second language acquisition (L2A). Section 4 focuses on the aspect of language testing and Cambridge examinations where preparation for the CAE and CPE are the aim of the research. The following part, Section 5, deals with the research methodology. In Section 6, the results and analysis of the candidates' answers from the CAE and CPE Speaking Papers are presented and discussed. In the final section, the Conclusions, summary of the research is given, along with possible recommendations, limitations of the current research are pointed out and suggestions are offered for further research.

2. The cooperative principle of conversational implicature

Communicating ideas is achieved through the use of language. Stubbs (1986) claims that language is used to express beliefs and adopt positions in the process of interaction with the other. How speakers use language to communicate ideas and information is the ideational function of language.

J.L. Austin, a philosopher at Oxford University (1940s-1950s) who was interested in language, laid the groundwork for what was to become Pragmatics – an independent branch of linguistics in the 1960s and 1970s. His aim was to find out how humans manage to communicate despite the imperfections in language, how they communicate as efficiently as they do. In fact, as stated by Aitchison, Austin was "...convinced that we do not just use language to *say* things (to make statements), but to *do* things (perform actions)" (Aitchison 2003, 31). In essence, pragmatics is the branch of linguistics which studies how speakers use language to achieve their goals and how hearers interpret the meaning the speaker wishes to convey. Furthermore, pragmatics is concerned with the role of context in language and how speakers and listeners rely on it for successful communication.

A great deal of what is unsaid is recognised as part of the communicated message. To provide further explanation, this intricate yet interwoven framework is presented by Yule in four parts: "...pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning, pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning, it is the study of how more gets communicated than is said, and the study of the expression of relative distance*"* (1996, 3).

In the field of Pragmatics, co-operation and implicature play an important role. Current pragmatic treatments are influenced by the work of

Grice (1967/1989) whose inferential approach to communication is fundamental. In what follows, attention will be placed precisely on Grice's work, providing an overview of the *conversational implicature* (CI) and *cooperative principle* (CP) and more specifically on Gricean's *maxim of manner* - relevant for the current research.

In 1967, the theory of conversational implicature was formally suggested by Herbert Paul Grice, a philosopher of language, who was intrigued how the hearer progresses from the expressed meaning to the implied meaning. He classified the phenomenon by identifying three types of implicatures: *conversational, scalar* and *conventional implicature*. "Conversational implicature", is generated directly by the speaker in relation to the context. In order for implicature to be interpreted, the cooperative principle and associated maxims of speech must first be applied. Grice postulated a general cooperative principle: "...make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (1975, 26-30). As such, participants are expected to co-operate, making their utterances relevant to each other all with an aim to deliver and interpret a message efficiently. Only in this way can the participants infer what the other one really means in their conversation. The cooperative principle of conversation is elaborated in four sub-principles called maxims which assist to interpret and understand the underlying implication of an utterance. Participants are expected to cooperate in order to reach the objective of their exchange through observing four maxims: quantity, quality, relation and manner, which Grice argues governs all rational interchange.

The four sub-principles, called maxims (of speech), listed below were introduced by Grice to explain how implicatures get conveyed:

a. Maxim of quantity
- make your contributions as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange), and
- do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

This maxim is focused on providing informativeness; requires utterances to contain enough information to fulfil the speaker's communicative goal, but not more information.

b. Maxim of quality: *Try to make your contribution one that is true*
- do not say what you believe to be false, and
- do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.