

Analyzing Pakistani Tertiary Classrooms Under Grice Principles - Getting the Meaning Across!

Nazra Zahid Shaikh*

Najeeb-us-Saqlain**

ABSTRACT

Pragmatics and discourse analysis are not completely new in the field of linguistics, but still their general understandings are not standardized. Normally, in our classrooms teachers' and students' interactions don't turn out positively; other than motivation and feedback reasons can be seen in the conversational structures too. Application and understanding of the Grice's Cooperative Principle in such situations is difficult and complicated to construe. Interpretation of 'cooperative' sometime varies from Grice's original concept by causing slip-ups and specifically, violations. A close study has been attempted to highlight the outlying nature of generally occurring 'cooperation' from Grice's writings. Clear distinctions were observed between sentence meaning and speaker meaning, the idea of "systematicity" in language, and the centrality of rationality to human action. This paper has been concerned with the way in which Grice's Cooperative Principles are represented in Pakistani English Language Tertiary Classrooms, and the interpretations to which they can lead. Research has been kept qualitative by opting questionnaire, observation & interviews as tools for the study on tertiary level classrooms to observe the 'conversational cooperation' in the overall learning experience.

INTRODUCTION

Language learning is subordinate to discourse understanding, implication and analysis, which varies head to head. Utterance and their meanings are poles apart, which can positively or negatively affect conversation's gist. These utterances can be analyzed on micro and macro levels. Microanalysis is the word analysis that can be strong or weak whereas macro analysis is the speech act analysis¹.

Discourse occurring in the classrooms is of high importance as it can guide or confuse students with regard to their subject matter. Every teacher comes in the class, delivers the planned lecture and leaves but the interactions, turns and responses somehow create too many questions to answer. i.e. Have students learnt something? Was teacher clear to learners? Has the topic been comprehended as per expectation?

Conversation/communication is an art that specifically needs to be taught as the impulsive but inappropriate acts can falsify the whole conversational process. Mostly, people listen to, reply only and not to respond the actual gist because they don't try to comprehend things in first go, for example:

T: Have you ever seen your fathers going on any foreign office trip?

S: How can I tell about all fathers?

* MS Scholar, NED University, Karachi Email:

** Dr., Associate Professor, NED University, Karachi

Email: _____

Date of Receipt: _____

T: No! Each one of you will share about your father only.

S: Oh! Okay.

Speaking for a long duration can't guarantee a fruitful ending and similarly speaking less can't be said as the cause of failure. For the last 10 years discourse is gaining the attraction of linguists as it is a complete area in itself but still it is not easy to generalize in every situation. Discourse analysis has created some confusion too; which hold queries like... what is discourse? How it is analyzed? Is body language discourse too? The basic complexity in the discourse analysis is where to start and where to end.

After analyzing utterances, discourse theories answer these confusions through two perspectives; firstly, what is said and what is implicated? Secondly, what is the part of conventional force (meaning) and what is not? This division provides three scales to evaluate any discourse i.e. what is said? What is conventionally implicated? And what is non-conventionally implicated?²

Pragmatics in classroom discourse tends to observe that why and how communication is not attaining success i.e. it analyses the mismatch between speaker and hearer understanding with the possible reasons of occurrences. (Beartz, 2008)

Classroom Discourse

Classrooms are the podiums for educational talks where discourse revolves around Sinclair & Coulthard's Initiation, Response and Follow-up. In classroom, teacher is the initiator, controller, diagnoser, manager and evaluator by holding maximum rights³. Speaking rights mainly are practiced by teacher only i.e. for descriptions and explanations, but good teachers find comfortable in sharing them with students to see their understanding through discussions.

Like normal conversations classroom discourse is also comprised of turns and shifts. Sinclair's model is fully applicable to elaborate such turns i.e. teacher is the main controller so s/he decides the next speaker by calling names from the class. In discussion sessions, forum stays open for students to exchange their views but provides teachers an option to intervene anytime i.e. to keep discussion on track.

Classroom discourse doesn't provide opportunities for educational talks but these are places for social interactions too; which pave ways for cognitive development. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of human learning describes learning as interdependent on social interaction and human intelligence. Vygotsky alleged learning on two interconnected levels:

Every function in the child's cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first, between people (inter-psychological) and then inside the child (intra-psychological). This applies equally to voluntary attention, to logical memory, and to the

formation of concepts. All the higher functions originate as actual relationships between individuals⁴.

Furthermore, Vygotsky argued that every learner's cognitive development is limited to a "zone of proximal development" (ZPD). Here "zone" is the gifted half cognitively developed potential in learner's brain, which gets complete through social interaction. (Briner, 1999). After home, the first place for ZPD is the classrooms where teachers and peers support each learner in the development of complex skills through collaborative learning, scaffolding, discourse analysis and modeling.

The Cooperative Principle

The whole process of conversation depends on the underlying assumption i.e. cooperation with each other in order to make the process successful. Success /failure of conversation completely relies on the active cooperation of participants.

According to Grice:

“Make your conversational contribution what is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.”

The success of communication is strictly conditioned to the cooperation between the participants. Here 'cooperation' means everything in the process i.e. understanding the context, speaking on turns only, give direct answers to the inquiries, etc.

Conversational Maxims

Although 'cooperation' is important in every conversation but on the other hand it is difficult to measure too i.e. what is included in the cooperation and what is not?

Grice has provided a detailed description of 'The Cooperative Principle' in terms of 'Conversational Maxims', which says:

1. Maxim of Quality

This maxim deals with the concreteness of thoughts. It argues that ideas should be shared if speaker is sure about them only. Confused statements, unsure and incomplete ideas can mislead listener.

In classrooms 'quality' is expected as the central part of the discourse as it provides clarity from the teacher is to clear the concept and from students to share their understanding. For instance,

T: What is a manuscript?

S: A report of more than 20 pages is a manuscript.

Quality can be observed here in the strength of the answer, as it is complete to satisfy the question. It is providing the complete basic knowledge.

2. Maxim of Quantity

Here 'quantity' is setting the limits to speak as per the requirement i.e. not much, not less. People who like to speak a lot lack in this maxim commonly but on the other side speaking less is not the guarantee of every appropriate thing. This maxim argues that utterances should target listener's satisfaction.

Quantity of every selected topic matters a lot both for teacher and student. Students can absorb a limited set of knowledge and teacher is expected to plan accordingly. Giving extra knowledge is good but requirement matters a lot. Quantity can be overlooked to see related ideas on teacher's part.

S: How was the class? What did the teacher teach?

S: Good, a new topic.

In this example quantity is missing here as complete question is not answered, just a hint is given. Such replies create numerous queries like which topic? Is the new topic completed? Has teacher provided notes? Was any quiz taken?

3. Maxim of Relation

In conversations relevance is the direct assembly of question and answer. Indirect replies have more than one meaning in general which can confuse the listener that which meaning should be taken and which not.

Relation can be seen in classroom in teachers' talk and students' responses. All good teachers try to link new knowledge with students' previous knowledge and supply latest examples to enable students' to relate their current lives. The same thing is expected in response from the students i.e. to provide crystal clear answers to teachers' questions.

T: How about a seaside picnic this Saturday?

S: I am going on shopping right now.

Relevancy is missing in this example, as there is no direct relation present between question and answer. The reply can be interpreted, as the student is not interested in the picnic or not discussing at present.

4. Maxim of Manner

According to Grice 'Manner' deals with 'How things are said?' not 'What is said?' This means speakers should be perspicuous i.e. ambiguous speech should be avoided and ideas should be highly organized

By relating it to the classrooms 'manner' is how teacher has planned lesson. If the lesson is not orderly than it can't teach anything to learners except making learning complex to them.

T: What about the Pakistan vs Ireland match?

S: Pakistan won, with 7 wickets, Sarfaraz Ahmed Man of the Match.

Here the reply is orderly to fulfill the query; all necessary details are provided in a smooth systematic manner.

Maxims' Implicatures

According to Grice, implicatures are the ways conversational maxims are interpreted in real settings i.e. it distinguishes the same/opposite nature of meanings and words.

S: May I carry your bag?

T: Thanks! Just come by yourself, that's enough.

Violating and flouting are two terms used to understand the implicature of maxims. Violating is said as a simple miss-out of any maxim whereas flouting is observed when a locutionary act has some serious per locutions in it.

For instance, 'flouting' can be easily observed in the above stated example i.e. here the reply is having some other meaning opposite to the uttered words. This seems teacher is angry on anything and has refused to take help.

S: I am ready to speak.

T: Your turn is over.

S: But I wasn't ready at that time.

T: I instructed you all that it's 'now or never'

S: [Stands and leaves the room in anger]

Here, the Student carries out violation. Teacher's instructions were clear-cut i.e. having maxims essence, whereas student's reply lacks in relation.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study is based on a Case-Study Method by using non-participant observations, questionnaires and interviews. 40 B.E students were observed for two weeks i.e. six sessions in controlled surroundings. Data was collected and then transcribed for analysis perspective.

Observations

Direct and non-participatory observations were made to conduct this study. Altogether 1280 utterances were recorded out of which 380 were observed as violations and 220 were as floutings. Teachers' discourse was observed having more floutings whereas students' discourse was filled with violations, which were the reasons of both misunderstandings and lack of knowledge.

Questionnaire

Teachers' views have been collected regarding the classroom discourse by questionnaires. Questionnaires were the amalgamation of both open-ended and close-ended questions seeking the views of English Language Teachers regarding their classroom discourse. 03 undergraduate teachers were asked to fill the designed questionnaires and their viewpoints proposed that they know the importance of classroom discourse but due to time constraints they were unable to give required attention to this matter. Some answers suggested that they agreed with the basic nature of cooperative principle that they overall outline classroom discourse but added that conversational maxims ignore minor conversational details and the direct/indirect background of the utterances.

Interviews

To know the administration's point of view structured interviews were taken from Head of Departments of 04 disciplines. Their viewpoints highlighted the casual approach of engineering administration towards the discourse. They didn't disagree with the importance of healthy and meaningful discourse but found little interested in giving their opinion about this as this is of less importance in comparison to core engineering subjects.

DISCUSSION

Current study was conducted to understand the basic conversational structures of Pakistani tertiary level classrooms. Majorly, Gricean maxims are criticized for the fact that they are not applicable on all cultures and this study was an argument on that. It is observed that certainly, Gricean Maxims are vague to cover all class happenings but this is not wrong to comment that they outline classroom conversational structures.

First raised research question was about the necessary components of Teachers' talk which can be answered in maxims i.e. quality, quantity, manner and relation. Teachers' talk is purposeful across the globe and if it lacks in any maxim then it will create confusions instead of clearing them. Generally, necessary components of a teacher's talk are the subject, topic and explanations that are outlined by the language, style and delivery. During the study it was observed that subject, topic and explanations were there in teachers' talk but the only arguable thing was their style. Teachers' were seen too fast and direct in their explanations that they didn't bother students' understandings.

Consider the following example from observed sessions:

T: Sponsorship letters are written to get financial support mainly. Formats are similar to other formal letters. Language is highly formal and they are expected to answer every possible query by providing full details. Understood?

S: Yes!

T: Now we are going to discuss about another important business issue i.e. decision making. Ready?

S: Yes!

Here teacher is flying high above without letting students a sigh of relief i.e. to understand the topic. No question was asked to counter students' understandings. This talk is having all necessary components but implicature is doubtful. Teacher asked nothing to satisfy her/himself about students' cognition.

Second research question was about the possible reasons of students' inappropriate responses, which can be answered by lack of knowledge and carelessness both. In our mix level classrooms majority is of average cognitive level that are average in every aspect of the sense. During observations students were seen less interested in the topic as Teacher's style and content both were failed to appeal them, a few times they were unable to comprehend the lesson due to their low cognitive level and a number of times they were found distracted from the lesson.

For instance:

T: What are the various types of resumes?

S: Formal, Informal, Verbal, and Electronic.

Here the student's reply is completely wrong which is seemed the result of his forgetfulness or unsure facts. He didn't understand the gist of the question and abruptly produced wrong answer.

Third raised question was about the role of administration in classroom discourse which was observed nowhere throughout the observations. Any authority did not visit classrooms at all but during interviews HoDs (Head of Department) told that they interact concerned teachers more often about their progress and difficulties and try to give useful suggestions. One HoD said that I truly agree with the strong communicative abilities and we conduct co-curricular and extracurricular activities to boost our students' productive skills and provide them chances to experience their future business communication.

Fourth raised question was about the impact of poor Teacher/Student conversation on overall classroom discourse and this can be answered negatively. Poor discourse was observed doing nothing except passing the time. Sometimes teachers were lacking in clearing the course content and sometimes students were observed demotivated which produced no learning at all. Healthy teacher-student discourse causes learning for students and satisfaction for teachers. In the questionnaires, teachers responded that they tried to teach them basics only, to give them the fundamental notions; rest would vary with their workplace and their observations. While students responded that they were learning so many things only first and the last time that they didn't understand the content and tried to clear such queries by visiting the teachers in their free time.

CONCLUSION

To conclude the study, it can be said that the Gricean Principles are certainly applicable in Pakistan's Tertiary level classroom situations. Although they are

observed vague in covering all discourse aspects but observed as guideline for the beginners. Every teacher's task is not only to plan the lesson but also to keep a sharp eye on the ways students are interpreting ideas. Flouting was majorly done on the teachers' part followed by their experience of playing with words and the students were observed lacking in fulfilling conversational needs under their incomplete knowledge and immature age.

Interpretations impact the processes, even silence.

REFERENCES

1. Grice, P. (1989, 1991). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
2. Ibid
3. Mathews. A., Spratt. M. & Dangerfield. L. (1985). *At the Chalkface: Practical Techniques in language teaching*. Edinburgh: Nelson
4. Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. United States of America. Harvard College, p. 57

Bibliography

- Brooks, P., Kempe, V. (2012). *Language development*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
- Brown, G and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Functional Perspective*. New York.
- Connolly. H. J. (1996). *Discourse and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar*, Walter de Gruyter.
- Coulthard .M. (1985). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, Longman.
- Clark. H.H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge University Press
- Cutting. J. (1996). *Pragmatics and Discourse: London and New York*.
- Diepenbroek, L. (2010). *Pragmatics in the ESL classroom*. Edmonton: University of Alberta, Department of Educational Psychology.
- D. Sperber and D. Wilson. (1986). *Relevance: communication and cognition*, Harvard University Press.
- F. Kiefer (1979). What do conversational maxims explain? *Linguistic Investigations*, 3, pp. 57-74.
- Fairclough, Norman L. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Grice, P. (1989, 1991). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In: P. Cole and J.L. Morgan, eds., *Syntax and semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech acts*, 41-59. New York: Academic Press.
- Grice, H.P. (1981). *Presupposition and conversational implicature*. In: P. Cole, ed., *Radical pragmatics*, 183-198. New York: Academic Press.
- Ifantidou, E. (2001). *Evidentials and relevance*. Amsterdam [u.a.]: Benjamins.
- Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Mathews. A., Spratt. M. & Dangerfield. L. (1985). *At the Chalkface: Practical Techniques in language teaching*. Edinburgh: Nelson.
- Powers, P. (2001). *The methodology of discourse analysis*. Boston: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Ross, S., Kasper, G. (2013). *Assessing second language pragmatics*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rieber . W. R & Wollok. (1997) *The Collected Works of L. S. Vygotsky: Problems of the Theory and History of Psychology*. Volume 3. Planum Press, New York.
- Sinclair, J. M. & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, J., (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Walsh. S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*: Routledge
- Walker. A. M, Joshi. K. A, & Prince. F. E, (1998) *Centering Theory in Discourse*, Oxford University Press