



*Corresponding author:

**Asst. Prof. Faris Kadhim
AL-Attabi (PhD)**University: Wasit University
College: College of Education
for Human SciencesEmail: falattabi@uowasit.edu.iq**Keywords:**Conversational explicature,
recognition, production**ARTICLE INFO****Article history:**Received 25 Jun 2023
Accepted 29 Jun 2023
Available online 1 Jul 2023**Conversational Explicature: Its Recognition and
Production by University Students****A B S T R U C T**

Conversational explicature is considered as one of the essential ways of communication. It refers to the way in which everything is made explicit and obvious in the speech and nothing is left to the imagination. However, the purpose of this study is to determine how conversational explicature is recognised and produced by university students. The data is collected using two different forms of multiple-choice discourse completion tasks, and the results are analysed using a method of quantitative analysis. 100 male and female students from Wasit University's English department at College of Education for Humanities made up the study's sample. The test has been carried out on March 30, 2022. It has been found that university students are able to recognise and produce conversational explicature so the study's objectives are accomplished. University students exhibit a discernible aptitude for recognising and creating conversational explicature, according to the study's findings.

© 2023 LARK, College of Art, Wasit University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31185/>**الحواريات الظاهرية: إدراكها وإنتاجها من قبل طلبة الجامعات**أ.م.د. فارس كاظم طعيمة / كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية جامعة واسط
الخلاصة:

تعتبر الحواريات الظاهرية أحد الطرق الأساسية للتواصل. إنها تشير إلى الطريقة التي يتم بها توضيح كل شيء في الخطاب وعدم ترك أي شيء ضمني. ومع ذلك، فإن الغرض من هذه الدراسة هو تحديد كيفية ادراك الحواريات الظاهرية وإنتاجها من قبل طلاب الجامعة. تم جمع البيانات باستخدام نوعين مختلفين من اختبار متعدد الخيارات، وتم تحليل النتائج باستخدام طريقة التحليل الكمي. تتكون عينة الدراسة من 100 طالب وطالبة من قسم اللغة الإنجليزية في جامعة واسط وكلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية. تم إجراء الاختبار في 30 مارس 2022. من أجل تحقيق أهداف الدراسة تم الافتراض بأن طلاب الجامعة قادرين على ادراك الحواريات الظاهرية وإنتاجها. وفقاً لنتائج الدراسة، يُظهر طلاب الجامعة قابلية ملحوظة لإدراك الحواريات الظاهرية وإنتاجها.

1. Introduction

A foreign language ought to be learned for purposes of communication. Even if there are many alternative ways to communicate, including the use of signs, facial expressions, gestures, etc., speech still holds the top spot among these methods. Speaking is one of the language's useful talents that allows for the interchange of thoughts, data, emotions, information, and knowledge. (Eckard & Kearny, 1981). Speaking involves participants interacting together recognizing, processing and producing meaning and information (Burns & Joyce, 1997).

According to Cameron (2001) and H. Brown (2004), information can be directly or indirectly communicated through speech. Directly expressing the meaning involves stating the message explicitly without leaving anything to the listener's interpretation. Indirectly expressing the meaning is when the speaker does not explicitly explain everything but instead leaves some information implied for the listener to figure out. Nevertheless, in pragmatics, the first style of communication is referred to as conversational implicature whereas the second is referred to as conversational explicature.

It is said that Iraqi university students are not familiar with this form of communication. For those students, understanding conversational explicature might be challenging. Instead of emphasising communicative skills, they have been concentrating on linguistic competence. These students have been studying syntactic constructions, forms of grammar, and categories of vocabulary for a very long time with no attention to the use of language for communication. There has been very little attention given to the factors that influence the communication process, e.g. language in use, meaning and communication.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Conversational Explicature

The concept of conversational explicature was first introduced by Sperber and Wilson (1986) in relevance theory. It is based on Grice's (1975) theory and is concerned with the explicit and pragmatically enhanced meaning of an utterance.

2.1.1. Meaning of Conversational Explicature

Sperber and Wilson (1986, p.182) define this phenomenon as "a proposition communicated by an utterance is an Explicature if and only if it is a development of a logical form encoded by the utterance". This concept, however, has a central position in the Relevance

theory of Sperber and Wilson (1986) who state that what is explicitly said can be elaborated through the process of pragmatic enrichment.

(40) - *Jack will bring a bottle to the party tonight.*

- *I'm going to cough.*

Gaskell, and Marslen-Wilson (1997) argue that, depending on semantics, the proposition that can be figured out is fragmented, minimal, or incomplete even if we resolve all the indexical references and disambiguate what is said. That is why it is important to consider the pragmatic enrichment. They add an utterance can be identified by a speaker uttering a conceptual structure and a listener activating this structure in his mind by a process of linguistic decoding.

Sperber and Wilson (2004, p.11) state that “the truth-conditional meaning of an utterance, what the speaker would normally be taken to assert, may go beyond the minimal proposition obtained by decoding, disambiguation and reference assignment”. So that, when someone says (*Jack will bring a bottle of alcohol to the party tonight*) and (*I'm going to cough very soon*), are considered as an explicitly developed proposition, these are explicatures.

According to Sperber and Wilson in their relevance theory (1986), what is meant by explicatures is that they refer to the part of the interlocutor's meaning that cannot be linguistically decoded, and which can be considered as part of the explicit truth-conditional meaning. Sperber and Wilson (1995) confirm that the addressee's role in figuring out explicature is to identify their true propositional form, the one that is intended by the speaker. the explicature of an utterance, however, correspond to its literal meaning.

Sperber and Wilson (1986) identified two sources of explicature that include the linguistic expression and the context in which it is used. So that there are two ways relied on in figuring out explicatures; either by linguistic decoding or by pragmatic inference. Honestly speaking, we do not have any linguistic expression that can be said to have a full degree of explicitness, and the degree of explicitness of the linguistic expression depends on the addressee's comprehensive knowledge. Meaning that conversational explicature of an utterance varies in its degree.

2.1.2. Degrees of Conversational Explicature

Sperber and Wilson (2002) claim that conversational explicatures are not of one degree but they vary in terms of their explicitness. Therefore, the amount of inference needed in identifying an explicature is not the same all the time, this amount varies in strength from one utterance to another. To put it in Wilson and Sperber's (2002, p. 44) own words “Explicatures

may be weaker or stronger, depending on the degree of indeterminacy introduced by the inferential aspect of comprehension”.

(41) - Mike said that he is going to get a bottle to the party.

- Mike said that he is going to get a bottle of a strong drink for the party.

- Mike said that he is going to get a full bottle of a strong drink to the party.

Explicature don not have the same, but they vary in the level of their explicitness, they vary in the amount of inference required in identifying the explicature. The less amount of inference needed, the stronger the explicature will be, and the greater amount required, the weaker the explicature will be. Thereby, the third utterance has greater explicitness, thus, it requires a little pragmatic intrusion to be observed, then comes the second with lesser explicitness, and finally comes the first one which has the least explicit proposition and in which there is a greater pragmatic intrusion is needed.

2.1.4. The Pragmatics of Conversational Explicature

Pragmatics is said to have some contributes to the notion of conversational explicature. Those contributions are identified by Carston (2010) who states that pragmatic contributions, however, exceed that of the enrichment processes mentioned above. She (2010) lists three ways in which pragmatics plays an essential role in this phenomenon. These ways are discussed as follows:

1. Linguistically unstated components of content

According to Carston (2002), pragmatics helps in identifying the content of the constituent of conversational explicature that are not articulated in the utterance. This can be done by supposing that the linguistic texture of the utterance involves some more structural components than is seen or heard. The presumed components can be considered as a covert referent to the explicitly stated linguistic material.

(47) - You can find fruits in the fridge.

- You can find a lot of fruits in the fridge for you to eat.

The first example can be intuitively enriched by the second so that its explicature and proposition can be identified and explicitly communicated.

Carston (2010) argues that these constituents of content are simply provided by an act of free pragmatic enrichment. This process is entirely a pragmatic one sine it looks for some kind of interpretation that is compatible with the assumption of optimal relevance.

2. Pragmatic modification of word meaning

Carston (2010) explains that pragmatic modification, unlike the first process, it has nothing to do with the linguistic components of content, but it is all about modifying the encoded meaning of words. According to this procedure, a hearer can understand the idea as conveyed by the use of some words that have different ideas. The recently used word might have a narrower or a wider meaning than the original one.

(48) - *To buy a flat in England you need money.*

- *Johnson: Lara, let's go to a club.*

- *Lara: no, I'm so tired. Let's go to the cinema.*

Carston (2010) says that understanding the explicitly conveyed proposition of these sentences requires some efforts for modifying their meaning. Looking at the first example, we can see that it is something fiddling and adds nothing to the truth that (*if you want to buy a flat, you need money*).

Thinking of the utterance as a whole and the word money, in particular, we can guess that the speaker has meant that (*buying a flat in England requires not only money*), in the simple meaning of the word, but a large amount of money. in the same vein, Lara's reply in the second example, the meaning communicated by the word „tired“ is not the usual meaning of this word which would involve being exhausted, it has a more specific sense that Lara cannot go to the club, but she has no problem going to the cinema.

3. Reinterpreting some of Grice's conversational implicature

Carston (2010) illustrates that pragmatics contributes to the conversational explicature of what is said by modulating the linguistically encoded meaning so that the hearer can understand the propositional content as it is conveyed explicitly. Carston (2010) believes that this process has some kind of association for some of the Gricean issues of conversational implicature.

(49) - *Susan has read some of her students' papers.*

- *She hasn't read all of her students' papers.*

In each of these pair of sentences, the first represents the linguistic utterance and the second is its encoded meaning or its interpretation. Honestly speaking, neither of these sentences seems to have any kind of linguistic modification or an enrichment process that is why Grice have considered them as instances of conversational implicature.

2.2. Recognition and Production

Language is utilised for both emotional and informative reasons in interaction. And in order for this interaction to be effective and accomplish its goals, language must be understood and used properly. For numerous linguists and academics working in many domains of linguistics, such as Harley (2014), Fromkin (1971), Gaskell & Marslen-Wilson (1997, 1998, 2002), Norris (1994), Levelt (1989), and others, the procedures of language subsequent recognition and production have played a crucial role.

2.2.1. Recognition

The definition of recognition given by Crystal (2008, p. 446) is "the perception and interpretation of the sound sequences of speech." He continues by stating that speech recognition is a method used by a hearer to ascertain the initial act of interpreting connected to the process of voice comprehension.

According to Traxler and Gernsbacher (2006), every time a participant in an encounter speaks, he expects the listener to understand the message that is intended to be conveyed. Speaking is seen as a means or a method for sharing and disseminating thoughts, ideas, information, etc. by converters. Traxler and Gernsbacher (2006) assert that participants in a certain type of interaction may comprehend one another's statements just by listening to and identifying the sounds of the words said in such interaction. From this vantage point, it is possible to claim that one of the psychoacoustic subfields where speech recognition is reduced to sensory resolution and auditory categorization is speech recognition.

In spite of Harley's claim that "Speech is at the heart of language" (2014, p. 258), he acknowledges that it is not always simple for a person to recognise speech in a given circumstance. According to Harley (2014), the reasons for the difficulty in recognising speech include the fact that a speaker's utterances are only available to the addressee for a very little period of time since they are spoken fluently and continually. The addressee only gets one chance to assess and recognise the word spoken because it is only available for a brief period of time. Additionally, speakers rarely speak word by word like a robot; rather, they speak quickly and fluidly, which makes it challenging, if not impossible, to distinguish between the boundaries between words. As a result, listeners typically find it challenging to separate spoken words into their constituent sounds.

Despite the aforementioned challenges, hearers often possess a great capacity for spoken phrase recognition, according to Harley (2014). This is due to the fact that recognition is an innate action that almost always happens naturally, without any apparent effort or struggle. In addition, Harley (2014) asserts that the context plays a crucial part in speech recognition. Words are simpler to recognise when they are part of a larger context rather than when they are isolated and out of context. Here, the term "context" refers to the linguistic context, the knowledge gained from the words that come before and after the person being recognised, or the situational context, which contains all of the general knowledge and experience from the perceiver's social life.

2.2.2. Production

Due to the fact that producing speech is a challenging and complex process, Harley (2014) believes that production is significantly less studied than the recognition process. Because it begins with our ideas, and because controlling those thoughts via experimenting is not simple, it is challenging. Production is described by Crystal (2008, p. 447) as an "expression for the process of the respiration, phonatory, and articulatory mechanisms throughout the process of speaking, together with the accompanying brain coding needed to facilitate their coordination and use."

According to Bussmann (2006, p. 651), the term "production" refers to the procedures used to create language, most often in relation to the creation of spoken language. Four phases are involved in the activities that are discussed in this definition. The first step is preparing the utterance, during which the speaker must choose the words he will use. Second, the speaker pulls the term from his mental lexicon in which he recalls the words he is going to pronounce. Incorporating the words into sentences comes third. Fourth, regulating the creation and pronouncing those phrases. It is also stated by Bussmann (2006, p. 651) that "evidence for this procedure is found in hesitation issues, breaks, speaking faults, anacoluthon, and self-repair."

Levelt (1989) argues that the process of producing speech requires three steps: conception, composition, and pronunciation. The process of conceptualization requires an individual to decide what to say and organise the idea and message he wishes to convey. While composition is the manner in which a person converts his or his ideas and thoughts into lexical forms, throughout this process the speaker looks for the appropriate words that will assist in formulating his or her message in his or her mental lexicon. The final stage of speech creation, articulation, is when the message is unveiled and explicitly articulated.

Harley (2014) states that speakers often think about a certain goal or aim before selecting the relevant material from their mental lexicon during the conceptualization stage of speech production. Preverbal communication is the result of this process. In order to conceptualise, there must be some form of connection between the speaker's internal vocabulary and the outer world. The speaker must ensure that his message will be recognised or comprehended by his audience when he conceptualises his message.

Throughout the conceptualization process, Levelt (1989) distinguishes between macroplanning and microplanning. Macroplanning is the process of selecting a certain message and pulling the pertinent details from memory. On the other hand, microplanning refers to the process of giving the detected information the correct propositional form and figuring out why the word is being used.

Levelt (1989) says that the process of formulation, which is the second stage of speech creation, has two basic parts: lexicalization and syntactic structuring. Syntactic structuring is the process of building sentences by placing the selected words together in a certain word sequence. Lexicalization is the act of selecting the appropriate words that may be utilised to represent the message in the speaker's thoughts.

The articulation process, in which what is in the speaker's thoughts is transformed into sounds produced in the proper shape and condition, pronounced in the appropriate velocity, and with the right prosody, is the final phase of speech production outlined by Levelt (1989). The speaker must make sounds while speaking in the proper order and recognise how his muscles work throughout the speaking process.

3. Methodology

3.1. Population and Sample of the Study

The study's population consisted of English-department students from Iraqi universities during the academic year 2021–2022.

The sample of the present study includes 100 male and female college students from the English department College of Education for Humanities at Wait University during the academic year (2021–2022). Teachers and repeaters are not included in the research in order to eliminate bias from prior experience.

3.2. Instrument

The current study uses a quantitative approach to examine how well university students recognise and produce conversational explicature.

Two different forms of multiple-choice discourse completion tasks are employed to accomplish the study's objectives. The first is a tool that tests students' understanding of conversational explicature, called the conversational explicature recognition instrument.

Jianda (2006, p. 4) says that this form of test is “test items where the test taker is required to choose the correct response from the several given options”. (See table 1)

Table 1: Sample of Conversational Explicature Recognition Instrument.

2. Conversational Explicature Recognition.

Carla: What shall I do? I can't get into this dress anymore and I haven't any other suitable one for the interview.

Marina: Why not borrow one of mine ?

- a. Marina offers Carla one of her dresses.
- b. Marina doesn't want Carla to dress one of her dresses.
- c. Marina wants one of Carla's dresses.
- d. Marina wants Carla to buy a new dress for the interview.

The second is a tool that examines how students produce conversational explicature, called the conversational explicature production instrument. This particular exam, according to Jianda (2006, p. 4), may be described as “a written questionnaire including some of brief situational descriptions, followed by a short dialogue with an empty slot for the speech act under study”. (See table 2)

Table 2: Sample of Conversational Explicature Production Instrument.

2. Conversational Explicature Production

You and your younger brother study in the same high school but in different classes. You are careless, never do your homework and always fail your exams. Your teacher usually scolds you saying that your brother is better than you, he always does his homework, he reads well, and has never failed a single exam. Your teacher wants you to be like your brother.

Your teacher : Your brother used to be such a studious student and yet you are so lazy. Why can't you try to be like him?

You-----

4. Data Analysis

4.1. Percentage and Frequency of Iraqi University Students' Answers to Question one

The first question in the test is intended to measure Iraqi university students' recognition of conversational explicature. The frequency and percentage of the students' responses to the test items are stated on the following table. (See table 4-1)

Table 4-1: Percentage and Frequency of the Students' Responses to Question one.

No. of item	No. of correct responses	Percentage	No. of incorrect responses	Percentage
1	63	63	37	37
2	65	65	35	35
3	61	61	39	39
4	66	66	34	34
5	73	73	27	27
6	69	69	31	31
7	60	60	40	40
8	62	62	38	38
9	67	67	33	33
10	64	64	36	36
11	59	59	41	41
12	61	61	39	39
13	68	68	32	32
14	71	71	29	29
15	70	70	30	30
Total	979	65.27	521	34.73

The results presented in the table (4-1) show that the total number and percentage of the correct responses are (979, 65.27), respectively while the total number and percentage of the incorrect responses (including unanswered items) are (521, 34.73), sequentially. From these results that are shown on the table above it can be seen that the percentage of the correct answers

exceed that of the incorrect ones which means that Iraqi university students are able to recognize conversational explicature .

Results Related to the first Aim

The first aim of the study is to find out Iraqi university students' recognition of conversational explicature. The results obtained are statistically analyzed and calculated in order to find out the frequency and percentage of the Iraqi university students' recognition of conversational explicature.

From the results presented on the table above, it can be noticed that Iraqi university students have the ability of a high extent in recognizing conversational explicature. Students' capability is ascribed to many reasons; first, students' interpretation of what they hear depends, to a great extent, on the literal meaning of what is said. They understand the utterances by taking into consideration the dictionary meaning of the utterance and its syntactic structure.

Second, when working on the meaning of what is said and depending on the context in which it is said, students can easily recognize that the speaker does not imply anything and the meaning of his words is obvious. Third, working on the literal meaning of an utterance, even if not always, does not require a non-linguistic knowledge, cultural aspects, and contextual information. In fact and as stated by Searle (1978, 1980) the literal meaning of an utterance is not always determined by its grammatical structure and its component words and it cannot be generalized that the literal meaning is context-independent or zero context. The point of view that takes the literal meaning away from context cannot be generalized and this is ascribed to the fact that the explicature of an utterance is not always of the same degree. As stated in chapter two, the explicature of an utterance vary from the higher degree of explicitness in which the role of context is of less importance to the lower degree of explicitness where context plays a vital role. Still, there are some linguists who insist on the belief that the literal meaning of what is said is context-free or null-context .eg. Katz (1977, 1981) who asserts that the explicit meaning of an utterance is determined by its syntactic structure and its component parts.

Forth, students' recognition of the explicit meaning of what is said can be attributed to the fact that they have been depending on such a way of understanding of the target language along the time of their study at the English department. They, to a high extent, depend on their knowledge of lists of vocabulary, word order, semantic meaning, syntactic function, and morphological forms of the component words of the utterance at hand.

4.2. Percentage and Frequency of Iraqi University Students' Answers to Question two:

The second question in the test is devoted to measuring Iraqi university students' production of conversational explicature. The frequency and percentage of the subjects' answers to the items of the test are stated on the following table. (See table 4-2)

Table 4-2: Percentage and Frequency of the students' Responses to Question two.

No. of item	<i>No. of Correct response</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	No. of Incorrect responses	Percentage
1	81	81	19	19
2	79	79	21	21
3	80	80	20	20
4	84	84	16	16
5	81	81	19	19
6	78	78	22	22
7	77	77	23	23
8	82	82	18	18
9	75	75	25	25
10	73	73	27	27
11	71	71	29	29
12	76	76	24	24
13	72	72	28	28
14	85	85	15	15
15	89	89	11	11
Total	1183	78.87	317	21.13

The results identified on table (4-2) tell us that the total number and percentage of the correct answers are (1183, 78.87), correspondingly whilst the total number and percentage of the incorrect answers (including unanswered items) are (317, 21.13), respectively. These results presented on the table above show that the percentage of the correct answers go beyond that of the incorrect ones making it sure that Iraqi university students have the ability to produce conversational explicature.

Results Related to the Second Aim

The second aim of this study is to find out Iraqi university students' production of conversational explicature. To achieve this aim, the selected sample of the study is tested by adopting a certain form of (DCT). The results obtained are calculated and analyzed statistically for the purpose of finding out the percentage and frequency of Iraqi university students' production of conversational explicature.

It can be seen, from the results presented on the table above, that Iraqi university students have a high ability to produce conversational explicature. Students' ability can be attributed to some obvious reasons; first, when using the target language, Iraqi university students can easily recall their linguistic knowledge in order to construct well-formed utterances containing an explicitly stated meaning. They do so by thinking of the proper syntactic structure and the appropriate vocabulary, then arranging the words according to their grammatical relationship.

Second, students have a high fluency in using explicit communication as they always use it inside their classroom interaction and in presenting their programs of study. Braine (1999) states that non-native English students, as they are taught by non-native instructors, are not flexible language users who are communicatively incompetent using the target language only in their classroom context interacting with non-native speakers. Because of this reason, students are found to depend on their linguistic knowledge with no cultural or non-linguistic knowledge and they sometimes use a too formal, an out-dated, or an inappropriate version of English (Medgyes, 2001).

Third, students' production of conversational explicature is influenced by their instructors' way of teaching. University instructors usually teach their students the target language explicitly and this encourages their students to depend on conversational explicature, as noticed from the results presented above. Braine (2010) asserts that students might take their instructor as an example in their use of language, they follow their style, use some of their words, and even the same pronunciation. Here appears the role of instructors and their influence on how language is used by their students.

Forth, students' use of conversational explicature can be ascribed to the fact that such kind of language use is superficial and easy to the extent that it doesn't require any effort, the students don't need to think of any additional meaning when communicating. All that is required from the students when producing conversational explicature is that they have to recall their semantic and syntactic knowledge and information in order to formulate their intended message.

5. Discussion and conclusion

The study has hypothesised that "University students have the ability to recognise and produce conversational explicature." It is clear from the results shown in Tables (4-1 and 4-2) that Iraqi university students are demonstrated to be able to recognise and produce conversational explicature. These results are based on the students' responses to the first and second questions, used to test the students' recognition and production of explicature.

Students' ability in recognizing and producing conversational explicature can be attributed to some reasons; first, students' experience and linguistic knowledge that have a vital role and an obvious impact on recognizing the conversational explicature of an utterance. Students are found aware of the syntactic structure and semantic meaning of the utterances of the target language and this awareness helps them to understand these utterances and produce similar ones. They are found enthusiastic and self-confident to produce well-formed utterances by choosing the appropriate vocabulary, using it in the correct syntactic structure, and with a proper arrangement of ideas. They do so depending, to some extent, on their working memory by recalling the needed information from what they have already studied. Their ability to recall such information is the reason behind their enthusiasm and self-confidence to recognize and produce conversational explicature.

Second, students are found to depend on some processes that help in recognizing and producing conversational explicature. We have seen that conversational explicature is not of one level, but there are different degrees of explicature. So that understanding these different levels of conversational explicature requires using processes that depend on using additional information that, in combination with linguistic knowledge, help in recognizing and producing conversational explicature. These processes are; bridging, disambiguation, reference assignment, and ellipsis (Sperber & Wilson, 1995).

Iraqi university students have been found utilizing linguistic, perceptual, and cognitive abilities to recognize and produce conversational explicature. This enhances their ability in communicating using the target language, therefore, this conclusion proves the hypothesis of the study.

References

- Braine, G. (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Association.
- Braine, G. (2010). *Non-native speaker English teacher. research, pedagogy, and professional growth*. Routledge: Madison Avenue, New York.
- Brown, H. (2004). *Language assessment principles and classroom practices*. London: Pearson Edition Print.
- Burns, A and Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on speaking*. Sydney: National centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Bussmann, H. (Ed.). (2006). *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*, (G. Trauth and K. Kazzazi, *Trans*). London & New York: Routledge.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. Cambridge Language Teaching Library. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Carston, R. (2002). *Thoughts and utterances: the pragmatics of explicit communication*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Carston, R. (2010). *Explicit communication and free pragmatic enrichment*. In: B. Soria and E. Romero (Eds.), *Explicit communication: Robyn Carston's pragmatics* (pp. 217- 287). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. Oxford: Wiley. Blackwell Publication.
- Fromkin, V. (1971). *Non-anomalous nature of anomalous utterances*. *Language* 1971, 47, 27-52.

- Gaskell, M. and Marslen-Wilson, W. (1997). *Integrating form and meaning: a Distributed model of speech perception*. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 1997, 12, 613-656.
- Gaskell, M. and Marslen-Wilson, W. (1998). *Mechanisms of phonological inference in speech perception*. *Journal of experimental psychology: Human Perception Performance* 1998, 24, 380-396.
- Grice, p. (1975). *Logic and conversation. Syntax and semantics*. New York: Academic.
- Harley, A. (2014). *The psychology of language: from data to theory*. London. Taylor and Francis. Psychology Press. Press.
- Jianda, L. (2006). *Assessing EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic knowledge: Implication for testers and teachers*. *Reflections on English Language Teaching* 2006, 5, 1-22.
- Katz, J. (1977). *Propositional structure and illocutionary force: a study of the Contribution of sentence meaning to speech act*. Hassocks, Sussex: Harvester Press.
- Levelt, W. (1989). *Speaking. From intention to articulation*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
- Marslen-Wilson, W. and Gaskell, M. (2002). *Leading up the lexical garden-path: Segmentation and ambiguity in spoken word recognition*. *Journal of experimental psychology: Human Perception Performance* 2002, 28, 218–244.

- Medgyes, P. (2001). *When the teacher is a non-native speaker*. in M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 429–442). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Norris, D. (1994). *Shortlist: a connectionist model of continuous speech recognition*. *Cognition* 1994, 52, 189-234.
- Searle, J. (1978). *Literal meaning*. *Erkenntnis* 1978, 13, 207-224.
- Searle, J. (1980). *The background of meaning*. in Searle, J. Kiefer, F. and M. Bierwisch, (Eds.). *Speech act theory and pragmatics* (p. 233-246). Dordrecht, Holland: Reidel Publishing Company.
- Sperber, D., and Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance communication and cognition*. Oxford. Blackwell.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (2002). *Pragmatics, modularity and mind-reading*. *Mind and Language* 2002, (1/2), 3–23.
- Sperber, D and Wilson, D. (2004). *Relevance theory*. In Horn and Ward (Ed.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 607-632). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Traxler, M. and Gernsbacher, M. (2006). *Handbook of psycholinguistics* Burlington, MA: Academic Press.