

*The Role of Informant-Context Knowledge in Interpreting Hybrid Texts:
A Pragmatic Study*

Venkanna Ithagani, The English and Foreign Languages University, India

The European Conference on Language Learning 2015
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

Interpretation of any text depends on the interpreter's context knowledge, cultural background, memory skills and language skills. Interpretation is one of the most complicated human cognitive activities. The interpreter's knowledge of the subject (or lack of it) can affect the whole interpretation process, i.e., the process, the transferring process and the reproduction process. The influence is reflected not only in the quality, quantity, relevance and manner (Grice's Maxims) of the interpretations, but also in the interpreting strategies employed. My hypothesis is that with a higher level of informants' socio-cultural, context and area knowledge, interpreters will have more detailed and deeper understanding of the sentences or conversation; therefore, producing higher quality relevant or expected interpretations. In addition, equipped with more socio-cultural knowledge, interpreters may be able to use higher level of interpreting strategies at the discourse level and lexical level. This paper reports the results of a pilot study that was conducted as part of my PhD research with the aim of exploring the influence of socio-cultural background on interpreters' successive interpreting of hybrid texts. Fifteen post graduate students and research scholars from different states and country at The English and Foreign Languages University in India participated in the experiment. These participants were given a questionnaire based on hybrid texts where they had to interpret the content. These participants were all comparable in regards to their previous knowledge on the conversation and interpreting experience. Results indicate that with more socio-cultural background knowledge, participants' performance was better in specialized interpretation.

Key words: Grice's maxims, context knowledge, cultural background, hybrid texts.

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Interpretation of any text depends on the interpreter's context knowledge, cultural background, memory skills and language skills. Interpretation is one of the most complicated human cognitive activities. The interpreter's knowledge of the subject (or lack of it) can affect the whole interpretation process, i.e., the process, the transferring process and the reproduction process. The influence is reflected not only in the quality, quantity, relevance and manner of the interpretations, but also in the interpreting strategies employed. This has been one general belief in pragmatics especially Relevance Theory. Hence, the general belief has been that context knowledge and socio-cultural background are crucial in the interpretation of texts. In this paper we show that even though utterances are couched in particular cultures, there are nevertheless certain universal aspects which are common to all cultures. It is these aspects that enable speakers to interpret hybrid texts.

All linguistic forms must be associated with the interactive, physical, cultural and social environment in which they are produced to be interpreted correctly. Linguistic behavior is grounded in a particular context, which surrounds informs, underlies and shapes a linguistic event. A conversation will have a physical context (where the conversation takes place), a social context (the social relationships of the participants), a cultural context (shared knowledge about the culture in which the informants are living.) and an encyclopedic knowledge content (specific assumptions shared by speakers and informants). An utterance within a conversation will also have a discourse context or what was said before the utterance which informs the hearer about how to respond to an utterance.

Grice (1968?) views communication as a cooperative attempt between the speaker and the hearer. In order to be cooperative, participants in a discourse must abide by the following four maxims:

- **Maxim of Quantity:** Informants must be informative, that is providing just an adequate amount of information, neither too long nor too little.
- **Maxim of Quality:** Informants must only assert truthful and well-supported information.
- **Maxim of Relevance:** Informants must be relevant.
- **Maxim of Manner:** Informants must be brief, non ambiguous and orderly.

For example, let us examine the following conversation between Tony and Anagha:

1. Tony: Its dark, how will we search for the books?

Anagha: Mobile.

Anagha's response is just informatively adequate: it is relevant and short, and we believe she's truthful. It thus obeys all the Gricean maxims. But we must still draw a trivial inference that there is the advantage of modern technology so that the light from the mobile would enable the informants to see what they are searching for. In other words, in

order to see Anagha's response as bearing relevance, we need to add to know the implicit assumption. Let us consider another example.

2. Sonia: My mother likes dramas.

Seema: I'm not my mother.

In this example, it seems as though Seema isn't actually answering the question. She certainly doesn't actually say whether or not she likes dramas. The implicature of her response, though, is that she does not like dramas. She has conveyed a meaning, deliberately, without explicitly saying it.

The problem is that a context contains an immense number of assumptions. How can we make sure that just the relevant bit of information is adopted? Pragmatic theories explain how we master our illative powers in order to make efficient use of context in the communication and how we are able to infer the intended meaning of a linguistic expression, even when that meaning is not made fully explicit. Pragmatics is an ability to draw contextually imaginable illations, which balances linguistic meanings and expressions.

Relevance Theory

Relevance theory was coined by Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson (1995) which seeks to explain the second method of communication; namely, the one that takes into account implicit inferences. It is a psychological model for understanding the cognitive interpretation of languages. It is "an inferential approach to pragmatics". It argues that any hearer/reader/audience will search for meaning in any given communication situation and will find meaning that suits their expectation of relevance.

Main ideas of Relevance Theory

The First Cognitive Principle of Relevance

Human cognition tends to be geared to the maximization of relevance (Sperber & Wilson 1995:260)

The Second Communicative Principle of Relevance

Every act of ostensive communication communicates a presumption of its own optimal relevance (Sperber & Wilson 1995:260).

Presumption of optimal relevance

- a. The ostensive stimulus is relevant enough for it to be worth the addressee's effort to process it.

- b. The ostensive stimulus is the most relevant one compatible with the communicator's abilities and preferences (Sperber & Wilson 1995:270).

Relevance to an individual (classical category)

An assumption is relevant to an individual at a given time if and only if it is relevant in one or more of the contexts accessible to that individual at that time (Sperber & Wilson 1995:144).

Relevance to an individual (comparative)

- a. Extent condition 1: an assumption is relevant to an individual to the extent that the contextual effect achieved when it is optimally is large.
- b. Extent condition 2: an assumption is relevant to an individual to the extent that the effort required to process it optimally is small (Sperber & Wilson 1995:145).

Information, then, 'is relevant to somebody if it interacts in a certain way with his existing assumptions about the world.

Hybrid texts

People must be able to do much more than decode and encode; they must use and interpret multiple languages in response to particular communicative and performative demands across a range of contexts. Hybrid texts, i.e. texts written by authors of a particular cultural and linguistic background in the language of a different culture, often pose problems of comprehension (i.e. 'comprehension of a text of one variety of English within the context or situation of another variety; Kachru, 1995:275), and hence interpretation (i.e. 'contextualization of the text within the variables which are appropriate for it within the context of its source language') for readers who do not share the author's cultural and linguistic background. Such texts have more than one interpretive context: 1) the surface meaning of the second language (in our case English); and 2) the underlying meaning of the first (or dominant) language of the author (Kachru 1986:166). The interpretation, then is bound to be influenced by this underlying meaning, which Zabus (1991:155) refers to as 'the source language in filigree'. A hybrid text is defined as: "a text that results from a translation process. It shows characteristics that somehow look 'out of place'/'strange'/'unusual' for the encountering culture, i.e. the intended culture".

Hybrid text regularly implies the processing of information originated in two distinct systems (i.e., culture and language). We call those texts hybrid texts when the pragmatic output or the appropriation of those two kinds of texts is not a simple addition of their pragmatic properties, but a factorial product. In order to understand hybrid texts, the informant must cognitively process the pragmatic difference or similarity between the mental, context and the text to allow him/her to build inferences. Informants must realize the significance of the appropriation of that particular context to that particular text.

In hybrid texts, we may have different situations. Sometimes, the context does increase immediately the exhibiting effect of the texts (the capability that verbal rhetorical strategies in descriptive, narrative, explicative or expositive texts can have to develop mental process in informant's mind), sometimes they do not. When texts are rhetorically complex (mainly when they show some kind of exhibit information or when context elements neither predictably match with the background knowledge of the informant or their expectations, nor can they be understood in an explicit way) they may convey a lot of conflicting meanings that might reduce the central effect of culture on the text or otherwise strongly direct the attention to text in an attempt to clarify the context with the information abounding.

Sometimes the text looks not sufficient to clarify the context. In those cases, the cognitive processing of the whole meaning of the text may depend on the context processing strategies. While trying to understand the whole meaning of the hybrid text the informant can exhibit a particular socio-culture.

Understanding a text is not limited to detecting similar appearance or different characteristics of objects or events it represents or to building a mental representation for its information content, but it also implies the identification of the objectives of its reproduction and the detection of pragmatic characteristics within the society.

In this research study, what I propose to do is present a literal English translation of Telugu texts which have a distinct local flavors to speakers of other languages and dialects and analyze the processing load involved and thereby its relevance.

For example, here is a literal translation of a piece of discourse from a Telugu text:

1. Swine Flu is on the rise; double your efforts. Support Pongal Kites.

The discourse contains stretches of language that are coherently organized. But what's the connection between swine flu being on the rise and doubling our efforts? Somehow we need to infer that the efforts are related to the previously mentioned swine flu. Since swine flu is considered dangerous, we infer that probably what is referred to is our efforts towards eliminating or reducing swine flu or its effects. We immediately face another confusing utterance: how is supporting an organization called Pongal Kites relevant to fighting swine flu? Once again, we need to rely on our general knowledge (here, very much culture-dependent) and access the fact that Pongal Kites is a charity that sells kites, and whose profits support fighting swine flu. In other words, the rather short discourse in (1) is actually interpreted as something like:

2. Swine flu is on the rise. (Thus) please double your efforts (to fight it). Support Pongal Kites (because they fight swine flu).

Example (2) is not only awkward; it feels unessential. Since we can infer the bracketed information easily, stating it explicitly in this manner is unnecessary. Speakers normally rely on informants' (receiver) cognitive abilities to draw such specific pragmatic

inferences. With the help of pragmatics, the language production and processing are made more efficient hence taking less time and effort.

Human languages are linguistically influenced, that is, they can never encode everything that we actually intend our addressees to understand as the message of our utterances. This is why the drawing of pragmatic inferences is critical in making language work as a communicative system. Consider again example (2). Although it seems a much more specific version of (1), it still does not explicitly encode every piece of intended information. Aren't the following added interpretations also part of the message contained in the text in (1)?

3. Swine flu (**in India**) is (**recently and anticipated to be in the future**) on the rise (**i.e., some people now died of it**). (**Thus,**) please double your efforts (**to fight it (and make an attempt to fight it even if you haven't)**). Support Pongal Kites because they fight on Swine flu (**and this will represent your effort in fighting on Swine flu**).

And even (3) does not weaken all information that goes into interpreting (1). How much is swine flu on the rise? We infer that it is rising significantly. How should the addressee support Pongal Kites? Presumptively, by buying many Pongal kites, which support the organization financially (rather than ethically, for example). We could specify more and more hidden assumptions. There's certainly a lot of interpretation that doesn't meet the semantic meaning. It is up to pragmatics to provide it.

Understanding Hybrid Texts: A Pilot study

A pilot study was conducted to study people's understanding of Hybrid Texts. In this case, the Hybrid Texts used were commonly used proverbs in Telangana state in South India. These proverbs are usually couched in particular socio-cultural settings. So, the main task in this study was to see if the relevance of these hybrid texts increase (thereby leading to a better understanding of the hybrid text) when factors like language, culture or political background of the speakers are similar.

The study

The study was carried out in one phase with 15 informants. The study aimed to examine the interpretation of hybrid texts applying Pragmatics and relevance theory. Informal discussions were carried out with the informants to find out their cultural and social background. In addition to these, their context and cognitive levels, and their preference towards hybrid text were elicited.

Aim

The human tendency to maximize relevance makes it possible not only to predict some of other people's cognitive processes, but also try to influence them. How indeed could you aim at influencing people if you had no way to predict how your behavior would affect their thought? Human intended communication, and in specific verbal message, engages

the attribution, by the communicator and the hearer (informant), of mental states to one another.

This study aims to explore the efficiency of using hybrid text to know informants' contextual implicature. The study focuses on 'hybrid texts' which are not understandable to informants who have different culture and social background.

Research tool

The main tool that was used for the present study was a set of questionnaires prepared for informants under study. The framework that was chosen for the analysis of hybrid text below was that of Relevance Theory. Relevance Theory states that although there may be huge variation in cultural backgrounds, the principles by which hearers use contextual information in interpreting utterances in conversation are universally the same.

The informants

The informants were 15. All of them were between 20 and 42 years of age. The data were collected from fifteen subjects by means of a questionnaire. These fifteen people came from fairly varied backgrounds (different countries like Russia, Germany, Syria, Indonesia, Togo, Bhutan, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka and the Indian informants were from different states (and language backgrounds) Kerala, Tamilnadu, Assam, Bihar, Utter Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Odisha). The informants were given fifteen hybrid texts in the form of proverbs and were asked to interpret them providing the first accessible meaning they arrive at without discussing the hybrid text with others or thinking about them too long. The only information given to the informants was that they were asked to interpret proverbs. Neither the origin of the proverb nor the specific context in which the proverbs in question are used was provided in the questionnaire. It was hoped, however, that letting them know that they were interpreting not just any utterance but proverbs would bring into play their encyclopedic entry for proverbs and would allow them easy access to the assumptions one is supposed to have about proverbs (i.e. that proverbs condense common experience into a memorable form embodying traditional pieces of wisdom; that is being attributable not to a specific person but a people, they are from part of that people's cultural heritage: and they function deeply embedded in a social context, not only conforming social norms and values but also giving confidence to their users), thus creating a context for interpretation. This expectation seemed to be supported by the suggestion that perhaps a majority of contextual assumptions are retrieved or derived from memory.

In other words, the contexts for comprehension are drawn not only from the physical environment, but from what Sperber and Wilson call the speaker's and hearers' cognitive environment: the set of assumptions that are manifest in them. It does not mean that physical, social and cultural factors do not play a role in utterance interpretation. They do, but they affect interpretation by affecting the individual's assumptions about the world. Understanding proverbs has a number of complications. First, most proverbs can be understood both literally and metaphorically. Second, proverbs are so-called echoic

utterances echoing the thought, or if you like wisdom, of a people, so proverbs cannot achieve relevance simply by demonstrating that someone understands it. Third, by representing popular knowledge 'in a manifestly skeptical, amused, surprised, triumphant, approving or reproving way, the speaker can express her own attitude to the thought echoed and the relevance of her utterance might depend largely on this expression of attitude' (Sperber & Wilson 1995:239). These complications are, however, taken into consideration only as far as it is required for the purpose of the analysis.

The Objective of this study

The objective of this work was to study the hybrid text by using relevance theory and Grice's Maxims principles thoroughly in the field of socio and cultural linguistics. The nexus between hybrid text, Pragmatics and Relevance Theory is an established fact. When I use my mother tongue, I am immediately identified as a person belonging to the Telangana region. It's because of the distinctive socio-cultural background I have in my usage of Telugu Language. By undertaking to do a close study of the hybrid text, I would like to study the language, Relevance theory and signifying practices that are present in the Telangana region.

The research questions addressed in this study are the following:

- 1) How can Hybrid Texts, especially proverbs, be analyzed through Grice's Maxims and Relevance Theory?
- 2) How are hearers able to bridge the gap between the linguistic meanings encoded in an utterance and the speaker's intended meaning?
- 3) Can the set of assumptions the hearer/reader provide help them to arrive at the intended interpretation?

Methodology

Ten Telugu proverbs used in the Telangana region were taken for this study. A literal translation of these proverbs was provided to the subjects. The ten proverbs varied in terms of frequency of use and transparency of meaning. The collection of data was done through self reporting questionnaires and structural interviews from multiple informants belonging to different language, social and cultural backgrounds. Interviews were conducted individually to know the possible implicatures. The responses were tabulated and analyzed.

Findings and Discussion of the findings

Here, we have seen that the informants tried to give some interpretations of the given proverbs in their own way. Informants gave the correct implication which is close to the optimal relevance or intended meaning. In this cognitive process, the selected informants used less effort and more effect because the proverbs might be understandable in any

context of the informants. The informants used their world knowledge to interpret the proverbs. Given below are the findings:

Proverb 1: Instead of taking a look and returning, he spoils it.

Implicature

- a) **A person who does more than what is asked.**
- b) **Over enthusiasm creates problems.**
- c) **The wrong person to do the right work.**
- d) **When immature, we do not think about the consequences of our actions.**
- e) **People who are too smart and clever may create more problems than good.**

Responses

Informants A, D and K came up with one of the expected contextual assumptions, i.e. with identifying 'being active' with 'danger' and associating the ideas of over enthusiasm behaviour to trouble. F, G, J and N, however, seemed contented with the literal meaning and did not move on to the metaphorical level. B, C, E, H, L, M and O appeared more hesitant in identifying the literal meaning and metaphorical meaning due to cultural and contextual meaning of the hybrid Text. The informants had to spend more cognitive effort and energy to draw relevant interpretations. The informants all interpreted 'being hyper-active' as 'bringing trouble' and thus interpreted the hybrid Text correctly. Informant I, however, clearly associates danger with smoke or fire but also hinted at the consequent relief.

Proverb 2: Meat is like mother and rice is like aunt.

Implicature

- a) **People prefer meat for party and celebrations.**
- b) **People prefer to have meat only while drinking wine.**
- c) **In some regions or countries people do not eat rice.**
- d) **Rice is interesting but lacks a sense of purpose when not accompanied by a good cut of meat.**
- e) **There is no love more sincere than the love of food.**

Responses

This hybrid text represents the pattern in the following way. Informants A, B, G, J, L, M and O were unable to come up with any interpretation of this proverb. C and D tried to come up with the intended meaning but they gave irrelevant explanations for this. Informants E, F, I and K seemed contented with the literal meaning and didn't move on to the metaphorical level. However, Subject H clearly associated the intended meaning with identifying 'community and the importance of the meat than rice'. Informant N gave a different interpretation which was irrelevant to the intended/literal meaning of the

hybrid text. Here, we can say that this hybrid Text is cultural specific. By this reason, some of the subjects didn't come up with the intended meaning.

Informants may be successful or unsuccessful in understanding hybrid Texts. They look at the context of hybrid Texts and relevance of correct implicature. In this cognitive process the informants take time to draw the relevant implicature. They investigate factors that obstruct or enhance context relevance, such as the premises' content and the premises' complexity. This attribution is greatly helped by the relative predictability of relevance-guided cognitive processes. However in the case of hybrid Texts that are culture specific and community specific the selected informants (non-cultural informants) are not able to understand the specific meaning of the hybrid texts. Most of the cases, in this present study, the informants are not able to draw the relevant implicatures for the selected hybrid texts. It might be the case that the informants don't share the context and cultural background.

Proverb 3: According to the season is the cultivation, according to wetness (moisture) is the crop.

Implicature

- a) Everything has its own time and plans to follow.**
- b) According to the situation and circumstances we have to act.**
- c) Human beings have some stages to grow up.**

Responses

This hybrid text yields distinct patterns of interpretation. Subjects A, B, C, G, I, N and O clearly came up with the intended meaning whereas E and L associated the meaning to the image created by the literal meaning. Informants D, F, H, K, and M appeared more hesitant in identifying the literal meaning and gave the interpretation a different, only remotely related direction. Informant J was not able to interpret any interpretation. Here, we assume that this hybrid text being not cultural specific, all the informants were able to come up with their literal and metaphorical meaning.

By observing the responses we come to know that the informants gave the response which is somehow relevant to the correct implicature of this hybrid Text. Therefore, informants gave the information about that thought which is relevant enough to be worth processing and which should require little processing effort as possible.

A relatively high degree of relevance is what makes some inputs worth processing. Many of the potential inputs competing for an individual's processing resources may offer a modicum of relevance, but few are likely to be relevant enough to deserve attention. What makes these worth processing is, to begin with, that they yield comparatively higher cognitive effects. However, two inputs yielding the same amount of cognitive effect may differ in the amount of processing effort required to produce this effect.

Obviously, it can be noted that the lesser the effort, the better. The relevance of an input is not just a matter of the cognitive effect it yields but also of the mental effort it requires.

Proverb 4: If reachable, hold the hair, if not, the legs.

Implicature

- a) **The cheat always waits for an opportunity.**
- b) **If circumstances are good, make maximum use of it. If not, be happy with what is available.**
- c) **Adjust according to the situation or place.**
- d) **Know the people's attitude before you react.**

Responses

The informant I stated that 'do whatever the best that you can do'. This is not a direct assumption of the intended meaning but is only remotely applicable. 'Whatever the best' is according to our situation and needs, you fulfill your desires. If not, fight for them. E appeared more uncertain in identifying the literal meaning, and gave a different interpretation of 'being disrespectful' and 'intimidating'. Informant A stated 'try to get gold, if you cannot go for silver'. According to this sentence, we can assume that it is the literal meaning of the hybrid text because the interpretation 'gold' as 'having greater importance' and 'silver' as 'having less importance' has been used instead of 'hair' as 'high' and 'legs' as 'lower'. Informants B G K and M came up with one of the expected contextual assumptions, i.e. with identifying 'availability', 'convenience', 'grab the best if not settle for less', and 'tactics', which were within the agreeable or acceptable domain of meaning of the Hybrid Text. H and L however, seemed contented with the literal meaning and did not move on to the metaphorical level ('if reachable then use your brain otherwise, just hang on'). The rest of the informants (F C D and O) interpreted the hybrid text not drawing the intended or relevant expectations. And informant N and J did not come up with any interpretation of the hybrid text.

Proverb 5: If lice were given supervision, they would shave the head extensively.

Implicature

- a) **Though permission is given, one may not leave the natural attitude which comes inherently.**
- b) **No change in behaviour although in a good position.**
- c) **What will happen if a thief is appointed a head of bank (finance)?**
- d) **Knowingly commit blunders or mistakes.**

Responses

Informant B moves on to the metaphorical level that 'if cats were given wings there could be no more sparrows' and 'Everyone is given something based on his/her

content or capability. Informants H and M came up with one of the expected contextual assumptions, i.e. with identifying 'ruin' and associating it with bad nature, when encouraged, can do more harm than be useful. K, however, seemed contented with the literal meaning and did not move on to the metaphorical level ('one should not trust a person of deceiving nature.'). Informant C came up with the metaphorical interpretation i.e. 'a proper person must be given proper responsibility'. D appeared more hesitant in identifying the literal meaning, and gave the interpretation a different, only remotely related direction. Informants E, F and O came up with one of the contextual assumptions of the hybrid text. I and J came up with irrelevant contextual assumptions of the hybrid text. Informants G, L and N did not come up with any contextual assumptions, literal or intended meaning of the hybrid text.

A careful analysis of the interpretations by the informants shows that literary devices like antithesis (as in Proverb 1), simile (as in Proverb 2), metaphor (as in Proverb 3), synecdoche (as in Proverb 4) and personification (as in Proverb 5) help in the understanding of these proverbs to some extent. Moreover, if we were to categorize proverbs under different categories like didactic, rhetorical, philosophical and epistemological, we find that the rhetorical and didactic one are easier to mentally process than the philosophical and epistemological. These show that there are some universal aspects in pragmatics that facilitate the understanding of even hybrid texts.

Conclusion

This study enlightens the importance of social-language communications. It emphasizes the importance of Relevance Theory in interpreting hybrid texts by facilitating in the understanding of the contextual meaning of language.

In current linguistic theory (Principles and Parameters approach), it is believed that universal principles guide languages of the world. However, the surface differences between languages are attributable to certain parameters that can be set in different ways for different languages. Likewise, we find that in pragmatics too, there are certain universal aspects (expectations that a particular text gives rise to) that are triggered when readers try to make sense of a text that they are not familiar with. Literary devices like simile, metaphor, synecdoche, personification etc. add relevance to the meaning conveyed and enable in understanding any text.

I have tried to elucidate in this paper the possibility of using hybrid texts to stimulate informants to cross their multiple barriers like linguistic, cultural and psychological with the help of the universal aspects of linguistic or pragmatic cues.

References

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). *Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena*. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction* (pp. 56-310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1957). Meaning. *The Philosophical Review*, 377–388.
- Grice, H. P. (1969). Utterer's meaning and intention. *The Philosophical Review*, 147–177.
- Grice, H. P. (1981). Presupposition and conversational implicature. *Radical Pragmatics*, 183.
- Grice, H. P. (1982). Meaning revisited. *Mutual Knowledge*, 223–243.
- Grice, H. P. (1988). *Utterer's Meaning, Sentence-Meaning, and Word-Meaning*.
- Kachru, B. B. (1983). The bilingual's creativity: discorsal and stylistic strategies in contact literatures in English. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 13(2), 37–55.
- Kachru, B. B. (1990). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*. University of Illinois Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1995). Transcultural creativity in world Englishes and literary canons. *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics: In Honour of Henry Widdowson*, 271–287.
- Kasher, A. (1976). Conversational maxims and rationality. In *Language in focus: Foundations, methods and systems* (pp. 197–216).
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Mieder, W. (1996a). *Hybrid Text*. In *American Folklore: An Encyclopedia*, ed by Harland Brunvand, New York, Garland.
- Mieder, W. (2004). *Hybrid Texts: A handbook*. Greenwood Pub Group.
- Labov, W. (1972a). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1981). Irony and the use-mention distinction. *Philosophy*, 3, 143–184.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (2002). Pragmatics, modularity and mind-reading. *Mind & Language*, 17(1-2), 3–23.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure.

Thomas, J. A. (2014). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Routledge.

Wason, P. C. (1981). Understanding and the limits of formal thinking.

Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2002). Relevance theory. *Handbook of Pragmatics*.

Zabus, C. J. (2007). *The African palimpsest: indigenization of language in the West African europhone novel* (Vol. 4).

Email ID: venkateflu141@gmail.com