https://doi.org/10.55737/trt/FL25.159

THE REGIONAL TRIBUNE

Pages: 212 – 224 | Volume: 4 | Issue: 4 (Fall 2025) | ISSN (Online): 3006-8428 | DOI: 10.55737/trt/FL25.159

Social Predictors of Pragmatic Skills and Conversational Maxims in Children

Iqra Saeed [1] Hina Rana [2] Sharmeen Tarar [3]

ABSTRACT: The study aimed to investigate the relationship among social predictors and pragmatic skills and conversational Maxims in children. For such purpose, children between age ranges 5-5.12 years and 6-6.12 years (N=66; males 33 and females 33) were selected from four private schools of Jhang Sadar(2 Advanced and 2 less Advanced school systems).Cross sectional research design and purposive sampling were used for this study. Pearson moment correlation and independent sample t test were used to compute values. There was no notable relation found among social predictors and pragmatic skills and conversational maxims in children between ages 5 – 7 years. The relationship between social predictors and conversational maxims was only significant at Quantity subscale. Whereas the relationship between subscales of conversational maxims was significant at Quality and Relevance. And with Pragmatic skills' subscales it was significant at Explanation and Knowledge. So, Quantity Maxim of Conversational implicatures predicts family system and types of schooling more significantly. Whereas Quality and Relevance of Conversational Implicatures predict subscales of Pragmatic skills (Explanation and Relevance) more significantly. There was no prediction of overall scores of conversational Maxims and Pragmatic skills.

KEYWORDS: Pragmatics, Conversational Maxims, Social Predictors, Wh-questions, Picture Elicitation

[1] MS Speech and Language Pathology, Centre for Clinical Psychology, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: itisiqra@gmail.com

[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Clinical Psychology, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: hinajrana@hotmail.com

[3] Senior Speech and Language Therapist, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: sharmeen.tarar1@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: Iqra Saeed
✉ itisiqra@gmail.com

Introduction

Human beings use language for expressing and understanding ideas, feelings and emotions of oneself and others. Language is a composed arrangement of organized structures for communicating with others by both with expressive and receptive language by reading, hearing, composing and talking (Bamberg, 2016). It contains a high level of structure at phonetic, lexical, syntactic and semantic levels (Bradlow & Alexander, 2007). *Pragmatics* is the way we change our discourse according to the surroundings and utilize language towards the objective of correspondence. It manages expressions that can change from articulation to articulation as setting (Nicholas & Lascarides, 1998). Young children assemble knowledge of interlocutors for picking the appropriate forms of dialect utilize for discourse (Siebel & Alston, 2000). Arundale (2015) presented two concepts of pragmatics. In first one small social settings and number of participants matter and in second concept, relationships between people are more important. Conversational Implicatures are the set of processes that constitute pragmatics in sense of inference described by Levinson, (2000) as what is said to what is commonly accepted or what has been said some time recently. Grice (1975) proposed the

progression of proverbs or maxims named as Gricean Maxims which include; i) *Quantity* that makes your commitments as informative as required ii) *Quality is* making an effort not to state what you acknowledge to be false and making an effort not to state for which you require satisfactory evidence iii) *Relevant is to* give relevance iv) *Manner is to* give the perspicuousness and void fogginess of expression with vital separation from dubiousness. Being brief and proficient. In Davies, 2007 proposed Gricean Helpful standard is thought to be a fundamental idea in pragmatics, yet it's elucidation is frequently tricky. Sedivy, (2007) presented Grice idea of conversational implicatures requires that speaker importance be measureable on the premise of sentence significance, and assumptions about the speaker's adherence to helpful standards of discussion and the capacity of the listener to work out the speaker's significance.

This study investigates the pragmatic skill development among children using Grice's conversational Maxims. This analysis was based on Urdu language pragmatics. The role of social predictors like gender of a child , their order of birth , structure of their family , educational status of their parents , languages they speak at home and school types were determined on child's pragmatic skills as these social factors are powerful in influencing child's pragmatic competencies. The study enabled the society as well as child's parents and peers to be aware of the multiple reasons behind children pragmatic deficits. The results of current study added up a new knowledge in this domain based on which further research will be conducted providing the baseline to develop further tools in Urdu language for indigenous population of Pakistan. The objectives of the study were to find out the difference between boys and girls Pragmatic Skills and Conversational Maxims. Moreover, to find out the difference between 5.1-5.12 and 6.1-6.12 years old children's Pragmatic Skills and Conversational Maxims. Furthermore, the objective was also to investigate the relationship among social predictors (i.e., gender of a child, birth rank, system of family , parental academic status, languages used at home and systems of schooling) with Pragmatic Skills and Conversational Maxims in children. And lastly, to investigate the prediction of social factors on Pragmatic Skills and Conversational Maxims in children.

Materials and Methods

Correlational research design was used to find out the prediction of sex of a child, order in which they were born, system of families, educational status of their parents, languages they speak at home and types of educational institutions on pragmatic skills and conversational maxims of children. Purposive sampling was used in the current study. Total 66 participants were included from four schools of Jhang Sadar. Schools were divided into two categories (i) Advanced school systems which were based on usage of multimedia, computer devices and Oxford books in schools (ii) Less Advanced school systems which were based on no usage of multimedia and computer devices, and they were using Punjab Textbooks. Almost 16 participants were selected from each school named as Smart school, Allied school and Sacred Heart High school. Whereas 18 participants were selected from The City School based on convenience of their availability. All 66 participants were selected on the basis of two age ranges (i) Thirty three participants were included with ages 5.1-5.12 years (ii) Other 33 participants were included within age ranges 6.1-6.12 years. These 66 participants were also equally divided on the basis of gender i.e., 33 boys and 33 girls. Participants that were included in the study were school going for at least 6 months with IQ's more than 70. Their Parents must be educated at least up to middle. Children who were selected, must be uttering 3-4 sentences.

Demographical information of those children is shown as, wducation of their fathers was Matric (*n=13),* F.A (*n=27*) and B.A (n=26). Education of their mothers was Matric/F.A (*n=27),* B.A (*n=27)* and master's and above (*n=12*). Their birth orders were first born(*n=22*), Middle born(*n=17*) and last born(*n=27*). The children belonged to nuclear family system were (*n=27*) whereas children belonging to joint family system were (*n=39*). Children speaking monolingualism at home were (*n=55*) whereas children speaking bilingualism were(*n=11*).For assessments, Slosson Intelligence Test – Revised Third Edition (SIT-R3-1) was used to monitor ability throughout the year. It was translated into Urdu according to the cultural norms of Pakistan. Tool was handed over to parents to fill for their children.70 (average) and more than 70 (high to profound) level of IQ was considered as a selection criterion for participants. Another tool used was Social Communication Skills-The Pragmatic Checklist. It has six subscales that are state needs, give commands, personal, interactional, want explanations and share knowledge and information. Formal permission from the author for the usage and translation of this tool was taken. Total score was 135, which means higher the scores, more efficient are the pragmatic skills whereas lower scores predict lower pragmatic skills. The total score was analysed in SPSS. Another assessment tool was Gricean Conversational Maxims checklist. It was devised by the researcher on the basis of above four Gricean Conversational Maxims; *Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relevance and Maxim of Manner.* Picture elicitation technique was also employed in which children were asked Blank's 7 Wh- questions by presenting them three pictures. Total 15 minutes (5min for each picture) were taken by children to describe three pictures. Children language sample was transcribed and then their Conversational Maxims were assessed. Total score of Conversational Maxims and Social Communication Skills- The Pragmatic Checklist was computed and analysed through SPSS. The pilot study was conducted to test the research logistics and to improve the quality of structured interview. Three pictures were also used for elicitation of child's pragmatics, out of which two were replaced later because of its inappropriateness according to age. The deficiencies revealed through pilot study were addressed appropriately. Formal permissions for data collections were taken from the relevant heads of the four schools of Jhang Sadar. They reviewed all the questionnaires and then formally allowed researchers for data collections. Assessment tools were used after obtaining permissions from Authors.

Results

Present study aimed to investigate the gender differences between social language skills and conversational implicatures of children between ages 5-7 years. The study also investigated differences among family system, types of languages a child speaks with others and categories of school on children's pragmatic skills and conversational maxims. Relationship between birth order and parental education on children's pragmatic skills and conversational maxims was also assessed.

First of all, descriptive analysis was carried out explaining the demographic characteristics, speech characteristics and characteristics of children. Independent sample t test and MANOVA were carried out for differences in gender, rank of birth, structure of a child's family, kinds of languages a child speaks at home and parents' academics. Pearson Product Moment correlation was also computed to find relationship among variables.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were calculated to examine the frequency of demographics and speech related characteristics.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Demographic Characteristics

Variable	f	%
Age		
5-6	32	48.5%
6-7	34	51.5%
Gender		
Male	33	50%
Female	33	50%
School		
City School	18	27.3%
Sacred Heart high school	16	24.2%
Smart school	16	24.2%
Allied school	16	24.2%
Father's Education		
Uptil Matric/F.A	13	19.7%
B.A	27	40.9%
Master's and above	26	39.4%
Father's Occupation		
Teacher	10	15.2%
Doctor	3	4.5%
Lawyer	5	7.6%
Engineer	9	13.6%
Businessman	20	30.3%
Other	19	28.8%
Nature of Father child relationship		
Satisfactory	64	97.0%
Moderate	2	3.0%
Unsatisfactory	0	0
Mother's education		
Uptil Matric/F.A	27	40.9%
B.A	27	40.9%
Master's and above	12	18.2%
Mother's Occupation		
Housewife	42	63.6%
Teacher	10	15.2%
Doctor	2	3.0%
Lawyer	1	1.5%
Engineer	2	3.0%
Businesswoman	3	4.5%
Other	6	9.1%
Nature of mother child relationship		
Satisfactory	58	87.9%
Moderate	7	10.6%
Unsatisfactory	0	0

Note. f- frequency, %-percentage

According to the results, education of fathers for majority of the children was B.A then master's and above and very few were educated until Matric/F.A. While education of mothers was equal for Matric and B.A, Very few mothers were educated till Masters. Most of the children's fathers occupation was businessmen and others (landlords, clerks & pharmacists etc.). They were teacher and engineers as well. But very few of them were doctors and lawyers. Whereas majority of the mothers were housewives. Mothers of many children were also teachers. Rest of them, were doctors, lawyers, engineer, businesswomen and others (nurses, pharmacists etc.). Nature of father child relationship was more satisfactory than mother child relationship.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of demographic characteristics of social predictors

	f	%
Gender		
Male	33	50%
Female	33	50%
Birth Order		
1st Born	22	33.3%
Middle Born	17	25.8%
Last Born	27	40.9%
Family System		
Nuclear	27	40.9%
Joint	39	59.1%
Types of Languages spoken at home		
Monolingual(Urdu)		
Bilingual(Urdu+ English)	55	83.3%
(Urdu+Punjabi)	11	16.7%

Note: f-frequency, %-percentage

According to the results, males and females were equally distributed. But their birth order varied as majority were last born, then first ones and lastly the middle born. Majority children belonged to joint family systems. Father's education of most of the children was B.A then master's and then above Masters. And mother's education was until Matric/F.A and B.A. Majority children were monolinguals speaking Urdu language more at homes as compared to bilinguals speaking Urdu and English or Urdu and Punjabi.

Table 3

Statistical Analysis of demographic characteristics of Speech Sample of children

Variables	*F*	%
Age of mono word speech		
5 months-1 year	61	92.4%
1year-1.5year	5	7.6%
Words uttered in 1 sentence		
5-10 words	22	33.3%
10-15 words	22	33.3%
15-20 words	16	24.2%
20-25 words	6	9.1%

Variables	*F*	%
Meaningful sentence utterance		
3 sentences	12	18.2%
4 sentences	23	34.8%
5-7 sentences	16	24.2%
More than 7 sentences	15	9.1%
Speech with outsiders		
Satisfactory	52	78.8%
Moderate	13	19.7%
Unsatisfactory	1	1.5%
Total sentences child speaks with father		
4 sentences	9	13.6%
5-7 sentences	26	39.4%
More than 7 sentences	31	47.0%
Total sentences child speaks with mother		
4 sentences	7	10.6%
5-7 sentences	18	27.3%
More than 7 sentences	41	62.1%

Note: f-frequency, %-percentage

The table depicts that, majority children started mono word speech at the ages of 5 months – 1 year. Now majority of the children uttered 5-10 and 10-15 words in one sentence. Meaningful sentence utterance of majority of the children were 4 sentences and then it is 5-7. Most of the children speech with outsiders was satisfactory. Number of total sentences child speaks with mother were more than he/she speaks with father.

Table 4

Independent Sample t test for Gender Differences on Pragmatic Skills and Conversational Maxims Sample(N=66)

Variables	Males n=33		Females n=33				95% CL	
	M	SD	M	SD	t(64)	P	LL	UL
Conversational Maxims	70.12	6.020	69.94	7.529	.108	.914	-3.170	3.534
Pragmatic Skills	102.18	14.677	101.52	12.057	.202	.841	-5.939	7.272

Note: CI=confidence interval; LL= Lower limit; UP=upper limit

Gender differences between males (n=33) and females (n=33) were computed on conversational maxims skills and pragmatic skills of children. However no notable gender differences were found between males and females.

Furthermore, results reveal that on average conversational maxims skills in males (n=33) were more than females (n=33). However, difference was not noteworthy *t(64)= .108, p>.05.*

Furthermore, results revealed that on average pragmatic skills in males (n=33) were more than females (n=33). However, difference was not of significance *t(64)= .202, p>.05.*

Table 5

Independent Sample t test for Family System on Pragmatic Skills and Conversational Maxims of children

Variables	Nuclear n=27		Joint n=39				95% CL	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	t(64)	*P*	LL	UL
Conversational Maxim	67.89	6.824	71.51	6.394	-2.202	.031	-6.911	-.337
Pragmatic Skills	100.07	11.435	103.08	14.517	-.898	.372	-9.680	3.675

Note: CI=Confidence Interval ; LL=Lower limit; UP= Upper limit

Differences on family systems were carried out. Children belonging to nuclear family system (n=27) and joint family system (n=39) were computed on conversational maxims skills and pragmatic skills of children. Notable differences were found between children on their conversational maxims skills whereas there was no crucial dissimilarity was seen between pragmatic skills of children and family systems.

Furthermore, results reveal that on average conversational maxims skills in children belonging to nuclear family systems were less then children belonging to joint family systems However, difference was consequential *t(64)= .-2.202, p<.05.*

Furthermore, results reveal that on average pragmatic skills in children belonging to nuclear family systems were a bit less than children belonging to joint family systems. However, variation was not notable *t(64)= -.898, p>.05.*

Table 5

Independent Sample t test for types of schooling on pragmatic skills and conversational Maxims of children

Variables	Advanced schools n=34		Less advanced schools n=32				95% CL	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	t(64)	*p*	LL	UL
Conversational Maxims	70.94	6.724	69.06	6.777	1.130	.263	-1.442	5.200
Pragmatic Skills	101.50	15.026	102.22	11.491	-.217	.829	-7.327	5.889

Note: CI=Confidence Interval ; LL=Lower limit; UP= Upper limit

Children belonging to upper middle school (n=34) and lower middle school (n=32) were compared on their conversational maxims and pragmatic skills. No noteworthy variations were found between conversational maxims and pragmatic skills of children and their type of schooling.

Furthermore, results reveal that on average conversational maxims skills in children belonging to upper middle school were more than children belonging to lower middle school. However, difference was not important *t(64)= 1.130, p>.05.*

Furthermore, results reveal that on average pragmatic skills in children belonging to upper middle school were a bit less than children belonging to lower middle school. However, difference was not of any importance *t(64)= -.217, p>.05.*

Table 6

Independent sample t test for types of languages spoken at home on pragmatic skills and Conversational Maxims of children

Variables	Monolingual n=55		Bilingual n=11				95% CL	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	t(64)	*p*	LL	UL
Conversational Maxims	69.49	6.863	72.73	5.781	-1.461	.149	-7.661	1.188
Pragmatic Skills	102.15	12.821	100.36	16.268	.402	.689	-7.072	10.636

Note: CI=Confidence Interval ; LL=Lower limit; UP= Upper limit

Children who are monolinguals (n=55) and bilinguals at home (n=11) were compared on conversational maxims and pragmatic skills by t test. No important differences were found between child's types of languages spoken at home on their conversational maxims and pragmatic skills.

Furthermore, results reveal that on average conversational maxims skills in children speaking mono language were less then children who are bilingual at home. However, difference was not significant *t(64)= .-1.461, p>.05.*

Furthermore, results reveal that on average pragmatic skills in children who are monolingual were more than children who are bilingual at home. However, difference was not significant *t(64)= .689, p>.05.*

Table 7

Statistical Analysis of Independent Sample t test for ages of children

Variables	5.1-5.12yrs n=32		6.1-6.12yrs n=34				95% CL	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	t(64)	*p*	LL	UL
Conversational Maxims	67.59	6.829	72.32	5.927	-3.010	.004*	-7.869	-1.591
Pragmatic Skills	102.81	13.769	100.94	13.048	.567	.573	-4.723	8.465

Note: CI=Confidence Interval ; LL=Lower limit; UP= Upper limit

Children ages 5-6 years (n=32) and 6-7 years (n=34) were compared on their conversational maxims and pragmatic skills using independent sample t test. Notable dissimilarities were found between children ages 5-6 years and 6-7 years on their conversational maxims skills whereas there was no significant difference was seen between pragmatic skills of children between these ages.

Furthermore, results reveal that on average conversational maxims skills in children ages 5-6 years were less then children ages 6-7 years. However, difference was remrkable *t(64)= .-3.010, p<.05.*

Furthermore, results reveal that on average pragmatic skills in children ages 5-6 years were more than children age 6-7. However, difference was not of any significance *t(64)= .567, p>.05.*

Table 8

Statistical analysis of Pearson Moment correlation between Predictors

Measures	GNDR	BRTHORDR	FATHREDU	MOTHREDU	FMLYSYTM	LNGEHOME	SCLTYP	CNVOMAXM	PRGMTC	M	SD
GNDR	-	.22	.02	.06	.21	.04	.00	-.01	-.02	1.50	.504
BRTHORDR	-	-	-.16	-.06	.00	.10	-.08	-.04	.05	2.08	.865
FATHREDU	-	-	-	.44**	-.07	-.06	-.38**	.07	-.12	2.20	.749
MOTHREDU	-	-	-	-	-.17	-.08	-.23	.02	.07	1.77	.740
FMLYSYTM	-	-	-	-	-	.321	.06	.031	.372	1.59	.495
LNGE_HOME	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.10	.18	.688.02	.33.48	.7550
SCLTYP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.14			
CNVOMAXM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	.025	23.35	2.453
PRGMTCSKL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101.85	13.332

p<0.05, p<0.01***

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between the predictors and dependent variables. There was no marked relationship between predictors (sex of a child, rank of their birth , parental academics, family unit, number of languages spoken at home and school types) and pragmatic skills and conversational maxims in children. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between dependent variables (Pragmatic Skills and Conversational Maxims). There was a significant relationship between explanatory subscale of pragmatics and quality and relevance subscales of conversational maxims. There was also seen a significant relationship between knowledge subscale of pragmatics and quality and relevance subscales of conversational maxims.

Table 9

Linear regression model for social predictor(quantity) and types of schooling

Model	B	95% CI
Constant	14.52	[13.45,15.60]
Types of schooling	-1.84	[-3.39, -.29]
R2	.08	
F	5.63	
▲R2	.08	
▲F	.02	

Note: CI=Confidence Interval ; LL=Lower limit; UP= Upper limit

A simple linear regression was calculated to predict quantity maxim based on types of schooling. A negative significant regression equation was found (F(1,64)=5.634, p<-.02, with an R2 of .081. Participants predicted quantity maxim is equal to 14.529 -1.842 when types of schooling are measured.

Table 10

Linear regression model for social predictor(quantity) and family system

Model	B	95% CI
Constant	11.02	[8.37,13.67]
Family system	1.64	[.04, 3.23]
R2	.06	
F	4.24	
▲R2	.06	
▲F	.04	

Note: CI=Confidence Interval ; LL=Lower limit; UP= Upper limit

Similar simple linear regression was calculated to predict quantity maxim based on family system. A considerable regression equation was found (F(1,64)= 4.241,p<.04),with an Rsquare .062.Participants predicted quantity maxim is equal to 11.062+1.641 when family system is measured.

Table 11

Linear regression model for prediction of Pragmatic subscale (Explanation) with Quality Maxim

Model	B	95% CI
Constant	2.78	[-4.12, 9.69]
Quality Maxim	.33	[.08, .58]
R2	.09	
F	6.97	
▲R2	.09	
▲F	.01	

Note: CI=Confidence Interval ; LL=Lower limit; UP= Upper limit

A simple linear regression was calculated to predict pragmatic skills through conversational maxims. An important regression equation was found (F(1,64)=6.975,p<.01,with an R2 of .09. Participants predicted explanatory pragmatics through quality maxim is equal to 2.786+ .333.

Table 12

Linear regression model for prediction of Pragmatic subscale (Explanation) with Relevance Maxim

Model	B	95% CI
Constant	6.99	[2.66, 11.32]
Relevance Maxim	.27	[.03, .51]
R2	.07	
F	5.21	
▲R2	.07	
▲F	.02	

Note: CI=Confidence Interval ; LL=Lower limit; UP= Upper limit

Simple linear regression was calculated to predict explanatory pragmatics through relevance maxims in which there was a significant regression equation was found (F(1,64)=5.211,p<.026,with an R2 of .075.Participants predicted relevance maxim is equal to 40.43 + 496.59 when their relevance is measured

Table 13

Linear regression model for prediction of Pragmatic subscale (Knowledge) with Quality Maxim

Model	B	95% CI
Constant	2.25	[-11.13, 15.65]
Quality Maxim	.69	[.20, 1.17]
R2	.11	
F	8.00	
▲R2	.11	
▲F	.00	

Note: CI=Confidence Interval ; LL=Lower limit; UP= Upper limit

A simple linear regression was calculated to predict pragmatic skills through conversational maxims. A significant regression equation was found(F(1,64)=8.005, p<.006,with an R2 of .11.Participants predicted knowledge pragmatics is equal to 2.259+.691 when Quality Maxim is measured

Table 14

Linear regression model for prediction of Pragmatic subscale (Knowledge) with Relevance Maxim

Model	B	95% CI
Model	B	95% CI
Constant	2.25	[-2.55, 13.07]
Relevance Maxim	.69	[.46, 1.33]
R2	.20	
F	16.91	
▲R2	.20	

Note: CI=Confidence Interval ; LL=Lower limit; UP= Upper limit

A simple linear regression was calculated to predict pragmatic skills through conversational maxims. A considerable regression equation was found(F(1,64)= 16.913, p<.000,with an R2 of .20.Participants predicted knowledge pragmatics is equal to 5.259+.896 when quality maxim was measured.

Discussion

The study was aimed to investigate the connection between social factors of the study and pragmatic skills and conversational maxims of children. First hypothesis was there is likely to be a relationship between Pragmatic skills and Conversational Maxims of children. Results did not infer any relationship between two variables.

Next hypothesis is there is likely be a relationship between gender, birth rank, family structure, parents academics, number of languages spoken to child at home and school systems on Pragmatic skills and

Conversational Maxims of children (5.1-6.12 years). Results proved somehow in favor of hypothesis in which it is said that there would be an impressive relationship between predictors and subscales of pragmatic skills and conversational maxims of children. Maxim of quantity had a remarkable relationship with family system*(M=1.77, SD=.74)* and a negative significant relationship with school type*(M=.33, SD=.75).* Kakepoto (2001) considered family as the most established social foundation on the planet. There was also an important relationship between explanatory subscale of pragmatics with quality subscale of conversational maxims(M=.27.32,SD=2.70). An appreciable relationship was also found between explanatory subscale of pragmatics and relevance subscale of conversational maxims(M=17.73, SD=2.86). A positive significant relationship was also found between knowledge subscale of pragmatics and quality subscale of conversational maxims. There was also a remarkable relationship between knowledge subscale of pragmatics and relevance subscale of conversational maxims.

Third hypothesis was there is likely be a difference between girls and boys pragmatic skills and Conversational Maxims. Results supported our hypothesis which predicted to have a likely difference between males and females pragmatic skills and conversational implicatures of children. The pragmatic skills and conversational maxims of males were more than females. But literature contradict with the results. Abdi & Williams, (2010) examined gender contrasts on social abilities of Iranian kindergarten youngsters in which young ladies scored higher than young men.

Last hypothesis was there would likely be a difference between 5.1-5.12 years old children and 6.1-6.12 years old children on their Pragmatic skills and Conversational skills at Gricean's Maxims.

Our results favored our hypothesis for conversational maxims that children from age 6.1years to 6.12 years(*M=72.32, SD=5.92*) would have more efficient pragmatic skills than children from age 5.1-5.12years(*M= 67.59, SD= 6.82)* but for pragmatic skills the scores for 5.1-5.12 years (M=102.81,SD=13.76) were higher than the scores of children from age 6.1-6.12 years(M=100.94, SD= 13.04) which means younger children have more efficient pragmatic skills than older children. As pragmatic skill checklist was filled by parents, so it might be overrated by parents or there may be other social and family factors involved in their efficient pragmatic skills.

Conclusion

The study was conducted to find out the differences in gender, age and types of schooling. The relationship of social predictors (gender, rank of birth, parents' academics, family units, languages used at home and types of educational systems) with pragmatics and conversational implicatures in children was also studied. Our results supported our hypothesis of gender and school differences between children. The relationship between social predictors and outcomes was only notable at quantity subscale. Whereas the relationship between subscales of outcomes were of significance at Quality and Relevance for Conversational Maxims and Explanation and Knowledge at Pragmatic skills. So, Quantity Maxims predict family system and types of schooling more significantly. Whereas Quality and relevance predict subscales of pragmatics(Explanation and relevance) more significantly. There were no prediction and relationship of overall scores of Conversational Maxims and Pragmatic skills.

References

Abdi, H., & Williams, L. J. (2010). Principal component analysis. *Times of California, 12*(5). http://dx.doi.org./10.1002/wics.101

Arundale, R. B. (2015). *Face Constituting Theory.* The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction (1st ed.). http://dx.doi:10.1002/9781118611463.wbielsi094

Bamberg, M. (2016). *Language, interaction, and culture*. The Sage Encyclopedia of Theory in Psychology, 498-500. http://dx.doi.org./10.4135/9781483346274.n174

Bradlow, A. R., & Alexander, J. (2007, January 17). Semantic and phonetic enhancements for speech-in-noise recognition by native and non-native listeners. The *Journal of Acoustical Society of America, 121*(4), 2339-2349. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2642103

Davies, B. L. (2007). Grice's Cooperative Principle: Meaning and rationality. *Journal of pragmatics, 39*(12), 2308-2331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.09.002

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Kakepoto, H. (2001). *Sociological impact of social change upon institutions of family with special focus on Pakistan*. Presented in International Conference on Business and Social Science Research.

Levinson, S. C. (2000). Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature**.** *Language, Speech, And Communication.* https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/5526.001.0001

Nicholas, A., & Lascarides, A. (1998). The semantics and pragmatics of presupposition. *Journal of semantics*, *15*(3), 239-300. https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/15.3.239

Siebel. M., & Alston, W. P. (2001). *Illocutionary Acts and Sentence Meaning*. Cornell University Press. https://doi.org/10.1163/18756735-06201012

Sedivy, J. C. (2007, April 13). *Implicature During Real Time Conversation: A View from Language Processing Research, Wiley*. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-9991.2007.00082.x