

Gricean Maxims Revisited in FB Conversation Posts: Its Pedagogical Implications

Chirbet Ayunon

Cagayan State University, Philippines

chirbet_ayunon@dlsu.edu.ph

Abstract

Grice's Cooperative Principle has remained in the limelight especially when it comes to analyzing utterances in a conversation. Although numerous studies have looked into the violation of conversations, real or imagined, on the Gricean maxims, none has explored conversations that are posted on Facebook. This paper then attempted to revisit the observance or violation of the Gricean maxims in FB conversation posts. FB nowadays is a good source of data for linguistic analysis and exploration. The author intends to investigate FB conversation posts and how participants in the conversations of this generation violate the Gricean maxims and the possible implicatures generated from the utterances.

The analysis clearly reflected speakers' attempts to cooperate in the conversation by providing answers that observe the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance and manner. In the same manner, evidence also suggests that the interlocutors in most cases tend to violate Grice's maxims. Of the four maxims, the maxim of quantity was frequently violated. However, it must be stressed that speakers disobey the maxims in order to achieve certain purposes. Among the purposes identified was to inject humor in the conversation and blend sarcasm in their statements.

The analysis of the FB conversations posts clearly shows that the message people intend to convey is not wholly contained in the words they use but may depend on the hearer's interpretation inconsideration of the context and implicated meaning. Generation of implicature comes out smoothly when interlocutors share a common background assumption. When this background assumption does not come into play, this may result to an implicature failure.

While the data used in this study are real conversations, the posting was done by the sharers; hence the researcher didn't have any hand in transforming the real conversations into a written conversation. Analysis was focused only on the utterances that were already posted on Facebook by random sharers. Further studies may look into actual conversations of people from various ages to see if violation varies depending on the age and sex of interlocutors, or maybe some other factors.

Keywords: Gricean maxim, facebook conversation, cooperative principle

Introduction

Conversations allow the exchange of information between a speaker and a hearer. When one engages in a conversation, he or she is expected to respond by giving the needed information in order to make a meaningful conversation. The major aim of communication is considered the exchange of information. The cooperation extended by speakers and hearers in a communication process may be attributed to their need to convey their intentions and implicit import of their utterances. Therefore, it can be said that things being equal, conversations are cooperative attempts based on a common ground and pursuing a shared purpose. This is encapsulated in Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle which advances the assumption that participants in a conversation normally attempt to be informative, truthful, relevant, and clear.

The CP is primarily concerned with the distinction between 'saying' and 'meaning', trying to answer the question 'how do speakers know how to generate implicit meanings and how can they assume that their addressees will reliably understand their intended meaning?' Therefore, as Davies (2000) stressed, CP is the basic underlying assumption speakers make when they speak to one another, that they are trying to cooperate with one another to engage in a meaningful conversation. The CP is designed to deal with situations like the one below:

A: *Is there another pint of milk?*

B: *I'm going to the supermarket in five minutes*

A speaker who may have read the above conversation will have little trouble in inferring that at the moment there is no milk and that some milk will be bought from the supermarket in a short while. Such instances in conversation prompted Grice to propose the Cooperative Principle and its attendant maxims as a way of explaining the implicature process. Grice (1975) argued the generation and perception of these implicatures are based on the following principle: *“Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.”* This means that when we communicate, we assume, that we, and the people we are talking to, will be conversationally cooperative - we will cooperate to achieve mutual conversational ends. This is primarily because as human beings, we communicate with each other in a logical and rational way, and cooperation is embedded into people’s conversations.

Gricean maxims was never an unquestioned theory. There were several criticisms on this theory. Hadi (2013) in his paper cited some critical challenges to Grice’s theory by naming that of Thomas (1998), Davies (2007), Taillard (2004) and others. Thomas (1998, as cited by Hadi 2013) argued that the proponents of Grice theory have neglected to explore the ambiguous term “cooperation” and have not interpreted and used this concept in their works. Ladegaard (2008) made it clear that because of the ambiguity and inconsistency within Grice’s own definition of cooperation, those who adopt this theory tended to define the term to suit their own purposes. Davies (2007) also argued that opposing interpretations of the “cooperation” notion originated from the conflict between Grice’s use of the term with the general meaning of the word. Moreover, some researchers claimed that Grice’s CP and its maxims are universal. Thomas (1988) criticized the work of Grice for three misinterpretations: viewing human nature optimistically, proposing a series of rules for effective conversation and believing that his suggested maxims would always be taken into consideration. Taillard (2004) also attacked Grice’s claim that people normally cooperate and follow the maxims and mentioned that human communication rests on a tension between the goals of communicators and audiences. Sarangi and Slembrouck (1992) also criticized the Gricean claim for the normality of cooperation. They suggested that Grice’s framework should be extended to include societal factors such as the social position of the communicators. Hadi (2013) concluded that Grice’s theory is flawed because of several reasons. First, it is too biased towards cooperation. Grice neglected the fact that there are instances when the purpose of speakers is to intentionally miscommunicate. Second, his theory is fundamentally asocial for failing to explain how people actually communicate concerning sophisticated social contexts. Moreover, the Hadi (2013) concluded that Grice’s theory is inflexible because it does not consider the fact that human communication is a complicated, diverse and rich phenomenon. It disregards the situations where the goal of the speaker is to miscommunicate. As Jin (1999) argued, the Cooperative Principle is not a rule to control ordinary conversation but rather a law observed in research on social talk. In the end, Hadi (2013) said that despite Grice’s work’s limitations, it still remains to be the center of the disciplines of pragmatics and the important role it plays in this field cannot be denied.

Despite these critical challenges, the use of Grice’s Cooperative Principle remains in the limelight especially when it comes to analyzing utterances in a conversation. Mukaro (2013) looked at the infringement of conversational maxim in public conversations in Shona: daily chats, talks and discussions. Armed with the maxims and enough background information on implicature, the researchers explored how the maxims were violated in their gathered data. They cited Yang (2008) who noted that there are cases of failure of conversational implicature because of different reasons that include linguistic nature or failure to understand the speaker’s real intentions or the misunderstanding of idioms of the language. Thus in their paper, the researchers pointed out that the most common form of implicature failure noted in Shona is the failure of the hearer to interpret idioms of the language. The violations of maxims in Shona were classified into three categories: maxim clash, opting out and flouting. In the same manner, Jin (1999) also explored the possibility of violating the maxims in order to better achieve cooperation in doctor-patient interaction. The discourse in doctor-patient interviews was analyzed to assess the way Leech’s (1983) four maxims for cooperation play out in the medical context. A total of 200 complete conversations between doctors and patients in the clinic of 6 hospitals in China were audio-recorded and analyzed. The researcher found some violations of the maxim of quantity and that violations of the maxim of quality were common for both doctors and patients. However, the author stressed that there was no evidence that the violation of these maxims undermined the cooperativeness of doctor and patient. The paper concluded that

contrary to Leech's argument, occasional violations in the medical context seem to produce a higher level of cooperation.

Another interesting study was conducted by Tupan (2008) where she explored the conversations in the American movie series entitled *Desperate Housewives*, an interesting film that combines elements of drama, comedy, mystery, thriller, farce, soap opera and satire (*Desperate Housewives*, n.d.) The housewives are desperate in their life because of love, betrayals, scandals, and conflicts among themselves which led them to lying to each other. This means that they often violate the maxims in their lies and do multiple violations to smooth them in which each lie seems to have purposes behind. Based on the data, the characters lied for different reasons such as hiding the truth, saving the speaker's or the hearer's face, satisfying the hearer by giving an appropriate utterance or responses that might cheer the hearer or avoid to hurt the hearer. Besides, the characters also wanted to build someone's belief so that they could convince the interlocutor with no doubt. Jakaza, E. (2013) employed a pragmatic approach to the study of newspaper discourse, predicting the results of the harmonized elections in Zimbabwe in 2008. The researcher's focus was to examine how journalists observed or flouted the cooperative principle and its maxims in their reports on the run-up to the harmonized election in 2008. He worked on the hypothesis that news reporters are expected to observe the maxims and cooperative principle in communicating with their audience. Results revealed that of the four maxims, two maxims were mostly violated or flouted: the maxim of quality was flouted as political-party candidates and newspaper reporters were overwhelmed by the goal of winning the electorate vote rather than telling the truth. The maxim of quantity on the other hand was infringed when politicians and news reporters provide insufficient information to support their claims.

Ngenget, S. (2017) also endeavored to revisit Gricean maxims in Manado Malay language, a language used by the people who live in Manado and its surroundings. The study aimed to find out how the Cooperative Principle is violated in Manado Malay language, and determine the purpose of the generated implicature. Findings revealed that the violation of Gricean maxims is observable in Manado Malay language. This means that Cooperative Principle is defied due to violation of the four maxims of Grice. This further indicated that the users of Manado Malay language have the tendency to use implicature in their daily lives. They also stressed that the implicatures were usually generated as a response to a question asked by the interlocutor. Therefore, the purpose of implicature generated in Manado Malay language is mostly for giving information. Jafari (2013) also attempted to investigate the conversations in Wilde's comedy, *The Importance of being earnest*, and focused on the dyads that create triggers for particular implications. It applied Grice's CP to explore which conversational maxims deliberately, unostentatiously or unconsciously. It also illustrated the implicature behind the violated maxims.

Although numerous studies have looked into the violation of conversations, real or imagined, on the Gricean maxims, none has explored conversations that are posted on Facebook. This paper then attempts to revisit the observance or violation of the Gricean maxims in FB conversation posts. FB, nowadays is a good source of data for linguistic analysis and exploration. Based on experience, people normally post quotations, statements, and their conversation with a family member, a friend, a teacher and even strangers. The author intends to investigate FB conversation posts and how participants in the conversations of this generation violate the Gricean maxims and the possible implicatures generated from the utterances. Further, the paper shall also offer implications of the findings of the study to the teaching and learning process.

Research Questions

Following Grice's Cooperative Principle, this paper aims to explore how conversations posted on Facebook adhere to the maxims forwarded by Grice. Specifically, it aims to provide answers to the following questions:

1. How may the utterances be described in terms of the following Gricean maxims:
 - a. Quantity
 - b. Quality
 - c. Relevance
 - d. Manner
2. How are the Gricean maxims violated in the FB conversation posts?
3. Using the classical Gricean notion of implicature, what implicatures are generated resulting from the violation of these maxims? What seems to be the purpose of the participants in violating a maxim?

4. How are the findings relevant to classroom teaching and learning?

Theoretical Framework

Grice (1975) proposes that conversation is based on a shared principle of cooperation and his work on the Cooperative Principle (CP) led to the development of pragmatics as a distinct discipline within linguistics. It was argued that the major aim of communication in pragmatics is to give and receive information; hence, people always try to adopt a cooperative behavior in conveying their concerns and intentions and in transferring their utterances implicitly.

Grice (1975) claimed that the process of producing and perceiving of these implicatures is based on the following principle: *“Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.”* His theory rests on the assumption that there is a distinction between saying and meaning. This means that speakers can produce implicit meaning and their listeners are able to perceive intended meaning from their conversations. Moreover, he argues that participants unconsciously follow certain rules and patterns in their conversations.

Under the general umbrella of the “cooperative principle,” Grice (1975) distinguishes more specific maxims:

1. Quantity. Speaker’s contribution is as informative as required.
2. Quality. Speaker tells the truth or provides adequate evidence for his/her statement.
3. Relation. Speaker’s response is relevant to the topic of conversation.
4. Manner. Speaker speaks straightforwardly and clearly and avoids ambiguity and obscurity.

These maxims identify a particular set of patterns in interaction and speakers are expected to make their utterances informative, truthful, clear and relevant.

Grandy (1989) cited Grice’s argument that each step in a conversational exchange can be analyzed in terms of whether it conforms to the maxims or not. There are four possibilities: in the most straightforward case, all maxims are obeyed; in the most devious case, a maxim is disobeyed but without the knowledge of the other participant. A different case is one where a participant overtly opts. Another case is when a maxim is flouted, that is, it is disobeyed not secretly but by a clearly nonconforming performance.

At the heart of the classical Gricean notion of conversational implicature is a certain assumption concerning the phenomenon that essentially, conversational implicatures are cases of speaker-meaning. More specifically, according to the Gricean notion of implicature, a speaker implicates *p* only if she means, or intend to communicate *p* by saying something else. This, according to Buchanan (2013) is called *meaning intention assumption*. This means that if meaning-intention assumption is correct, in order for a speaker to conversationally implicate *p*, she must mean, or intent to communicate *p*.

Grice defined conversational implicatures as a variety of implicatures, which is a concept that he apparently expected could be grasped independently. Presumably, there is a connection between Grice's general concept of implicature and his theory of speaker's meaning. In a broad sense, one might be said to implicate that *q* if and only if one means that *q* by doing something, where the pertinent kind of meaning is that which Grice called utterer's occasion-meaning and defined in terms of the speaker's intentions toward the hearer. Alternatively, implicature might be defined more narrowly so that one may be said to implicate that *q* only if one means that *q* in this sense but the proposition that *q* is not what is said (Grice 1989).

With the Cooperative Principle and the general concept of implicature in the background, Grice defines conversational implicature as follows:

A man who, by (in, when) saying (or making as if to say) that p has implicated that q, may be said to have conversationally implicated that q, provided that (1) he is presumed to be observing the conversational maxims, or at least the Cooperative Principle; (2) the supposition that he is aware that, or thinks that, q is required in order to make his saying or making as if to say p (or doing so in those terms) consistent with this presumption; and (3) the speaker thinks (and would expect the hearer to think that the speaker thinks) that it is within the competence of the hearer to work out, or grasp intuitively, that the supposition mentioned in (2) is required. (Grice, 1989).

Conversational implicature then reveals an implicit meaning, which can only be uncovered by participants

who share the same background assumptions. In the classical Gricean notion of implicature, it is divided into the particularized implicature and the generalized implicature. The first one refers to the implicature that requires a specific context, while the latter refers to implicature that arises without any particular contexts.

Methodology

Research Design

The present paper employed a qualitative research methodology in analyzing the utterances found on the conversations posted on Facebook. Qualitative research methodology allows the researcher to stay close to the empirical world. By observing people in their everyday lives, listening to them talk about what is on their minds, and looking at the documents they produce, the qualitative researcher obtains first-hand knowledge of social life that is unfiltered (Taylor, 2016). In this paper, the conversations are real conversations of Facebook users and are shared by them in their respective FB accounts.

Data Collection

The paper concentrated on conversations as posted by Facebook users which, are themselves naturally occurring because they are natural conversations, but have been shared via the perspective of the one who posted the conversation. There is a little twist on the data that this paper has concentrated on as these have already been written as a sharing on FB. Still, this data was derived from situations that exist minus the researchers' interventions.

Hence in the gathering of data, the researcher had to do the following: 1) access Facebook and scroll on her wall and look for posted conversations; 2) since minimal data were derived using step no.1, the researcher had to visit the walls of her friends to see if there are conversations that were posted from December 1, 2017 until the month of February 2018, which was the gathering of data. Once conversations are spotted, the researcher screenshot the conversation and are made part of the data.

Participants

It must be understood that sources of the screenshot conversation posts are friends of the author in Facebook. The 50 conversations posts were shared by 37 individuals comprising of 25 females and 12 males. There is a variation of participants in the conversations posted and the one who posted it may not necessarily be part of the actual conversation at all. Consent of the sharers of the conversation was considered by asking them via a private message from the researcher asking permission to use the posted conversation as part of the study. It must be noted that, since the conversations were naturally occurring, the utterances shared were a mixture of several languages: Ilocano, Ybanag, Tagalog and English. These are the languages generally spoken by the people in the locality.

Inter-coding and Inter-rater Reliability

The author deemed it important to ask for the help of an inter-coder in coding the data gathered. The inter-coder is a holder of the Masters in Education major in English and has finished academic requirements of Ph.D. in Language Education at Cagayan State University. She was the campus paper adviser in the campus for two years. To arrive at a common ground, the intercoder underwent an orientation and practice facilitated by the author following the criteria set by Grice (1975). All the 50 conversation posts under study was given to the intercoder. There were discrepancies in the coding when the author and the intercoder compared their coding; however, whenever there was a discrepancy, they discuss the sentences by looking at the content of the conversation post and finally agree as to what is the most appropriate way of coding the exchanges. Out of the 50 conversations subjected for the inter-coder's analysis, agreement was seen in 46 instances with four instances of discrepancy; hence, the inter-rater reliability is 92% which is relatively high.

Data Gathering Procedures

The gathering of the FB conversation posts during the specified time generated a total of 50 conversation posts from 37 FB friends. Upon closer scrutiny of the gathered conversation posts, the author noticed a discrepancy in terms of the length of the posts. However, length of the conversation was disregarded because the unit of analysis in this study is the utterance unit. The paper then considered 50 conversation posts enough to answer the objectives of this paper. Cameron (2001) stressed that the number of data depends on the researcher's goals, resources and the kinds of claims the researcher is hoping to be able to make. In fact, according to Cameron

(2001) some highly respected researcher, like the linguist Deborah Tannen, have worked on very small and specific data samples. Hence, the researcher dwelt on 50 conversation posts and explored the observance and violation of the utterances on the Gricean maxims.

Data Analysis Procedures

After the conversations were screenshot and were made part of the data, the exchanges were then analyzed to see whether the utterances as posted, violate any of the Gricean Maxims: Quality, Quantity, Relevance and Manner. Hence, all utterances were explored noting the criteria set by Grice (1975) as seen below.

Maxim	Violating the Maxims
QUANTITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the speaker does the circumlocution or not to the point • If the speaker is uninformative • If the speaker talks too short • If the speaker talks too much • If the speaker repeats certain words
QUALITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the speaker lies or says something that is believed to be false • If the speaker does irony or makes ironic and sarcastic statements • If the speaker denies something • If the speaker distorts information
RELEVANCE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the speaker makes the conversation unmatched with the topic • If the speaker changes conversation topic abruptly • If the speaker avoids talking about something • If the speaker hides something or hides a fact • If the speaker does the wrong causality
MANNER	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the speaker uses ambiguous language • If the speaker exaggerates things • if the speaker uses slang in front of people who do not understand it • If the speaker's voice is not loud enough

Results and Discussion

Observance of the Maxims

Armed with the maxims and enough information on implicature, the paper shall first present how the utterances may be described in terms of its observance of the Gricean maxims. Observance of the maxims, as Grice explained, reflect the interlocutors' attempt to follow the rules in a conversation in order to understand each other on a direct and basic level.

Maxim of Quantity

This category relates to the quantity of information provided such that the speaker ensures that his contribution is as informative as required for the current purposes of the exchange and his contribution should not be more informative than is required. The following conversations illustrate responses that observe the maxim of quantity:

(from Conversation 1)

Pa: Where are you na?

(Where are you now?)

Me: Casa Angela pa lang Pa.

(Here in Casa Angela, Pa.)

(from Conversation 29)

Question: Magkano naman kikitain ko, every bottle?

(How much will I earn per bottle?)

Answer : You can earn as much as 1,500 every bottle kasi kapag member ka may 50% off discount ka sa lahat ng products 😊👉

(You can earn as much as 1,500 every bottle because if you are a member, you are entitled of 50% discount on all the products.)

(from Conversation 35)

Flea: Mommy, why is daddy using the vacuum?

Me: to get the dirt

The response of the speaker in Conversation 1 is just exactly what was needed by the father as he was just asking where he was. The speaker did not mention too much nor too little to answer the question of the father. In Conversation 29, the provided response to the question how much will he earn for every bottle sold is just enough to satisfy the given question. In Conversation 35, the mother answered just enough to the question why the father was using the vacuum and that was to get the dirt. Notice that in the above conversations, the speakers were all trying to cooperate in the conversations by giving the brief responses and included information that was needed in order for a meaningful conversation to transpire.

Maxim of Quality

Under this category, conversations are expected to be truthful such as information that is delivered should not be false, and that speakers should not say something which lacks adequate evidence. The following conversations manifest the speakers' attempt to be truthful by saying things which are truthful:

(from Conversation 13)

Me: anak bakit letter A sagot mo? (Pic 1)

(Child, why did you answer letter A?)

Y: Hindi ko naman kasi trabaho mag repair.

(Because it is not my job to repair)

(from Conversation 38)

Me: hindi na. Graduate na ako nun. Nakasama ka ba nun sa WOW pinas? Teka... sino ka na kasi????

(No. I already graduated then. Were you part of the WOW Pinas? Wait, tell me who you are.)

Her: ate.. ako si SANDY.

(Big sister, I am SANDY.)

(from Conversation 24)

Her: You're really cute for a guy!

Me: (chuckle to myself) thank you but I'm the same gender as you

In Conversation 13, the mother was asking her child why he chose letter A as his answer and the child's answer was truthful because it is true that as a child, it is not his work to repair appliances. In Conversation 38, the question was asking who the speaker was, and she answered it truthfully by saying that she was Sandy. In the last conversation, the speaker admitted very honestly first by thanking the addressee and then saying that they have the same gender. The speaker. Her admission of her gender is a truthful act because if she wanted to deceive, she could have just gone with ride and pretend that she was a man. It was obvious that following the

maxim of quality requires the speakers to say the truth and something that is evident-driven.

Maxim of Relevance

The Maxim of Relevance requires the speakers to provide information that is relevant to the present interaction. Everything that is provided should be something that has a relation to the issue on hand. This is evident in the following conversations:

(from Conversation 46)

Atenista: I have a question, do you only hire graduates from Ateneo and the top schools?

Me: No, we also hire graduates from PLM, PUP, etc.

(from Conversation 30)

Driver: Bababa na kayo?

(Are you going down?)

Girl Passenger: oo kuya, bababa na (paos talaga)

(Yes, I am.)

In the first conversation, the student was asking if they only hire graduates from Ateneo and other top schools and the response provided is relevant to the question. In the same manner, the response of the passenger is relevant to the question of the driver. The above conversations do not contain responses that are not related to the questions posed. This way, the speakers are cooperating in the conversations.

Maxim of Manner

The maxim of Manner, Grice notes that speakers should be perspicuous by avoiding obscurity, avoiding ambiguity and being brief and orderly in delivering information.

(from Conversation 35)

Flea: Why is daddy using the vacuum to get the rat poops

Me: Because it will suck all the rat poop so that daddy does not have to sweep it anymore.

(from Conversation 44)

Mama: (at the office-on the phone) Xy, Are you going to school now?

Xy: No.

In Conversation 35, the mother provided a clear answer to the child’s question why daddy is using the vacuum to get the rat poops. In the next conversation, the child clearly mentioned that she is not yet going to school, a clear response to the mother’s question. In these instances, the responses were delivered in a clear manner and made use of terms that not ambiguous, thus observing the maxim of manner.

It is clear in the above instances that speakers, in their attempt to cooperate in the respective conversations they are engaged in, provided answers and responses that directly observe the four maxims under study.

Violation of the Maxims

The conversations also give clear instances of how the maxims were violated. The objective of the identification of violations is to see the effects of violations and relate them to the principle of cooperation in conversation.

Violation, according to Grice (1975), takes place when speakers intentionally forget to apply certain maxims in their conversations to cause misunderstanding on the participants or to achieve some other purposes. From the 50 posted conversations, the following table summarizes the violations reflected in the gathered data.

Table 1. Maxim Non-Observances Distribution Table

Maxim of Cooperative Principle	Total Instances Found	Percentage
Quantity	16	45.7%

Relevance	10	28.57%
Quality	6	17.14%
Manner	3	8.57%

The table clearly shows that the maxim of quantity appears to be the most commonly violated maxim in the 50 conversations posted on FB resulting to 16 instances of violation with a percentage of 45.7%. Generally, the participants who violated the maxim of quantity were observed to be saying too much when it is not required. Saying too much may be the result when a speaker wants to convey the message that he knows what he means. The following instances are examples from the gathered data that violate the maxim of quantity:

(from Conversation 48)

Me: kasanu diay utang mun nabayagen

(How about your debt? It's been a long while since you got that amount)

She: kasanu ket saan ku met nasingir. Awan garud pagbayad ko ta saan ku garud nasingir madi da met

agbayad. Ket kunak nga singsingirendak ket kuna met agidiay nangala kaniak ti item ket bay am a ta singiren daka awan pagbayad mi.

(My debtors are not paying me too. I don't have money to pay you because I haven't collected any amount from my debtors too. I told them you are asking me to pay my debt already but they told me they don't have money to pay me.)

In the above conversation, the female sharer saw her debtor in the market and asked her about her debt. The response of the woman debtor is too lengthy saying a lot of reasons but does not mention anything as to when is she going to pay the amount she got from the sharer. The woman debtor obviously was doing a circumlocution and does not directly answer the question of the speaker. The obvious reason for violating the maxim was the woman's attempt to gain sympathy from her. Another instance of violating the maxim of quantity is as follows:

(from Conversation 14)

KFC: (I supposed she's asking Toffi's number)

Toffi: Why are you asking my number again? You go you ask the other crew who asked my number don't ask me again.

(from Conversation 16)

Child1: mom, tumaas grades ko sa geometry...

(mom, my grade in Geometry increased)

Mom: good... u see, pag nag-a outline ka ng notes, mas maganda, mas madaling magreview..... blah blah blah....

(Good! You see, when you outline your notes, it's easier to review.. blah blah blah)

(from Conversation 38)

Her: u look familiar

(You look familiar)

Me: (lumuwag dibdib at naexcite) alam mo, ikaw din! Hahahaha kanina pa kita inaalala kung kilala ba kita. CSU ka din ba? Ambassador ka din ba? Anong batch ka???

(Felt excited) You know, you too look familiar! I've been trying to recall if I knew you. Are you also from CSU? Are you also part of the Ambassador? What batch do you belong?)

It is clear from the above conversations that the response of Toffi, Mom and the female are too lengthy but not necessary. In the first instance, Toffi is supposed to just provide his number but gave a lengthy question. In the second instance, the mother appreciated the increase in her son's Geometry grade but mentions other things

like outlining notes will facilitate reviewing and will yield to a better result. In the third instance, the female sharer gave a lengthy response to a trigger statement. Their violations of the maxim of quantity was triggered by certain reasons like to show that the speaker has become impatient, to give emphasis, and to help recall information between the speaker and the addressee. Indeed, violating a maxim is triggered by certain causes and instances. As demonstrated in the study of Khosravizadeh & Sadehvandi (2011), Barry, an ordinary man with a simplistic view of life, violated the maxim of quantity mostly through redundancy, talkativeness, and circumlocution. The constant violation of the maxim of quantity by Barry seems to place the character in a higher position in terms of verbal humor.

This is followed by non-observance of the maxim of relevance resulting to 10 instances in the entire gathered data with a percentage of 28.6%. Maxim of Relevance is violated when

(from Conversation 5)

PROF: Class are you done?

ME: Nope sir. I'm Kim.

(from Conversation 8)

Friend: Bakit kokonti lang mga pictures mo sa phone mo?

(Why do you only have few photos in you cellphone?)

ME: Mahal ko kasi sarili ko

(Because I love myself.).

(from Conversation 20)

Tita: Neng, ba't ka naka-sleeveless? Hindi ka nilalamig?

(Why are you wearing sleeveless? Don't you feel cold?)

Ako: Matagal nang malamig ang puso ko.

(My heart has been cold for so long)

Tita:

Ako: The cold never bothered me anyway. Let it go. ☺

The above sets of conversations are reflective of the unmatched answers of the speakers to questions like “*Class are you done?, Bakit kokonti ang pictures mo sa phone mo?, and Bakit ka nakasleeveless?*” It is observed that their responses to these questions seem to be unmatched with the questions given. It is not clear though if these responses are intentionally designed by them to be irrelevant to the questions asked from them. But looking deeper in to the posted conversation, the utterance of Kim is irrelevant because the teacher was asking them if they are done with their task in the classroom. Kim was obviously wanting to inject humor in the conversation. In the second instance, the utterance of the male sharer “*mahal ko kasi sarili ko*” does not have anything to do with the question why does he have very few pictures in his phone. In the conversation, the sharer obviously wanted to be humorous as justified in his saying he loves himself too much that he gets jealous everytime people say he is handsome. This is the same case with the third instance where the woman sharer wanted to be funny by saying that her heart has been cold for sometime and that the cold never bothered her anyway, lines she lifted from the song *Frozen*.

Further, the result shows that the maxim of manner was the least maxim that is violated. This runs counter to the findings in the study of Parasta (nd) where the maxim of manner was the most frequent maxim to be flouted by all characters. Maxim of manner flouting occurred when a character gives indistinct or unclear statements or comments. Those non-observances too the maxim of manner generally happen when a character delivers sarcasm, irony, tease or banter. Maxim of manner is violated when the speaker's utterance is ambiguous or does not have a clear meaning. In the present study, occurrence of the violation of the maxim of manner can be seen in the following example:

(from Conversation 4)

Male friend: Nu adda uncle iti masakigan ni Max eh ni M---- agpakasar da

- (Uncle, if M--- will be made pregnant, they will get married)
 Father: *Kayat ku ajay ah uray kastuy yak eh haan ku papanawen ajay babain*
 (I'd love that. Even if I'm like this, I will accept the woman)
 Me: *Halla Papa ni J---- ajay. You know nman the love*
 (Pa, that's J---. You know that's love.)

Just to set the context in the above conversation, the male friend is teasing the sharer of the post, who obviously is a homosexual, with the possibility of impregnating a woman. The father, expressed his desire for that to happen and welcomed the idea; however, the male sharer insinuates that he loves another one. Instead of mentioning the name, the sharer made the person anonymous by just giving an initials of the name. This is clearly a violation of the maxim of relevance because the speaker spoke in an unclear manner. This is again observed in the following conversation where the customer, as affected by his accent, sounded so unclear to the speaker, thus violating the maxim of manner.

- (from Conversation 23)
 Me: *Hi this is Abigail from ***** Customer Service. May I have your name please.*
 Cx: *R-U-N-D-U-S*
 Me: *So it is RUNDUS*
 Cx: *I mean are you in the United States*

Generation of Implicature

Grice clearly pointed out that not all people observe the maxims. When people fail to observe the maxims, it might lead to the creation of an implicature. Implicature therefore arises as a result of non-observance of the maxims. In this case, speakers choose not to observe one or more maxims with the deliberate intention of creating an implicature. When violating the cooperative maxims, the speaker so innately desires his/her recipient to understand and uncover the hidden meaning behind the utterances. This means that when a speaker violates the maxims, he/she is not trying to mislead, deceive or be uncooperative but rather prompting the listener to look for meaning beyond the semantic level. To recall, in one of Grice's famous examples on conversational implicature, a motorist has run out of gas and is approached by a passerby who informs him that there is a gas station around the corner. Looking at the statement of the passerby, and upon the assumption that he is speaking cooperatively, the motorist might conclude that what was in the mind of the passerby is that the gas station is open and has gas to sell. This way, the passerby can be said to have *conversationally implicated* that the gas station around the corner is open and since it is open, it has gas to sell. As Grice defined it, a speaker conversationally implicates that *p* only if the speaker expects the hearer to recognize that the speaker thinks that *p*. The following conversation is an example of a violation of a maxim and the conversational implicature generated:

- (from Conversation -01)
Conversations with Papa (over the phone, he is worried that I am not yet at home)
 Pa: *Where are you na?*
 (Where are you now?)
 Me: *Casa Angela pa lang Pa.*
 (im here at Casa Angela Pa.)
 Pa: *Debut or Wedding?*
 (Is it a debut or a wedding?)
 Me: *Miss Gay Pa.*
 (It's Miss Gay, Pa.)
 Pa: *Nabartek ka manin anaku, kasanu Miss gay ata nagdakkal tyan mu.*
 (You are drunk again, how can you be in a Ms. Gay pageant, you have a big tummy)

In the above conversation, the father was asking if the son is on a wedding or debut as that has always

been the preoccupation of the son who happens to be an event organizer. The son violated the maxim of quality by saying an untrue statement that he is attending Ms. Gay. The conversational implicature here is that the speaker intends to say that he is not just into debuts and weddings, but also on pageants. Considering context now, the speaker here is open to everything about his sexuality and he was like telling his father, in a jokingly manner, that he can also join gay pageants or watch gay pageants. The father, who seem to know the son really well, took the joke lightly and answered back in a humorous way too.

Clearly, the interlocutors violate the maxims with certain purposes in mind. After having a look at the FB conversation posts, this paper summarizes the reasons of their violation of the maxim based on the context of their respective conversations.

Table 2. Purposes in Violating the Maxims

Purpose of the Violation	Frequency
To inject humor in the conversation	16
To reflect sarcasm in the statement	9
To emphasize a point	6
To hide identity	1
To convince buyers to purchase	1
To elicit sympathy	1
To impress	1
Total Instances of Violation	35

The table clearly shows that the speakers involved in the gathered conversations violate the maxims with a purpose. And as shown on the table, the speakers who violated the maxims in general wanted to inject humor in the conversations. It must be noted that this is also reflective of speakers who obviously are characterized as funny and wanting of light humorous conversations, instead of heavy dramatic scenarios. There is also an attempt of the speakers to inject sarcasm. In the study of Szczepanski (2014), sarcastic remarks always flouted the maxim of quality, which led the authors to conclude that the maxim of quality is closely connected to sarcasm. In the present data, sarcasm was found not only in the violation of the maxim of quality but also maxims of quantity and relevance.

Conclusions

The analysis clearly reflected speakers' attempts to cooperate in the conversation by providing answers that observe the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance and manner. In the same manner, evidence also suggests that the interlocutors in most cases tend to violate Grice's maxims. Indeed, several cases have been identified where speakers violate the maxims. Of the four maxims, the maxim of quantity was frequently violated. However, it must be stressed that speakers disobey the maxims in order to achieve certain purposes. Among the purposes identified was to inject humor in the conversation and blend sarcasm in their statements.

The analysis of the FB conversations posts clearly shows that the message people intend to convey is not wholly contained in the words they use but may depend on the hearer's interpretation inconsideration of the context and implicated meaning. Generation of implicature comes out smoothly when interlocutors share a common background assumption. When this background assumption does not come into play, this may result to an implicature failure. When seen now in the classroom scenario, language teachers all over the world, should be aware that when students engage in certain conversations inside the classroom, there may be instances where they communicate implied meaning. And since the classroom teacher facilitates learning in the classroom, or as Idrus (2018) puts it, the teachers play a big role in determining the success or failure in the classroom. In other words, the responsibility for a successful and meaningful communication to take place is passed on heavily among the teachers who should be able to deduce these meanings from the students' utterances.

Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study clearly reveal that participants in a conversation still adhere to the maxims set forth by Grice (1975) and they, too, may violate the maxims with a purpose in mind. When seen in the classroom scenario, where formal and informal conversations between students and teachers transpire, these findings may find themselves useful among language teachers. In teaching the language to our students, exposure to the target language has always been considered important because the greater the exposure to the target language, the more abundant input is accorded among our learners. As Liu (2003) explains, language is a vehicle for the expression or exchanging of thoughts, concepts, knowledge and information as well as the fixing and transmission of experience and knowledge. Hence, he said that communication is the most fundamental social function of language. So as students continue to exchange thoughts and ideas in the classroom, the language teacher has to have the ability to extract implicatures from the students' statements; hence, this would give them a better understanding of whatever meaning is expressed in the conversations they are engaged in.

Gricean pragmatics should therefore find its place in the classroom and language teachers all over the world should realize that it is important for them to understand both what they are teaching and what is happening in their classrooms. Since teachers are dealing with students, their language and language use, it is imperative that they know how to properly deal with messages that circulate in the classroom, whether they be directly stated or implied. The Gricean maxims then should serve as guiding principle for the 21st century teachers. They should be aware when certain maxims are violated, and thus be able to uncover the hidden meanings or implicatures from their students' statements.

Gricean Pragmatics or Pragmatics in general, is then important in classroom language teaching where language is used in social context to promote the teaching and learning of language for use in social contexts. It is of high value that we arm our students with pragmatic competence which they can use as they go outside the classroom after their formative years. This pragmatic competence is what they will need to negotiate understanding in the specific contexts where they will find themselves in.

References

- Buchanan, R. (2013). Conversational implicature, communicative intentions, and content. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00455091.2013.892758>
- Davies, B. (2000). *Grice's cooperative principle: Getting the meaning across*. In Nelson & Foulkes (Eds). Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Gauker, C. (2001). Situated inference versus conversational implicature. *Nous*. Vol 35, No.2 Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org.lib1000.dlsu.edu.ph/stable/pdf/2672002.pdf?refreqid=search%3A4c72256bc831c0c3e5831f9f8dc69624>
- Grice, H.P. (1989) *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole, & J. Morgan (Eds.) *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
- Grandy, R. (1989). On Grice on Language. *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol.86, No. 10 86th Annual Meeting of American Philosophical Association. Retrieved from: <http://0-www.jstor.org.lib1000.dlsu.edu.ph/stable/pdf/2026659.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3A5017e5328f471c1ce39ec6372fc86030>
- Hadi, A. (2013). A critical appraisal of Grice's Cooperative principle, *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*. Retrieved from: <http://www.scirp.org/journal/ojml>
- Idrus, M. (2018). A case study of a lecturer's politeness strategies in an international classroom as a West Midlands University. *The Asian EFL Journal* October 2018 Vol. 20, Issue 10
- Jakaza, E. (2013). *Gricean implicature and election predictions: A case of Zimbabwean 2008 election campaign*. South African linguistics and applied language studies. Retrieved from: [2018 TESOL International Journal Vol. 13 Issue 4 !\[\]\(de39936b55a933e93340536bf287c7e2_img.jpg\) ISSN 2094-3938](http://0-</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

www.tandfonline.com/lib1000.dlsu.edu.ph/doi/abs/10.2989/16073614.2013.837607

- Jafaro, J. (2013). *The pragmatic analysis of Wilde's comedy: The importance of being earnest*. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 3. No.12. Retrieved from: <http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol03/12/01.pdf>
- Jin, J. (1999). The use of maxims for cooperation in Chinese medical interviews, *Health Communication*, 11:3. Retrieved from: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/hhth20>
- Khosravizadeh P. & Sadehvandi, N. (2011). *Some instances of violation and flouting of the maxim of quantity by the main characters in Dinner for Schmucks*. International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics. Singapore: IACSIT Press.
- Liu, L. (2003). A new perspective on the goals of TEFL in China. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol. IX, No. 11. (Available at: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Liu-Goals.html>).
- Mukaro, L., Mugari, V., & Dhumukwa, A. (2013). *Journal of comparative literature and culture. Violation of conversational maxims in Shona*. United States: World Science Publisher. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/5244868/Violation_of_Conversational_Maxims_in_Shona
- Ngenget, S. (2017). A revisit of the Gricean maxims in Manado Malay language, *Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching*. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320275967_A_Revisit_of_Gricean_Maxims_in_Manado_Malay_Language
- Parasta, J. (n.d) *Non-observance of conversational maxims in building humorous atmosphere in the comedy movie "The Wizards return"*. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/33432765/non-observance_of_conversational_maxims_in_building_humorous_atmosphere_in_the_comedy_movie_the_wizards_return_alex_vs_alex
- Szczepanski, P. (2014). *Flouting the maxims in scripted speech*. Retrieved from: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:872861/FULLTEXT01.pdf>
- Tupan, A. Natalia, H. (2008). *The Multiple Violations of Conversational maxims in lying done by the characters in some episodes of Desperate Housewives*. Retrieved from: <http://kata.petra.ac.id/index.php/ing/article/viewFile/16760/16741>

About the Author

Ms. Chirbet C. Ayunon is an assistant professor in Cagayan State University Cagayan, Philippines, teaching Language and Literature subjects in undergraduate and graduate programs. She received her bachelor's degree in English in St. Paul University Philippines and her master's degree in Teaching English Language at De La Salle University in 2002. Currently, she is enrolled at De La Salle University for her Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics. Her research interests are on the area of sociolinguistics and discourse analysis.