

Revisiting Gricean Maxims in Speech Participants' Convivial Conversations

ROCKY JAMES G. SARASUA

Cauayan City National High School-Main

rockyjames.sarasua@deped.gov.ph

Abstract— This paper revisited the observance or violation of the Gricean maxims by the language participants in convivial conversations. Using a purely qualitative approach in the study, the researcher was able to gather 26 participants who were the sources of the data for analysis. Data analysis procedure centered on the criteria provided by Ayunon (2018) as established by Grice. The analysis evidently mirrored the participants' attempt to observe the Gricean maxims. Maxim of Quantity emerged as the most observed maxim as manifested in the language users' conversations. Similarly, the Maxim of Quantity was also the most violated maxim among the four Gricean maxims. Violations of the maxims were motivated based on the excerpts of the conversations, and participants violate a maxim to crack a joke or to express sarcasm. Gricean maxims play an important role in the teaching and learning process where effective communication is as important as content knowledge and pedagogy, learners' diversity, numeracy, stakeholders' actions, and educational policies. By understanding the basics of how these maxims work together in conversations, teachers have the power to understand deeper the meanings conveyed by their learners. Training for teachers in improving their pragmatic competence is highly suggested since they are the implementers of the curriculum, and they are the direct influencers in students' pragmatic competence as well.

I. Introduction

Conversation is the most human and humanizing thing people do (Turkle, 2015). Knight (2016) articulates that good conversation can be a building block for all effective communication. Conversations allow a speaker and a listener to share knowledge. When someone engages in a discussion, he or she is expected to reply by providing the necessary information to make the discourse meaningful (Ayunon, 2018).

Human beings are expected to follow a particular manner of interaction to communicate effectively. As a result, Herbert Paul Grice, a linguist, developed the Cooperative Principle (CP) and its maxims based on ordinary language philosophy as a way of interaction for successful communication (Herawati, 2013).

The CP focuses on the distinction between "speaking" and "meaning," attempting to answer the question, "how do speakers know how to construct implicit meanings and how can they expect that their addressees will reliably understand their intended meaning?" (Ayunon, 2018).

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the acknowledged purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are participating, according to Grice (1989) as he defines CP. He divided his principle into four maxims and sub-maxims:

In Maxim of Quality, the main point of this principle is to “try to make your contribution one that is true.” “do not say what you believe to be false” and “do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence” are its sub-maxims.

“Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)” and “do not make your contribution more informative than is required” are the essential principles in conforming to the second maxim, which is the Maxim of Quantity. Maxim of Relation is about “being relevant.” The Maxim of Manner is the last of the four maxims, which states that one must “be perspicuous.” In order to observe this fourth maxim, a language user must be aware at all times to “avoid obscurity of expression,” “avoid ambiguity,” “be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity),” and “be orderly.”

The cooperative principle and maxims are vital in explaining how speakers can communicate more than they say. Speakers may observe all the maxims as in the following example by Al-Aameri & Jamil (2020):

(1.) *Husband: Where is my watch?*

(2.) *Wife: It is on the table in the hall?*

The wife has answered the question clearly (Manner), truthfully (Quality) with the right amount of information (Quantity), and satisfied the goal of the question (Relation).

Grice pointed out that the cooperative principle's maxims might go unfulfilled in everyday speech in various ways. When some speakers want their listeners to grasp their speech without having to follow the maxims, they will break them but not lie or mislead them. People can break a rule if they are likely to deceive others. People can also infringe on a maxim by failing to follow it without intending to deceive someone. Paltridge (2012) provides an example:

(1.) *How are you getting to the airport tomorrow?*

(2.) *Well.... I'm going with Peter.*

B is flouting the maxims of relation and Quantity in this example since his answer is irrelevant and A has provided less information than is required; he is flouting the maxim of Quantity from which B concludes that he may have to drive himself to the airport. As a result, a maxim may be violated in a way that benefits another maxim.

According to Grice (1989), a participant in a discourse may fail to follow a maxim in one of several ways: (1) He may discreetly break a maxim; if so, he may be liable to mislead in some instances. (2) He may opt-out of both the maxim and the Cooperative Principle's operation; he may express, suggest, or allow it to become clear that he is reluctant to cooperate in the manner required by the maxim. He might say, for example, I can't say anything else because my lips are sealed. (3) He may be confronted with a conflict: he may be unable, for example, to fulfill the first Quantity maxim (Be as informative as is required) without violating the second Quality maxim (Have adequate evidence for what you say). (4) He may defy a maxim; that is, he may openly fail to follow it.

Furthermore, Grice distinguishes between violating and openly flouting a maxim. If a speaker flouts a maxim, he has purposefully and openly failed to observe one or more maxims for (a) communicative purpose(s), resulting in implicatures in a conversation.

Yule (1996) provides an example of flouting a maxim:

(1.) *Leila: Whoa! Has your boss gone crazy?*

(2.) *Mary: Let's go get some coffee*

According to Yule, Mary intentionally violates the Relevance maxim in order to make an implicature in her response to Leila's question. There are certain reasons why Mary responds to Leila's question with an unrelated answer, and Leila has to make some inference from Mary (for example, the boss may be nearby), and she understands why Mary makes an apparently unrelated remark. The implication here is that Mary is unable to respond to the question in that context.

On the other hand, Grice defines maxim violation as "quiet and unostentatious." If the speaker violates a maxim, he or she is likely to provide insufficient, ambiguous, or irrelevant information, which may impair communication but does not result in accusations. In some interactions, the speaker disregards Gricean maxims because he or she may infringe, opt-out of, or suspend a maxim (Mooney, 2004).

Several researchers in language and pragmatics conducted studies on CP in different aspects of language and communication, and the results of their studies add significance to CP.

Interested in seeing how journalists reported on the cooperation principle and its maxims in the run-up to the 2008 harmonized election, Jakaza (2013) used a pragmatic approach to the study of newspaper discourse to forecast the results of the harmonized elections. Two of the four maxims were primarily violated or flouted, according to the findings: the quality maxim was flouted by political-party candidates, and newspaper reporters were overwhelmed by the goal of gaining the electorate's vote rather than reporting the truth. On the other hand, the maxim of Quantity has been violated when politicians and news reporters present insufficient evidence to back up their claims.

LaFond (2000) contends that inexperienced writers tend to violate the Quality maxim, and as a result, they are unable to meet the Quantity, Relevance, and Manner maxims. That is, violating the Quality maxim has an impact on the fulfillment of other maxims because when the Quality maxim is violated, students find it challenging to adhere to other maxims. Mukaro (2013) investigated the violation of conversational maxims in public conversations in, such as daily chats, talks, and discussions. Employing the maxims and sufficient background information on implicature, the researchers investigated how the maxims were violated in the data they collected.

Herawati (2013) discovers in her study that the interlocutors in the conversations in some situations observe all the maxims, especially those of Quality and Relation. In many situations, however, the maxims of Quantity and Manner are not observed in a way that is different from what Grice suggests, which leads to a possible interpretation of the cultural patterns of the Indonesian language. On the one hand, Birner (2013) introduces an eye-opening concept about implicature. He went on to say that what is implicated can be either conversationally or conventionally implicated and that what is conversationally implicated can be due to either a generalized or a specific conversational implicature. In another culture, Ngenget S. (2017) also attempted to examine Gricean maxims in Manado Malay, with the goal of determining how the Cooperative Principle is violated in Manado Malay, as well as the purpose of the implicature generated. The violation of Gricean maxims can be seen in the Manado Malay language, according to the findings. This also suggested that Manado Malay language speakers had a proclivity for using implicature in their daily lives. They also emphasized that the implicatures were frequently formed in response to the interlocutor's question. As a result, the primary objective of implicature developed in Manado Malay is to provide information.

In employing CP in films, Tupan (2008) investigated the conversations in the American television series *Desperate Housewives*. The housewives are desperate in their lives as a result of love, betrayals, scandals, and internal conflicts that have led them to lie to each other. This means that they frequently violate the maxims in their lies and commit multiple violations to smooth them out, with each lie appearing to serve a purpose. According to the data, the characters lied for a variety of reasons, including concealing the truth, saving the speaker's or hearer's face, satisfying the hearer by making an appropriate utterance, or responding in a way that might cheer the hearer or avoiding hurting the hearer. Furthermore, the characters desired to strengthen someone's belief so that they could easily persuade the interlocutor.

Grice's conversational maxims have been questioned by some authors. Horn (1984), for example, identified only three maxims, and Sperber and Wilson (1986) ignored maxim structure in favor of focusing on the concept of relevance.

Accurate as it can be, studies regarding the Cooperative Principle and its maxims would not be equated to the plethora of studies conducted in other fields. Studies on this topic are still scarce nowadays. In the Philippines, very few mustered their academic prowess to conduct CP studies, which pushed the researcher to add to the bank of knowledge on CP. Daily conversations

offer the richest source of data for this study, and therefore, the researcher will investigate the concept of CP in language users' daily conversations; how conversations violate the Gricean maxims, and the implicatures created from these utterances.

Research Questions

Following Grice's Cooperative Principle, the purpose of this research is to explore how daily conversations comply with Grice's maxims. Its specific goal is 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; and
 - d. manner?

2. How are the Gricean maxims violated and flouted in the conversations of language users?

Theoretical Framework

This research endeavor is anchored on the social constructivist worldview, which holds that individuals seek understanding of the world in which they live and work. Individuals develop subjective meanings of their experiences- meanings directed toward particular objects or things. These meanings are varied and multiple, leading the researcher to look for the complexity of views rather than narrowing meanings into a few categories or ideas (Creswell & Creswell, 2000).

Grice's notion of conversational implicature revolutionized the pragmatic theory and is still considered one of the foundations of modern pragmatics.

In the study, the researcher seeks to explore the language users' conversations through the Gricean Cooperative Principle. Grice (1975) says that when people communicate, they assume, without realizing it, that they, and the people they are talking to, will be conversationally cooperative – these people will cooperate to achieve mutual conversational ends. Through this principle, the researcher will be able to describe and infer unstated meanings in language users' ordinary conversations.

Grice (1975), as cited by Ayunon (2018), asserted that the process of making and perceiving these implicatures is founded on the following principle: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the point at which it occurs, by the recognized purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." This means that speakers can create implicit meaning in their dialogues, and their listeners can detect the intended meaning.

Furthermore, he claims that participants automatically follow certain norms and patterns in their interactions.

Under the general umbrella of the CP, 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.

Grandy (1989), as cited by Ayunon (2018), quoted Grice's argument that each step in a conversation can be analyzed in terms of whether or not it conforms to the maxims. There are four possibilities: in the most obvious case, all maxims are obeyed; in the most devious case, a maxim is disobeyed but without the other participant's knowledge; A case in point is when a participant expressly chooses. Another instance is when a maxim is flouted, that is when it is clearly disobeyed rather than secretly.

Grice (1975) observes that in everyday conversations, people tend to imply or suggest things rather than say them directly; that is, the speaker frequently manages to convey implicature, which does not express the information explicitly but which the hearer may recognize through implication.

The assumption that conversational implicatures are basic examples of speaker-meaning lies at the heart of the standard Gricean conception of conversational implicature. A speaker implicates p only if she means or intends to express p by saying something else, according to the Gricean notion of implicature. This is known as meaning intention assumption, according to Buchanan (2013). This suggests that assuming the meaning-intention assumption is valid, a speaker must mean or intend to transmit p in order to implicate p in a discourse.

On the concept of implicature, according to Yang (2008), when speakers are able to mean more than what is actually said, this is referred to as implicature. As a result, implicature refers to the additional, unstated meaning that the speaker implies. Implicature works when the speaker and listener work together. This essentially sums up implicature and how speakers and hearers of a language interact cooperatively and politely. The term "conversational implicature" refers to pragmatic inferences based on contextual factors and the understanding that conventions are observed in conversations (Mukaro et al, 2013).

Grice described conversational implicatures as a collection of implicatures, a term he seemed to think could be grasped on its own. Grice's basic concept of implicature and his theory of speaker's meaning are most likely connected. In a broad sense, one might be said to implicate that q if and only if one means that q by doing anything, with the relevant kind of meaning being Grice's utterer's occasion-meaning, defined in terms of the speaker's intentions toward the hearer.

Alternatively, implicature could be defined more narrowly, such that one is said to implicate that q only if one means that q in this meaning but not the notion that q . (Grice 1989).

II. Methodology

Research Design

The study follows the direction of purely qualitative approach which explores and understands the meaning of individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). With this approach, the researcher was able to gather rich data from the participants' daily conversations. Specifically, it employs descriptive-qualitative research design.

Participants

The sources of the conversations were from the 26 individuals comprising of 23 females and 2 males. The participants in the study have varied positions, occupations, ages, civil status, and economic status. Convenience sampling procedure was undertaken to extract at least 20 excerpts from the conversations of the 26 individuals who participated in this study since everyone is a participant to a daily conversation. Standard operating procedures and considerations in the ethical standards in conducting research were observed in the study. Participants were asked to participate in this study by recording their conversations whenever the researcher is present. Since the conversations are naturally occurring, it is noted that the data gathered were a combination of different languages but mostly English and Filipino. Further, the conversations were not recorded from the time the speakers began speaking but it was by the time the researcher was able to record. Hence, it is more appropriate to choose excerpts from the recorded conversations.

Data Collection

During the data gathering procedure, 20 conversations with an average length of 3 minutes were collected from 26 individuals. Before recording, a consent was asked to the participants, and parental consent for participants who are minors. After the permission, the researcher then recorded conversations that were actually happening at the moment. This means that the recordings of these conversations mostly did not capture the beginning of a conversation since the researcher is trying to capture the natural setting of the conversation. These recorded conversations were then transcribed. Each conversation was provided with a separate file for organization. The different transcribed recorded conversations were closely read and noted through coding.

Data Analysis

The exchanges were then analyzed to see if the utterances as recorded in the daily conversations violated any of the Gricean Maxims: Quality, Quantity, Relevance, and Manner, after the conversations were recorded and made part of the data. As a result, all utterances were

investigated using the criteria as provided by Ayunon (2018) and established by Grice (1975), as shown below.

Maxim	Violating the Maxim
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

III. Results and Discussion

Conformance to the Maxims

The first of the results and discussion presents the following excerpts in the gathered and recorded conversation among participants which conformed to the different maxims presented by Grice. This category refers to the amount of information offered, with the speaker ensuring that his contribution is as informative as is necessary for the current aims of the exchange, and that it is not more informative than is necessary. Note that the names provided in the excerpts from the conversations are not the real names of the participants who participated in this study. In this, the researcher just use pseudo names to hide the participants' identities. Below is the table showing the prevalence of observance of the different maxims:

Table 2. Prevalence of Conformance to the Maxims

Maxim Cooperative Principle	Total Instances Found	Percentage
Quantity	67	48.55
Quality	14	10.14
Relevance	48	34.78
Manner	9	6.53
total	138	100

The above table shows the prevalence of the observance of the different maxims of Grice. It can be noted from the table that the maxim of Quantity is the most observed maxim with 67 instances or 48.55%, while the maxim with the least number of instances found in the conversation is the maxim of manner with 9 instances or 6.53%.

Observance of Maxim of Quantity

Clarity of message is a vital element in effective communication (Sarasua, 2021). When conforming to the maxim of Quantity, it is critical not to withhold facts necessary to keep the conversation moving during communication. However, a speaker must be careful not to overwhelm the listeners with irrelevant information. In abiding with the maxim of Quantity, therefore, one should make his/her contribution to the conversation as informative as required, and not contribute more information than required. The following excerpts from the different language users' conversation is a vivid manifestation of the observance of the maxim of Quantity:

(from Conversation 1)

Darna: Anong gusto mong ulam?

(What dish do you like?)

Ding: Adobo lattan.

(I prefer Adobo.)

(from Conversation 5)

Darla: Wow! Ang ganda, fren! San mo nabili yan?

(Wow! Friend, that's beautiful! Where did you buy that?)

Kris: Thanks! Sa Banchetto lang, fren. 100 lang.

(Thanks! I bought it at Banchetto. It costs a hundred pesos.)

(from Conversation 11)

Mama: Magsara ka na ng bintana kasi paulan na, Bless.

(Bless, start closing the windows for it is about to rain.)

Blessy: Opo, Mama.

(Yes, Mom.)

In the above excerpts, Conversation 1 observes the maxim of Quantity by providing enough information through directly answer her choice of food to eat. Further, the reply to the question also did not exceed the needed information during the conversation. Kris, in Conversation 2 provided the exact needed response to the question of Darla. In fact, in the conversation Kris provided a reply to the commendation as well as the question which is also needed in that conversation. Blessy in Conversation 3 provided just exactly a correct and polite reply to her mother's imperative mood in requesting her daughter to close the windows for it is about to rain already. In the above excerpts from the conversations, responses of the language users provided informative and enough information which generally conforms to the maxim of Quantity.

Observance of Maxim of Quality

Conversations in maxim of quality are required to be truthful, meaning that information presented should not be false, and speakers should not say anything without sufficient evidence. If the speaker lies or says something that is believed to be false, does irony or makes ironic and sarcastic statements, denies something, and distorts information, then one can say that the speaker is violating the maxim of quality. Below are example excerpts from gathered conversations which conform to the maxim of quality:

(from Conversation 24)

Pirena: Nagpintas man ta buok mu, color brown. Nagpakulay ka ba?

(Your brown-colored hair is stunning! Did you apply hair color?)

Amihan: Anyan! Hahaha! Natural aytoy!

(Anyan! Hahaha! This is all natural!)

(from Conversation 38)

Hazel: Yung totoo kasi ah. (insisting) Si Karen ba yung kumuha ng susi dito sa bag ko?

(Just tell me the truth. Did Karen get my key inside my bag?)

Janice: (laughing) Ako, sissy Hazel! (laughing) Puro ka kasi chismis kanina. (handed the key)

(It's me, sissy Hazel! You were focused gossiping at that time.) (laughing)

(from Conversation 18)

Stranger: Kuya, alam niyo po ba yung room ni ma'am Filma?

(Kuya, do you know the room of ma'am Filma?)

Kuya Dading: Wen, adding. Dun sa tapat ng kubo nab ago.

(Yes, little brother. Just go to the room adjacent the new nipa hut.)

Responses of the speakers in the following conversations above demonstrate truthfulness in their replies during the conversation, hence, conforming to the maxim of quality. In conversation 24, Amihan was praised by Pirena because of her hair color. Pirena asked Amihan if the hair color is natural, and Amihan replied truthfully that her hair color is just natural. In Conversation 18, Kuya Dading answered the stranger's question truthfully by providing clear directions on the whereabouts of the room of ma'am Filma. These excerpts from the conversations gathered clearly manifest truthfulness in their response as interlocutors in the conversations.

Observance of Maxim of Relevance

According to the Maxim of Relevance, presenters must deliver information that is pertinent to the current engagement. Everything you submit should be related to the problem at hand. Following the relevance rule minimizes random, nonsensical dialogues with no continuity and makes interactions easier to follow. The maxim of relevance is evidently observed in the following conversations:

(from Conversation 32)

Buyer: Magkano yung Manga po?

(How much is your Mango?)

Vendor: Yung hilaw o yung hinog?

(The Green one or the Ripe one?)

(from Conversation 43)

Teacher: Sinong nakapagbasa sa Module 4 natin?

(Who read our Module 4?)

Student: Buong Module 4 po ba yung dapat basahin, ma'am?

(Are we going to read the entirety of Module 4, ma'am?)

(from Conversation 15)

Janice: Sissy, gagamitin mo ba 'yang pamaypay mo mamaya sa klase?

(Sissy, are you going to use that hand fan later in your class?)

Rocky: May aircon ba dun, sissy?

(Does the room have an air conditioner, sissy?)

In the above excerpts from gathered conversations, Vendor from Conversation 32 provides a relevant response to the buyer of Mango by asking what particular mango is that buyer buying. In Conversation 43, the student's response is relevant because the students clarified whether or not they were going to read the entirety of the module 4 or not. Rocky's question as a response to Janice's question, in Conversation 15 is relevant because asking the availability of an air conditioner will be the basis on whether or not Rocky will lend Janice his hand fan.

Observance of Maxim of Manner

Speakers, in observing the maxim of manner, should be conspicuous by eliminating obscurity, ambiguity, and providing information in a brief and systematic manner, according to Grice. Interlocutors should avoid using unfamiliar terminology, and saying things that may cause confusion. To conform in the maxim of manner, one must state events in a clear, methodical, and logical manner. Below are excerpts from conversations that adhere to the maxim of manner:

(from Conversation 17)

Boy: Favorite ko talaga ang Coldplay. Napakarelaing ng mga kanta nila. Sila yung kumanta nung The Scientist tapos Yellow ayy.

(Coldplay is my favorite band. Their songs are relaxing. They sang the songs The Scientist and Yellow.)

Abunda: Ahhh Oo nga. Yung Yellow ba na kanta nila yung official soundtrack ng Crazy Rich Asians?

(Yeah, that's right. Their song Yellow is the official soundtrack of the movie Crazy Rich Asian, right?)

Boy: Wen, sila nga yun!

(Yes! It's them!)

(from Conversation 4)

Elle: Nu'ng pumunta ba tayo sa RSPC in Roxas noon eh saan ba tayo dumaan ulit?

(When we went to RSPC in Roxas, where did we go specifically?)

Melany: Sa Roxas yun noon, maamshee. Nagpa-Cabatuan tayo maamsh, tapos Aurora, tapos San Manuel na maamshee. Bakit po, maaamsh?

(It's in Roxas, maaamshee. We went to Cabatuan road first, then to Aurora, Isabela, and San Manuel, maaamsheee. Why, maamsh?)

(from Conversation 31)

Kisses: (Laughing) Tawang tawa ka na naman sa boses ni Alyanna. Bakit na naman? (laughing)

(You are laughing out loud again in the voice of Alyanna, Kisses. Why)

Irene: (Laughing) Oo. Naaalala ko pa nga noon sa Sports Zone eh kinanta niya yung It's All Coming Back ni Celine Dion. Binuksan niya pa yung pinto ng room natin. (laughing)

(Yes. I can still remember before when we went to Sports Zone, Alyanna sang It's All Coming back by Celine Dion. She even opened the door in our videoke room.)

Conversation 17 adheres to the maxim of manner. The speaker shares his favorite band Coldplay. He is aware of the fact that the listener may not know Coldplay and therefore, Boy provides expounded on his favorite band by providing the famous song they sang (The Scientist, and Yellow). The listener understands Boy's message when Abunda clarified if the song Yellow was the official soundtrack of the movie Crazy Rich Asians. Orderly reply to a query is evident in Conversation 4 as the speaker provided an orderly explanation on the directions going to Roxas, Isabela, hence observing the maxim of manner. Same orderly response is evident in Irene's conversation with Kisses in Conversation 31, where she narrated their experience in going to Sports Zone when they went to the videoke room and Alyanna sang It's All Coming Back by Celine Dion, then Alyana went outside so that other people inside the Sports Zone will hear her voice.

Non-observance to the Maxims

In numerous situations and in various contexts, people do not satisfy or observe the maxims throughout ordinary speech (Alvaro, 2011). According to Grice (1975), violations occur when speakers purposefully fail to implement specific maxims in their dialogues in order to produce misunderstanding among the participants or achieve other goals. From the gathered conversations, below is the table showing the prevalence of violation per maxim by the interlocutors.

Table 1. Prevalence of Violation in the Maxims

Maxim Cooperative Principle	Total Instances Found	Percentage
Quantity	38	54.29
Quality	6	8.57
Relevance	14	20.0
Manner	12	17.14
total	70	100

The table shows that the maxim of Quantity is the most prevalent violated maxim by the interlocutors in the gathered conversations garnering 38 instances with a percentage of 54.29. Ayunon's (2018) findings provide a similar result with that of the current study, presenting that the maxim of Quantity is also the most prevalent violated maxim in the conversations. Speakers in the gathered conversations were too repetitive of their responses, talk too short or talk in circumlocution. Below are excerpts from the conversations which violated the maxim of Quantity:

Non-observance of Maxim of Quantity

(from Conversation 2)

Allan: Maaamsh Films, papasok po ba kayo tom?

(Maaamsh Films, are you going to school tomorrow?)

Maamsh Films: Sobrang busy ko naman bukas, may activity kasi kami sa church tapos sasamahan ko yung anak kong mag exam sa Cagayan. Baka magpaalam muna ako kay sir PRG.

(I am very busy tomorrow. We have activities in the church, and I will go with my daughter to have her exam in Cagayan. Maybe I will ask permission from sir PRG.)

(from Conversation 16)

Agnes: Besh tuloy ba yung outing natin sa 7?

(Besh, is our outing on the 7th of the month confirmed?)

Carmen: Nagpirma naman na ako sa travel order besh tapos per department naman iyon. Wala pa naman silang update besh.

(I already signed in the travel order besh, and that is per department. There is no update up to now, best.)

Both conversations above violated the maxim of Quantity by not directly answering the question. In Conversation 2, Allan only wanted to ask whether Maaamsh Films will go to school tomorrow, but she answered too long and she became uninformative. The same situation happened in Conversation 16 when Carmen answered in an uninformative manner to Agnes if it is confirmed that they will be having an outing on the 7th of the month.

Maxim of relevance is the second most prevalent violated maxim by the interlocutors. In this violation, the speakers attempted to provide irrelevant response to the question by the other speakers in the conversations. Below are excerpts of the conversations where maxim of relevance is violated:

Non-observance of Maxim of Relevance

(from Conversation 11)

Kath: Ma'am, nagagalit po ba si Sir G?

(Ma'am, is sir G angry?)

Ma'am: Gusto mo bang punta tayo sa SM muna ngayon?

(Do you want to go to SM with me for now?)

(from Conversation 20)

Jane: Nakasama ko si ma'am Beth sa seminar noon sa region eh. Magaling ba siya?

(I was able to be with ma'am Beth in a seminar before in the region. Is she competent?)

Celine: Maingay yun. Uubusin niya yung oras niyo kakachismis, sis.

(She is loud. She will spend all of your time gossiping, sis.)

Speaker in Conversations 11 redirected the topic to another when asked if sir G is angry, a violation of maxim of relevance. Similarly, Celine in Conversation 20 violated the maxim of relevance by answering irrelevantly to the questions on Jane. Ma'am in Conversation 11 may indicate that sir G is angry at the moment, that is why she asks Kath if she wanted to join her in the mall, while Celine's response to Jane may indicate of Beth's incompetence to work.

Maxim of Manner is the third most violated maxim in Grice's maxims. Below are excerpts from the conversations gathered where the maxim of manner is violated:

Non-observance of Maxim of Manner

(from Conversation 26)

Jay: Congrats, bes! Ang galing galing mo talaga! Libre na yan!

(Congratulations, Bes! You are indeed amazing! Treat us!)

Mark: (nods, and walks away)

Jay: Ayyy (confused)

(from Conversation 33)

Arden: Bes, super naenjoy ko yung Ms. Gay sa RM. Sika ngay?

(Bes, I enjoy the Ms. Gay RM last night. How about you?)

Angelo: Grabeh ang daming tao, tapos yung mga vavakla eh todo din sa rampa. Kilala ko yung isang kalaban ni Christian dun eh kaklase natin dati.

(Wow! There are so many people, and the gays were all driven to walk the stage. I know one of Christian's competitors. He was once our classmate before.)

It is evident in Conversation 26 that maxim of manner is violated when the speaker did not provide a response and gesture expected of him. In Conversation 33, the speaker is ambiguous in his response when asked if he enjoyed the event. Jay's nodding and walking away may indicate impoliteness, or disapproval from treating the speaker who congratulated him, while Angelo's response may mean that he did not fully enjoy the event.

Maxim of Quality is the least violated maxim in the gathered conversations from this study. When a speaker purposefully asserts anything that is incorrect or for which the speaker has insufficient evidence, the quality maxim is violated.

Non-observance of Maxim of Quality

(from Conversation 8)

Benj: Where na kayo mga ses?

(Where are you, sisters?)

Gerald: Sa Kangaroo Beach na, ses. (laughs)

(I'm at the Kangaroo Beach already, ses.)

(from Conversation 8)

Benj: Saan ka na ses Gerald?

(Where are you now, ses Gerald?)

Gerald: Landbank na.

(Landbank already.)

Karen: Landbank Saguday na daw siya mga ses (laughs)

(He's in Landbank Saguday already, sisters.)

In the excerpts from the gathered conversation above, the speakers said things that are actually false and misleading. In Conversation 8, Gerald answered that he is already in Kangaroo Beach resort when in fact he is travelling to Centro Cauayan City from Villa Luna, and Karen's expounding of a particular branch of Landbank where Gerald is currently located is also false since Gerald is really at Landbank Cauayan City. Karen's and Gerald's intention in their false provision of a correct and true response is to joke at the moment of the conversation.

IV. Conclusion

The paper revisits the different maxims in the conversations of language users in the researcher's context. The analysis in this study manifested how conversations conform to and violate the Gricean maxims. By investigating how the different speakers cooperate in the conversation by observing the different maxims, it can be provided that the maxim of Quantity is the most prevalent observed maxim in the conversations. Most of the gathered conversations are structured in a question and answer conversation where speakers are asked to answer questions on any topic, and the observance of the maxim of Quantity is usually needed to cooperate in the conversation. However, despite the fact that the maxim of Quantity is the most observed maxim in the gathered conversations, it is also the most violated among the four maxims. It can also be noted that this maxim is the easiest to be traced in the language users' conversations.

However, it can also be noted that the violations in the maxims are motivated by the different intentions posited by the interlocutors. The speakers in the gathered conversations violated the maxims to joke, or to express sarcasm. Other speakers violated the maxim because they do not actually have the concrete and sufficient evidence to answer a query, and they resulted to answering the question anyway which resulted to a violation. The study of the recorded conversations clearly demonstrates that the message people want to express is not entirely contained in the words they employ, but rather depends on the listener's assessment of the context and implied meaning. It can also be stressed here that in other contexts, especially when other researchers from other regions or situations will analyze the conversations, they may have a different take because the conversations are context-dependent.

Pedagogical Implications

Noting the research findings from this study, Gricean maxims play an important role in the teaching and learning process where effective communication is as important as content knowledge and pedagogy, learners' diversity, numeracy, stakeholders' actions, and educational policies. Understanding the basics of how these maxims work together in conversations, teachers have the power to understand deeper the meanings conveyed by their learners. Further, it gives teachers a more profound connection with the students during class interaction, school-based activities, discussions, and other activities where communication takes place. Note also that these maxims can also be observed in non-verbal communication modes. Teachers must be aware of the acts, omissions, and statements of their learners to understand what they want to convey. This is important, especially for the teacher to be able for them to appropriately address their needs.

The concept of the Gricean maxim is part of a general concept which is pragmatics. Pragmatics, therefore, is vital in the effective implementation of the teaching and learning process. Teachers will have a strengthened classroom management strategy if they will understand more how their students interact in the classroom. However, one should also understand that language proficiency, especially in the target language is of consideration for both teachers and learners who are using English as their second or foreign language to understand the Gricean maxims. No language user has been perfect in observing these maxims, and it can be gleaned from this study and other studies that communicators sometimes fail to observe the maxims purposively or for varied reasons. This means that as teachers, one should also have an allowance for mistakes, since both teachers and students are also using language in social contexts, and there may be circumstances of misunderstanding (Sarasua, 2021). Training for teachers in improving their pragmatic competence is highly suggested since they are the implementers of the curriculum, and they are the direct influencers in students' pragmatic competence as well.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alvaro, R, N. (2011). The role of conversational maxims, implicature and presupposition in the creation of humour: an analysis of woody Allen's anything else. Master dissertation. Aristotelian Society, suppl. (35), 121–52.
- [2] Augurzky, Petra; Franke, Michael; Ulrich, Rolf (2019). Gricean Expectations in Online Sentence Comprehension: An ERP Study on the Processing of Scalar Inferences. *Cognitive Science*, 43(8), -. doi:10.1111/cogs.12776
- [3] Ayunon, C. (2018). Gricean Maxims Revisited in FB Conversation Posts: Its Pedagogical Implications. *TESOL International Journal*, 13(4), 81–95.
- [4] Birner, B. (2013). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Wiley: Blackwell.
- [5] Davies, B. L. (2008). Grice's cooperative principle: Meaning and rationality. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 2308-2331.

- [6] Gary C. Woodward (2017) Reclaiming Conversation: The Power of Talk in the Digital Age by Sherry Turkle, Mass Communication and Society, 20:1, 146-148, DOI: 10.1080/15205436.2016.1234165
- [7] Grandy, R.E. (1989). 'On Grice on language'. The Journal of Philosophy, 86. 514-525.
- [8] Grice, H. P. (1989). Studies in the way of words. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- [9] Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In Cole, P. & Morgan, J.L. Syntax and semantics. Vol. 3, Speech acts. New York: Academic P.
- [10] Herawati, A. (2013). The Cooperative Principle: Is Grice's Theory Suitable to Indonesian Language Culture?. Jurnal Lingua Cultura, 7(1), 43-48.
- [11] Jakaza, E. (2013). Gricean implicature and election predictions: A case of Zimbabwean 2008 election campaign. South African linguistics and applied language studies.
- [12] LaFond, L. (2000). Telling truths or Titanic tales: The interrelatedness of Gricean maxims. Carolina Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 1, No. 1, 8-42.
- [13] Mooney, A. (2004). Cooperation, violations and making sense. Journal of Pragmatics, 36(5), 899-920.
- [14] Mukaro, L., Mugari, V. and Dhumukwa, A. (2013). Violation of Conversational Maxims in Shona. United States.
- [15] Ngenget, S. (2017). A revisit of the Gricean maxims in Manado Malay language, Journal of Linguistic and English Teaching.
- [16] Paltridge, B. (2012). Discourse Analysis. Great Britain.
- [17] Sarasua, R. J. (2021). ERROR ANALYSIS ON STUDENTS'ESSAY COMPOSITION: REFERENCE FOR CORRECTIVE FEEDBACKING MECHANISM. International Journal of Arts, Sciences and Education, 2(1), 51-60.
- [18] Sarasua, R. J. G. (2021). Students' Strategies in Understanding Non-Literary Texts.
- [19] Turkle, S. (2015). Reclaiming conversation: the power of talk in a digital age. New York: Penguin Press.
- [20] Yang, C. (2008). Language Use in Context: A Course in Pragmatics. Beijing: University of International Business and Economics Press.
- [21] Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.