

## **CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF DATA**

### **4.0 The Introduction**

In this chapter, the researcher will focus on Grice's theory of cooperation and its conversational maxims and to see the extent Internet Chat Room users apply Grice's Cooperative Principle in their conversation. This chapter provides an analysis of the data collected from the Internet Chat Room conversations qualitatively. A brief introduction of each of the situation of the 10 Internet Chat Room conversations is provided in chapter three. The interpretation of the implied meanings was derived at by the researcher. In this chapter, the chats are explained according to the strategies used to create the implicatures, within the adhering and violating of the four maxims. An attempt will be made to see to what extent the Internet Chat Room users in the data conform or violate to Grice's Cooperative Principle and its four conversational maxims

Grice (1971) noted that certain conversational "maxims" enable the users to nominate and maintain a topic of conversation: quantity, quality, relevance and/or relation or manner. Therefore, the researcher feels that there is a need to analyse how the Internet Chat Room users interact to see how interactors are able to accommodate and make adjustments to each other in an effort to build understanding in conversations. There are times when a speaker cannot honour one or more maxims. Therefore, the interactors may be misled into thinking that the user is being cooperative in every way if the other interactor does not opt to conform to a maxim.

The emergence of overlapping in Internet Chat Room conversation is also problematic. This is because temporal overlap in display of time is not an option in one-way CMC, since one-way systems force messages into a strict linear order. On the other hand overlaps of exchanges are rampant in CMC environments. In dyadic communication, users are unable to tell whether their interlocutor is in the process of responding or may become impatient and send a second message before a response to the first has been received, resulting in incomplete exchange sequence showed. This is because sometimes it takes time to respond to the questions. In a group communication, unrelated messages from other participants often intervene between an initiating message and its response, in likelihood proportional to the number of active participants involved in the communication. However, it is a fact of life that people follow the routine of taking turns, when they talk and avoid talking excessively.

In Internet Chat Room, turn-taking holds talks in an orderly affair. This turn-taking according to Bodden, (1994:66) “is integral to conversational exchanges”. In the next section the analysis of Gricean Framework will be presented and describe how Grice’s Co-operative Principle is developed. The subsequent section will present Grice’s theory of cooperation and the conversational maxims.

In the analysis of this study the researcher identifies examples in the data that adhere to the Grice’s Co-operative Principle and also the violations of this principle based on the data compiled from a series of Internet Chat Room conversation. In the next few paragraphs the researcher will introduce a few of Grice associated maxims and try to relate them to Internet Chat Room conversation.

#### **4.1 The Four Classes of Maxim Conformation**

In this section, the researcher provides the four classes of maxims. Firstly, the researcher identifies the adherence of the maxim. Based on the data collected, the researcher categorises the data according to Grice's four classes of maxim adherence.

According to Grice (1975) the four classes of maxims are: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance and the maxim of manner. After the adherence has been identified, the researcher made an interpretative study using the sample, paying special attention to the context of the utterances. All these will be explained in the four maxims.

This study indicates that Internet Chat Room interactors employ strategies that show adherence to convey the messages. Grice (1975) proposes that the co-operative principle can be explicated in terms of maxims of co-operation in conversations. Violation of the co-operative Principle would normally lead the interactors to ask questions. However, Grice (1975) does not consider such cases as communication failures and it is clear that he has not developed the co-operation.

#### **4.2 The Context of Conversations Among Chat Room Users**

Based on the data compiled, the researcher observes that the data contained exchanges that centred around general topics to current issue. The topics of discussion form the context of the conversations that the Internet Chat Room users produced. Basically, the topics are every day exchanges. The context of the conversation in this respect, includes the absence of face-to-face communication. In this his text based CMC, users interact by means of typing a message on the keyboard of one computer screens which either appear immediately or at a later point in time. The streams of conversations within chat rooms are far from mere linear progressions. They branch out constantly following several streams at once and interacting with many interactors at a time.

This study indicates that Internet Chat Room interactors may often participate in one stream of conversation at a time. This means that when a person issues statements, each of which are more or less obviously intended to apply to different streams of conversations. In Internet Chat rooms one turn can be used equally well within more than one stream of conversations. That is, one turn may contribute to multiple conversations. Several conversations can also be begun by one utterance.

#### **4.3 Observing Cooperative Principle**

The main focus of this study is to identify the adhering of the maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner.

#### **4.3.1 The Maxim of Quantity**

Grice (1975) suggested a Co-operative Principle as a statement of what participants in interaction must generally assume each other to be doing

Grice (1975) in his theory states that in a conversational, the speakers should make their contribution as informative as is required for the current purpose of exchange. The maxim of quantity says that the speaker should make his contribution one that is true. The following extract from the data shows the adherence to the maxim of quantity by the Internet Chat Room users.

##### **Extract 1 (Chat 1: Mamak Chat Room)**

##### **Lines 5- 8**

5	[SwEEty]:	hi...CuTiE
6	[CuTiE ]:	hi SwEEty
7	[SwEEty]:	cat wif mi.
8	[CuTiE]:	ok

The use of “hi”, and “ok” as a response by Internet Chat Room users are a form of greeting, acknowledgement and confirmation. “hi” and “ok” here can be considered an initial desire to

continue conversation. Notice that the form “hi” is a very short response but it adheres to the maxim of quantity that is contributing only what is sufficient for the current purpose of exchange. The use of “ok” here can also indicate agreement and understanding and is often necessary to respond quickly. This is because a potential respondent may get drawn into another conversation if too much time is spent producing a message. A minimal response is often typical of the Internet Chat Room conversations.

### **Extract 2 (Chat 2: Mamak Chat Room)**

#### **Lines 9-12**

9	[ChipsMore]:	ur real name
10	[redDevil]:	usop ok redi
11	[ChipsMore]:	so call u usop
12	[redDevil]:	ok

The response given by [redDevil] “ok” to [ChipMore] question denotes that [redDevil] understood [ChipMore]. The ability to interpret such responses lies in the assumption that [ChipsMore] recognizes [redDevil] response is infact observing the cooperative principle and the maxim of Quantity, Thus [redDevil] has responded appropriately to [chipsMoRe]’s question by being very brief.

### **Extract 3 (Chat 4: Alamak Chat Room)**

#### **Lines 15-16**

15 [boi-boi]: startbucks. Sj

16 [min]: ok. When

In extract 3, the word “ok” as a response by [min] denotes a quick response and it is understood by [boi-boi]. [min] has given the right amount of information (Quantity). In the above statement the maxim of Quantity has been observed, as the statement of intent of meeting [boi-boi] in Starbuck was agreed. According to the cooperative principle, the maxim of Quantity requires the speaker to be as informative as possible. The reponse by [min] “ok when” in line 16 above is a form of acknowledgement and confirmation, “ok” here can be considered an initial desire to continue conversation. The form “when” is a very short response and it adheres to the maxim of quantity, that is contributing only what is sufficient for the current purpose of exchange. Although it is not a proper question form but people still understand. The use of “ok” here can also indicate agreement and understanding and is often necessary to respond quickly. This is because a potential respondent does not want to spend too much time in producing a message. A minimal response is often typical of the Internet Chat Room conversations.

#### **Extract 4 (Chat 1: Mamak Chat Room)**

**Lines 13 – 14**

13 [CuTiE]:	i min r u workin o stadyin
14 [SwEEty]:	stadyin

In the above example [CuTiE] is asking [SwEEty] whether he or she is working or studying. From the [SwEEty] reply “stadyin” the researcher can see that [SwEEty] is obviously still studying. [SwEEty], in this case, is giving a direct response that complies to Grice’s maxim of quantity. Although [SwEEty]’s response is short but it is sufficient and is capable of making the conversation going. In extract 5, below is another example where the maxim of quantity by Grice’s is complied to.

#### **Extract 5 (Chat 1: Mamak Chat Room)**

##### **Lines 15 - 16**

15 [CuTiE]:	wher
16 [SwEEty]:	tailors

In the above example is a simple statement where maxim of quantity is observed by the Internet Chat Room users. The example above depicts a short response. However, there is coherence and unity in the response given by [SwEEty]. Therefore, the response can be considered informative as is required for the current purposes of exchange and in order for the conversation to proceed.

In Extract 6 below the researcher will explain how the Internet Chat Room users make a sufficient contribution to the conversation by not being more informative than that is required.



### **Extract 6 (Chat 4: Alamak Chat Room)**

#### **Lines 17-20**

17 [min]:	c u on Friday 5 pm
18 [boi-boi]:	how to no u
19 [min]:	I use glasses black t n jean and u
20 [boi-boi]:	I carry black canvas bag.

In the above instances [boi-boi] wants to know how to recognize [min] by asking a question “how to no u” and [min] gives a precise response by describing what kind of attire he is wearing. Thus, contributions given by min are sufficient by not being more informative than that is required by giving clear and precise description of himself so that [boi-boi] could recognize him in order to avoid confusion. Obviously, [min] response was short but it was clear and precise in order to be recognized by [boi-boi]. Therefore, the example above can be deemed as complying to Grice’s maxim of quantity. In the extract below is a simple and direct response.

### **Extract 7 (Chat 7: Alamak Chat Room)**

#### **Lines 11-12**

11 [min]:	where?
12 [boi-boi]:	Starbucks. sj

Notice that, the above contribution by [boi-boi] is straightforward, clear and sufficient. Thus, the contribution by [boi-boi] supports the maxim of quantity and Grice's Cooperative Principle by being precise and informative as is required for the current purposes of exchange.

The maxim of quantity is also often undermined in Internet situations. At one extreme there is a refusal to communicate or lurking. Lurkers are people that access a chatgroup and read its messages but do not contribute to the discussion. This can be seen in extract 8 (line 18) when [Idi] enters the Chat room without participating in the conversations.

**Extract 8 (Chat 1: Mamak Chat Room)**

**Lines 18-20**

18 [Idi]:	.....
19 [SwEEty]:	y .... No answer? Who r u? welcome.....
20 [Idi]:	.....☺ nothing to say lah, bye

Extract 9, also shows how the interlocutor (speaker) makes a sufficient contribution to the conversation by not being more informative than required. This adhered to the maxim of quantity by Grice.

**Extract 9 (Chat 2: Mamak Chat Room)**

**Lines 6-11**

6 [red Devil]:	What's ur real name by the way.
----------------	---------------------------------

7 [ChipsMoRe]: Umi (☺)

8 [red Devil]: So I called you Umi only. But u hvn't asked my name.

9 [ChipsMoRe]: ur real name

10 [red Devil]: usop ok redi.

11 [ChipsMoRe]: so call u usop

ChipsMoRe's reply is so minimal. This can be seen in ChipMoRe responses in Line 7 of extract 9 "Umi(☺)". ChipMoRe is in fact complying to redDevil's request to tell him her name. It seems that such a minimal answer may satisfy the request but does not satisfy the person making it, who expects more. This can be seen in Line 8 extract 9 by the word "only". RedDevil's "by the way" (in line 1) serves as a warning to chipMoRe that he is saying now is not quite relevant to what went before as might be expected. "By the way" is not part of the way redDevil should ask ChipsMoRe her name. Though it seems quite inappropriate for ChipsMoRe to ask redDevil his name in the same way that he asked her "What's ur real name by the way". Nevertheless, the response by ChipsMoRe is very minimal and in fact complies with redDevil's request to tell her name. Thus, ChipsMoRe adhered to Grice's cooperative principle and the maxim of quantity by being informative and say neither more or less than is necessary for the purposes of exchange as is required for the conversation to proceed. In the next section the researcher will explain the maxim of quality.

#### **4.3.2 The Maxim of Quality**

According to Grice, (1975) the maxim of quality a contributor to spoken discourse should try to make his contribution one that is true. The maxim of quality can be expressed as follows:

Try to make your contribution one that is true, specially:

Do not say what you believe to be false.

Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

(Grice, 1975)

In other words he or she should not say what he believes to be false. Contributor is expected to tell the truth or provable by adequate evidence. The point of an analysis of this kind is not to suggest that we always behave exactly according to the principles; common experience shows that we do not. But we do seem to tacitly recognize their roles as a perspective or orientation within which actual utterances can be judged. For example, people who tell lies or make false claims can be challenged; if they talk too much they can be told to shut up; if they say something irrelevant, they can be asked to stick to the point: The fact that we do all these four maxims indicate that we are bearing these maxims in mind. Moreover, if someone makes a remark that seems to flout these maxims, we instinctively look for ways to make sense of what has been said. (Grice, 1975:26)

The extract below shows maxim of quality is adhered to.

**Extract 10 (Chat 2: Alamak Chat Room)**

**Lines 21-27**

21 [redDevil]:	how much ah
22 [ChipsMoRe]:	RM40.000

23 [redDevil]:	u must be rich
24 [ChipsMoRe]:	no lah
25 [redDevil]:	u can afford
26 [ChipsMoRe]:	my dad bought lah
27 [redDevil]:	u so lucky

The participants above observe the maxim of quality by giving very direct and appropriate and exact respond to the questions that were asked. Contributions are expected to adhere to the maxim of quality in the exchange between [redDevil] and [ChipsMoRe] by contributing only what they believe to be true. For example, in the extract 10 [redDevil] asked [ChipsMoRe] the price of the bike “how much ah”. [ChipMoRe] answers truthfully and also directly addresses [redDevil’s] question there is no additional level of meaning, no distinction to be made because the answered given was precise and truthful. The participants adhered to the cooperative principle, the maxim of quality as proposed by Grice. The success of a conversation depends upon the participants respond to the question. The way in which participants try to make conversations work is sometimes called cooperative principle.

In Line 24 and 26 of Extract 10, [ChipMoRe] answered “no lah” and “my dad bought lah” denote that [ChipMoRe] is being very honest and truthful, taken literally, [ChipMoRe] reply is true and cooperative and the speaker is cooperating to the maxim of Quality.

In extract 11 of Chat 3 of Alamak Chat Room shows the maxim of quality is adhered to by the two participants.

**Extract 11(Chat 3: Alamak Chat Room)**

**Lines 11-14**

11 [Sexy Jessie]: did you like my voice.

12 [Silkstockings]: ok baby

13 [Silkstockings]: yes I loved ur voice very sexy.

14 [Silkstockings]: u ve a sultry voice

In the above extract, [Silkstockings] responses to Sexy Jessie questions “yes I love ur voice very sexy” and “u ve a sultry voice” shows that [Silkstockings] show that [Silkstockings] adheres to the maxim of quality by being honest giving responses that he or she believes to be true. The answered given by [Silkstockings] “yes I loved ur voice very sexy’ shows that the participants knew each other before and obviously, [Silkstockings] has heard [Sexy Jessie] voice in order to be able to give comments. In this instance, [Silkstockings] gives a compliment to Sexy Jessie voice as sultry and thus, [Silkstockings] adheres to the maxim of quality by contributing what one thinks that is true. Another example that further supports Grice’s maxim of quality is shown below:

**Extract 12 (Chat 3: Alamak Chat Room)**

**Lines 20-23**

20 [Sexy Jessie]: donoe lah

21 [Silkstockings]: I can recomen u

22 [Sexy Jessie]: oh.....sure...

23 [Silkstockings]: sure

Silkstockings reply “sure” to Sexy Jessie shows assurance and Sexy Jessie “oh....sure... shows affirmative response of her intention to recommend Sexy Jessie to a recording house. Thus, they are adhering to the maxim of quality by being truthful. The extract below indicates an assurance response by Silkstockings “I give u the hp no” in the extract shown below.

#### **Extract 13 (Chat 3: Alamak Chat Room)**

##### **Lines 24-25**

24 [SexyJessie]: how?

25 [Silkstockings]: I giv u th hp no.

#### **4.3.3 The Maxim of Relevance or Relation**

Exchanges in conversations are expected to adhere to the maxim of relevance in the exchanges between participants of Internet Chat Room are relevant for the current purpose of exchange. The maxim of relevance – that contributions should clearly relate to the purpose of the exchange – is also undermined in some Internet situations. The contributors in the maxim of relevance are expected to make their contributions relevant. The researcher feels that for most participants it is difficult to sustain untruths when involved in long term-term, intensive interactions. The next

extracts show that the participants are aware of this maxim and adhere to it. In doing so, they are upholding to Grice's Co-operative Principle.

**Extract 14 (Chat 4: Alamak Chat Room)**

**Lines 5-9**

5	[boi-boi]:	where u liv.
6	[min]:	Subang Jaya
7	[boi-boi]:	oh..near lah
8	[min]:	u
9	[boi-boi]:	PJ

Here is an instance by the participants that show maxim of relevance is adhered to by relating their contribution to the purpose of the exchange and relevant to the questions asked. The extract above shows a simple and direct question with a direct, clear and relevant reply. The reply supports the maxim of relevance or relation when [boi-boi] asks [min] the question “where u liv” and [min] gives pertinent reply “Subang Jaya”. The exchanges between the two participants are deemed relevant for the current purpose of exchange. Thus, the participants in this extract are aware of this maxim and adhere to it. In doing so, they are actually upholding the co-operative principle by Grice.

The extract below shows the maxim of relevance is adhered to:

**Extract 15 (Chat 4: Alamak Chat Room)**

**Lines 14 - 17**



14 [boi-boi]: Friday 3pm can o not

15 [min]: 5pm can?

16 [boi-boi]: can

17 [min]: c u on Friday 5pm

For instance, [boi-boi] responds “can” to [min]’s suggestion of time by giving relevant and a suitable time for their meeting and to show agreement. This shows that they adhere to the maxim of relevance as suggested by Grice (1975). The next example is seen in response to [boi-boi] “I carry black black canvas bag”. Noticed that [boi-boi]’s response was in relation to a description by [min] “I use glasses black t n (t-shirt and) jean and u” of himself. There is coherence and unity in the contribution given by the participants. Thus, the participants in the above extract adhered to the maxim of relevance. The next section will explain the maxim of manner.

#### **4.3.4 The Maxim of Manner**

The maxim of manner which explains that the speaker describes things in the order in which occurs and ambiguity and obscurity should be avoided. The maxim of manner suggests that a contributor is expected to avoid ambiguity or obscurity, is direct and straightforward. Thus, a contributor in the maxim of manner needs to be clear otherwise, his or her intention may not have been conveyed correctly resulting in misunderstanding and communication breakdown.

The maxim of manner is also seriously challenged by the way some Internet situations operate. Brevity is certainly a recognized desideratum in Internet chat room conversations, in terms of sentence length, the number of sentences in a turn, or the amount of text on a screen. Style manuals repeatedly exhort users to be brief and while there are several signs of brevity in the different Internet situations, it takes only a short exposure to the Web to find many instances where the principle is honoured more in breach than the observance.

The extract below will show maxim of manner adhered to by the participants.

**Extract 16 (Chat 2 Alamak Chat Room)**

**Lines 17-22**

- |                 |                            |
|-----------------|----------------------------|
| 17 [ChipsMoRe]: | u hav super bike?          |
| 18 [red Devil]: | yes, Italian bike, Aprllia |
| 19 [ChipsMoRe]: | eh...must be expensive     |
| 20 [red Devil]: | it is                      |
| 21 [ChipsMoRe]: | how much ah,               |
| 22 [redDevil]:  | RM40.000                   |

The above extract shows how participants make a clear contribution. [ChipsMoRe] wants to know whether [redDevil] have superbike and [redDevil] gives a clear respond “yes, Italian bike, Aprillia”. It is important to be clear and not obscure. Thus, [redDevil] had to mention the brand name “Aprilla” obviously there is cooperation in the contribution by the two participants. They adhered to the maxim of manner because the conversational meaning of utterances was conveyed clearly. The appropriate and clear response by [redDevil] helps to clarify the unnecessary doubt that might arise due to ambiguity. Another instance is in Line 22 above when [redDevil] tells exactly the price of his Italian bike. [redDevil] could have said “not expensive or a tiny fraction of my dad’s salary” but he answered “RM40.000 which answered clearly (manner) thus, he is adhered to the cooperative principle and the maxim of manner. The next extract will also show the adherence of the maxim of manner.

#### **Extract 17 (Chat 5: Alamak Chat Room)**

##### **Lines 5-10**

5	<[shes]>	oh...I m veri kol.
6	<[darling]>	kol?
7	<[shes]>	yes.. kol
8	<[darling]>	may I ask u wat do u min? u min cool.
9	<[shes]>	not cool ..C-O-L-D ..sejuk lah cos rain here.
10	<[darling]>	oh I c...sejuk

In order to be clear and not obscure, [shes] had to spell the word “cold” and [shes] translated it into Malay to be more clear by using the word ‘sejuk’. . Thus, [shes] adhered to the maxim of manner because it was necessary to be clear. If she had not done so her intention may not have been conveyed correctly. Risk of communication failure in case of unclear or insufficient input as interactors may become confused. Participants are able to accommodate and make adjustments to each other in an effort to build understanding. In the extract above both participants are cooperative in their conversation.

It seems obvious that adherence of these maxims may create coherence in conversations and contribution is deemed relevant because it is easy to determine what the participants are talking about. Again, all these maxims can help account for clear and brevity. Thus, adherence to these maxims can lead to successful conversation.

It has been established that in this study, there are a number of instances of adherence to the cooperative principle and the conversational maxims which is the main focus of this study. The next section, the researcher will explain the violations of conversational maxims in general.

#### **4.4 Violation of Conversational Maxims**

A speaker may be unable to conform to all the maxims at once, if two are in conflict, she may have to sacrifice one to the other. It may be impossible in some situations for example, to say as much as necessary without saying things without adequate evidence. Likewise, in some

situations such as taking oath a speaker may have to sacrifice the maxim of manner and be obscure or risk violating the maxim of quality by saying something she believes to be false.

If the speaker flout the maxim of quality you're considered flouting the code of moral. He or she flouts the maxim of quantity, manner, and relation you are considered rude. Choosing a wrong word can distort your intended message, misguide your receiver, and undermine your credibility. Words may have different meanings for different people. Sometimes when our meaning is unclear, it is because we did not structure our statement effectively and thus, violating Grice's four conversational maxims. In the next section, the researcher will explain violations of Grice's conversational maxims in relation to the chat room data. The extract below will show the violations of Grice's conversational maxims.

#### **4.4.1 Violation of Maxim of Quantity**

The speaker can be said to violate a maxim of Quantity when they know that they do not give sufficient information. The speaker who flouts the maxim of Quantity seems to give too little or too much information. In this section, we can see examples of statements flouting the maxim of quantity in the data. The maxim is flouted when the speakers contribute more or less than is required for the purpose of the conversation. The contribution should not provide too little or too much information than is needed. When the speakers contribute more than is required, the speaker is said to be overstating and when the speaker provides too little information, the speaker is said to be understating.

In the extract below shows the violation of maxim of Quantity. Here, we can see examples of statements flouting the maxim of quantity in the data. The maxim is flouted when the speakers contribute more or less than is required for the purpose of the conversation.

**Extract 18 (Chat 1: Mamak Chat Room)**

**Lines 18 – 23**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 18 | [SwEEty] wat would u like 2 do after stadyin? |
| 19 | [CuTiE] well...I wait 4my mum and dad.        |
| 20 | [SwEEty] y? you mum                           |
| 21 | [CuTiE] yes mum decision                      |
| 22 | [SwEEty] oh..u don want to make ur decision   |
| 23 | [CuTiE] well mum is better                    |

In extract 18, the maxim of quantity is flouted as the speaker provides information in order to answer [SwEEty] question]

In the above extract, [SwEEty] asks the question and an appropriate answer is expected from [shes]. However, [shes] does not answer the question appropriately but rather gives unnecessary information. For [SwEEty] question “wat would u like 2 do after stadyin?” [CuTiE] responds

should be direct thus flouting the rule of Gricean and the maxim of quantity. In line 19 [CuTiE] responds “ well...I wait for my mum and dad” Obviously, [CuTiE] does not conform to maxim of quantity because the word dad was dropped in all the responses given therefore the two chatters did not observed Grice’s conversational maxims. This is because in real life when we talk we do not use full sentence.

In Extract 19 below, participants in a conversation, fail to meet the expectation by not being sufficiently informative, therefore, violating the cooperative principle, the maxim of Quantity. Here, [CuTiE] responses in Line 19 of extract 19, “well...I wait 4 my mum and dad” shows that he/she violates the maxim of Quantity when he/she knows that [SwEEty] wants to know the truth the decision made by [CuTiE]. [CuTiE] is seen as violating the maxim of Quantity by not giving [SwEEty] enough information. As [SwEEty] wants to know what [CuTiE] intends to do. [CuTiE] on the other hand, does not want to give enough information.. Here, [CuTiE] covers up the decision by leaving it to his/her mum to make decision. [CuTiE] when asked “wat would u like 2 do after stadyin”? [CuTiE] could have told [SwEEty] of his decision after completing his studies. By not being informative he/she does not adhere to the maxim of Quantity.

#### **Extract 19 (Chat 5: Mamak Chat Room)**

##### **Lines 11 – 14**

11 [shes] am sori anyway when is ur birthday?

12 [darling] jun lah

13 [shes] which date?

14 [darling] u want to buy me present ke?

In extract 19 above, [darling] responses “jun lah” does not answer [shes] questions “when is ur birthday?” because it is understood that [darling] should give [shes] the date. [darling] deliberately supplies insufficient information and [shes] wrongly assumes that [darling] is cooperating. Here, [darling] knew what [shes] was talking about, yet she being not précised and not answering to [shes] question therefore, [darling] was seen as not conforming to Grice’s conversational maxims of quantity by giving irrelevant information.

#### **4.4.2 Flouting of the Maxim of Quality**

The speaker flouting the maxim of Quality may do it in several ways. The speakers may say something that obviously does not represent what they think. The maxim of Quality says that the speaker should make his contribution one that is true, but this is clearly not the case in extract 21 Line 17-18, as [shes] asked [darling] “wat u like 4 ur birthday? [darling] just stated that he/she had lost her mobile phone. Here, [darling] was not adhering to the maxim of Quality, since he/she was not really saying what he/she thought. [darling] is saying indirectly that she wants a hand phone.



The extract below shows the violations of the maxim of Quality.

**Extract 20 (Chat 5: Alamak Chat)**

**Lines 15-16**

15 [shes] u didn't tell me ur birthday yet.. how 2buy

16 [darling] ok wat u want 2 buy 4 me?

17 [shes] wat u like 4 ur birthday?

18 [darling] well

19 [shes] so u want a hp right?I lost my new hp .

20 [darling] its okay. I think it is 2 expensive

[darling] appropriate replies should be simple 'yes' or 'no' but [darling] responses “ its okay. I think it is 2 expensive” which according to the maxim of quantity is contributing more than is required. Notice that in the extract below, [darling] responses constantly violated the maxim of

quality by giving unnecessary information than is required and thus, not being cooperative and not conforming to Grice's conversational maxims. For example, in [darling's] "its okay. I think it is 2 expensive" which flouts the maxim of Quality if he/she knew that [shes] would not be able to afford it.

### **Extract 21 (Chat 9) Facebook**

#### **Lines 12-15**

12 [nick]: ok. Ur name was a little old folly so, I thought im going to chat with some one well knowledged. 13[merlin]: excuse me u know what im JUST 91+lah 14[nick]: wow Ur really old folkyyy 15[merlin]: sorry I'm 19 ) 1 2 have reply them very fast 2 say bye.
--

In the extract above we can see that the speakers flouted the Maxim of Quality in order to add a dramatic effect to the conversation. In this extract, [nick] is just assuming that [merlin] is an old person based on his name which sound typically old, but [nick] has no evidence that [merlin] is indeed an old person. We can see the dramatic effect being conveyed by [nick] with the use of interjection "Wow".

#### **4.4.3 Violation of the Maxim of Relevance**

If speakers flout the maxim of Relevance, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance and did not say, and make the connection between their utterance and the preceding one.

Speakers often assume that every utterances make sense, and that they are relevant to each other and form a coherent whole. The maxim of relevance applies without

exceptions, so that it is not a question of communicators following, violating or flouting the maxim. To understand an utterance is to prove its relevance, and proving relevance is determined by the accessibility of its relevance to the addressee. Take a look at the extract below.

**Extract 22 (Chat 5: Alamak Chat)**

**Lines 21-28**

21 [shes] its okay if u really nid it.  
22 [darling] okay. then see u again  
23 [shes] tq but u have not told me ur birthday  
24 [darling] nevermind lah we chat at the weekend okay.  
25[shes] but what weekend.  
26[darling] I gtg now.  
27[shes] hey...wait, so wat u think of me?  
28[darling] his best friend is a wonderful person.

Here, [darling] assumes that [shes] will know that “at the weekend” means “next weekend”. [darling] may know that is what he/she means, but he/she needs to be sure, since he/she is about to leave the chat room immediately. Thus, in Line 27 [shes] “hey...wait, so wat u think of me”? and in Line 28 [darling] “his best friend is a wonderful person”. [darling] does not say he/she was not very impressed with [shes], but by not mentioning him/her in the reply and apparently saying something irrelevant, she implies it.

In the extract below, we see the maxim of relation is flouted.

**Extract 23 (Chat 7 YM Chat)**

**Lines 8-11**

8[loser-not] yes why? U wanna add me in ur space? Addlah I sen u my pix now
9[d-devil] yeap...I add readi ur pix in my space/ frendster u look good in ur pix
10[loser-not] I feel good too, I go fitness club always.
11[loser-not] oh yes no wonderlah.

[d-devil]’s compliments [loser-not] on how good she looks, probably she looked really pretty or beautiful. It is quite normal in Malaysian culture for people to direct the compliment away from them by bringing up other topics. We see this happening to [loser-not]’s utterance where she says nothing about the way she looks but talks about the way she feels. A simple answer like ‘thank you’, in response to the compliment would be appropriate. She also attributes to her

feeling good by going to the fitness centre. The statement is irrelevant to the conversation they were having thus, flouting the maxim of manner.

#### **4.4.4 Violation of the Maxim of Manner**

When speakers are obscure and unclear to the point that the message is indecipherable, it is considered as instances of flouting the maxim of manner. This maxim is flouted when speakers are obscure and ambiguous, as well as be long winded and not arranging utterances orderly. The strategies employed to convey implicatures are the use of ambiguous words and statements and code-switching. A word, phrase or sentence is ambiguous if it has more than one meaning. Ambiguity arises when context is insufficient to determine the sense of a single word that has more than one meaning. Speakers who flout the maxim of manner, appearing to be obscure, are often trying to exclude other people, as in this sort of exchange between [SwEEty] and [CuTiE] in extract 23, Sample 1 below:

#### **Extract 24 (Chat 1 Mamak Chat Room)**

##### **Line 27-30**

27 [ SwEEty] gtg

28 [CuTiE] ok, wer u goin?

29[SwEEty] buy white stuff.

30[CuTiE] k, hope 2 chat wif u again

In Line 29 above, [SwEEty] says in an ambiguous way, saying “buy stuff 4 someone” because [SwEEty] is avoiding saying “sanitary towel” so that [CuTiE] does not know that [SwEEty] that she is buying sanitary towel. In the extract above, the maxim of manner is flouted with the word white stuff. The word white stuff is ambiguous as it has many meanings.

#### **Extract 25 (Chat 7 YM Chat)**

##### **Lines 19-23**

19 [Divya] hah..hah..I feel like going to the cinema.

20 [Apu] inge Cinema?

21 [Divya] Ane...why lah? U wan to join me?

22 [Apu] aiyoh.. inge tangechi..

23 [Divya] state PJ, Salman Khan movie. Like to see Bollywood movie.

Words like ‘inge’, ‘aiyoh’, and ‘tangechi’ are terms in Tamil. The participants in this study were a representation of the Malaysia society particularly the Indian community, therefore this was understood by both respondents. However, in the opinion of the researcher these terms ‘inge’,

‘aiyoh’ and ‘tangechi’ may not be familiar to a non –Malaysian because they may not heard of these words. Thus, from the English discourse point of view, the terms used in the extract above are considered ambiguous. The implicature of this flouting is similar to the extract below.

**Extract 26(Chat 7 YM Chat)**

**Lines 11-15**

11 [Divya] all buaya only
12 [Apu] I don't like girls gatal-gatal one
13 [Divya] I oso no like gatal-gatal one
14 [Apu] I think I m not readi oso
15 [Divya] ya lah too young

The above extract uses terms like buaya, gata-gatal, ya and lah that would not be understood by speakers other than those of Malaysian community. The use of Malay words would be easier for the speakers. In this case code-switching occurred. This causes confusion among the non -Malay speakers as they may not understand the Malay words, thus flouting the maxim of manner. Some people may not know what ‘buaya’ means. The word ‘buaya’ means crocodile but in this context ‘buaya’ refers to men who like to flirt around. Therefore, the usage of the word ‘buaya’

causes the flouting of the maxim of manner. Sometimes when speakers use certain words, the meaning is ambiguous, as the words they choose to use have several meanings attached to them. In the extract above, the word 'gatal-gatal' refers to itchiness; it is usually used when talking about body or skin. The word 'gatal-gatal' can also be cheeky when referring to girls who behave cheekily.

### **Extract 27**

#### **My Space Chat**

#### **Lines 4-5**

4 [sham] aiyoh..here always rain cannot go out so boring.
5 [dude] Haiyah..boreing meh..u stay at home also boring.

Here, the code switching strategy is used in the extract above, when the speakers use three words that are not English, such as "aiyoh", "haiyah" and "meh" to show a certain dramatic expression or an exaggerated expression. The code switching also indicates the ethnicity of the speakers in the chat room conversation.

## **4.5 Conclusion**



In summary, the conformity to the Cooperative Principle and the violation of the maxims can be shown as below.

Maxims	Adherence	Violation	Total
1	9	2	11
2	4	2	6
3	2	3	5
4	2	4	6

In short, these maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, co-operative way: they should speak sincerely, relevantly, and clearly, while providing sufficient information. This chapter has discussed the underlying assumption that defines pragmatics as meaning in interaction. The Internet Chat room interactors contribute to the making of meaning. Interaction performs actions and the study of the speakers meaning and interpretation depends on the four conversation maxims of Grice's cooperative principle.

In this study the conduct of interaction is conformity with Grice's cooperative principle and the conversational maxims. However, the researcher also looks at violations of the conversational maxims. The researcher feels that Grice's cooperative principle is flexible. Therefore, it serves as a good for the interpretation of underlying meanings and assumptions. The result of the analysis also used to identify the types of maxims that are adhering to Grice's cooperative principle and the types of maxims that are overtly violated Grice's cooperative principle in

Internet Chat room conversation, including the meanings they convey and the evidences are used to show how Internet Chat room interactors view implicit and underlying meanings.

In conclusion, the researcher can see all the twenty-five extracts indicate how the five conversational maxims are adhered to and there are instances when the participants show a little bit of violation and exaggeration. Nevertheless, the participants in this study show that the high degree of cooperativeness in their contribution and thus support the four conversational maxims by Grice.

