



التداولية في الخطاب الرقمي: تحليل اللغة والسياق وتفاعل المستخدمين عبر المنصات الرقمية

م. م أسماء كاظم صكر

الباحث ايمان ضرغام جواد

الباحث اسراء عبد الكريم يوسف

جامعة المثنى

كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية

asmaa.siqar@mu.edu.iq

ملخص البحث: تتناول هذه الدراسة الممارسات التداولية في الخطاب الرقمي في العالم المعاصر، مع التركيز بشكل خاص على التواصل عبر الإنترنت في الحياة اليومية، نظراً للاستخدام المتزايد لهذه الوسائل من قبل الأفراد بشكل مستمر. يسلط البحث الضوء على أهمية تحليل الخطاب الرقمي، موضحاً كيفية تحليل الخطابات بصورة صحيحة اعتماداً على مجموعة من الخصائص. كذلك، يعرض مبادئ غرايس الأربعة (الكم، الكيف، العلاقة، والأسلوب)، والتي تؤدي دوراً مهماً في إنجاز عملية التواصل، سواء في الواقع أو عبر وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي، إذ تسهم في جعل المحادثة أكثر فاعلية عند التزام المتحدث والمستمع بها. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، يناقش البحث ظاهرة خرق هذه المبادئ (أو انتهاكها) من قبل المشاركين في المحادثة، موضحاً كيف يمكن أن يتم هذا الخرق بشكل مقصود أو غير مقصود. كما يوضح كيفية تطبيق مبادئ غرايس في المحادثات ودورها في توجيه عملية التواصل. وفي جانب تحليل البيانات، تم اختيار مجموعة من المقاطع الفيديوية القصيرة من برنامج معين، حيث جرى تحليل أجزاء من هذه المقاطع بدقة لمعرفة ما إذا كان المشاركون يلتزمون بالمبادئ الأربعة أو يقومون بخرقها.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التداولية، الخطاب الرقمي، مبادئ غرايس، المنصات الرقمية

Pragmatics in Digital Discourse: An Analysis of Language, Context, and User Interaction Across Digital Platforms

Asst. Lect. Asmaa Kadhim Sager

The researcher Eman Dhurgham Jawad

The researcher Asraa Abdulkarim Youssef

Department of English College of Education for Human Sciences Al Muthana University

asmaa.siqar@mu.edu.iq

Abstract: This study presents pragmatic practices in digital discourse in today's world, and it focuses more on communication through the internet in everyday life, because people now use these methods of communication very frequently on a daily basis. The analysis of digital discourse is very important here, as it shows how to analyze formal discourse correctly through certain features. Then, Grice's four maxims (Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner) are introduced. These principles play a major role in conversations, whether in real life or through social media, and they are essential in making communication effective when both the speaker and the listener follow them. After that, the study discusses the violation (flouting) of these four maxims by participants in



conversations, explaining how each maxim can be violated either intentionally or unintentionally. The study also focuses on the methodology. It explains Grice's maxims and how they are used in conversations, and how these principles guide communication. In the data analysis section, some short videos are selected from the Career Ladder program, which was created by Max. Parts of these videos are taken and analyzed carefully to determine whether the participants violate the four maxims or not.

Key words: pragmatics, digital discourse, Grice's maxims, digital platforms

1. Introduction

Language is the main means through which people communicate in their every daily life to express their ideas, feelings, and other aspects of human experience. Through language, people build relationships and exchange information. Researchers consider language the base of human communication (Yule, 2020). Traditionally, people communicated face to face or through written letters to convey meaning to others. Here, with technological developments, communication has expanded to include emails, videos, voice messages, and other digital forms. These changes have greatly changed the nature of communication compared to the past (Crystal, 2011). In recent years, digital discourse has become dominant through social media platforms such as email and instant messaging applications. This form of discourse has emerged as a reflection of new patterns in language use within communication (Herring et al., 2013). From a scientific perspective, and in light of these developments in modern communication, the study of language has become bigger to include the analysis of digital discourse. This explains how language is used in different contexts on the internet and technology (Herring et al., 2013). Grice's four Maxims play a very important and effective role in conversations. Grice's Maxim of collaboration is mainly important and has a powerful effect on communication, especially in analyzing digital interactions. The role of speakers becomes clear when they adhere to or disregard these Maxims, whether intentionally or unintentionally, to achieve communicative goals such as humor, flattery, innuendo, sarcasm, and others (Grice, 1975). In light of the topics discussed previously, this research highlights the importance of clearly analyzing digital discourse and using language correctly and effectively for multiple purposes. It also emphasizes the importance of how speakers convey meaning and how they manage conversations effectively and accurately, even in the absence of body signals. It addresses misunderstandings that arise in communication and examines the way meaning is conveyed clearly and explicitly. This helps bridge gaps in pragmatic studies of discourse, especially in applying Grice's Maxim of cooperation, so that communication becomes more effective, clear, and free from the problems that cause so much misunderstanding in daily life and work.



2. Digital Discourse Analysis

Digital discourse analysis (DDA) It is a very important domain that studies many disciplines and explores them through the use of language in digital communication (Moshinsky, 2022). DDA includes analyzing the language used in digital texts such as emails, chat logs, social media posts, blogs, and online forums. At this juncture, it is observed that DDA focuses on studying how language is used in digital contexts, considering social, cultural, and technological factors (Jones, 2015). At this juncture, researchers often use digital discourse analysis to explore how people use language to construct their identities, form relationships, and negotiate power dynamics in cyberspaces. This domain arose in response to the increasing prevalence of digital communication and the need to understand how language use evolves in this new context. DDA draws on various disciplines, such as linguistics, communication studies, sociology, anthropology, and psychology. Researchers in this domain use a range of qualitative and quantitative methods to analyze digital discourse, including text analysis, ethnography, and conversation analysis (Darics, 2015). DDA has obtained increasing attention from researchers and scholars in various fields in recent years (Darics, 2015). Here are some examples of expert and scholar opinions on digital discourse analysis:

1. DDA offers a good option for studying discourse in the digital age, providing new, innovative, and sophisticated methods for analyzing the complex intersections of language, culture, and technology in digital communication (Machin, 2018).
2. DDA deals with a unique, distinctive, and valuable perspective on the study of language use in digital communication, supplying insightful perspectives on how digital communication impacts social, political, and cultural practices in the 21st century (Herring, 2016).
3. DDA is a quickly growing domain of study, attracting researchers from various academic domains to exciting research on the intersection of language, culture, and technology in digital communication (Georgakopoulou, 2020).

3. Cooperative Principle

Herbert Paul Grice (1975), an influential British philosopher, suggested the Cooperative Principle, a major concept in the field of Pragmatics. This substantial theory was first given during his William James Lectures in 1967 and was formally published in his seminal 1975 essay, *Logic and Conversation*, which later appeared in his collected work, *Studies in the Way of Words* (Grice, 1989). This concept of cooperation is based on the idea that the relationship between two or more people in a conversation rests on several characteristics or principles, such as honesty, clarity, and ease of understanding between the



parties. To achieve optimal interaction and a meaningful dialogue, the speaker must ensure that the information they provide is clear, truthful, relevant, concise, and comprehensive. Through these principles, a sound, clear, and ideal dialogue, free from misunderstandings, is achieved—this is what is known as the principle of cooperation. These cooperative principles consist of a set of guidelines that a speaker may follow or violate during a conversation between two or more people.

This probability of collaborative effort is very important because it allows listeners to infer unstated, implied meanings, known as implicatures, even when the speaker deviates from the literal meaning of their words. To Systematize this rational behavior, Grice outlined four associated Conversational Maxims: Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner. According to Grice (1967), the Cooperative Principle is: "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" (Grice, 1975, p. 45).

4. Conversational Maxims

4.1. Quantity

The principle of quantity is one of the important rules introduced by the British philosopher H. P. Grice. This principle states that communication between people should be complete and understandable, and that the speaker should provide appropriate and sufficient information in the conversation. According to this principle, there are two main rules: first, the speaker must provide complete and sufficient information, neither misleading nor incomplete, so that the listener can understand it. Secondly, the speaker should provide information according to the question posed by the listener. They should not provide too much information for a simple question; this directly leads to confusion, and the listener cannot clearly grasp the speaker's intended meaning (Grice, 1975). The information given should be relevant to the context and contribute meaningfully to the conversation. The speakers should avoid adding unnecessary or excessive details that may confuse the listener or make the dialogue less effective. For example, when someone asks, "How are you today?" the speaker should simply respond by saying whether they feel good or bad. It is unnecessary to add unrelated details such as, "I am fine now, but yesterday many bad things happened to me. For instance, I woke up late, which caused me to be late for work, and my boss punished me. Later, I was in a bad mood, and after finishing work, my car broke down in the middle of the street, and people helped me. After that, I returned home late." In addition, redundancy should be minimized to ensure clarity and focus in communication. The message becomes more concise and effective. The speakers can maintain a balance between providing enough information and avoiding unnecessary elaboration. By



following these rules, speakers can maintain effective and cooperative communication that aligns with Grice's principle of quantity (Grice, 1975).

4.2. Quality

The principle of quality is one of the most important principles proposed by the British philosopher Grice. This principle is based on honesty in a conversation between two people, and it should be clear and unambiguous. Both parties should be honest in their speech. This principle is based on honesty and truth. Speakers should not say anything that is incorrect, inaccurate, vague, incomprehensible, or lacks sufficient evidence. These things are very important in this principle. Grice presents the general formula for this maxim, stating, "Try to make your contribution one that is true" (Grice, 1975). The British philosopher divided this maxim into two sub-rules:

1. "Do not say what you believe to be false" ((Grice, 1975, pp. 45–46).
2. "Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence" (Grice, 1975, pp. 45–46).

This principle clearly and explicitly emphasizes the truthfulness of information provided by both parties in a conversation. The speaker must believe what they are saying and have sufficient evidence to support their claims for the sake of accuracy and validity. Therefore, we conclude that the first and most important rule is absolute truthfulness. The speaker must be completely honest in their statements and avoid lying or providing uncertain information to prevent any potential errors. If you see something wrong, you must not say it. For example, when Sally asks, "Where is the Burj Khalifa located?" and Jean replies, "It is in Dubai," this represents adherence to the maxim because Jean provides an honest and truthful answer (Grice, 1975). In addition, the second rule emphasizes that sufficient evidence is very important, and without it, one cannot make a judgment or say anything, because the listener might dismiss the information as unreliable or insufficient.

Additionally, Grice's concept of the violation of the maxim, which occurs when the speaker is dishonest and wants to mislead the listener with something other than the truth. For instance, when Sally asks, "Where is the Burj Khalifa located?" and Jean replies, "It is in Amsterdam," this violates the maxim because the speaker deliberately provides false information, misleading the listener (Grice, 1975). Here, the speaker violates this principle and is uncooperative, directly violating the principle of cooperation. Finally, the last rule is overstepping the bounds. Grice shows that the speaker overtly violates. In this principle by using irony, metaphor, or exaggeration. He assumes that the listener is not taking this seriously, and therefore, the listener implicitly infers another meaning (Grice, 1975).



4.3. Relation

The third principle is had here., the relation principle, introduced by the British philosopher Grice. This principle calls for conversational relation. This means that the conversation must be about the same topic between the two people. For example, When both interlocutors are engaged in a discussion about tennis and the 2025 world rankings, responding to a question about football would be considered irrelevant and inappropriate within the conversational context. In his book *Logic and Conversation*, Grice (1975) places the relation principle under the category of relationships and says, simply, “Be relevant.” Often, people talk to each other about different topics simultaneously. This is what the British scientist Grice wanted to clarify. He wanted people to adhere to these principles: that the conversation be understandable, that people talk about the same topic, and that their thinking becomes focused on the same subject. This means that any question, sentence, word—anything at all—should be appropriate to the question and relevant to the topic, thus fulfilling the purpose for which the conversation was held. When the speaker changes the subject suddenly or presents irrelevant information unrelated to the current conversation, the listener, according to the reciprocal principle, must assume that the speaker is still cooperating. Therefore, the listener must understand the implicit meaning and consider the underlying interpretation. For example, John is talking to another classmate about their classmate Erick, who just returned to school. John asks, “How is Erick at school?” John’s friend Jessie replies, “Thank God he hasn’t been expelled from school yet.” Here, John must infer that the implicit theme is that Jessie means Erick is dishonest and always cheats on exams, which will eventually lead to his expulsion from school (Grice, 1975).

4.4.Manner

The last principle is the principle of manner, which is one of the four rules identified by the philosopher Paul Grice (1975) in his book *Logic and Conversation* under the Cooperative Principle. This principle is concerned with how one expresses ideas, meaning that what one says is not related to truth, falsehood, or relevance of information. This principle states that speakers should be clear. There are several sub-rules included: (1) avoid ambiguity in expression, (2) avoid confusion, (3) be concise (avoid unnecessary verbosity), and (4) be organized . According to Levinson (1983), when Speaker A asks, “How was the lead singer?” (Levinson, 1983, p. 108). The speaker responds to the listener with a phrase or word that tends to exaggerate the description of something unnecessary. “The singer produced a series of sounds corresponding closely to the score of an aria from *Rigoletto*,” (Levinson, 1983, p. 108). Here, the speaker ignores this important sub-rule in order to avoid ambiguity and brevity. What the listener inferred was that the singer’s performance was clear and technically



correct. Here, It is observed that it lacked true artistic quality, and this was disappointing.

5. Flouting Conversational Maxims

Flouting Conversational has been defined by many scholars, who have mentioned it from different perspectives. Below are some important definitions that illustrate how this concept is understood in the field of pragmatics. First, Herbert Paul Grice (1975) defined the Flouting Conversational Maxims as a deliberate violation of all four maxims (quantity, quality, relation, manner), and the goal here is to convey a deep meaning implied during this conversation that occurred between two people . Second, Joanna Cutting (2002) state the Flouting Conversational Maxims as a certain strategic act or behavior in communicating with others, where the speaker violates a certain maxim during the conversation to convey and clarify a deeper or more accurate meaning, and this depends on the listener to identify the violation and interpret the implicit or implicit meaning. Trang and Hoa (2020) explain the Flouting Conversational Maxims as the deliberate non-compliance or breaking of these rules of the four maxims (quantity, quality, relation, manner) in this conversation to convey an implicit and deep message, and here the violation is intentional and obvious, and it aims to enhance the meaning in the dialogue .

5.1.Flouting Quantity Maxim

Ignoring the quantity principle here indicates that the speaker has completely failed to incorporate the quantity principle into the cooperative principles. This is a major mistake that leads to two important reasons in this conversation. First, either the speaker here did not provide sufficient information for the purpose of this conversation and provided unimportant, unclear, or somewhat ambiguous information, which leads to a violation of this rule. Second, either the speaker provided too much unimportant information, just redundant information, which is a reason for the listener not to understand, because at this point in this conversation there is too much information that may cause the listener to mislead, which also violates the rule.For example:

Sally: I hope you brought coffee and tea.

Jean: Ah, I brought Orange juice.

In this example, Jean tries to tell Sally about the thing that he did not bring indirectly, and over here Jean deliberately provides insufficient information in this way that he did not bring coffee and tea, and this is a response to Sally's question; here, Sally expects as a listener to receive the implicit or mystical meaning of this thing from Jean. And here Jean did not provide sufficient, appropriate and clear information, and this phrase was classified to Jean as ignoring the principle of quantity because it provided a less-than-expected



answer for certain reasons, this constitutes a clear violation of this principle, whether intentional or not. (Grice,213:1989).

5.2.Flouting Quality Maxim

In this matter, the principle of quality is violated when the speaker says or expresses something on a particular topic that does not accurately convey what he intended to say or what he was thinking. At this point, It is observed that the speaker has failed to present this information correctly and that the information he provided was not entirely accurate. Here , the speaker does not state what requires sufficient and appropriate evidence in the dialogue, nor does he convey what the speaker believes to be wrong. Over here , the example of flouting maxims the one who disagrees with the principal should and requires the speaker to say what he thinks is true in this conversation as explained in the following dialogue (Grice, 1975).

Jessie: Look. Winter has come.

Erick: Yes. Suddenly, my room becomes a fridge now.

Here, these two friends are discussing a specific winter topic: the weather. Eric has clearly violated the principle of quality when he answers his friend's question by saying that his room will freeze like a refrigerator this season. This is illogical, inaccurate, and untrue; in reality, a room doesn't turn into a refrigerator. Clearly, there's an implied meaning Eric is trying to convey to his friend, rather than stating it directly. This is obvious.

5.3.Flouting Relation Maxim

In this matter, the principle of relation is neglected or happens when the speaker fails or is unable to show relevance to the topic during the conversation. In some cases, even if the speaker is not relevant to a specific topic, this does not mean that they are completely irrelevant to the conversation on that particular topic. This sometimes occurs when the speaker wants to hide certain things or information, or when the speaker wants to convey information to others on a circumstantial basis. For example:

Michael: Jack, the bell is ranging.

Jack: I am on the phone!

In this previous conversation, Jack answers something that was irrelevant to the topic, and thus here he violates the principle of relevance because it was irrelevant to the topic. In this case, Michael must understand Jack's unspoken, hidden, and unclear message, which is that Michael should open the door because Jack is now making a phone call to someone (Kurniati and Hanidar,142:2018).



5.4. Flouting Manner Maxim

The principal of manner is violated when the speaker fails to adhere to this principle, and this is when the speaker makes a speech or words that are vague, unclear, lack of brevity, order, or use ambiguous language, whether the speaker in this conversation intended this thing or not. For example:

Mike: Let's go to the cinema today.

Anna: I got a Zoom meeting, and it might finish at 8 p.m.

At this juncture, the result of this conversation, especially Anna, that she says an ambiguous and unclear sentence that carries two meanings. First, the refusal, which is an indirect response to his refusal to go to the cinema, or second, that she is able and wants to go to the cinema, but only after the meeting is over (Marlisa, R., & Hidayat, 132:2020).

6. Method

This important study of formal and informal interpersonal conversations employs an analytical, descriptive, and qualitative approach to examine how digital communication platforms worldwide observe or disregard Grice's cooperative principle—that is, whether these four maxims (quantity, quality, relation, and manner) are violated during online interactions or in real-life conversations. Linguist Herbert Paul Grice first introduced the cooperative principle in 1975, arguing that successful communication in conversation depends on speakers reaching a shared understanding of cooperation: "Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose of the talk exchange" (Grice, 1975, p. 45). To illustrate how this collaborative principle works, Grice has four basic rules of conversation: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. These maxims guide speakers during conversation in producing meaningful, clear, relevant, and effective messages.

Each of these four maxims, identified by the linguist Grice, has a specific function in both digital and real-world conversations and significantly influences speakers through adherence or violation. For example, the maxim of quantity requires that a speaker's contribution be rich, understandable to the listener, and that information be provided as required, without being too much or too little depending on the question posed. The maxim of quality dictates that a speaker should not say anything they believe to be false or lacking sufficient evidence. The maxim of relation requires that information be relevant to the topic of the conversation. Finally, the maxim of manner requires that the speaker's contribution be clear, concise, unambiguous, organized, and understandable to the listener (Grice, 1975).

7. Data Analysis



This section analyzes data from the popular Career Ladder program. The analysis is based on Grice's four Maxims (quantity, quality, relationship, and manner). The analysis focuses on a dialogue between two people: Max, the program's creator, and another people. From this dialogue, people can infer how the participants adhered to or intentionally violated these Maxims during their interaction. This process allows us to construct implicit meaning and understand how indirect implications arise from the violation or transgression of Grice's Maxims during communication.

Ep. 444 Career Ladder

Max: Is it a very Brazilian thing?

Camela: It is not a very Brazilian thing, everyone in the world can do it, but I do not think it's very common.

In this conversation, it indicates that the woman adhered to the Maxim of quantity and provided sufficient information on the question of no less and no more, when Max asked about the job, is it common in the country of Brazil, the answer was enough for this question. The response was highly relevant to the topic, thereby fulfilling the Maxim of relation. It also adhered to the Maxim of quality, as it provided accurate and reliable information. Finally, the Maxim of manner was maintained, as the explanation was presented in a clear and coherent manner.

Max: see. Why did you choose to do it?

Camela: I don't think I chose it.

Max: Oh, it chose you?

Camela: It chose me, yes, definitely.

Max: Really? At what age?

Camela: I'm 43 now, so it is been five years . It's hard to say in English, but I had to know something to develop something inside myself , so I can do this job.

Here is a clear violation of the quantity Maxim. Max wanted to know at what age she started, but the woman provided additional and more information than was required. The woman's answer was that she wanted to develop herself before starting this work, but the question was about her age. The woman could have given only the age at which she started, but her answer was different. This may have been done to keep the conversation going for a longer time and to avoid clear guessing. She may also have wanted to add extra information in order to prevent Max from connecting the events correctly. This additional information confuses Max and makes it harder for him to reach a clear conclusion. Another



possible reason is that this reflects a common communicative behavior. Some people, by nature, do not limit their answers to the exact amount of information requested. Instead, they provide extra, unnecessary details even when only one piece of information is asked for. This behavior is common among many people in everyday communication.

Max: Do you need a degree for it?

Camela: I need study and dedication, but I don't need a degree for it.

Max: Do you touch people?

Camela: Not in the bodies, but I think, I touch them in their souls.

Max: A singer?

Camela: No, I wish.

Max: Is it a kind of performance?

Camela: No.

In this dialogue, the woman adhered to all of Grice's Maxims, and this is ideal in this conversation. We have no violation, meaning she adhered to the Maxim of quantity, giving a sufficient answer to Max's question about the university degree, and she replied that she did not need this degree. She also adhered to the Maxim of manner, meaning she gave clear and unambiguous answers. She also adhered to the Maxim of relation, all her answers were relevant to the question. Finally, she did not violate the Maxim of quality and provided correct answers, such as when Max asked about the job, if she was a singer, she said, "No, I wish".

Ep. 340 Career Ladder

Max: Hello, Yuri. How are you?

Yuri: Incredible! I love you, and if you guess I will give you whatever you want.

In this dialogue, there is a clear violation from Yuri of the Maxim of relation, in this dialogue Max asked Yuri how are you, and Yuri's answer was irrelevant and he replied that he could not believe that he saw Max and he loved him very much and asked Max to guess his guest and also added If Max knew his guest he would give him what he wanted. Here, Yuri is very self-confident and used this technique in order to make Max under pressure not to guess. Or maybe he studied the way of conversation well and used this kind of way in order for Max to be nervous or somewhat surprised or perplexed Max. Surely, Yuri wants to get to the end of the conversation without Max guessing to his job and this is his



main goal. And also we have the nature of people, some people, this is their nature or their way of speaking.

Max: Do you like your job?

Yuri: It's not just a job man, I mean, I feel that, I'm unemployed.

Max: But you do something?

Yuri: Yes, of course, I live life, man.

In this interaction, Yuri clearly violates all four of Grice's maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. First, there is a clear violation of the Maxim of Quantity, as Max's question requires a simple "yes" or "no" answer, but Yuri provides a different type of response. Second, Yuri deliberately violates the Maxim of Quality by giving information that is somewhat inaccurate and by showing hesitation. He uses expressions such as "I mean" and "I feel", which indicate uncertainty and lack of confidence, and then states that he is unemployed. Third, the Maxim of Relation is directly violated when Max asks a follow-up question about whether Yuri is working, but Yuri's response is irrelevant to the question. Max does not ask about Yuri's life in general, yet Yuri answers in that way. Finally, the Maxim of Manner is clearly and intentionally violated, as Yuri provides vague, unclear, and manipulative information that leaves Max confused. All these violations are used strategically by Yuri to make Max lose the guessing game and to keep the conversation going until the end. Moreover, Yuri appears to be a very intelligent participant who knows how to handle such situations, which suggests that these violations are deliberate. Through creating ambiguity and confusion, he successfully makes the interaction more engaging and misleads Max.

Yuri: If I exist, yes.

Max: Maybe you do spiritual work?

Yuri: I'm very spiritual, but I see everything we do in life as spiritual.

Here, Yuri clearly violated the Maxim of manner. When Max asked him if he was paid, his answer was vague, ambiguous, and insufficient, leaving the listener with several questions. Similarly, when Max asked if he practiced spiritualism, his answer was also vague and manipulative. He replied that he was indeed a spiritual being but didn't specify whether he performed spiritual acts. Yuri's use of evasive language was deliberate; he didn't want Max to reach a crucial point in his deductions, which was his goal from the beginning.

Max: Are you self_employed?

Yuri: Nah, I'm an employee, and I have apayslip.



Max: Is it a creative job?

Yuri: Very creative, but some people would say that what I do it isn't creative.

In this dialogue, Yuri did not violate any of the four Maxims, and all his answers were good, relevant to the topic, and sufficient—neither more nor less than required. He answered with accurate and truthful information, and finally, his answer was clear, unambiguous, and not obscure.

Max: For your job, do you work for a big company?

Yuri: We have 17 ployees.

The violation of the Maxim of relation in this question is clear and deliberate on Yuri's part. When Max asked him if he worked for a large company, his answer was completely irrelevant; he said they had 17 employees at the company, which doesn't match the question at all. The definitive answer is yes or no, not something like that.. In other words, Max didn't ask about the number of employees at the company.

Ep. 439 Career Ladder

Max: Do you have a job?

Mark Stewart: I do, Thank Goodness. F1 is helping me deal with brain.

Max: Deal with your brain?

Mark Stewart: yes.

In this conversation, Mark clearly violated the Maxim of relation when he asked Max whether he had a job. At the beginning of the conversation, Mark answered correctly by stating that he had a job. However, he later clearly and deliberately violated the Maxim of relation when he stated that the formula helps him deal with his mind. This response is irrelevant to Max's question. Max asked only about the job, whereas Mark's irrelevant answer was intended to confuse Max so that he would not guess his job. Alternatively, this response may have been intended to prolong the conversation. More accurately, Mark aimed to make the guessing game more difficult for Max in order to prevent him from guessing correctly.

Max: So you deal with the mind, and F1 helps you do it.

Mark Stewart: Correct.

The response "Correct" to Max's sentence "So you deal with the mind, and F1 helps you do it" can be considered a violation of the Maxim of Quantity. Although the answer is correct and clear, it provides less information than



expected for a double-barreled question that inquires about the relationship between dealing with the mind and the use of Formula 1. Mark deliberately gave a concise response without clarifying the details, leaving the listener to infer the connection, which constitutes a clear example of flouting the Maxim of Quantity. This violation explains why Mark, through this brief response, intends to encourage Max to think more deeply about other possibilities and to render the guessing game more ambiguous in order to discourage him from making an accurate guess. Consequently, Mark provides an answer that does not fully address Max's clear question. This strategy also serves to complicate the situation for Max by withholding sufficient information, thereby causing confusion.

Max: "Do you work for a particular team?"

Mark Stewart: "Nope. We get lots of help from all the teams, really."

In this conversation, Mark Stewart's reply to Max's question, "Do you work for a particular team?" shows a violation of the Maxim of Manner. He said, "Nope. We get lots of help from all the teams." While the answer is correct, it is vague because he didn't mention which teams or what kind of help they provide, using a general phrase like "lots of help." This makes the listener need to think more to understand the full situation. The vagueness was intentional to keep the answer general and protect some details, while still keeping the conversation fairly clear. When Mark violated the Maxim of manner, he gave vague, unclear, or insufficient information. This helps Mark win this game. When Max cannot understand these things, things become in Mark's favor. This is a type of style used to make things difficult for the listener and create a kind of manipulation of the answer so that the listener does not reach anything important related to this game.

Max: Is it a charity?

Mark Stewart: Yes, it is.

Max: Ok, that is interesting, when did you start it?

Mark Stewart: Almost ten years ago

In this part of the conversation, Mark didn't violate any of the four Maxims. He was perfect and answered the question exactly. When Max asked him if it was charity, he said yes. This answer was sufficient, nothing more and nothing less. The question required a yes or no answer, and Mark adhered to this Maxim. He also adhered to the Maxim of quality; his answer was correct, precise, and confident, without hesitation. The maxim of relation was never violated because Mark's answer was relevant to Max's question. Finally, the Maxim of manner was not violated; the answer was clear and unambiguous. In the second question,



when Max asked when he started, Mark's answer was also perfect, maintaining all four Maxims without violating any of them. He answered approximately ten years ago. Here, Mark can't always break or violate the principles during this conversation to allow for more flexibility in the discussion. Also, Max is smart and experienced; he knows how to manage such situations.

Max: And the job we are talking about—is it a charity that helps children?

Mark Stewart: More the brain.

Here, in this conversation, Mark violated the Maxim of relation, and the answer was somewhat vague and incomprehensible. Mark was able to give more clear information than what he said. More with brain, not with charity that helps children. This type of answer suggests to the listener that the speaker does not want to give more hints, or perhaps Mark wants to end this conversation in this style in order to avoid guessing, or he intends for the conversation to continue for a longer period, but he is trying hard to prevent Max from clearly taking any important information about this career.

8. Discussion of the Findings

In the analysis of the digital program created by Max, there are many violations that occurred between Max and the other people. Of course, each person has his own style; for example, each person violated a specific maxim more frequently (quantity, quality, relation, manner). In some cases, there was no violation, and the conversation was ideal and understandable to both parties. In the first episode of the analyzed program, Ep. 444_Career Ladder, the conversation between Camila and Max initially proceeded without violating any Maxims, as the woman's answers directly corresponded to Max's questions. However, The response was highly relevant to the topic, provided accurate information, and adhered to the Maxim of Quality. Finally, the Maxim of Manner was not violated; rather, the response was clear and well organized. After that, Camila only violated the quantity principle once and did not violate any other principle at the end of the dialogue. This demonstrates Camila's ability to manage dialogue without breaking too many principles. This can be attributed to the woman's lifestyle; she may prefer to provide information only to the required extent, or she may wish to conclude the conversation more quickly, or she may not want to engage in further details.

In this episode (Ep. 340 - Career Ladder) of this show, Yuri begins the conversation by violating the Maxim of relation in order to challenge Max by not guessing the job, or to confuse Max, and also to keep the conversation going until the end. Then, Yuri deliberately and directly violates all the Maxims so as not to give Max anything, not even the smallest clue, to guess. He uses this tactic because he knows Max well, and this helps him win the game. He provides too



much or too little information, or inaccurate, irrelevant, and vague information that prevents the listener from properly forming their thoughts. Later, Yuri specifically violates the Maxim of manner by giving an ambiguous answer. This type of tactic creates confusion for the listener, which is exactly what Yuri wants. Finally, he violates the Maxim of relation so as not to answer Max's question naturally. In this episode (Ep. 439 - Career Ladder), several violations occur. First, the Maxim of relation is violated, followed immediately by the Maxim of quantity. Mark uses this tactic to control the situation from the outset and prevent Max from dominating the conversation. Later, Mark violates the Maxim of manner to make it harder for Max to guess. However, he then adheres to the rules of the conversation and answers questions systematically. Towards the end of the conversation, Mark reverts to his old tactic of violating the Maxim of manner to ensure the conversation continues until the end of the allotted time.

In conclusion, in each episode of this program, the participants who climbed the ladder demonstrated their own distinctive conversational styles. Each individual tended to violate a particular maxim more frequently during the interaction, while other maxims were violated only once, or in some cases not at all. At times, the conversations were free from violations of all maxims, whereas in other instances several maxims were violated, with at least one maxim remaining unviolated. For example, in the episode that brought together Camila and Max, Camila only violated one principle of the conversation, which is the principle of quantity. But in the rest of the dialogues, she did not break the principles, on the contrary, she adhered to these principles, and the dialogue was perfect. In the second episode, Yuri violated the maxim of relation three times and the maxim of manner twice, while the remaining maxims were violated once each. In the final episode, Mark violated the maxim of manner twice, whereas the other maxims were violated once during the conversation. This analysis illustrates that each participant possesses a distinct style of communication.

9. Conclusion

In conclusion, Grice's four Maxims —quantity, quality, relation, and manner— have been illustrated, explained, and applied in both formal and informal conversations, as well as in programs and speeches. The influence of Grice's Maxims is clearly evident in every conversation, as demonstrated in Max's popular program Career Ladder and in the opinions of critics regarding these principles and their apparent impact. This study reveals that, there are numerous instances of maxim violations between the host and the individuals he encounters on the ladder. However, there is also clear intelligence and tact in the participants' responses to the host's questions, as they often manage to answer without violating any of the four Maxims. This reflects the speaker's intelligence, tact, and refined approach to responding appropriately without overstepping conversational boundaries. In the three previous episodes, each participant



employed a personal style that led either to the violation or the observance of one of the Maxims. This variation depends largely on their adherence to or violation of Grice's Maxims. Such behavior is crucial in any conversation because it reveals aspects of human nature in communication. People may violate a principle, or choose not to, in order to mislead the other party, to end the conversation more quickly, or to withhold important information when they prefer not to disclose it; this behavior is a natural part of human interaction. Moreover, each individual may deviate from a particular principle more frequently than others during conversation, and this is entirely normal, as it reflects their unique communicative style. Therefore, these four conversational principles are essential for making communication clearer, more understandable, and free from misunderstanding, thus ensuring full comprehension for both the speaker and the listener.

Reference

- Ayunon, C. (2018). Gricean maxims revisited in FB conversation posts: Its pedagogical implications. *TESOL International Journal*, 13(4), 82–95.
- Brumark, A. (2006). Non-observance of Gricean maxims in family dinner table conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- Canlı, M. (2021). Violation of Grice's maxims and its effect on the conversational structure and plot development of Ishiguro's *Never Let Me Go*. *Eurasian Journal of English Language and Literature*, 3(2), 386–394.
- Crystal, D. (2011). *Internet linguistics: A student guide*. Routledge.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Darics, E. (2015). *Digital business discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2020). *Digital discourse analysis: Theoretical perspectives and methodological challenges*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press.
- Hasan, N., Mohamad, N., Ghazali, M. F. M., Rifin, M. N., & Salleh, N. A. A. M. (2024). Guidelines of rational communicative behavior: An analysis of Grice's maxim exploitation. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 14(5), 919–933. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v14-i5/21617>



- Herring, S. C. (2016). Interactional coherence in CMC. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 21(4), 294–309.
- Herring, S. C., Stein, D., & Virtanen, T. (2013). Pragmatics of computer-mediated communication. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Jones, R. (2015). *Digital literacies*. Routledge.
- Kurniati, M., & Hanidar, S. (2018). The flouting of the Gricean maxims in the movies *Insidious* and *Insidious 2*. *Lexicon*.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Machin, D. (2018). *Digital discourse analysis: New insights and challenges*. Routledge.
- Marlisa, R., & Hidayat, D. N. (2020). The analysis of flouting maxims in the *Good Morning America (GMA)* talk show. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*.
- Sial, M. A. (2019). A pragmatic study of Grice's maxims in newspaper news reports. *Journal of Media and Communication Studies*, 11(3), 45–58.
- Trang, T. T. H., & Hoa, N. T. Q. (2020). An investigation into the flouting of conversational maxims employed by male and female guests in the American talk show *The Ellen Show*. *Journal of Science and Technology*, 18(6), 117–122.
- Yule, G. (2020). *The study of language (7th ed.)*. Cambridge University Press