



## ANALYSIS OF GRICEAN MAXIMS IN 'THE OYSTER AND THE PEARL': A PRAGMATIC STUDY

### **Alina Khan**

BS English, Department of English Language and Literature University of Lahore Sargodha Campus

[bsell07203059@student.uol.edu.pk](mailto:bsell07203059@student.uol.edu.pk)

### **Muhammad Ali Shahid**

Lecturer, Department of English Language and Literature University of Lahore Sargodha Campus

[muhammadalishahid05@gmail.com](mailto:muhammadalishahid05@gmail.com)

### **Palwasha Iqbal**

BS English, Department of English Language and Literature University of Lahore Sargodha Campus

[bsell07203060@student.uol.edu.pk](mailto:bsell07203060@student.uol.edu.pk)

### **Mahnoor**

MPhil Biosciences, CIRBS department, International Islamic university Islamabad

[mahnoor.msbio133@iiu.edu.pk](mailto:mahnoor.msbio133@iiu.edu.pk)

### **Abstract**

*Having a conversation is one way to get more information. When the speaker is talking to the listeners, they must have context in it so that there is no misunderstanding between them. To prevent misinterpretation between the speaker and the hearer. This research aims to find out and analyse the type of maxims used in "The Oyster and the Pearl" play. The researcher used descriptive qualitative method to collect and analyse the text by implanting the Gricean Maxims as the theoretical framework. The results of the study showed that the characters in the one-act play "The Oyster and the Pearl play" used all four of Paul Grice's maxims. The researcher coded 24 dialogues and found 8 maxims of quantity, 5 maxims of quality, 8 maxims of relation, and 5 maxims of manner in the play dialogues. The characters in the play 'The Oyster and the Pearl' manipulated all cooperative principles in their utterances, but mostly, used the quantity maxim. It can be concluded that submissive maxims and cooperative principles are mostly obeyed in play, proving the conversation's effectiveness. The study implies that Gricean maxims, which make the way of talking polite and effective, are very handy in daily conversation*

**Keywords:** Cooperative Principle, Grice's Maxims, Pragmatic Study

### **Introduction**

People cannot separate themselves from communication in society in their daily lives. Conversations are conducted through language, which is an important aspect of human interaction. Examples of language used in daily life include thinking, communicating, expressing feelings, and other things. Language is also used to convey ideas. When people converse, the hearer typically tries to understand the meaning of the words and the speaker's or writer's intended message. This means that both the speaker and the listener must be able to deliver their intended message clearly in order for both of them to understand each other. The study of intended speaker meaning in context is known as pragmatics Yule (2005). People utilize communication to engage with one another, and it may also be utilized as a tool to Pragmatics is one area of linguistics that examines speaker utterances. Studies that look at the meaning of speech in particular circumstances or contexts are also included in pragmatics. Put another way, pragmatics is the scientific study of the reciprocal relationship that exists between speech forms and functions. According to Averina (2023) pragmatics is concerned with the management of language, specifically choosing words from a pool of

options that will meet our needs and those of others when they are utilized in social interactions.

In accordance with Leech (2018) pragmatics is the scientific study of meaning and how to relate communication to real-world contexts. It also encompasses a variety of elements that can facilitate conversational communication and help identify fundamental ideas pertaining to pragmatic or semantic phenomena. Five key elements that were the primary focus of Leech's description of pragmatics are listed below:

**a) Speakers and Audience**

Here, pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as it is conveyed by a speaker and understood by a listener. As a result, this is less about how words or phrases in the speech itself are understood and more on analyzing what individuals mean when they say them.

- **Speech in context**

In this sense, pragmatics focuses on capacity, or skill, to use language. This means that this portion of the study must entail interpretations of what the speaker intends in a given situation and how the context effects what is said.

- **Communicative action.**

The word's have literal meaning, the speaker's intention, and the purpose of the statement. In order to avoid miscommunication between the speaker and the listener, the speaker must comprehend and be aware of what will be spoken, as well as if the listener will grasp what the speaker will say.

- **Oral discussions:**

Oral discussions can serve as a starting point for examining the requirements of a certain circumstance.

As indicated by Mouton (2011) helpful guideline is a widespread clarification of why, with one's conversationalist's participation and with shared inferential estimations, it is feasible to speak with the most capricious phonetic and non-etymological means. As per Yule (1996), helpful guideline is the unavoidable collaboration suspicion and it occurs much of the time. Helpful guideline is the assessment that speakers don't just notice the co-usable standard in discussion, yet additionally a further rule connecting with the interactional idea of discussion (Suardana, 2022).

In order for a discussion to go smoothly and efficiently through cooperation, both the speaker and the listener must be able to grasp each other's words. As to Grice (1989) the cooperative concept serves as a basic prerequisite for the conduct of logical conversations. For language researchers and language learners who wish to use pragmatics as a research topic, these cooperative principles are crucial. This is a sort of covert agreement between the speaker and the listener to cooperate when speaking to each other. As a result, the cooperation principle is a fundamental guideline that they must observe when the speaker in the conversation speaks and also consider the nature of the conversation they are having. Every person's ability to interact and communicate with people is essential to maintaining positive social and professional relationships. In a strict sense, we only converse and understand one another in our daily lives that is, you and I. As per Grice Paul (1989) Grice has put forth his theory of the cooperative principle to elucidate our daily conversations. The cooperation concept is a general requirement for having a reasonable conversation. The fundamental idea is that for a conversation to be managed as effectively as possible, the participants must cooperate with one another. Then, Grice suggested maxims to manage it effectively. The quality, quantity, relevance, and manner maxims are the four categories of Gricean maxims. According to the study's conclusions, the movie's protagonists embraced four different kinds of maxims: relational, quality, quantity, and manner maxims.



The circumstance is considered to be flouting the conversational maxims when the speaker purposefully disregards them. According to Grice (1989) speaking concepts or words with a hidden meaning in order to elicit the listener to infer the meaning from the speaker is known as flouting maxims. The condition is known as contempt of the maxims when the speaker willfully ignores the conversational rules. Disregard of maxims, according to Grice (1989) is when speakers employ terms or words with a hidden meaning to elicit the listener to figure out what is being said in a discourse. Now, the four maxims—quantitative, qualitative, relational, and manner—can be used to categorize the disrespect for the principles. The speaker is seen to be disobeying the principle of quantity if he provides very little information in order to fulfill the formalities of the conversation and doesn't go into further detail. Politicians use this tactic when they don't want to respond to inquiries or discuss certain topics. However, the quality standard is simply ignored if the speaker uses insufficient evidence in the discussion. While some speakers do it purposefully, others do it accidentally. There are two possible outcomes: either the speaker lacks sufficient understanding about the subject, or the speaker does not want to reveal the evidence. But in both situations, the audience might not have a positive image of the speaker.

Thomas (1995) Celebrities, politicians, and analysts may defy these maxims in order to make a significant point or to try to trick the recipient. The author has examined and evaluated the discourse of various individuals from a variety of backgrounds, including politics, the media, and personal relationships. The study's conclusions demonstrated that most of the time, speakers knowingly break the dictum. Nonetheless, the attempt is made in a way that requires the hearer to accept the speaker's words without question and fail to recognize the breach Brenier (2013).

A speaker who willfully transgresses the maxims without intending to deceive or mislead the audience is infringing on their rights. According to cutting (2002) a speaker's imperfection in regard to speech results in an infringement. Aitchison (2014) CMs may also view disregarding the conversational maxims as non-compliance. The interlocutors decline to cooperate when they opt out because there are valid reasons for doing so. According to Grice (1989) a converser unintentionally refuses to follow the CMs in the conversation exchange, indicating that they have chosen to opt out. According to Bimer (2013) opting out of a conversation occurs when one of the parties declines to participate in the cooperative discussion. According to Allott (2010) CMs can occur when a person doesn't respond to a question posed to them during a conversation; this is interpreted as a refusal to participate in the discourse. According to Mesthrie (2001) a discussion participant chooses not to observe CMs by expressing resistance to cooperating in the manner that the maxim requires.

The Grice maxims were used in this study to William Saroyan's "The Oyster and the Pearl" by the researcher. California-born William Saroyan (1908–1981) was a renowned writer whose parents were immigrants from Armenia. He was in an orphanage for five years, from the age of three to eight, following the death of his father. In the 1930s, he started writing short tales. Later, he wrote plays, novels, and memoirs. "My Name is Aram," "The Laughing Matter," and "The Oyster and the Pearl" are some of his well-known pieces. Saroyan believed that people are inherently good, and his plays usually ended happily and humorously. His literature frequently praised hope in the face of misfortune. One-act drama "The Oyster and the Pearl" was published in 1953. In O.K. by-the-Sea, California, where Harry has been operating his barbershop for 24 years, one of his plays is set. In the play, Clay Larrabee and Harry Van Dusen have a philosophical conversation while Van Dusen is cutting Larrabee's hair. Notwithstanding the difficulties his family faces, Clay's search for a pearl in an oyster represents his desire for a better life. Harry shares his experiences and viewpoints with Clay during their talk, imparting life lessons. At the play's conclusion, Clay walks out of

the barbershop with renewed optimism and resolve to pursue his search for the pearl and face life's obstacles head-on. "The Oyster and the Pearl" addresses a number of topics. The play's central message is to unwind and slow down since doing so will make life much happier and more enjoyable. The drama shows faith in the fundamental decency of human nature and includes humor and a beautiful ending. The play's core themes are on the difficulties of interpersonal relationships and human communication. The play explores how people share experiences, express meaning, and build connections with one another through the exchanges between Harry and Clay. Harry's contacts with the locals and their shared experiences, which capture the richness and simplicity of daily life, are at the center of the narrative.

Many interesting exchanges in *The Oyster and the Pearl* can be examined under the prism of pragmatic research, with special attention paid to the cooperation principle maxims. Whether in person or through text, these maxims are essential guidelines that communicators (both listeners and speakers) must go by to guarantee efficient and successful communication. It is recognized in pragmatic research that effective communication requires cooperation between the two persons involved in an interaction. According to Allan (1986) effective communication necessitates the active involvement of all communicators. Communication is a social activity, similar to other social interactions.

The application of Grice's four maxims in the dialogue of the play *The Oyster and the Pearl* is the main topic of this research study. In order to create a cooperative principle between a speaker and a hearer in a discourse that is true based on sufficient evidence, instructive, relevant, clear, concise, and ordered, maxim theory is applied. It is anticipated that by using maxim theory to the analysis of the talks in this book, we would be able to apply the cooperative principle in each exchange, resulting in cooperative, efficient, enlightening, harmonic, and smooth exchanges. It adheres to the notion of Grice's Cooperative Principle. The goal of this research project is to examine how the play *The Oyster and the Pearl* uses maxims in its dialogue. These four maxims are the ones about quality, number, relationships, and method.

### **1.1 Research Objectives**

- i. To find out Gricean maxims in the one-act play *The Oyster and the Pearl* by William Saroyan
- ii. To analyze the Gricean maxims in the play *The Oyster and the Pearl* by William Saroyan

### **1.2 Research Questions**

- i. What kinds of maxims are found in the one-act play *The Oyster and the Pearl* by William Saroyan?
- ii. How do the Gricean Maxims act in the one-act play *The Oyster and the Pearl* by William Saroyan?

### **Literature Review**

The cooperation principle maxims that were employed in the novel "The Fault in Our Stars" were examined, according to Saragih (2020). *The Fault in Our Stars*, a novel, served as the data source. It satisfied the cooperative principle by adhering to its four tenets: maxim of number, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. Grice's theory was the one that the researcher employed in this study. To address the research questions, a descriptive qualitative method was used in this study. The researcher used both the non-participatory methodology and the observational method to gather the data. The researcher applied the pragmatic identity method to the data analysis. Based on the theory of Sudaryanto the findings demonstrated that the innovation mostly applied the degree of cooperation principle. Thirty data points pertaining to the cooperative principle were discovered. There



are 15 data for the quantity maxim, 3 for the quality maxim, 10 for the relational maxim, and just 2 for the way maxim.

According to Sidabutar (2022) the cooperative principle was examined through an analysis of the film “Willoughbys” by utilizing various maxims. This investigation employed Grice’s (1975) cooperative principle as its primary hypothesis. Observational approach and non-participatory methodology described by Sudaryanto (2015) were used in the descriptive qualitative study design. Additionally, this study employed the pragmatic competence-in-equalizing approach and the pragmatic identity method for data analysis. And the film “Willoughbys” was subjected to every theory. According to the study’s conclusions, the movie’s protagonists embraced four different kinds of maxims: relational, quality, quantity, and manner maxims. With six appearances, the quality maxims were the most common types. Four times did the quantity maxims appear? There were four instances of the relation maxims. With three appearances, the maxims of manner turned out to be the type with the fewest maxims.

Iskandar (2010) conducted an analysis of “The Simpsons Season 5” scripts in order to pinpoint conversational maxims that fall under the purview of pragmatics—more precisely, the Gricean Maxims. The goal of this study is to identify the different kinds of maxims that were included in the scripts and to classify any infractions or departures from those maxims. The author discovered through this investigation that the Gricean Maxims were both applied and broken. The majority of the time, the speakers in the scripted dialogue have upheld the maxims. However, on occasion, they have purposefully or unintentionally disregarded those aphorisms in their discourse. The speaker's willingness to employ or defy the maxims causes both their fulfillment and violation. Furthermore, intentionally and inadvertently providing false information, failing to satisfy one ideal without going against the second, and refusing to collaborate are all considered infractions of those maxims.

Saleem (2021) noted that a few contemporary American writers used a variety of conversational dialogue styles in their short stories, offering insights into the different ways writers use dialogue to accomplish literary effects and express meaning. Each essayist endeavors to utilize a particular conversational correspondence style in light of their own encounters and information base. Each character has an unmistakable conversational style that mirrors their singular characters and particular elements. Writers in the US today create different characters utilizing conversational composing styles that peruse can promptly grasp and partner with specific characters. According to Gricean maxims, these characters break various conversational rules throughout their exchanges. The picked present day American journalists utilize conversational sayings to upgrade their influence, availability, and convincingness, making them more persuading than different scholars. It proceeds to express that as well as loaning the tales a refined tone, the gadgets of incongruity, similitude, misrepresentation, exaggeration, and facetious inquiries may likewise raise peruses’ degrees of interest.

Karim (2019) examined how participants applied the maxims of quality, quantity, relation, and method to create effective communication in a selection of English TV interviews as they applied Grice’s cooperative principles. In order to keep the conversation going, the speakers cooperate with one another by adhering to specific norms and guidelines. The purpose of the study is to demonstrate the function of language in communication as well as the key elements of the supposed meaning that language conveys. Political and artistic interviews are the two categories of English TV interviews that are chosen for analysis based on the cooperation principles. These are the two regions where the moims’ observation and non-observance are most readily visible. It is theorized that political leaders and artists frequently employ disregard for the cooperation principle as a tactic to further their

objectives. According to the study's findings, politicians and artists both transgress the principles in unique ways and for distinct reasons.

In her critique of the Grice Maxims' application in conversation, Hossain (2021) emphasized the value of clear communication in preserving wholesome social and professional connections and provided examples of how people use these maxims in their day-to-day interactions. In a strict sense, we only converse and understand one another in our daily lives—that is, you and I. Paul Grice offered his hypothesis of the cooperation principle to describe the conversations we have in our daily lives. They mainly criticize Gricean theory in their paper. It begins with a summary of Gricean theory and its tenets before illuminating how implicature and Gricean theory have evolved over time. It also demonstrates how the Neo-Griceans put forth a fresh theory in an effort to address the issues with the Gricean framework. It demonstrates how implicatures are conversational but that maxims are still used in discourse. This article centers on Grice's theory of the cooperation principle, emphasizing the significance of Grice's maxims in practical discourse. This work will be beneficial for the researcher's future investigation of the Gricean Maxim in the discussion. This essay seeks to determine whether the Gricean Maxim may be applied to discussions in our day-to-day interactions.

In order to shed light on how Grice's cooperative principle is applied in everyday communication, Priangan (2021) carried out a study to examine the conversational maxims used and broken by speakers in informal conversations between two English language education students at State Semarang University's Graduate Program. The author employed a descriptive qualitative research design to accomplish the purpose. As a result, the methodology for this study involves the methodical collection and analysis of data. Based on the findings of this study, the author separated into two groups. According to the Initial result, the author discovered that the maxim of quality was the one that came up the most in the conversation. The maxim of quantity appeared 16 times, while the maxim of quality appeared 13 times, 2 times appeared for the maxim of relation and only 1 time for maxim of manner. Three types of maxims were broken in the conversation, according to the second outcome. The speakers broke two maxims: the maxim of quality (two times) and the maxim of quantity (only once). The outcome suggested that the speakers adhere to the Gricean maxims. It also indicates that both speakers understanding each other and that the discussion is proceeding smoothly.

Hasan et al. (2020) underlined the significance of employing maxims in speeches and discussions. The definition of the maxims and their significance in the discourse were also provided by the study. The study claims that Grice established four language maxims that serve as the cooperation principle. These maxims were introduced with the intention of establishing standards that were morally righteous, suitable, concise, and unambiguous. This means that the speaker cannot utilize untrue or improper information to deflect the listener's attention Hasan et al. (2020). Four maxims were identified by the study: quality, quantity, relation, and manner. By establishing these four guidelines, the expectation was that speeches would always adhere to the truth, be succinct, accurate, and pertinent.

Usman (2021) stated that the research uses Paul Grice's Maxims and Conversational Implicatures to examine Prime Minister Imran Khan's speech to the UN General Assembly on September 2019. The study used both qualitative and quantitative methods to achieve this goal. YouTube used text derived from the subtitles to gather the data. Paul Grice Conversational Implicature (Maxims) was used to examine the text in order to determine whether the maxims were included, ignored, observed, and/or broken during the discourse. The study's analysis revealed that his statements had a double meaning and obviously ignored and broke the maxims. Tables and graphs were used to display the results. To convey

his message to the UN members, he rejected the maxims and shied away from the observables. He frequently employed ambiguous terminology to elicit the listener's interpretation of the conversation's unstated meaning. In order to ensure that Muslims in India have a bright future, Prime Minister Imran Khan broke rules by offering anything. In an unprecedented move that highlighted the state's debt crisis and its efforts to combat money laundering, Prime Minister Imran Khan broke with convention for the benefit of Muslims in India. His words were feeble even after all of his hard work and the nation's praise, and this was mostly because the maxims were broken, disregarded, observed, and rejected.

In their study, "Grice's Cooperative Maxims as Linguistic Criteria for News Selectivity" Aghagolzadeh (2012) suggested that Grice's cooperative maxims could be applied as linguistic criteria for news selectivity. They have attempted to clarify in their research how Gricean maxims might be used in the selection of new forecasting. They claim that Newscasters have a listener and Gricean maxims can be applied to it.

Similar to this, Zainuddin (2014) examined the data to identify the four categories of conversational maxims that appeared in the transcripts of the Dr. Oz talk show's two episodes. These were the maxims of manner (11), relevance (14), amount (28), and quality (6). The maxim of amount, which appeared in 28 utterances (47, 45%) on the Dr. Oz talk show, was the most common form of maxim. Because the respondents' information was instructive and met the interviewer's requirements, the dominant type of maxim emerged. The extent to which the questions asked influence the specific types of maxims that comes into play. The interviewees make an effort to explain the conversation's goal.

In a descriptive qualitative study according to Arso and Ardi (2016) examined the maxims included in the script for the film "Up". The research has two main goals, which are as follows: to list the maxims are used in the up movie script and show how they might be used to teach speaking. Descriptive qualitative research is what this study is. The research's focus is on the maxims found in the Up movie script. The information comes from "Up". After gathering the data through observation, the researcher proceeds with a series of stages in data analysis. The cooperation principle, which the researcher has identified, falls into four types. These criteria are referred to by the researcher as number, quality, relation, and manner. The researcher provides five instances from the film that illustrate each cooperative principle. The researcher provides instances from each dialogue scene in the film that demonstrate how the maxims are broken. The researcher decides to examine the script for the film up. The screenplay is one hundred pages long. The investigator collected 24 conversations, each containing a maxim for each of the subcategories. The use of maxims in the narrative for the film up is intended to instruct viewers in speaking English. The ability of the pupil to identify maxims and use them when speaking English is an indication. In order to optimize educational outcomes, the researcher advises educators to employ authentic materials, such as this film. Students can study maxims while having fun and finding amusement in a movie.

Malinda (2019) examined the dialogue maxims from the motion picture "Tangled." The purpose of this study is to list the maxims that the lead character in the "Tangled" film uses the most frequently. Furthermore, this study examines the several conversational maxims utilized by the writer character in the "Tangled" movie, as stated by Grice (1975). 33 data were discovered and were taken from the "Tangled" film. Next, a descriptive qualitative research method was used to analyze the data. The most frequently used maxim in this study is determined by using the number. The data are comprised of the following maxims: 10 for quality, 12 for quantity, 5 for relation, and 6 for way. These are meant to facilitate cooperative discourse in social situations. It is possible to conclude from this analysis that 33 data were found. The dialogue most usually employs the maxim of quantity 12 data. This

demonstrates that the maxim of quantity applies to cooperative conversational activities in social life. This study can therefore be used to support the idea that quantity—or the amount of information and utterance conveys—is particularly essential in everyday speech. The recommendation for future scholars interested in this branch of pragmatics is to explore topics such as studying a book, movie, or other media.

A pragmatic analysis of maxim flouting in the film “12 Years a Slave” was carried out by Putri Melania (2023). She distinguished between four categories of maxim flouting: quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, as well as different rhetorical devices like tautology, understatement, overstatement, metaphor, irony, and rhetorical question. The study, which made use of Grice’s (1975) theory and qualitative research techniques, discovered that characters in the movie utilized maxim flouting to accomplish particular communicative objectives, such highlighting their ideas or conveying feelings. A sum of 25 maxim of flouting instances of saying spurning were tracked down through investigation, with representation and incongruity being the most frequently utilized strategies. The review underscores the worth of Maxim of flouting in accomplishing open objectives and stresses the need of realistic examination in figuring out correspondence in film.

Grice’s (1975) Cooperative Principles were examined by an Aini (2015) in relation to dialogue in the motion picture “The Little Rascals Save the Day.” Utilizing a descriptive qualitative method and talk insightful system, the review found infringement of the maxims of quantity, quality, and relevance. These violations were attributed to speakers’ uneasiness, their craving to move the topic of the discussion, and their longing to try not to hurt the listener. The study emphasizes how crucial contextual elements are to comprehending communication objectives and maxim flouting in discourse. Future studies, according to the researcher, could look into alternative theoretical frameworks such as Davies (2007) and real-world conversation scenarios, such as native children speaking with their parents or formal and informal exchanges between native speakers and non-native speakers. This study emphasizes the need for more research and advances our knowledge of cooperative principles in dialogues in real life contexts.

The goal of the current study was to determine the efficacy and efficiency of communication using the cooperative principle and maxims by Grice (1975). In a discussion, cooperation is basically required from both the speaker and the hearer. As a result, individuals can prevent misunderstandings and have a productive and efficient interaction. Since mutual understanding is the aim of communication, it is crucial to come across as cooperative during the exchange. When both the speaker and the hearer comprehend each other’s words, cooperative behavior is demonstrated Lasiana (2020). It indicates that two people are already conversing cooperatively when they are able to grasp and make an effort to understand one another.

### **Research Methodology**

This study applied a qualitative method to investigate how Grice’s maxims (1989) were applied in the dialogues of *The Oyster and the Pearl* by Willaim Saroyan, focusing on the pragmatic language use that characters employed to communicate effectively. Qualitative approaches were selected because they were well-suited to examining the complex relationships and communication techniques of the characters in the play. This method enhanced the understanding of dialogue dynamics and thematic developments by allowing a detailed analysis of how characters followed cooperative behaviors and communication rules. Grice’s Maxims—Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner—were systematically extracted from and categorized in dialogue snippets as part of the qualitative coding technique employed in this study. Each dialogue section was thoroughly examined through careful reading and interpretation to find instances where these maxims were applied. For instance, it



was routinely recorded when characters provided sufficient information (Quantity), gave accurate responses (Quality), made relevant contributions (Relation), and used clear language (Manner). Through this process, the researcher aimed to gain insights into how well the characters of the play cooperated through verbal exchanges to create effective and meaningful communication. The study aimed to illuminate the cooperative nature of dialogue and how adherence to these rules enhanced the overall dynamics and realism of the story by using Grice's Maxims as an analytical framework. The qualitative study emphasized the interaction between characters' intents, interpretations, and reactions in shaping dialogic encounters, offering a comprehensive understanding of how communication unfolded within the play's context.

### Data Analysis

#### Dialogue

- **Clay:** "Well, I did what you told me, Mr. Van Dusen. I hope it's all right. I'm no barber, though."
- **HARRY:** "You just gave me a haircut, didn't you?"

#### Explanation

**Maxim of Relevance:** Harry's question is directly relevant to Clay's admission about cutting his hair.

Clay reveals uncertainty about his hair-cutting abilities as a barber and hopes he executed it correctly, despite feeling inexperienced. Harry's reply, "You just gave me a haircut, didn't you?" is directly tailored to Clay's statement, recognizing his action and displaying that Harry is actively engaged in the conversation. This dialogue belongs to the maxim of relevance, as Harry's response directly related to Clay's previous remark, and free from irrelevant or unnecessary information.

By providing a thoughtful and relevant answer, Harry shows that he is attentively listening to Clay and his dedication to understand his concerns. By responding relevantly this helps to build trust and clarity in the conversation, and demonstrating that Harry is interested and actively listening in what Clay has to say. The maxim of relevance is therefore crucial in this dialogue, as it allows the conversation to stay focused and effective.

#### Dialogue

- **CLAY:** "I guess I'll never be a barber."
- **HARRY:** "May be not. On the other hand, you may turn out to be the one man hidden away in the junk of the world who will bring merriment to the tired old human heart."

#### Explanation

**Maxim of Quality:** Harry's statement is truthful and encouraging, given the context of Clay's self-doubt.

Clay, feeling disheartened after cutting Harry's hair, doubts his ability to succeed as a barber. Harry, perceiving Clay's self-doubt, responds with a sympathetic and empowering statement. Harry's response is outstanding, as it validates Clay's uncertainty and offers a genuine and creative perspective on his potential. He presents as a creative and imaginative view of Clay's capacity to make a positive potential impact, emphasizing his strengths and encouraging him to consider his ability to bring happiness to others. By providing a thoughtful and supportive response, Harry statement belongs to the maxim of quality, demonstrating that he prioritizes Clay's well-being and is committed to help him realize his potential. Through this conversation, Harry's response not only addresses Clay's concerns but also motivates him to think more positively about his abilities.

#### Dialogue

- **CLAY:** “Who? Me?”
- **HARRY:** “Why not?”

**Explanation**

**Maxim of Relevance:** Harry’s question is directly relevant to Clay’s expression of surprise.

**Maxim of Quantity:** Harry’s question is concise and seeks clarification.

Clay reveals his self-doubt regarding his ability to become a professional barber, and Harry offers with a heartfelt and encouraging statement, proposing that Clay has the potential to make a positive impact on others. Clay react with disbelief, asking “Who? Me?”, and Harry responds with a brief “Why not?”

These dialogues belong to the Maxim of Quantity, as Harry’s responses provide ideal amount of information to address Clay’s questions. “Why not?” is a masterfully crafted response to Clay’s skepticism, one that neither too creative ambiguity nor too in detailed. This demonstrates Harry is thoughtful and ability to provide the right amount of information in his communication, providing just enough information to encourage Clay without inundating him.

**Dialogue**

- **CLAY:** “Not me! Did you ever do stuff like that?”
- **HARRY:** “I did.”

**Explanation**

**Maxim of Quantity:** Harry’s response is a truthful answer to Clay’s question, demonstrating the maxim of quality.

Harry motivates Clay to explore his capacity to spread happiness to others, and Clay asks for further explanation. Harry offer’s warm and empathetic response, presents engaging examples creative pursuits like melody creation, composing, painting, writing, and inventing, innovative design that can spread happiness. This dialogue belongs to Maxim of Quantity by providing balanced and informative information that address clay needs and showing understanding. Clay expresses disbelief, asking if he has real experience with creative pursuits, and Harry responds with a simple, humble and heartfelt “I did”, again demonstrating the Maxim of Quantity by providing a concise and meaningful response. Through these exchanges, Harry shows thoughtful consideration in his communication, adapting his responses to the conversation demand.

**Dialogue**

- **CLAY:** “What did you do?”
- **HARRY:** “Invented a philosophy”

**Explanation**

**Maxim of Quantity:** Harry’s response provides sufficient information to answer Clay’s question, demonstrating the maxim of quantity.

Clay continues to doubt his potential to bring joy to others and asks Harry if he has accomplished something comparable. Harry affirms that he has with a warm smiled, and clay inquiries about his achievement what specifically he did. Harry shares that he invented a philosophy.

The dialogues belong to the Maxim of Quantity, as Harry’s responses provide exactly the right amount of details to address Clay’s questions without creating ambiguity. When Clay inquires about Harry accomplishment, Harry offers with a brief and meaningful answer, “I Invented a philosophy”, supplying just right amount insights to satisfy Clay’s curiosity without overwhelming him. This shows that Harry considerate and supportive in his communication, providing just the right amount of information to empower Clay.

**Dialogue**

- **CLAY:** “What way did you invent?”
- **HARRY:** “The Take-it-easy way.”

**Explanation**

**Maxim of Quantity:** Harry’s response provides a concise answer to Clay’s question, demonstrating the maxim of quantity.

Clay is interested in Harry’s past achievements and asks him to expand what he signified by inventing a philosophy. Harry clarifies that a philosophy is a mode of living, which intensifies Clay’s interest. Clay asks Harry to define the kind of philosophy he invented, and Harry respond is direct with a concise answer, “The take-it-easy way”. This dialogue highlights Harry’s thoughtful communication approach, as he provides exactly the right amount of information to respond to Clay’s queries. By describing philosophy as a way to life, Harry’s offer provide a clear and applicable explanation that facilitates Clay comprehend the concept. When Clay request for further details, Harry’s answer is brief and succinct, providing just enough context to quench Clay’s interest without overwhelming him. This dial belongs to the Maxim of Quantity, as Harry’s replied are tailored to the conversation’s demand, neither too creates ambiguity nor too detailed. By providing the precise amount of information, Harry is able to maintain a balanced conversation and motivate Clay to reconsider his perspective about himself.

**Dialogue**

- **HARRY:** “You just gave me a haircut, didn’t you?”
- **CLAY:** “I don’t know what you’d call it. You want to look at it in the mirror? (He holds out a small mirror.)”

**Explanation**

**Maxim of Manner\_** (Clay’s response is polite, considerate, and avoids direct answer)

After completing the hair cut Harry’s hair cutting, clay express doubt about the results, humbly acknowledging his lack of expertise. He starts to comb out Harry’s hair, and Harry kindly notes, “You just gave me a haircut, didn’t you?” Clay responds with a different remark, “I don’t know what you’d call it,” and offers a mirror for Harry to examine the results, displaying a considerate and respectful attitude. This dialogue belongs to the Maxim of Manner, as both characters display a strong commitment to respect and thoughtfulness in their communication. Harry’s gentle teasing and Clay’s modest offering of the mirror exemplify a courteous and considerate conversation, where both parties value harmony and respectful conversation and free from criticism or judgment.

Clay’s answers in this exchange flout the Maxim of Manner. Although Clay answers Harry’s inquiry in a courteous and thoughtful manner, it also evades a clear response. Rather than admitting or denying giving Harry a haircut, Clay answers incoherently and gives Harry a mirror so he may see the outcome. The Maxim of Manner, which calls on speakers to be explicit and forthright in their communication, is broken by this oblique answer.

**Dialogue**

- **HARRY:** “Did he say when he was coming back?”
- **CLAY:** “No. All he said was, enough’s enough. He wrote it on the kitchen wall.”

**Explanation**

**Maxim of quality:** In this dialogue, Harry’s question seeks more information, and Clay’s response is honest and straightforward, providing more information, illustrating the Maxim of Quality.

Clay expresses his desire basically he want to get his father to come home again and he want to buy a present for his mother, prompting Harry ask probing questions to grasp the situation. Requesting clear and specific answers, asking did he say when he was coming

back, and Clay responds with a clear and concise answer, “No”. This dialogue demonstrates the Maxim of Quality, as Harry perceives accurate and trustworthy information, and Clay provides truthful and meaningful details. Harry’s statements display that he is actually interested in understanding the situations, and Clay’s responses demonstrate his willingness to share information.

These dialogues belong to the Maxim of Quality, as they describe a commitment to understanding and clarity. Harry’s statement, “Did he say when he was coming back?” is a straightforward and relevant inquiry, examining essential information about Clay’s father’s departure. Clay’s response, “No. All he said was, enough’s enough. He wrote it on the kitchen wall” provides a clear and concise answer, affording Harry a better comprehension of the situation. By valuing clarity and understanding in conversation, both Harry and Clay engage in a meaningful conversation, illustrating the Maxim of Quality.

#### Dialogue

- **HARRY:** “I don’t know, Clay. I hope so.”
- **CLAY:** “Yeah. Thanks a lot for the haircut, Mr. Van Dusen.”

#### Explanation

**Maxim of manner:** In this dialogue, Harry’s response is polite and considerate, and Clay’s response is grateful and courteous, illustrating the Maxim of Manner.

Clay and Harry continue their conversation, Clay confides in Harry about his family and his efforts to bring his father home. Clay also reveals that he wants to place an ad in a newspaper related to his father. At this Harry raised a question in his mind, “How do you expect to reach your father through an ad in this newspaper if he’s not even in this town?”, but Clay remains hopeful. Told about an incident of how they completed the process of picking cotton together in a village in Kiran County. Harry expresses his interest in the ad in the newspaper and asks what you would like to say in your ad. Clay thought for a moment before suggesting, “Come home, Dad. We miss you.” Harry offers words of encouragement, and Clay thanks him for the haircut before departing.

These dialogues belong to the Maxim of Manner, as Harry and Clay follow politeness and respect in their communication, using clear and meaningful language and displaying actual interest in each other’s lives. The two dialogues, in particular, showcase this maxim, as Clay demonstrates gratitude for the haircut, saying “Thanks a lot for the haircut, Mr. Van Dusen”, and Harry responds with politeness and a positive tone, “I don’t know, Clay. I hope so”. This polite and respectful conversation creates a warm and considerate atmosphere, showing the value of manner in effective communication.

However, the Maxim of Quantity is slightly flouted, as Harry’s response to Clay’s question about the ad is brief and not very informative, and Clay’s response is a polite acknowledgement that doesn’t add much to the conversation. Overall, the dialogue demonstrates a commitment to politeness, truthfulness, and relevance, but falls slightly short in terms of providing informative and helpful responses.

#### Dialogue

- **THE GIRL:** “Hey, Mr. Van Dusen, how much would you charge to cut a girl’s hair?”
- **HARRY:** “Well, that depends on the girl and her hair.”

#### Explanation

**Maxim of relevance:** In this dialogue, The Girl’s question is relevant to the context and Harry’s response is relevant to the question, illustrating the Maxim of Relevance.

The girl, Miss McCutcheon, introduces herself to Harry Van Dusen, as she enters the shop, to which Harry is delighted. Miss McCutcheon is new to the town and she has decided to teach the children at school. Harry overhears all of this and teases Miss McCutcheon



about her new town, asking she really lives in the town Harry makes a humorous comment. Introduces herself to Harry Van Dusen, and they exchange pleasantries... Miss McCutcheon requested a poodle haircut and asks about the cost, to which Harry responds with a charming comment, “Well, that depends on the girl and her hair.”

This conversation belongs to the Maxim of Relevance, as Harry’s replies are thoughtfully related to McCutcheon conversation. The two dialogues, in particular, describe this maxim, as Harry’s responses are thoughtfully tailored to Miss McCutcheon’s questions and statements, creating a cheerful and playful atmosphere. By being relevant and engaging, Harry establishes a connection with Miss McCutcheon, making the conversation delightful and effective.

### Dialogue

- **HARRY:** (Bowing) Miss McCutcheon.
- **THE GIRL:** I’m new here.

### Explanation

**Maxim of Manner:** Harry’s bow and greeting demonstrate politeness and respect, illustrating the Maxim of Manner.

Miss McCutcheon introduces herself to Harry Van Dusen and they engaged in a courteous salutation, with Harry showing respect with a bow and addressing her as “Miss McCutcheon”. She then shares is new to the town and she has decided to teach the children at school. This initial exchange is warm, friendly, and respectful, setting a positive atmosphere for their interaction.

This conversation belongs to the Maxim of Manner, as they engaged in a courteous and respectful conversation. The girl’s greeting, “How do you do?” is a courteous greeting, with Harry showing respect with a bow and addressing her as “Miss McCutcheon” This dialogues display the Maxim of Manner, as both speakers exchange is warm, friendly and respectful setting a positive atmosphere for their interaction By using positive and elegant language and gestures, Harry and Miss McCutcheon demonstrate a mutual esteem for each other, making their conversation polite and effective.

### Dialogue

- **THE GIRL:** Well, this is your shop. It’s open for business. I’m a customer. I’ve got money. I want a poodle haircut.
- **HARRY:** I don’t know how to give a poodle haircut, but even if I knew how, I wouldn’t do it.

### Explanation

**Maxim of Quality:** Harry’s response is honest and straightforward, explaining his inability and unwillingness.

Miss McCutcheon asks a poodle haircut from Harry, who refuse, recommending San Francisco as the better for such specialized style. She seeks clarification, inquiring about reasons behind his decline, and Harry reveals his expertise being a barber, but admits his lack of skills how to give a poodle haircut and even if he prossesd skill, he wouldn’t do it. This conversation display Harry’s commitment to quality and expertise in his work, as he values skills over accommodating every request.

These dialogues belong to the Maxim of Quality, as they describe a commitment to understanding and meaningful conversation. Miss McCutcheon determination, “I’m a customer. I’ve got money. I want a poodle haircut” highlight her expectation service, but Harry’s reply, “I don’t know how to give a poodle haircut, but even if I knew how, I wouldn’t do it” reaffirms his dedication to excellence quality, demonstrating his unwavering dedication to providing high-standard services that meet with his high standard and expertise, even if it means declining a customer’s request.

However, this dialogue DOES flout the Maxim of Manner, as Harry's response, although honest, is blunt and dismissive, lacking a polite tone and considerate language. He could have offered an alternative solution or a referral to someone who could help her, instead of simply refusing and telling her to go to San Francisco.

#### Dialogue

- **HARRY:** You are?
- **THE GIRL:** Yes, I am.

#### Explanation

**Maxim of Relevance:** Harry's question is directly related to The Girl's previous statement, seeking confirmation, illustrating the Maxim of Relation.

Miss McCutcheon discloses that she has been in residence since last Sunday and reveals that she is new to the town and she has decided to teach the children at school. Harry displays interest and curiosity, requesting for confirmation, "You are?" to which Miss McCutcheon replies with a smile, "Yes, I am". This conversation reveals a clear, concise and meaningful sharing of information, with both speakers sharing pertinent and essential details.

These dialogues belong to the Maxim of Quantity and the Maxim of Relevance. Harry's statement, "You are?" is asking for clarification, inquiring just the right amount of information to clarify Miss McCutcheon's role, in doing so they conform to the Maxim of Quantity. Miss McCutcheon's reply, "Yes, I am", delivers a concise and relevant answer, relating to the context of dialogues and fulfilling the Maxim of Relevance. By exchanging the right amount of information and maintaining focus, Harry and Miss McCutcheon engage in effective communication and advance the conversation.

#### Dialogue

- **HARRY:** I mean, besides a husband...
- **THE GIRL:** I'm not looking for a husband.

#### Explanation

**Maxim of Relevance:** Harry's statement is directly related to The Girl's question, providing a relevant answer, illustrating the Maxim of Relation.

Harry reveals his personal story of settling how he came to the town twenty-four years ago, feeling like he had abandoned his quest for something, but ultimately discovering what he desired – the ability to take his time in this small town. He then turns and asks Miss McCutcheon about her ambitions, asks what's the reason behind her coming and what she is seeking, and adds with a smile "besides a husband". Miss McCutcheon replies with a witty comment, saying that she expects a husband in life to seek her out, rather than actively pursuing one herself.

The exchange belongs to the Maxim of Relevance, Harry and Miss McCutcheon engage in a meaningful and thoughtful conversation. Harry's statement, "What are you looking for, Miss McCutcheon?" is a logical follow-up to their conversation, and Miss McCutcheon's response is a relevant and witty answer that enhances the conversation. Harry's subsequent question, "I mean, besides a husband..." is also relevant, as it lightheartedly explores Miss McCutcheon's aspirations and adds a playful tone to the conversation. By maintaining their responses relevant and engaging, Harry and Miss McCutcheon craft a charming and effective conversation.

#### Dialogue

- **THE GIRL:** Cooking? ... I must say I expected to see a much older man.
- **HARRY:** Well. Thank you!

#### Explanation

**Maxim of Manner:** Harry's response is polite and considerate, acknowledging The Girl's comment.

Miss McCutcheon shares her doubts about the town's lack of drive and its potential effects on her education approach. She wonders what knowledge she can teach children who appear to prioritize enjoyment and games over practical objectives. Harry offers alternative subjects suggestions, including English, singing, dancing, and cooking. Miss McCutcheon is taken aback surprised by the suggestion of cooking and also remarks on Harry's youthful appearance, expecting him to be more senior.

These dialogues belong to the Maxim of Manner, as they engaged in considerate and respectful exchange. Harry response, "Well, Thank you!" is a heartfelt acknowledgement of Miss McCutcheon's kind words. Miss McCutcheon's remarks, "I must say I expected to see a much older man" is a considerate expression of her surprise, phrased in a thoughtful manner. By using respectful language and tone, Harry and Miss McCutcheon engage in a respectful and harmonious conversation, even when addressing potentially sensitive topics like age with tact. This polite conversation relate with the Maxim of Manner, emphasizing the valuing of respectful communication in social interactions.

### Dialogue

- **THE GIRL:** Why? Aren't you a barber?
- **HARRY:** I am.

### Explanation

**Maxim of Relevance:** Harry's response is directly related to The Girl's question, confirming his profession.

Miss McCutcheon, seated in the chair, speaks in a hushed tone but with a hint of frustration, and asks Harry for a poodle style haircut. Harry replies that she would need to travel to San Francisco for that particular style, implying that's not a style he is comfortable with or willing to try. She presses, inquiring why she can't receive the haircut at his shop, highlighting that Harry is a professional barber, the shop is open for customers, and she is willing to pay. Harry's replies are brief and relevant, yet somewhat evasive, implying he may be hesitant to attempt a poodle haircut.

These dialogues belongs to the Maxim of Relevance, as they exemplify directly applicable related and pertinent exchange. The girl's query, "Why? Aren't you a barber?" is a pertinent inquiry, exploring a justification for why Harry's refuse to give her a poodle haircut. Harry's reply, "I am" is a straightforward and relevant answer, affirming his profession and implying his ability to perform the haircut. By maintaining their responses relevant and focused responses, Harry and Miss McCutcheon engage in a productive and meaningful conversation, illustrating the Maxim of Relevance.

### Dialogue

- **THE GIRL:** Why not?
- **HARRY:** I don't give women haircuts. The only women who visit this shop bring their small children for haircuts.

### Explanation

**Maxim of Quality:** Harry's reply is honest and sincere, explaining his policy.

Harry emphasizes his failure to give a poodle hair style, and regardless of whether he could, he wouldn't, referring to his shop's specialization in men's hair styles. When squeezed for an explanation, Harry makes sense of that he doesn't give ladies hair styles, besides in situations where ladies get their small kids for hair styles, featuring his shop's emphasis on customary hair stylist administrations.

The dialogues relate to the Maxim of Quality, as they demonstrate a commitment to specialization and standards. Harry's assertion, "**I don't give ladies hair styles**" is an unmistakable articulation of his shop's skill and concentration, focusing on quality over obliging each solicitation. His extra clarification, "**The main ladies who visit this shop bring their little youngsters for hair styles**" supports this responsibility, exhibiting his commitment to conveying excellent administrations inside his subject matter, instead of giving and taking on quality by endeavoring to offer administrations outside his specialization.

#### Dialogue

- **THE GIRL:** I want a poodle haircut, MR. Van Dusen.
- **HARRY:** I'm sorry, Miss McCutcheon. In my sleep, in a nightmare, I would not cut your hair.

#### Explanation

**Maxim of Quality:** Harry's response is honest and emphatic, reiterating his refusal.

Harry emphasizes his shop's specialization in men's hair styles, expressing that he doesn't give ladies hair styles, aside from while ladies get their youngsters for hair styles. Regardless of this, Miss McCutcheon perseveres in her solicitation for a poodle hair style, tending to Harry as Mr. Van Dusen. Harry answers with a firm refusal, expressing that even in his most dreaded fears, he wouldn't think about trimming her hair, underscoring his obligation to his shop's skill and norms.

The dialogues relate to the Maxim of Quality, as they demonstrate a strong commitment to specialization and standards. Harry's reaction, "Please accept my apologies, Miss McCutcheon. In my rest, in a bad dream, I wouldn't trim your hair" is a clear articulation of his devotion to quality, featuring that he focuses on his shop's skill and notoriety over obliging each solicitation. By maintaining this stance, by keeping up with this position, Harry maintains the maxim of quality, displaying his steadfast obligation to conveying excellent administrations inside his subject matter.

However, this dialogue DOES flout the Maxim of manner, as Harry's response, although honest, is blunt and dismissive, lacking a polite tone and considerate language. His use of hyperbole ("in my sleep, in a nightmare") could be seen as slightly offensive or sarcastic, which flouts the Maxim of Manner.

#### Dialogue:

- **THE MAN:** Can I get a haircut, real quick?
- **HARRY:** (Getting out of the chair) Depend on what you mean by real quick.

#### Explanation

**Maxim of Quantity:** Harry asks for clarification on the Man's request for a quick haircut. This exchange demonstrates the Maxim of Quantity, as Harry seeks additional information to provide the best response.

Clark Larrabee exits the shop, and Harry watches him leave. The sound of a truck shifting gears and driving off is heard, indicating Clark's departure. Harry returns to his relaxed state, reading a book and sitting in the chair. The tranquility is disrupted by the entrance of a well-dressed man around forty years old, who asks for the barber. Harry identifies himself as the barber, and the man requests a quick haircut. Harry seeks clarification on what the man means by "real quick", demonstrating a focus on understanding the scope of the request to ensure a high-quality service.

The dialogues relate to the Maxim of Quantity, as they demonstrate a balance between providing necessary information and avoiding excessive detail. The man's question, "Can I get a haircut, real quick?" is a concise request, but Harry's response, "Depends on what you mean by real quick" seeks clarification, ensuring he understands the man's expectations



without asking unnecessary follow-up questions. By providing just the right amount of information, Harry and the man efficiently communicate, illustrating the Maxim of Quantity in their brief conversation.

**Dialogue:**

- **HARRY:** You're next, Clark.
- **CLARK:** I'm just passing through, Harry. Thought I might run into Clay here.

**Explanation**

**Maxim of Relevance:** Clark's response is relevant to Harry's question and explains his intention. This exchange demonstrates the Maxim of Relevance, as Clark's response is directly related to Harry's greeting.

Harry apologizes to Miss McCutcheon, telling her that she doesn't need to change her appearance, and helps her out of the chair. As she gives him an annoyed glance, Clark Larrabee enters the shop, and Harry greets him, indicating that he's next in line for a haircut. However, Clark reveals that he's just passing through and was hoping to run into someone named Clay, making his visit unrelated to getting a haircut.

The dialogues relate to the Maxim of Relevance, as they demonstrate a shift in the conversation's focus. Harry's statement, "You're next, Clark" is a relevant remark assuming Clark is there for a haircut. However, Clark's response, "I'm just passing through, Harry. Thought I might run into Clay here" changes the context, making Harry's previous statement irrelevant. Clark's comment introduces a new topic, revealing his true purpose for visiting the shop, and illustrating the Maxim of Relevance, as the conversation adapts to the new information.

**Dialogue:**

- **CLARK:** (Handing Harry three ten-dollar bills.) Give him this, will you? Thirty dollars. Don't tell him I gave it to you.
- **HARRY:** Why not?

**Explanation**

**Maxim of Quantity:** Clark asks Harry to give Clay money, and Harry asks why secretly. This exchange demonstrates the Maxim of Quantity, as Harry seeks clarification on Clark's request.

Harry inquires if Clark has returned home, and Clark reveals that he has parted ways with his wife Fay and is bound for Salinas. Harry offers him a shave, but Clark refuses, saying he must catch a vehicle back to Salinas. Harry tells Clark that his brother Clay is on the shore, and Clark request Harry to pass Clay thirty dollars, but requests that Harry not disclose that the source of money came from him.

This conversation belongs to the Maxim of Quantity, as they exemplify a balance between presenting right amount of information and avoiding more detail or ambiguity. Clark's statement, "Will you give him Thirty dollar? Don't tell him I gave it to you" is a clear and succinct direction, providing just required amount of information for Harry to understand the task. Harry's replies, "Why not?" concise and relevant to Clark statement, highlighting justification for Clark's request for secrecy, without asking unnecessary follow-up questions. By providing just enough information, Clark and Harry actively engaged in communication, illustrating the Maxim of Quantity in their exchange where the right amount of information is provided to achieve the communicative goals.

**Dialogue:**

- **THE MAN:** Where's the barber?
- **HARRY:** I'm the barber.

**Explanation**

**Maxim of Relevance:** Harry's response is relevant and answers the Man's question. This exchange demonstrates the Maxim of Relevance, as Harry's response directly addresses the Man's inquiry.

Clark Larrabee leaves the shop, and Harry is witness his departure. The sound of a truck changing gears and driving off is audible, signifying Clark's exit. Harry then resumes his peaceful state, picking up a book and settling into the chair to read. The sincerity is disrupted by the arrival of stylish man in his forty years old, who asks for the barber services. Harry replies introducing himself as the barber, prepared to serve the new customer.

These dialogues belong to the **Maxim of Relevance**, as they displaying concise and relevant conversation. The man's query, "**Where's the barber?**" is a relevant question, seeking the identity of that person who can provide the service he required. Harry's replies, "**I'm the barber**" is a clear and relevant answer, providing the required amount of information and establishing his profession. By keeping their conversation brief and on-topic, the man and Harry communicate effectively, demonstrating the Maxim of Relevance in their direct conversation.

#### **Dialogue:**

- **THE MAN:** What do the people do here?
- **HARRY:** Well, I cut hair. Friend of mine named Wozzck repairs watches, radios, alarm clocks, and sells jewelry. Imitation stuff mainly.

#### **Explanation**

**Maxim of Quantity:** Harry provides relevant information about the town's activities. This exchange demonstrates the Maxim of Quantity, as Harry provides the relevant information the Man seeks.

When a well dressed man of about forty years old enters the shop and asks for the barber and Harry's answers by identifying himself as a barber. The man wanted a quick haircut and Harry started giving him a haircut with some questions like has the person visited the shop before. The man told Harry that he is waiting for his car to be serviced across the street and that he wanted a haircut because he is heading to Hollywood. He also asked about the distance to Hollywood and Harry provides him the details and also shares some details about the town Ok-by-the-Sea, and what the residents of the town do, including his own work as a barber and told about his friend Wozzck various adventures.

These dialogues are belongs to **Maxim of Quantity**, because they show how to maintain balance between providing required information while avoiding extra details. As for Harry's response "**Well, I cut hairs and a friend of mine named Wozzck repairs watches, radios ,alarm clocks and sells jewellery. Imitating stuff mainly**" provides with relevant information about the people of town and their jobs just by simply telling about his friend and his job. Which mean that he avoided unnecessary detailed. Also the question "**what do the people do here?**" Is an open ended question but Harry's response gives a concise and relevant answer which illustrates the Maxim of quantity?

#### **Dialogue**

- **HARRY:** I've been here twenty-four years, Clay, and this is the first time I've ever heard of anybody finding an oyster on our beach – at Black Rock, or anywhere else.
- **CLAY:** Well, I did, Mr. Van Dusen. Its shut tight, it's alive, and there's a pearl in it, worth at least three hundred dollars.

#### **Explanation**

**Maxim of Relevance:** This exchange demonstrates the maxim of relevance, as both speakers provide relevant information that contributes to the conversation's purpose and goals.

Clay Larrabee presented Harry Van Dusen an oyster he found at Black Rock, claiming it contains a pearl worth considerable amount at least \$300. Greeley mentions that Miss McCutcheon uncertain about the existence of a big pearl, leading Harry to ask if she would accept the possibility of a smaller one. Clay reveals that he purposely searched for the oyster during a low tide and discovered it alive and tightly shut, convinced that it holds a precious pearl. Harry is doubtful, having never known of anyone discovering an oyster on their shore in 24 years

This conversation illustrates the **Maxim of Relevance**, as Harry's response is directly tied to Clay's previous assertion and doesn't introduce irrelevant information. By responding in a pertinent way, Harry demonstrates that he is attentively engaged in listening to Clay and is seeking to understand his claim. This helps to establish trust, clarity and understanding in the conversation, and shows that Harry is genially engaged in what Clay has to saying. The maxim of relevance is therefore crucial in this dialogue, as it allows the conversation to stay focused and effective.

However, this dialogue DOES flout the Maxim of Quality, as Harry's response is skeptical and dismissive, without considering the possibility that Clay might be telling the truth. Harry's statement "I've never heard of anybody finding an oyster on our beach" is not a sufficient reason to doubt Clay's claim, and he could have asked more questions or sought evidence to support or refute Clay's claim.

### **Conclusion**

According to the analysis, Grice's maxims are effectively applied by the characters in "The Oyster and the Pearl" to promote effective communication, which helps them accomplish their communicative objectives through cooperative discussion. The Cooperative Principle, which states that conversation participants should cooperate to make their contributions meaningful and relevant, is strongly adhered to in the play. The research theory rests on the maxims of Grice (1989). The research employs the qualitative method. Four different categories of maxims are included in the play dialogues: manner, quantity, quality, and relational maxims. Throughout the discussions, examples of maxims in use are given. In order to ensure that presenters deliver just enough information without overpowering the conversation, the Maxim of Quantity is widely used. When Harry answers questions about the community or his services, for example, he provides enough information to answer the questions without going into needless detail. There is also a strong emphasis on the Maxim of Quality, wherein individuals such as Harry and Clay give accurate and truthful information during their interactions. When Harry is honest about his limitations or discusses personal experiences, for example, this guarantees clarity and trust in communication. Additionally, the Maxim of Relation is clear since characters answer each other's queries and remarks immediately, keeping the dialogue flowing and relevant. This is demonstrated by the way Harry answers questions about his work or the services he provides in his barbershop. Finally, while it is not as prevalent, the Maxim of Manner nevertheless contributes to the upholding of civility and clarity in interactions. For example, Harry's courteous responses to customers and his consideration of their requests demonstrate adherence to this maxim. The researcher concludes that the Cooperative concept is used extensively in the play. Among the statements made by the characters are all of the Gricean maxims. The cooperation principle is expressed in 24 maxims. Eight maxims of quantity, five of quality, six of relevance, and just five of manner are extracted from the 24 data points. The table below displays the research's conclusions:

### **Table 1 Maxim used in play "The Oyster and The Pearl"**

No	Types of Maxims	Amount
1	Maxim Of Quality	8
2	Maxim Of Quantity	5
3	Maxim Of Relevance	6
4	Maxim Of Manner	5

This makes it evident that a number of the characters in the play “The Oyster and the Pearl” make good use of Grice’s Maxims to show how characters cooperate during discourse to attain successful communication. The recurrent use of these maxims highlights the collaborative aspect of dialogue, wherein characters sustain meaningful encounters by upholding clarity, relevance, truthfulness, and appropriate levels of information. This commitment to Grice’s ideas emphasizes the value of joint communication in narrative and improves the dialogues’ realism and involvement.

### References

- Aghagolzadeh, R. (2012). Grice’s Cooperative Maxims as Linguistic Criteria for News Selectivity. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(3), 547-553. DOI: [10.4304/tpls.2.3.547-553](https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.3.547-553):  
<https://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol02/03/16.pdf>
- Allott, N. (2010). *Key Terms in Pragmatics*. London & New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Averina, F. E. (2023). A Pragmatic Analysis of Flouting Maxims in Classroom Verbal Interaction as Seen in *Freedom Writers* Movie. *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, 6(1), 16-30. DOI: [10.52429/selju.v6i1.38](https://doi.org/10.52429/selju.v6i1.38)
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hedberg, N. (2013). Introduction to Pragmatics by Betty J. Birner (Review). *Language*, 89(4), 953-957. DOI: [10.1353/lan.2013.0067](https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2013.0067)
- Hossain, M. (2021). The Application of Grice Maxims in Conversation: A Pragmatic Study. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(10), 32-40. DOI: [10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.10.4](https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.10.4) : <https://al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/jeltal/article/view/2166>
- Karim, A. (2019). An Analysis of Grice’s Cooperative Principles in Some Selected English TV Interviews. *Journal of the University of Garmian*, 6(1), 445-455.
- Khan, A., & Saleem, M. (2021). A Study of Modern American Short Stories from the Perspective of Gricean Maxims. *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, 6(1), 16-30. DOI: [10.52429/selju.v6i1.38](https://doi.org/10.52429/selju.v6i1.38)
- Leech, G. (2018). The Principle Features of English Pragmatics in Applied Linguistics. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(2), 77-80.
- Malinda, R. (2019). An Analysis of Pragmatism Study of Conversational Maxim Used in “Tangled” Movie. *Universitas Batanghari*.



- Priangan, M. A. (2021). An Analysis of Conversational Maxims in Casual Conversation. *MASILE*, 2(2), 2021.
- Saragih, A. (2020). Maxim in Novel "The Fault in Our Stars". *Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 8(1), 340-352.
- Sidabutar, A. (2022). Grice Types of Maxims in *The Willoughbys* Movie. *Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 10(1), 326-337.
- Suardana, I. M. (2022). The Analysis of Maxims Found in the Novel "Never Go Back". *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, 6(1), 16-30. DOI: [10.52429/selju.v6i1.38](https://doi.org/10.52429/selju.v6i1.38)
- The Gricean Maxim Analysis in the Scripts of *The Simpsons* Season 5. *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, 6(1), 16-30. DOI: [10.52429/selju.v6i1.38](https://doi.org/10.52429/selju.v6i1.38)
- Thomas, J. (1995). Definition of Flouting Maxim. *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, 6(1), 16-30. DOI: [10.52429/selju.v6i1.38](https://doi.org/10.52429/selju.v6i1.38)
- Usman, W. (2021). Analysis of Grice's Maxims in the Speech of Prime Minister Imran Khan at UN General Assembly. *City University Research Journal of Literature and Linguistics*, 4(2), 2021.
- Yule, G. (2005). *The Study of Language* (3rd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.