THE REALIZATION OF GRICEAN PRAGMATICS IN FILIPINO TEXT MESSAGING CONVERSATIONS

MILDRED A. ROJO-LAURILLA
De La Salle University-Manila
laurillam@dlsu.edu.ph

The study explores the notion of HP Grice's Four Maxims as realized in mobile phone discourse, particularly text messaging or short messaging service (SMS). Using data from selected Filipino SMS conversations, observance and non-observance of the maxims are described, and possible effects on the conversation posited. The results revealed that texters typically observe the maxims, although there were occasional instances of non-observance. Non-observance appeared non-intentional, and possibly constrained by the limited number of letters or characters that mobile phones accommodate, as well as by the style of particular texters. The maxims of quantity and relevance appeared to be the most observed of the four maxims.

1. Introduction

H.P. Grice's principles and maxims are rules which interlocutors must know and follow in order to communicate effectively. Communicators have a choice to follow these norms, but they may also violate them and achieve different effects (Yus, 2003). The maxims, as cited by Dale and Reiter (1995), include the maxims of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. The maxim of quality requires the interlocutors to make their contributions true; that is, participants should not talk about something that is false to them or those lacking evidence. On the other hand, the maxim of quantity is the need for speakers to supply enough information in the discourse to be understood. The maxim of relevance simply asks for relevance of the contributions, while the maxim of manner includes the goal of avoidance of obscurity of expression and ambiguity. Grice (1975, as cited in Mey, 1993 himself summarized the four and said, "Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (p.66).

The field of pragmatics has benefited from Grice's theory (Saygin & Cicekli, 2002. It has been used as a framework in many studies in order to identify the consequences of the observance or non-observance of the maxims in spoken communication and in its connection to writing in mono- and cross-cultural settings (White, 2001). Believing in the capacity of the

Gricean framework to reveal substantial results and effects, several researchers utilized the said framework in analyzing human-computer communication (Saygin & Cicekli, 2002), natural language generation (Sripada, Reiter, Hunter & Yu, 2003) and family dinner conversations (Brumark, 2005).

Saygin and Cicekli (2002) utilized Grice's cooperative principle to determine whether non-observance could distinguish real humans from computers (whose task is to imitate humans). Through conversation analysis and survey, the study showed how certain violations, particularly of the relevance maxim, helped in revealing the true identity of computers. Nonetheless, the violation on the maxim of manner made the computers more like humans. Saygin and Cicekli (2002) indicate that pragmatic analysis enabled them to understand what principles guide human-computer conversation. The study proved the flexibility of Gricean pragmatics – that it could be applied in other fields like this, which concerns Artificial Intelligences.

White (2001) explored the role of Grice's maxims in successful writing. The study revealed that mono- and cross-cultural differences of individuals resulted in different expectations about writing.

In the study of Sripada, Reiter, Hunter and Yu (2003), they analyzed whether the observance of the maxims would help an addressee to correctly interpret the textual summary of time-series data. They suggested that the use of Gricean framework was suitable and effective for the generation of textual summaries of data. Moreover, the researchers also believed that the said framework was important in the communication of data to humans. Even though the study is not that useful to people who are outside the field of artificial intelligence or natural language planning, it still confirms that the Gricean framework could be used in other fields.

In a more recent study, Brumark (2005) applied the Gricean perspective to track certain types of indirectly phrased utterances found in family dinner conversations. The aim of the study was to determine whether there were members who deliberately flout, violate, or neglect one or more of the conversational maxims. Most of the participants broke the maxims through the use of irony, sarcasm and joking. However, the study's goal to observe the participants as naturally as possible was a bit affected due to the presence of the video camera that the researcher used when recording the conversations. This initiated some forms of non-observance like joking and sarcasm. The study concluded that the non-observance of the maxims in everyday conversations may also have beneficial effects on a particular context. For instance, it may be used or special effects in particular contexts – non-observance of the maxim could provide the needed salience for a punch-line or a joke.

Other than these types of discourse, a new kind of electronic discourse is rapidly spreading. Computer mediated discourse, or CMD is popular, prevalent and influential in many countries (Thurlow, 2006). In his paper, Thurlow (2006) contends that CMD had languages which are very distinctive. This led him to depict CMD as a "linguistic revolution" (p. 672). Moreover, he asserted that language is continually changing especially when used with technology.

Spitzberg (2006) defined computer mediated communication as "any human symbolic text-based interaction conducted or facilitated through digitally-based technologies" (p. 1). He explained how these CMC technologies can have unusual and diverse effects on interpersonal relationships, depending on a particular society. These effects, according to him, could either be positive or negative.

Cellular phones are considered to be a CMC technology (Spitzberg, 2006; Thurlow, 2006). Their function of sending text messages has become a worldwide phenomenon, and even more so as costs continue to decrease (Thurlow, 2006). Text messaging is one way by which a person could communicate with other people whom they know.

Similar to electronic mail, text messaging provides no visual cues or sounds to represent language. It is only the writing component which allows the receiver to interpret the message. A new type of language developed with the use of text messaging since the standard cellular phone can only contain a maximum of 160 characters (Torres, 2001; Grinter & Eldridge, 2003). Text messaging is made possible by the use of a cellular/mobile phone to send messages to another phone, regardless of both the senders' and receivers' service providers (Grinter & Eldridge, 2003). Text messaging is very useful that it can be used to carry on an information conversation, coordinate communications and plan activities (Grinter & Eldridge, 2003).

Compared to the abundant researches on Gricean pragmatics, there are limited studies on text messaging despite its popularity (Bryant, Sanders-Jackson & Smallwood, 2006). In the study of Bryant, Sanders-Jackson and Smallwood (2006), text messaging was categorized to be a "socially interactive technology" (henceforth, SIT) (p. 16) which could affect adolescent offline social networks. Later on, it was proved that the users of SIT's do not seem to create either stronger or weaker social ties. This study strengthened the notion that new technologies can really have different effects with people with different ages in a particular culture.

On the other hand, text messaging has become very popular in the Philippines. It has become a form of mass communication (Grinter & Eldridge, 2003) and therefore a part of every Filipino's life (Torres, 2001). In her paper, Rojo-Laurilla (2002b) mentions that the country was recently tagged as the "texting capital of the world" (p.1). Her studies enriched the

meaning and impact of text messaging in the Philippine context, focusing on the effects of gendered conversational styles (Rojo-Laurilla, 2002a) and the sociolinguistic dynamics of text messaging (Rojo-Laurilla, 2005).

The study of gender on Philippine text messaging (Rojo-Laurilla, 2002a) attempted to describe the possible differences of the men and women's conversational style. Text samples were analyzed, comparing how males and females open and close conversations, apologize, compliment and use emoticons. The research revealed that there were no significant differences between Filipino men and women's "texting" conversational styles. Furthermore, the study gave a detailed conclusion on gendered Philippine text messaging as opposed to studies on gendered FTF and CMC.

Another means of approaching text messaging is by analyzing and explaining its sociolinguistic dynamics (in Rojo-Laurilla, 2005). Multiple regression analysis was used in order to reveal that the age, gender and occupation of texters were the main predictors of texting style. Moreover, discourse features such as politeness markers, role, topics, speech acts and co-texter texting styles were also found to be salient in texting style. The study reveals how language, in terms of text messaging, varies according to social context. Using Hymes' ethnography of speaking, the study explored how sociological factors or particular conditions of life affect communication. This refers to what Mey (1993) called the "fabric of society" (p. 187).

All in all, the literature on text messaging proves that its impact and style is dependent on the cultural context. In the case of Filipinos, men and women have similar conversational style. Moreover, Filipinos also vary their use of text messaging according to context.

This study, thus, aims to apply the Gricean Principles in evaluating text messaging conversations, particularly identifying maxims observed within a mediated non-face-to-face context. The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What maxims do Filipino texters commonly observe or violate in text messaging?
2. What are the consequences of the observance and non-observance of the maxims on their textmates (interlocutors in text messaging)?

Upfront, the study acknowledges some limitations. First is the number of respondents. Since the study does not aim to generalize the results, the participants do not represent the greater majority of Filipino SMS users. It attempts to demonstrate the applicability of the maxims in selected mediated communication exchanges. Second, for ease in the analysis, the researcher chose the initial 3-5 conversations from a possible range of 10 conversation sets which the participants recorded in their log sheets. A conversation set is

typically a minimal pair (A-B); however, it could expand depending on how the interlocutors developed a topic. A conversation set therefore revolves around one topic. Third, the respondents were told that they had the option of selecting which conversations to report, as some of it may be too personal. Their privacies were in this regard, respected by the researcher, hence only a sampling of the actual number of conversations was provided by the respondents. In addition, this study would not focus on how gender affected observance versus non-observance, although gender differences were noted in terms of which gender observed which maxim more than the other.

2. Methods and Procedures

2.1 Participants

The participants for this study were chosen based on the *snowball technique*. Friends and acquaintances were asked by the researcher if they could request other people they knew who use SMS for permission to participate in the study. They had varying ages, and they all came from different locations in Metro Manila. The total number of participants was thirty, fourteen of which were males and sixteen females. Two of the males were teenagers; one in his twenties and married; four were in their thirties, two married and two single; six were in their forties and married; and one was in his fifties and married. The females on the other hand, consisted of six teenagers; three in their twenties and single; two in their thirties and single; and the remaining six in their forties and married.

2.2 Instruments

A log sheet (see Appendix A) was constructed by the researcher as a means of gathering the participants' texting (SMS) data. More than 30 of these were handed out to different people. The log sheet was used by the participants to record the text messages they sent and received within the day. Only those who returned their log sheets on the specified deadline were included in the final pool of participants.

Attached to the log sheets is a cover letter in which the participant is informed of the aims of the study.

The participants were instructed not to change any spelling or punctuation marks embedded in the messages in order for the data to be more authentic.

2.3 Procedure

After the distribution and collection of the log sheets, the researcher read the collection of text messages per respondent. The primary aim was to select the initial conversation sets only. But because most of them only

reported one or two conversation sets with some single messages, the researcher then opted to include those single messages, wherein a message did not receive a reply (to be consistent with the procedure of Grinter & Eldridge, 2003).

After selection, came the transcription of the data, for greater ease in analysis. Messages were kept in their original form, specifically the spelling, the grammar and the punctuation marks, since these are some of the ⁻important facets of text messaging which could reveal the mood and manner of the texters. Slight changes in their transcriptions may affect the analysis and result of the study. After the completion of these tasks, coding of both the observance and non-observance of the four maxims per conversation set was done.

2.4 Analysis of data

A conversation set contains at least a pair of utterances, e.g. a message sent and a message received as in the example below:

A: *R u going 2 the movies?*
B: *Nope. Sorry! Myb nxt time.*

A conversation set is coded as "observing" the maxim if both texters appear to be cooperating by providing information that is required. A conversation set is coded as "violating" or non-observing a maxim if there are linguistic or pragmatic elements that do not adhere to what the maxim dictates.

In this study, only frequency counts are reported. No statistical treatments were involved as the aim was to record instances of observance and non-observance rather than to test relationships between variables. In addition, some extracts of the SMS conversations are included as examples.

Furthermore, as will be reported herein, references to female or male participants that observed or violated the maxim meant that they were the initiators in the interaction.

3. Results and Discussion

Table 1 below presents a comparison between maxims observed and not observed by the respondents.

Table 1. Total number of observance and non-observances of the maxims (per conversation set)

Maxim	Number of Non-Observances	Number of Observances
Quality	3	4
Quantity	24	66
Relevance	27	19
Manner	4	5
Combination	1	0
TOTAL	59	94
Total number of conversation sets	153	

3.1 Content analysis

Upon inspection of the data, it was noticed that those who participated in the study often sent or received text messages from their family (significant others, children, parents, relatives), and co-workers. It was seldom that they received messages from strangers, or from those with whom they have other transactions. Topics dwelt more on domestic or home-related concerns, followed by work related concerns (or school related in the case of students). This is still consistent with the findings of Rojo-Laurilla (2005).

Out of the 153 conversation sets of the participants, 59 reflected non-observance of the maxims. The remaining 94 conversation sets observed the four maxims. It indicates that even in the mediated means of communication, people still "cooperate" in general to be understood and to engage in successful and meaningful communication.

Data reveal that the maxims of quantity and relevance were more prevalent in text messaging compared to the two others. There were more observances in the maxim of quantity (66 with 43 females, 23 males) compared to relevance (19). This seems to indicate that the texter expects to be supplied with sufficient information; indicating success in communication where no clarification is needed. On the other hand, of the 19 conversation sets that observed the maxim of relevance, it was still the females that predominantly followed this maxim (14) compared to the males (5).

Data also indicated non-observances in that the maxim of quantity generated a violation of 24 conversation sets. The number of males and females who did not observe this maxim was equal (12 each). For the maxim of relevance, twenty-seven instances of non-observance were noted (27). Those who violated this maxim were mostly females (14 females), but the males were not far behind (11 males).

In terms of manner, the data included 5 conversation sets that observed the maxim (3 men; 2 women), but four of the conversation sets indicated a violation of the maxim. The people who observed the maxim of manner had a positive response from their text-mates.

Like the maxim of manner, there were five conversation sets which presented the observation of the maxim of quality (4 from the men, one from a woman). The maxim of quality was the least violated in the text messaging data. Only three respondents, all females, appeared to violate it. Two of the females' reason for not observing the maxim was quite similar. They were accusing the sender/receiver of not telling the truth even though they do not have sufficient evidence. Text messaging may also be a good area for investigating potentially "suspicious" motives of the interlocutor.

A special case in this study was the violation of both the maxim of relevance and manner. A male violated this maxim because his answer was not related to the question. Moreover, the manner in which he answered the question was also in the interrogative form, which could leave the receiver of that message confused. This non-observance could have occurred because the male was in a hurry and could have possibly mistyped the characters.

3.2 Observance

The following illustrate how each maxim is observed through excerpts and possible explanations.

3.2.1 Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality was the most difficult to detect because with the absence of one's facial expression, hand or body movements, including the intonation of the voice as the utterance is said, it was hard to tell whether a person was telling the truth or not. The receiver of the message might have difficulty discerning whether there is truth to the statement of the sender of the message.

Here is an example where the female is asking permission to go on a sick leave:

<div>

Female: *Sir, d me mkpsok buks, skit tyan me*
Boss: *Cge, okey lang.*

</div>

Translation: *Sir, I can't report for work tomorrow, my stomach aches.*
Ok, that's all right.

In this example, it would be difficult to tell whether the female was really sick or not unless there are other evidences or additional propositions provided. The boss would just have to assume that the female was telling the truth, by replying with "okay, sure" indicating his approval of the request.

3.2.2 Maxim of Quantity

Text messaging may be used as the simplest and quickest way to ask for specific details. In this instance, the maxim of quantity was observed in order to satisfy the sender's query. An example wherein a specific detail is asked by the sender is shown:

Female: *Bakit gabi ka umuwi*
Friend: *Nanood kami ng movie*

Translation: *Why were you home late?*
We watched a movie.

The query was concisely addressed and no other unrelated details were provided.

3.2.3 Maxim of Relevance

When texters are able to send back messages relevant to the topic being discussed for a smooth conversation, this minimizes misunderstandings. Thus, participants appear to adhere to the maxim of relevance. In the examples below, texters attempt to avoid any possible misinterpretation by following the maxim of relevance:

Female: *Pwede ko bang ipaayos 2ng laptop?*
Friend: *Sige dalhin mo nlang sa shop ok?*
Female:*Ok pero kelangan daw 2 agad*
Friend: *Try ko mtapos agad.*

Translation: *Would you be able to fix the laptop?*
Just bring it to the shop, Ok?
Ok. But we need it back soon.
I will try to finish as fast as I can.

In this example, the friend agrees to the request and tells her to bring it to the shop – a reply which does not convey too much information but is rather very relevant. The female sends another relevant message as an additional condition to the request and an adequate reply was similarly provided. It was clear that both were able to form a simple agreement.

3.2.4 Maxim of Manner

It seems logical to assume that the maxim of manner would always be observed by users of text messaging especially because the absence of facial expressions and prosody (or vocal intonation) could also lead to misunderstandings. Here is an example of a male, requesting some load or call/text credits from his co-worker:

Male:	*Gud am, Sir Jim pkludan nga ako ng 30*
Co-guard:	*Smart load*
Male:	*Tnx sir Jim*
Co-guard:	*Ok pkbgay nlang kay paston ang bayad*

Translation: *Good morning Sir Jim, could you put a 30-peso load?*

Smart load (referring to the company the male subscribes to)

Thanks, Sir Jim.

Ok, just give your payment to Paston.

The male used *"paki"* in his text – the equivalent of *please* in English. He also greeted his co-worker with *good morning*, which is a pleasant way of starting a conversation. He also thanked his co-worker after the latter sent his request. The co-guard responds appropriately. This example shows that the observance of the maxim of manner in text messaging can also be a way of continually building and maintaining relationships. If one had not observed the maxim, the transaction may not have been successfully carried out.

There appears to be a need to be polite in making requests even in the mediated context as with the traditional face-to-face settings. This use of politeness is unlike the mood for informational reasons where a simple question-and-answer may suffice even without the pleasantries and politeness markers.

3.3 Non-Observance

The non-observance of the maxim appears to create different outcomes for senders and receivers as illustrated by the following examples.

3.3.1 Maxim of Quality

Based on the literature, the maxim of quality is violated when a person insists on speaking what is false and when a person claims something which lacks evidence (Dale & Reiter, 1995).

In text messaging, it is difficult to distinguish whether a person is stating the truth. Sometimes it is also hard to distinguish whether a person's statements have a solid basis, especially when one of the interlocutors does not have an idea of the content or topic being pursued in the exchange.

In this example, the woman is informing her boyfriend about a new rumor in the local show business or entertainment scene:

Female: *Be si sam in luv kay chix*
Boyfriend: *Haha yak be mis kta daan me kna eric ha (27)*

Translation: *Be, Sam is in love with Chix,*
                  Haha, yuck, Be, I miss you, have to drop by
                  Eric's ok?.

The boyfriend responds by apparently laughing, typing "haha." This appears initially to respond to the simple information being given. Then he suddenly changes the topic to refer to his girlfriend, saying he misses her and suggesting that they see each other face to face. The male was probably not interested about the topic while at the same time violating the maxim because it provided details of another totally unrelated event .While this could also be interpreted as violating the maxim of relevance, quality is questionable as there was no way to prove whether he would really visit his friend's place or not as a means of evading his significant other.

Another example on the possible challenge or violation of the maxim of quality is illustrated below. A woman suspects something about her significant other. She is asking the man whether he is keeping secrets from her:

Female: *R u keeping me secrets?*
Special Someone: *What!? of course not.*
Female: *Ok. always kip n touch and tke cre of urslf.*
Special Someone: *Sure... thnx 2 Luv u.....*

Translation: *Are you keeping secrets from me?*
                  What!? Of course not.
                  Ok. Always keep in touch and take care of
                           yourself.
                  Sure. Thanks, too. Love you....

Her significant other replies with a question of "what", which could mean, "What are you talking about?" and a concise, "...of course not." This reaction may make the woman realize that she has no valid proof about her accusation. There is also element of doubt whether the special someone is covering up something or is telling the truth, by trying to sound surprised and responding on the negative.

3.3.2 Maxim of Quantity

It is important in text messaging that when sending information, sufficient data is given. One possible consequence of not outright providing

sufficient information is the possibility that the receiver sends another message asking for more information. Here is an example:

Husband: *Paigib ka n lng ga2bihin ko uwi*
Wife: *Bkit san ka punta*

Translation:
Husband: *Ask someone to help you get water. I'll be home late.*
Wife: *Why? Where are you going?*

The husband only informs her wife that he would come home late. The tendency for a wife, especially if she is not used to her husband going home late, would be to ask where he was going. If only the husband provided sufficient information in his initial message, his wife could have just said: "okay."

Here is another example where the receiver (the friend) is the one who seems to be violating the maxim:

Female: *Anong gawa nyo marami bang customer*
Friend: *Ayos lang*

Translation: *What are you busy with right now? Are there a lot of customers?*
It's all right.

The female initiator wanted two important pieces of information, what the friend was busy with, and whether there were a lot of customers. The friend's reply was only, "it's alright" implying that the friend either deliberately opted not to answer both questions directly, or simply wanted to answer only one of the questions but still ambiguously.

There are also other situations wherein the receiver does not provide any information to the sender:

Female: *What's due on Monday?*
Classmate: *(no reply)*

This is interpreted to be non-observance of the maxim of quantity since no information was supplied. If this was a face-to-face interaction and the other interlocutor did not speak, it would be considered a little bit rude not to respond. But in texting, this phenomenon could happen for a variety of reasons: (a) the receiver may not have out-bound credits; (b) he/she may not know the answer to the question; (c) there may have been a huge amount of messaging at the time it was sent, clogging the server; or (d) he/she was simply not in the mood to reply or was too busy to respond.

On the other hand, "texters" also tend to violate the maxim of quantity because they inform or "text" too much. Here is an example of an excessive contribution of information:

Female: *When are rehearsals?*
Friend: *Monday, Pasong Tamo Ext. Rehearsal Hall*

Although at the surface the exchange appears acceptable, on the contrary, taking into consideration the maxim of quantity, the responses were more than what was asked. The only question of was on WHEN but the response included a WHERE. The friend could have possibly supplied too much information just to avoid being misunderstood or to avoid receiving additional messages from the sender. Although supplying the interlocutor with more than what is needed is acceptable generally, and is not to demerit the supplier of the information, it may still be considered a violation of the maxim of quantity.

3.3.3 Maxim of Relevance

Relevance is important in text messaging especially when costs of sending messages are considered. Most people aim to provide information through text messaging which will serve their various purposes with the least cost, hence they attempt to plan carefully how to word the message, including considerations on short cuts and number+letter combinations (Rojo-Laurilla, 2005). However, there are still situations that arise when some texters are unable to answer questions posed by the sender. While more often occurring between people who know each other, this also occurs between unknown senders texting a receiver. Here is an example:

Female: *Hi! helo? Kumusta kna?*
Textmate: *Ok lang kita ba tyo buks?*
Male: *Hus dis? Please...*
Textmate: *Well, want a frnd lang*

Translation:
Female: *Hi! Hello! How are you?*
Textmate: *I'm okey, can we just meet tomorrow?*
Male: *Who is this please?*
Textmate: *Well, I just want to be-friend someone.*

In the example above, the female's intention was just to greet her text mate by asking him how he was doing. The text mate replies by also stating another question: "Is it okay that we meet tomorrow?" The question is in no way related to the female's greeting but it indicates a different purpose or plan.

The other example is parallel to the previous, wherein the male asks the unknown person who he was. The latter responds with: "I just want a friend." Anonymity could be the reason for the irrelevance of the answer. He does not want the other person to know his true identity.

In the data, there was a case where the reply appeared to be unrelated:

| Uncle: | *Bob, kailan ka uwi s Negros* |
| Nephew: | *Kailangan cge uwi kami lahat familia* |

Translation:

| Uncle: | *Bob, when are you going back to Negros?* |
| Nephew: | *I have to. Ok... The whole family is going.* |

The uncle asked his nephew when he would be visiting the province of Negros located in the southern Visayan region of the Philippines. The nephew replied saying all of the family members would go. Although the nephew's response could have accurately answered a different question which is about details of his trip, the example seemingly shows that the nephew flouted the maxim of relevance, probably because the nephew may have misinterpreted the implying reason for the initial question by his uncle. He could have simply answered a possible date of departure.

3.3.4 Maxim of Manner

Most Filipinos resort to text messaging if a face-to-face (FTF) interaction is not possible. Hence, it is more difficult to visualize the expression and feelings of the interlocutor. The maxim of manner is essential in text messaging because it is one way of ensuring a smooth conversation. Because of the absence of immediate feedback for clarification, violations of the maxim of manner may still occur.

This example presents a conversation which violates the maxim of manner twice:

Female:	*Pwde pki erase n no. k dyan kc ayw kng mktangap ng linasaal!!*
Friend:	*Galit k b? wag m n man ako idamay pls...*
Female:	*Wala akng pki sau ok!!*
Friend:	*Bhala k n nga! Yun ang gus2 mo eh!!*
Female:	*Thanx...*

Translation:

| Female: | *Could you please erase my number in your phone because I don't want to receive any more message from people with bad manners!!* |
| Friend: | *Are you angry? Please don't put the blame on me.* |

Female:	*I don't want to have anything to do with you, ok??!!!*
Friend:	*Fine! If that's what you want!*
Female:	*Thanks...*

The receiver asks the sender whether she is mad because the message the latter sent seemed too strong and accusatory and contained two exclamation marks for emphasis. While using two exclamation points in conventional composition are typically not allowed, it may be allowed in text messaging where it means that the person is either mad or very excited. The friend says, "Fine! That's what you want!" the female still replies with a "thanks." This may appear confusing because typically, the tendency of an angry person is not to reply anymore. This conversation set is the equivalent of a fight in F-t-F. It shows that arguments are also possible in text messaging.

3.3.5 Maxims of Relevance and Manner

The researcher found one instance of a violation of both maxims of relevance and manner.

Female:	*d b i tld u not to col me at hme? Kulit mo!*
Male:	*every man deserves a second chance...*
Female:	*d na 2 work, believe me.*
Male:	*for fools do fall in love.....*

Translation:	
Female:	*Didn't I tell you not to call me at home? You're so insistent!*
Male:	*Every man deserves a second chance.*
Female:	*This will no longer work out, believe me.*
Male:	*for fools do fall in love.*

Outright the conversation seems to be cohesive as it implies a topic related to a love relationship, and that there are problems between interlocutors. However, the male appears to be violating the maxim of relevance and manner as he does not really "contribute" directly in responding to the comments of the female. Every time he sends a reply, he simply sent lines from some songs, which do not clearly give an indication of which aspects of the female's contributions are being addressed or responded to.

3.4. Possible consequences

As shown in the different examples above both for the observance and non-observance of the maxims, several possible consequences may be presented:

(a) Observance of the maxim of quality and quantity will require minimal or no more response from the interlocutor if the information is sufficient enough and no other clarifications are needed.

In this case, a final acknowledgement such as "ok" or "k" among other utterances would indicate success in communication. Messages that already contain enough information and in the form most acceptable given the space restrictions of the mobile phone's SMS function (e.g. even with the presence of short cuts or number + combinations, some coinages) will be understood by both parties.

(b) A response which is slightly different from any expected or anticipated information may likely cause the interlocutor to ask for more clarification. When this happens, communication has not reached a fully successful state and may likely become a case of non-observance, unless all conditions are finally met through additional texts sent and received (as in option *a* above).

(c) The maxim of relevance may be most distinguishable in circumstances where topic shifts impede understanding of one of the interlocutors. Remaining on the topic and appropriately signaling change in topic will not violate this particular maxim.

(d) The maxim of manner may be most distinguishable in circumstances where politeness is needed.

(e) Technicalities of the system (e.g. server problems, or actual mobile phone problems) may also impede success of communication. In this case, interlocutors provide explicit explanation for lack of response or the inability to understand some of the messages due to some delays or due to some of the texts being missing (when the number of characters reached the maximum allowable and the system automatically cuts off the excessive characters on screen).

In view of the above conditions, observance of the maxims is preferred by people engaging in the mediated communicative exchange. However, non-observance of the maxims still exists. Non-observance does not usually appear to be deliberate on the part of the person violating a maxim, but rather due to the way the message is understood by the receiver or due to some technical problems encountered. It could also be due to the way the person intended to "compose" a message that might not be easily comprehended by another. Violations are, in fact, inevitable given the constraints of this particular medium of communication.

The texture of the "text-lingo" or characteristics of text messaging which are understood by people engaging in this type of discourse already serves as a clue or mark that fulfills the notion of "presuppositions" or what is considered to be preliminary information or background knowledge readily

available. Texters are assumed to be competent to participate in this kind of exchange so that they can readily detect which notations or symbols are added contextualization cues to the message being read. What appears to be a consolation is the fact that text messaging is only a means to re-connect and communicate with people who are at that particular moment physically absent. These are the same people that the texter might meet at a later time, allowing him/her a chance to pick-up on the conversation initiated by the sender through the text message, or build on a temporary link by mediated means. In this way, there will be an opportunity to clarify, expound, explain or even "repair" miscommunication or misunderstandings brought about by any possible ambiguous or vague messages, ensuring continuity and success of communication.

4. Conclusion

In summary, the present study indicates that Filipino texters generally observe the four maxims even in a mediated context, although there are occasional instances of non-observance. In cases of non-observance, the maxim of relevance was the most violated, followed by the maxim of quantity, then by the maxim of manner, and finally the maxim of quality. The researcher was also able to obtain a special case in which both the maxim of relevance and manner were not observed or violated. In terms of gender, females violated the maxims more frequently than the males. This does not mean however those females have a tendency to be uncooperative. It probably means that they have different interpretations and expectations of the communicative exchange. The study was also able to show that the Gricean principles of cooperation may be applied in mediated contexts. This means that as people begin to take advantage of communication technologies, only certain aspects of the communicative exchange may be altered or modified based on the constraints of the chosen medium. But in terms of speaker intent and meaning, texters are more likely to follow the general rules for cooperation which would bring success in communication.

Furthermore, the study is consistent with what the literature indicates – that people make use of text messaging in order to plan activities, coordinate communications and chat (Grinter & Eldridge, 2003). Because of this, it becomes more important to test and integrate theories that were originally anchored on face to face or interpersonal communication and extend it to the context of mediated discourse.

As more and more people are engaging in SMS discourse, this means of communication can no longer be ignored. As this type of discourse appears to change the landscape of how people generally communicate, it should also not escape the fact that youth in general are more affected by it. Teachers for instance, especially those teaching English, may want to emphasize the

structural differences between text "grammar" and the preferred grammar, especially in composition writing. They may also start sensitizing the students on the appropriateness of using text (SMS) language based on situation of context and situation of culture (Halliday, 1978) as a prelude to the understanding of "genres" or text types. In this way students will be made aware of how language affects culture, and how language shapes the meanings that are often bound by cultural constructs. It is also through the study of genres that students may begin to really see if SMS language may be considered as a genre of its own and begin the analyze its impact to communication, based on certain rules governing talk.

In addition, students may also begin to realize how their activities make meaning based on the texts that they produce through their mobile phones.

REFERENCES

Brumark, A. (2005). Non-observance of Gricean maxims in family dinner table conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics. Unpublished,* 1-33. Retrieved June 5, 2006, from Science Direct database.

Dale, R. & Reiter, E. (1995). The role of the Gricean maxims in the generation of referring expressions. *Cognitive Science, 19*(2), 233-263. Retrieved June 15, 2006, from http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/dale96role.html.

Grinter, R. E., & Eldridge, M. A. (2003). Wan2tlk?: Everyday text messaging. *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 441-448). New York: ACM Press. Retrieved January 21, 2006 from http://delivery.acm.org/10.1145/650000/642688/p441-grinter.pdf

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning,* Baltimore: University Park Press.

Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: An introduction.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Rojo-Laurilla, M.A. (2002a). "He texts, she texts": Gendered conversational styles in Philippine Text Messaging. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics, 33*(1), 71-86.

Rojo-Laurilla, M.A. (2002b). *Can i txt u: Exploring relationships between the English language and text messaging (Sub-study 2: A preliminary investigation on the effects of text messaging on students' grammar and spelling competencies).* De La Salle University-Manila. Unpublished manuscript.

Rojo-Laurilla, M.A. (2005). *Defining the Filipino texter and texting style: A sociolinguistic analysis of text messaging in the Philippines.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, De La Salle University-Manila.

Saygin, A. & Cicekli, I. (2002). Pragmatics in human-computer conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34*, 227-258.

Sripada, S., Reiter, E., Hunter, J., & Yu, J. (2003). Generating English summaries of time series data using the Gricean maxims. SIGKKD '03. August 24-27, 2003. Washington, D.C. USA. Retrieved July 16, 2006 from http://www.csd.abdn.ac.uk/~ssripada/sumtime/kdd.pdf

Spitzberg, B. H. (2006). Preliminary development of a model and measure of computer mediated communication (CMC) competence. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11*(2). Retrieved July 15, 2006, from http://jcmc.indiana.edu/ vol11/issue2/spitzberg.html

Thurlow, C. (2006). From statistical panic to moral panic: The metadiscursive construction and popular exaggeration of new media language in the print media. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 11*(3). Retrieved August 27, 2006, from http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol11/issue3/thurlow.html

Torres, A. (2001). 4 Sme, Txtng is lyf. *Thefeature.com Archives.* Retrieved August 10, 2006, from http://www.thefeaturearchives.com/ 10667.html.

White, R. (2001). Adapting Grice's maxims in the teaching of writing. *ELT Journal, 55(1)*, 62-69.

Yus, F. (2003). Humor and the search for relevance. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 1295-1331.

Some Words used in the Paper:

Text – refers to the text message or SMS; may also refer to the act of sending SMS (verb "to text")

Texter – a person who engages in SMS communication; a person who "texts"

Textmates – people whom the texter communicates regularly through SMS (people part of his text network)

Load – credits; call/text charges

Miscol (missed call) – a person attempts to ring up the texter but does not continue to call; serves to signal that he/she wants the receiver to know an attempt to call, or expects to be texted back

TEXTING LOG SHEET

Name of Texter	Person Texted and role relationship (e.g. friend)	Messages Sent by the texter	Messages received by the Texter	Comments /Additional Notes