



## Exploring Maxim of Quantity in Spoken Academic Discourse

Dr. Tehseen Zahra

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of English, Air University Islamabad, Pakistan Email: [tehseen.zahra@mail.au.edu.pk](mailto:tehseen.zahra@mail.au.edu.pk)

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received:	September	30, 2023
Revised:	October	28, 2023
Accepted:	November	30, 2023
Available Online:	December	17, 2023

### ABSTRACT

Grice's maxim of quantity is accredited to govern linguistic performance. Speakers are presumed to contribute as much information as required for referent identification, while listeners are ideally believed to expect clear, unambiguous and concise summarization of conversation. The Maxim of quantity is exploited to explore the quantity of information delivered in classroom sessions. The data for this study is gathered from undergraduate classroom sessions of three public sector universities in Pakistan. This study explores how far Grice's maxim of quantity is relevant in determining the quantity of information in classroom discourse and how far speakers and hearers observe and non-observe Grice's maxim of quantity in classroom discourse. This study is quantitative as well as qualitative in nature. Words per minute uttered by the speakers and the context/atmosphere of classroom sessions are explored. The findings of the study reveal that observance and non-observance of the maxim of quantity depend on the activities performed in classrooms, the needs of the students and the context of classroom sessions.

#### Keywords:

Maxim of quantity, academic discourse, classroom sessions, context



© 2023 The Authors, Published by AIRSD. This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Common Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0

Corresponding Author's Email: [tehseen.zahra@mail.au.edu.pk](mailto:tehseen.zahra@mail.au.edu.pk)

## INTRODUCTION

Linguists who worked on conversational maxims concentrated on the broader aspects of the cooperative principle that widen the scope of pragmatic inquiry by analyzing, understanding and interpreting the speaker's intended meaning and the hearer's understanding of the intended meaning in a specific context. Gricean philosophical span covers the perception of speakers' implicit or possible meaning beyond the superficial and literal meaning. Davies (2007) explained the cognitive philosophical approach to pragmatics with specific reference to Grice's philosophy. He stated that the fundamental concern of Grice is "saying and meaning". Grice examined the speaker in a way that speakers know how to transfer the information implicitly and how speakers understand that the implicit meanings have been transferred to the hearers. Despite Grice's focus

on speakers' utterances, the observer/listener may be unable to analyse the speakers' complexity, ambiguity, and specific purpose or perspective.

Language had long been considered a neutral and passive phenomenon whose primary function was communicating or reflecting what was happening in society. However, whether it is a society that preserves a language or culture itself preserved by a language has been a riddle for many years in the debate of sociolinguistics. To keep the ball rolling in society, the participants must cooperate. This sense of cooperation is where people are not considered to be trying to confuse others or withhold relevant information. There are certain cooperative principles of conversation categorised into four sub-principles called maxims. Accordingly, the speaker should contribute concerning his/her assigned roles; there must be some rules to follow to perform these roles. These rules are defined by Grice (1975) as maxims, i.e., the Maxim of Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and the Maxim of Manner. It is necessary to observe these maxims to cooperate or facilitate the participants in the conversation. This study brings forth the issues related to the maxim of quantity only.

Conversational maxims are believed to be a cultural model for understanding the implicit meanings in linguistic structures to elaborate pragmatic implications in everyday communication. A simple linguistic structure "to cut a long story short" may be used to conclude the whole discussion, and it is evidence that the speaker is going to provide precise (quantity of) information (Grice, 1989). According to the pragmatic ideology of context, the information provided by the speakers is contextual. If a speaker tries to violate or deviate from conversational maxims, he still follows the cooperative principle. Kleinke (2010) has explained that phenomenon with examples:

A: What pet do you have?

B: Yes, I have a bird.

This is straightforward information the speaker provides, and the hearer can understand it easily.

A: What pet do you have?

B: I have a blue crown hanging a green parrot/ a rainbow lorikeet.

In this example, the speaker also provides extra information and can evoke different questions cognitively in the hearer's mind. It may provide a chance for the hearer to elaborate on his point of view and experience, while the former example provides direct information, and the pet can be a dog, cat, or rabbit. At the subordinate level, the speaker provides too little information; sometimes, he consciously does not want to provide sufficient information. Cruse (2000) has provided an example to elaborate on this phenomenon.

A: What will you eat in lunch?

B: Food.

In this example, speaker B does not want to provide relevant/specific information, so according to the Gricean maxim of quantity, the speaker does not observe the maxim of quantity. Although the speaker non-observe the maxim of quantity, he provides some information to the hearer. Interpretation of the message is relative. For instance, if speaker A says “he is tall”. Speaker B may assume that the person is six feet tall, while hearer C may assume that the person is five feet and eight inches tall.

Referential communication is related to communicative acts between speakers during communication (Yule, 2013). Successful communication depends upon successful acts of reference where the listeners identify and understand the entities (human and nonhuman). Understanding discourses, mainly spoken discourse, is not accessible. Every listener has some set patterns that may differ from each other’s ideas/patterns. These ideas may be referred to as relative ideas/patterns. For instance, language becomes vague when someone says ‘small table’ when there is only one table because the size of a small table may differ for every listener. I think, here, saying ‘table’ would suffice. One of the solutions to this problem is not to use the adjective redundantly’ to get the intended referent.

Gricean cooperative principle concentrates on how the speaker and the listener act cooperatively to understand each other mutually. Communication is a collaborative process, as suggested by Clark and colleagues in their pioneer work on language use (Clark et al., 1983; Clark, 1996). According to Clark’s theory of language use, the ‘common ground’ of the interlocutors is essential for communication. Where the listener and the speaker can mutually understand what is being talked about. In the conversation, the speaker acts as the presenter, and the listener is the acceptor/receiver of the information. The speaker's contribution will be acceptable if the listener understands it successfully. Mutual understanding of a stance helps in meeting the goals of the conversation. If the speaker wants to be understood, he should avoid making ambiguous statements or giving insufficient information. He would, indeed, make expressions as informative as he could to convey the intended referent. Being cooperative partners, the speaker should avoid using indefinite modifiers and try to make speech easier for the listener to comprehend. The minimal unit of joint action contribution may consist of presentation and acceptance; utterance may count as presentation, and it needs to be accepted by the listener. It means that the contribution is incomplete without the appropriate presentation of the speaker and acceptance of the presentation by the listener. A question is not accepted until the listener has uttered/shown that he has understood the question. The appropriate quantity of information to be delivered to the listener is vital to continue the conversation. To identify the referent, the listener will not agree with the under-description stance and expect the speaker to provide sufficient information. Therefore, it is clear that he would adhere to the maxim of quantity (Clark, 1996). Mutual sharing of knowledge between the speaker and the listener assists in using a few words to explain the idea, which is pragmatics. Pragmatics studies how transmission of meaning depends not only on linguistic knowledge but also on context, inferred intent and encyclopedic knowledge about the status of those involved.

### **Research Questions**

How far is Gricean maxim of quantity practical in determining the quantity of information delivered in classroom sessions?

How far speakers and hearers observe and non-observe Grice's maxim of quantity in classroom sessions?

### **Research Objectives**

To find the authenticity of Gricean maxim of quantity to determine the quantity of information delivered in classroom sessions.

To explore the observance and non-observance of Gricean Maxims of quantity in various contexts of classroom sessions.

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

In cooperative principle, Grice deliberated on four maxims, i.e. the maxim of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. According to the maxim of quantity, the information passed by the speaker must carry appropriate quantity, i.e. it should be as informative as required. The maxim of quality is related to truthfulness; the speakers should not say anything about not having complete knowledge. Maxim of manner states that the speaker should avoid obscure expressions. Lastly, the maxim of relevance is related to the appropriate contribution and goal of conversation (Grice, 1975). These maxims are considered unstated assumptions in conversation (Mukaro et al., 2013), as Grice did not provide any patterns or guidelines to gauge these maxims' observance or no observance. Grice's maxim of quantity is the focal point of this study.

Grice (1975) explained Maxim of Quantity as speakers should provide their interlocutors with as much information as necessary, but not more. Standard pragmatic accounts in the Gricean tradition are based on informativity: the amount of information required to establish unique reference in a given context. These accounts distinguish between under-informative, minimal, and over-informative referential expressions. Key to this distinction is a referent's competitors: objects of the same category found in the situational context (e.g., how many stars the listener must choose from when hearing "Click on the blue star"). Thus, the expression "the blue star" would be minimal if there were two stars of different colours on the screen, but the same expression would be under informative if there were two blue stars or over informative if there were a single star (Rubio-Fernandez, 2019).

Two prominent options likely to occur in any conversation that plays a pivotal role in breaking the rules of cooperative principle (Grice, as cited in Yuliasri, 2014); the first is flouting of maxim ("a condition when the speaker refuses to follow one or more maxims and attaches a hidden meaning to the literal meaning within the utterance and the other is violating maxims"). The second is violating maxims (a condition when the speaker denies identifying one or more maxims intentionally to deceive the interlocutor). These are called non-observance of maxims. The observance or non-observance of cooperative principles is not intentional all the time. Nugroho, Faridi, and Hartono (2021) observed the non-observance of Grice's conversational maxims exploited by characters in the Friends TV Show. They concluded that in most situations, participants non-observe the cooperative principle for reasons such as face-saving, creating humour, avoiding directness, and avoiding being offensive. Hence, depending on context, maxims are flouted or violated in different situations. To avoid referring explicitly to a particular

person or group of people, a speaker may use a more general expression; in doing this, the speaker non-observe the Gricean maxim of Quantity. However, it may be evident to the hearer and the observer to whom the referring expression refers. In saying "those people", for example, a speaker may implicate a specific group whose identity may be derived from the context or even implicate a specific person who is a member, and probably a prominent member, of that group.

Observance and non-observance of Grice's conversational maxims may exist in spoken and written discourses. Abari and Lotfi (2013) analysed the Gricean Maxim of quantity in the research articles written by Iranian and native English writers. For this purpose, they selected 30 psychological articles from the Journal of Psychology. Out of thirty, ten Persian articles were written by Iranian writers, ten English articles by the same Iranian authors, and native English authors wrote the remaining ten English articles. Then, these articles were observed and compared based on Grice's maxim of quantity. The findings revealed that both Persian and English articles non-observe the maxim of quantity in their writings. The frequencies of violation in Persian articles were higher than in English articles written by native English authors. However, no notable differences were found between the English articles written by both English and Iranian authors (Abari & Lotfi, 2013).

Simin, Bahadori, and Bagherzade (2016) examined the maxim of quantity in the spoken discourse of male and female Persian speakers in ending a conversation. They randomly selected 30 male and female speakers and asked them to fill out a questionnaire about different situations and how they would end the conversations. The analysis showed that male speakers frequently observe the maxim of quantity in informal contexts. In contrast, female speakers frequently observe the maxim of quantity in formal contexts to end their conversations.

Non-observance of the maxim of quantity sometimes creates a comic effect such as Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011) analysed two characters, Barry and Tim, in a comic movie entitled "Dinner for Schmucks". They identified five occasions where the characters violated the maxim of quantity. Sometimes, it becomes unavoidable to non-observe the maxims to achieve a particular goal or purpose. Likewise, Barry, due to his talkative and uninformative nature, mostly non-observes the maxim of quantity, whereas Tim, who belongs to the upper wealthy class, remains informed primarily and truthful. Likewise, another study was conducted by Lestari and Firdaus (2021) on the movie "Detective Pikachu". The purpose of the study is to explore the flouting of the maxim of quantity in the characters' dialogues. Although the maxim of quantity is flouted by the speakers/characters (in almost thirty dialogues), the listeners/characters are least bothered because they understand the message well and can respond to the speakers.

Many researchers (such as Kleinke, 2010; Khosravizadeh & Sadehvandi, 2011; Rubio-Fernandez, 2019; Rasool, Zahra, & Khawar, 2023) exploited Grice's cooperative principle to explore observance and nonobservance of the maxim of quantity in written and spoken discourses. However, different genres and disciplines are explored pragmatically by employing cooperative principles, but little attention has been paid to spoken academic discourse, particularly classroom sessions. This study explores the observance and non-observance of Grice's maxim of quantity in classroom sessions. I used quantitative and qualitative approaches

to explore the quantity of information delivered by the instructors (male and female) in classroom sessions.

### **Data Collection**

The data for this study is collected from undergraduate classrooms of three public sector universities in Islamabad. Ten lectures were recorded from each university, and five male and five female instructors were selected through convenience sampling from each university for data collection. Fifteen female and fifteen male classroom sessions were recorded and transcribed. Almost 755 minutes were recorded for female classroom sessions, and 61507 words were transcribed. For male classroom sessions, 765 minutes were recorded, and 64834 words were transcribed. So, the total corpus size is 126341 words.

*Table 1: Selected Disciplines for Lecture Recording*

<b>Name of institute</b>	<b>Discipline</b>
Quaid-i-Azam University	Chemistry, Computer Sciences, Physics, Linguistics
National University of Modern Languages	Education, English (Linguistics and Literature)
Air University	Physics, English, Masters in Business Administration

### **ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

Grice's maxim of quantity states that the speaker should be as informative as required and not contribute more information than required. In the Cooperative principle, Grice stated two extremes of observance and non-observance of the maxim of quantity. However, he did not propose any criteria to measure the quantity of information delivered by the speakers. Hence, there are two known approaches to analysing the quantity of information. First, it can be calculated through the number of words uttered by the speakers in a given period. However, testifying the required number of words, let us say per minute, may depend on one and/or several linguistic and extra-linguistic factors. For instance, linguistic factors such as the speaker's linguistic competence and competency on the topic spoken might contribute significantly to the articulation rate of words per minute. However, the rate of words per minute required to be spoken mainly depends on extra-linguistic factors such as genre, audience, and context.

Genre is a significant determiner of uttering the required number of words; for example, the word limit is usually expected when performing written genres such as research articles, book reviews, and essays. Limiting the rate of words on spoken genres is generally imposed by allocating total time instead of words of speech/talk to the speaker.

In addition to genre, the second extra-linguistic factor, which determines the required quantity, is purely based on the amount of information the audience anticipates. The speaker needs to consider the audience's expectations, level and response to decide the rate of words to be spoken.

Depending on these manifestations of the audience, it may desire to listen more in fewer words and vice versa.

Besides genre and audience, context plays a significant role in articulating the required words within a particular situation. When human beings interact with each other, they share contextual information explicitly and/or implicitly while exchanging ideas with the particular purpose of achieving communicative goals. This sharing of contextual information may occur at different levels of context, including linguistic, situational, and cultural, which may be better catered to through different theories of pragmatics. These theories help understand different manifestations of context in deciphering the intended meanings of interlocutors. Firstly, linguistic context refers to the context within discourse, like coherence and cohesion in speech. Secondly, situational context decodes the language used in a specific environment/situation, time and territory. Finally, cultural context deals with the pragmatics of linguistic codes to speakers' epoch, culture and custom. Hence, the contextual use of language appears to be a significant feature of academic discourse where speakers/instructors display their linguistic performance according to the context. For instance, instructors utter words during classroom sessions according to the needs of the students in that specific atmosphere. This atmosphere is, furthermore, affected by various generic constraints such as content to be taught, personal beliefs of teachers and students, institutional norms and intended goal to be achieved through these classroom sessions. Hence, in sum, these are the various factors related to the context that are most likely to affect the rate of words produced by the speakers. These factors at a time may determine the actual requirement of the number of words to be uttered; for example, the same factor, let us say, content to be taught may be affected by some other factor, such as institutional norms, which would result in saying more words on the topic and vice versa.

### **Ideology of Ideal Speaker**

Lisa B Marshall (2013) has pointed out that an ideal speaker can utter 110 to 150 words per minute during a formal conversation. Natural, informal speech may result in the utterance of more rapid words. When you are in a hurry and want to deliver an essential message, you will rapidly utter the words per minute (later WPM), which will be higher than in normal formal conversation. Furthermore, she said a cultural and personal aspect may also affect the delivery of words per minute. Brizendine's (2006) gender-based study concluded that WPM uttered by females is nearly 250, while WPM uttered by males is ideally 125. Looking at the psychological perspective of speech, Miller (2006, as cited in Brizendine ) said that the faster speaker with 195 WPM is more convincing than the speaker with 102 WPM in counter-attitudinal conversation. Binnenpoorte (2005) recorded fifty speeches of male and fifty-eight female participants and concluded that male participants contributed 223 WPM while female participants contributed 220 WPM with pauses without pauses, 266 WPM for females and 274 WPM for males. In this case, the WPM of males is higher than females.

### **Ideology of Ideal Speaker and Delivery of Information in Academic Discourse**

Considering the ideal speaker's ideology, the quantity of information instructors deliver in classroom sessions is analysed and calculated. The calculated WPM results of classroom

sessions are compared with the findings of Lisa B Marshal, Binnenpoorte, and Brizendine. The following formula will be employed to calculate the words per minute.

$$\text{Words per minute} = \frac{\text{Total words spoken}}{\text{Total time consumed}}$$

I recorded the data of fifteen male instructors. A detailed description of the duration of the class, total words uttered by the male instructors in the class and words spoken per minute for male participants is presented in the following table.

**Table 2: Description of male instructors' Classroom sessions**

Male Instructor	Time Consumed	Total Words (uttered by instructor)	Words per minute (approximately)
M1	1:03:38	4239	67 words
M2	44:41	3100	70 words
M3	45:34	5100	111 words
M4	51:57	7110	139 words
M5	51:53	3450	66 words
M6	50:54	3388	58 words
M7	54:08	3310	61 words
M8	50:01	3075	62 words
M9	40:39	4010	102 words
M10	43:01	3388	78 words
M11	43:11	2700	62 words
M12	44:26	4210	96 words
M13	1:04:01	4198	65 words
M14	59:38	3810	65 words
M15	57:10	4200	73 words
Total	765 minutes	58288	1175

The highest frequency of words uttered by the male participant in the classroom is 111 words per minute, and the lowest is 58 words per minute. From a quantitative perspective, only two speakers fulfil the criteria of the ideal speaker from Lisa B Marshall's perspective of the ideal speaker, and no participant fulfils the criteria of the ideal speaker from Binnenpoorte's and Brizendine's point of view.

**Table 3: Description of Female Instructors' Classroom Sessions**

Female Instructors	Time Consumed	Total Words (uttered by instructor)	Words per minute (approximately)
F1	1:2:30	5360	87 words
F2	50 minutes	2105	42 words
F3	1:3:00	6038	96 words

F4	01:07:15	6124	92 words
F5	40 minutes	2345	59 words
F6	38 minutes	2790	74 words
F7	50 minutes	3232	65 words
F8	50 minutes	1610	33 words
F9	49 minutes	5586	114 words
F10	1:3:21	4681	74 words
F11	58:3:00	4590	80 words
F12	51:40:00	3220	63 words
F13	57:4:30	4510	79 words
F14	55:23:00	4410	80 words
F15	34:28:00	3100	91 words
Total	755 minutes	69704	1129 words

The findings show that only one participant satisfies the criteria of Lisa B Marshall, while no female participant fulfils the criteria of ideal speaker proposed by Binnenpoorte and Brizendine.

The highest frequency of WPM of male instructors in classrooms is 111, and the lowest frequency of WPM is 58. The highest frequency of WPM of female classroom participants is 114, and the lowest is 33. The frequency of WPM of female instructors in classrooms is comparatively lower than that of male instructors. The following table clarifies the whole picture of the WPM of male and female participants.

*Table 4: WPM of male and female participants*

Type	Gender	Highest Frequency WPM	Lowest Frequency WPM
Classrooms	Male	111	58
Classrooms	Female	114	33

The total time of lecture recording of male instructors is 765 minutes, and the total words uttered during this time are 58288, while the total time of lecture recording of female instructors is 755 minutes, and the total number of words uttered during this time is 69704.

*Table 5: Total time, total words and WPM of male and female participants*

Type	Gender	Total Time (in minutes)	Total Words	Total WPM
Classrooms	Male	765	58288	76
Classrooms	Female	755	69704	92

The statistical results of the recorded data show that neither male nor female instructors fulfil the criteria of ideal speakers presented by Lisa B Marshall, Brizendine, and Binnenpoorte.

### **Limitations of Maxim of Quantity**

For the maxim of quantity, Grice has given two main postulates. First is “make your contribution as informative as is required during conversation”, and second is “do not make your contribution more informative than required.” The philosophy of ideal speakers proposed by Lisa B Marshall, Brizendine and Binnepoorte confines speech to a limited amount of words, but the pragmatic ideology of quantity of information depends upon the matter of information provided rather than the number of words spoken by the speakers to share the idea. Suppose,

- i. A has said a statement B
- ii. There is an expression C, which is more informative than B.
- iii. However, the given word limit (WPM) strategy to measure the ideal speaker’s behaviour does not allow him to speak more than the limit because this may not adhere to the standard of the ideal speaker. If the speaker observes the maxim of quantity, he may flout the maxim of relevance because the speaker may not be able to deliver the idea within a given word limit.
- iv. The use of fewer words (WPM) may mean that the speaker wants to avoid a breach, not to deliver extra information, and the use of more words (WPM) may mean that the speaker wants to make his/her contribution as informative as required. He should not exceed the given word limit. However, the speakers can practically not count the words on the spot in a given situation.

### **Measurement of Quantity of Information**

The quantity of information is independent of the number of words. It is relative and based on individual experiences. One sentence may fulfil the criterion of quantity for one person; there is a possibility that it may not fulfil the criteria for another person.

### **Classroom Activities**

Instructors use fewer words in classrooms during lectures; there can be different reasons. First, in classrooms, instructors either use a writing board (to write) or PowerPoint slides to explain their points of view. So they write and speak at a time, and it may be possible that when your brain works on two kinds of activities, the number of words per minute may lessen. In most classroom sessions, instructors used writing boards or PowerPoint slides. Sometimes, instructors assign some activities for the students to solve during the class, or they may ask the students to read the handouts or conduct tests. During this time, the instructors remain silent; they observe the class and utter comparatively fewer words. In the following example, the instructor asked the students to sit in groups to discuss essay writing. I observed that during this classroom session, students exchanged ideas related to the topic of discussion. However, the instructor uttered only a few words, i.e. twenty-two words per minute. It does not mean the instructor is not providing sufficient information or she is not an ideal speaker. It proves that the contextual use of fewer words in that situation is sufficient to deliver the whole idea.

The instructors may ask the students to do various tasks in classrooms, like reading handouts, or they may take a test. During that time, the instructors remained silent and played the role of an

observer. Hence, they utter comparatively fewer words in that period. In the following example, the instructor asked the students to sit in groups to discuss essay writing. I observed that although the students discussed during this period, the instructor uttered only a few words, i.e. twenty-two words per minute. It does not mean the instructor is not providing sufficient information or she is not an ideal speaker. It proves the contextual use of fewer words in that particular situation.

T: “Using our previous knowledge about this particular writing now I will ask you what an essay is. Okay, you can discuss this with me, but first of all, discuss it in your group. Umar (student) comes here and sits with this group. (Meanwhile, the class started discussing with each other.)

After some time, the instructor asked the students questions about the completion of tasks.

Teacher: OK, I think all of you have discussed. Now, who will tell me the definition of an essay?”

### **Need-based Language Use in Classrooms**

Instructors speak according to the needs of students. In interactive classrooms, instructors allow the students to share their ideas, so the words/minute delivered by the instructors may be low. In other situations, when students ask questions from the instructors, the WPM uttered by the instructors may be high. In another classroom session, I observed that the students ask questions of the instructor. While the instructor was replying, her WPM delivery was comparatively higher, i.e., 109 WPM, than in the previous situation. Hence, the delivery of words per minute is situational too.

In other situations, when students ask questions from the instructors, the WPM uttered by the instructors is high. In the following example, the instructor delivered a lecture on “speaking skills”; during this session, the students asked a question from the instructor. The WPM spoken by the instructor is comparatively higher, i.e. 109 WPM, than the other classroom situations.

“T: *aik time may ap sun rahay ho lekin thori der baa dap bolo gay na. You will take the place of a speaker. Theek hay. That is a role play kay kabhi ap listener ho gay kabhi speaker ho gay. [At one moment, you will be listening, but at another moment, you will speak as well and take the role of the speaker. Right. This is called role play. You will be a listener at one time, while you will be the speaker the other time.] The idea of speaking is clear now? Ok. What is speaking?*

S: *Agar koi question pochna ho tu /i/ [Do you want to ask any question?]*

T: *Han tu jo symbols ap kay mind may save ha ap un ko use karo gay na. Question pochnay kay liay, for example, agar may kahon kay teacher is teaching and you are standing in front of a door. Tu ap kay mind may ye aay ga kay may poch lon kay kia may ander ajaon? [Yes, these symbols are saved in your mind. When you want to ask any questions, you use these symbols. You may use these symbols to get permission from your instructor to enter the class. May I come in?]*

So what will you do? You will utilise those symbols which are saved in your mind.”

### **Delivery of Words in Various Contexts**

The use of words in certain situations is context-dependent. The speaker cannot measure that he/she is giving more/less information in a given time. As far as the concept of the quantity of information is concerned, it is relative, i.e. its concept varies from person to person. I observed that in classroom sessions, there can be back-and-forth movement from formal to less informal. In formal situations like delivering a lecture on a particular topic, the delivery of words is relatively lower than the words uttered in less informal situations like telling jokes or sharing previous events. In a situation where the instructor is discussing the previous trip, the delivery of words in that less informal situation is higher, i.e. 121 WPM, than teaching in a formal situation where the delivery of words per minute is 89 WPM.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

I found that Gricean maxims of quantity do not provide the foundations/criteria to measure the appropriate quantity of information. However, cooperative principle, including maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, give an overview of how speakers and listeners facilitate each other by observing these four maxims. This study aims to explore the factors that may assist in determining the appropriate quantity of information in spoken academic discourse. This study reveals that spoken academic discourse, particularly classroom discourse, is independent of the ideology of the ideal speaker in terms of words per minute (Marshall, 2013; Brizendine, 2006; Miller, 2006 & Binnenpoorte, 2005). However, analysing the contextual use of language plays a vital role in determining the quantity of information. The number of words used in classroom sessions depends on the needs of the students, the environment of the class and the activities that are performed in classrooms. All these factors may be determined through the contextual use of language. The contextual uses of the language of other genres and disciplines, such as motivational speeches, folk tales, and children’s literature, may be explored.

### **REFERENCES:**

- Abari, A. F., & Lofti, A. R. (2013). The Gricean maxim of quantity in academic texts: A study of English and Persian journal articles written by native and non-native speakers. *International Journal of Basic Sciences and Applied Research*, 2(12), 1023-1029.
- Binnenpoorte, D., Van Bael, C. P. J., Den Os, E. A., & Boves, L. W. J. (2005). Gender in everyday speech and language: a corpus-based study. *Interspeech*. 8(4). pp. 2213-2216.
- Brizendine, L. (2006). *The female brain*. Random House LLC.
- Miller, N., Maruyama, G., Beaber, R. J., & Valone, K. (1976). Speed of speech and persuasion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(4), 615-630.
- Clark, H. H., Schreuder, R., & Buttrick, S. (1983). Common ground at the understanding of demonstrative reference. *Journal of verbal learning and verbal behaviour*, 22(2), 245-258.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cruse, Alan D., 2000. *Meaning in language: an introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press

- Davies, B. L. (2007). Grice's cooperative principle: meaning and rationality. *Journal of pragmatics*, 39(12), 2308-2331.
- Kleinke, S. (2010). Speaker activity and Grice's maxims of conversation at the interface of Pragmatics and Cognitive Linguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 42(12), 3345- 3366.
- Nugroho, A. P., Faridi, A., & Hartono, R. (2021). The Non-Observance of Grice Maxims in (The Tv Show) Friends to Create Verbal Humour. *The Journal of Educational Development*, 9(1), 1-12.
- Rubio-Fernandez, P. (2019). Overinformative speakers are cooperative: Revisiting the Gricean Maxim of Quantity. *Cognitive science*, 43(11), e12797.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard UP, Cambridge, MA.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation: the William James lectures, II. In Cole, P., Morgan, J.L. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press, Cambridge.
- Rasool, S., Zahra, T., & Khawar, Z. (2022). An Investigation of Grice's Cooperative Principle in an Interview with Ishaq Dar: A Pragmatic Analysis. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research*, 25(2), 1-21.
- Khosravizadeh, P., & Sadehvandi, N. (2011). Some instances of violation and flouting of the maxim of quantity by the main characters (Barry & Tim) in Dinner for Schmucks. In *International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics*. Vol. 26, pp. 122-127.
- Lestari, D., & Firdaus, D. (2021). Flouting Maxim of Quality in the Characters' Dialogues in "Detective Pikachu". *CALL*, 3(1), 93-104.
- Marshall, L. B. (2013). *Smart talk: The public speaker's guide to success in every situation*. Macmillan.
- Mukaro, L., Mugari, V., & Dhumukwa, A. (2013). Violation of conversational maxims in Shona. *Journal of Comparative Literature and Culture (JCLC)*, 2(4), 161-168.
- Simin, S., Bahadori, F., & Bagherzade, N. (2016). Gendered-based use of maxim of quantity in Iranian spoken discourse: A case of closing conversation. *The Philologist*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Zahra, T. (2018). *Pragmatic Analysis of Academic Discourse: Insights into Code-Switching*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Yule, G. (2013). *Referential communication tasks*. Routledge.
- Yuliasri, I. (2014). The shift of Grice's maxim flouting in Indonesian translation of the Donald Duck comics. *Arab World English Journal*, 3, 225-238.