

A PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF THE LANGUAGE OF PARTICIPANTS IN THEATRE FOR DEVELOPMENT IN KAGORO-HILL COMMUNITY, KADUNA, NIGERIA: A CASE AGAINST HEPATITIS

Amos ATAMA

Department of English and Literary Studies
University of Nigeria, Nsukka
atama.amos@gmail.com, 08065654868

&

Paul ADAMU

Department of English,
Kaduna State College of Education, GidanWaya, Kafanchan.
pauladams830@gmail.com, +3247036968338

Abstract

Because of the need to combat the much-dreaded hepatitis virus in rural communities, *Theatre for Development* (TFD) is deployed to Kagoro-Hill, a rural community in Southern Kaduna, Nigeria. Using a *Focused Group* as the sample population, data is collected from ten (10) participants out of whom only two are medical personnel. Theoretically, *Grice's Cooperative Principle* (CP) is used to examine how cooperation is achieved through the use of language. Findings reveal that while the maxim of *quality* and *quantity* are either upheld or flouted at different times in the conversation of the participants, the maxim of *relevance* and *manner* however remain constant for each of the data examined. It can therefore be concluded from the findings of this paper that TFD plays a crucial role in the dissemination of combative measures against the hepatitis virus in rural communities and that the responses of the respondents contain pragmatic contents. This paper therefore recommends that the responses of respondents in any health-related programme should be subjected to a pragmatic analysis, like this one, in order to ascertain the effectiveness or otherwise of such a health-related campaign. This is because it is through language that feedback can be measured and guaranteed.

Keywords: Theatre for Development, Focused Group, Participants, Pragmatics and Cooperative Principle.

Résumé

En raison de la nécessité de lutter contre le virus de l'hépatite tant redouté dans les communautés rurales, Theatre for Development (TFD) est déployé à Kagoro-Hill, une communauté rurale du sud de Kaduna, au Nigeria. En utilisant un groupe ciblé comme échantillon de population, les données sont collectées auprès de dix (10) participants dont seulement deux sont du personnel médical. Théoriquement, le principe coopératif de Grice (PC) est utilisé pour examiner comment la coopération est réalisée grâce à l'utilisation du langage. Les résultats révèlent que si la maxime de qualité et de quantité est soit maintenue soit bafouée à différents moments de la conversation des participants, la maxime de pertinence et de manière reste cependant constante pour chacune des données examinées. On peut donc conclure des résultats de cet article que le TFD joue un rôle crucial dans la diffusion des mesures de lutte contre le virus de l'hépatite dans les communautés rurales et que les réponses des répondants contiennent des contenus pragmatiques. Cet article recommande donc

que les réponses des répondants à tout programme lié à la santé soient soumises à une analyse pragmatique, comme celle-ci, afin de déterminer l'efficacité ou non d'une telle campagne liée à la santé. C'est parce que c'est par le langage que le feedback peut être mesuré et garanti.

Mots-clés : Théâtre pour le développement, groupe ciblé, participants, pragmatique et principe coopératif.

Introduction

Theatre for Development (TFD) is a means of communication primarily through dramatization or dramatic performances. Central to its objective therefore is to communicate messages that can champion societal change and revolution through performances. Since communication is central to TFD, it is expedient to examine the concept of communication (White 557-578). Communicating information occurs in many different ways. In humans, it is frequently done through spoken and/or written language, but non-verbal communication also plays a significant role in our interactions. Hence, it is typical to constantly communicate information, intentionally or unintentionally, about perceptions, intentions and feelings, as well as about social identity. Communication is central to our everyday functioning and can be the very essence of human condition (Williams, 6-8). Longe and Ofuani (1) strongly believe that communication means cooperation, organization and it has a structure.

Language is therefore a method of human communication, either spoken or written in a structured conventional manner (or in some cases unstructured and unconventional manner) with the intention of passing across a message (Goddard 11). The importance of language has been captured by many scholars across the globe. To Meyers (13), “the most tangible indication of our thinking power is language –our spoken, written, or signed words and the ways we combine them as we think and communicate. Humans have long and proudly proclaimed that language sets us above all other animals”. But the primacy of language use is to communicate. Nevertheless, language does not occur in a vacuum. It “comes to life when functioning in some environment” (Halliday 28). Going forward, the objectives and basic assumptions of this paper are given below:

The objectives of this paper are therefore spelt out thus:

- i. To examine the language of participants in TFD programme on hepatitis,
- ii. To put this language in a context and analyzed them pragmatically,
- iii. To use Grice's Cooperative Principle as a means of analysis,
- iv. To prove, through this theory, whether or not cooperation is achieved or not.

Major Assumptions of the Paper

This paper is predicated on the following assumptions:

- i. that the hepatitis virus exists in rural communities and there is a need to enlighten people about it;
- ii. that one way to go about this is to use Theatre for Development;
- iii. that Theatre for Development (TFD) is a means of communication primarily through a dramatization or dramatic process;
- iv. that the responses of the participants, if the TFD is initiated in a rural community like Kagoro-Hill community in Southern Kaduna, can be linguistically relevant for feedback;

- v.that these responses can contain “pragmatic content”; and thus if clause (iv) above is achieved, can be analyzed pragmatically;
- vi.that Grice’s Cooperative Principle can be used in this case to analyze these pragmatic contents;
- vii.that if this theory proves to be applicable, the level of cooperation between the participants of the TFD and the initiators of same can be ascertained.

The Concept of Theatre for Development

Theatre for Development (TFD) refers to theatre and how it is used as an instrument for stimulating change, solving problems, bringing communities together and building a community, all of which is geared towards social change and transformation. Its methods involve drama, songs, dances and other forms of theatrical performances. Based on these capabilities of TFD mentioned above, it would certainly not be out of place to describe it as a social work. This is in consonance with its participatory role in helping to address health related issues like hepatitis. Thus, its developmental roles are seen in the light of raising people’s levels-their incomes, and consumption levels of food, medical services, education, through relevant economic growth; creating conditions conducive to the growth of people’s self-esteem, political and economic systems and institutions which promote human dignity and respect, and increasing people’s freedom to choose by enlarging the range of their choice(Osunketan310).

Having explained TFD in the light of development, it is therefore considered here as one of those channels capable of developing the health sector in as it can be used to create the much-desired awareness for health-related issues. Correspondingly, Asiyanbola (395) sheds light on the concept of national development that it denotes development in all facets of human endeavours – health, medicine, information, communication, education, justice, politics, trade, aviation and transport. The emphasis made here is that the pivotal role of TFD in stimulating and galvanizing support for developmental programmes in health -related issues or medicine makes it a viable tool in this regard. Akinfeleye (59) also shares this view when he says that: “National development will refer to the process of social change within a society or nation. This will entail national integration, territorial integration and values integration”. Nevertheless, this work does not suggest that with the use of TFD and modern communication as initiatives, all the problems of the community with regard to hepatitis will magically go away but the right communication channel will have the right impact and create a positive change (Daramola, 70).

Pragmatics and the Cooperative Principle (CP)

Akmajian, Demers, Farmer, and Harnish (363) are of the view that the term Pragmatics as far as language is concerned has a broad implication specifically in relation to meaning and interpretation;hence, they remark thus “We will take the term Pragmatics to cover the study of language use, and in particular the study of linguistic communication, in relation to language structure and context of utterances”. This submission focuses on language and the fact that it enhances what they have term “linguistic communication”.

In addition, they are of the view that Pragmatics is concerned with the structure of language and the context in which utterances occur. All of these are pivotal to how meaning is construed and interpreted. It is also in the light of this that they suggest that

“Pragmatics must identify central uses of language, it must specify the conditions of linguistic expression (words, phrases, sentences, discourse) to be used in those ways, and it must seek to uncover general principles of language use”(Akmajian et al. 363). Regardless of the stance taken by these authors, one thing that is central to any pragmatic investigation is the emphasis on context (Huang 13-14; O’Gard, Archibald and Katamba 197; Schmitt 70). Perhaps, this is what makes Gee’s (11) submission relevant here to the effect that “we craft what we speak or write to fit or context in which we are communicating”.

It must, however, be stated here that context is not constant as it is erroneously perceived but ever changing. Again, Yule (27) differs slightly from the definition above when he says, “The study of what speaker mean, or “speaker meaning” is called Pragmatics. Thus, the major focus is on the speaker and the message he sends across or intends to pass across. This is what he calls the “speakers meaning”. Hence, it is not enough to infer or decipher the meaning of what is said but understanding exactly what it is that the speaker wishes to communicate is paramount to the entire communication process.

From the above position therefore, Pragmatics is concerned with an interpretation of what is meant even when it is not said. A bulk of this deduction, however, rests on the term “shared assumption and expectations” (Yule127). By implication, it can be guessed that interpreting the “unsaid” or perhaps what is “unwritten” is a function of a “mutual knowledge” of what the outcome of certain utterances, events or things might be otherwise it would be a fruitless endeavor, trying to interpret what is unsaid or unwritten. to a large extent therefore, the bulk of the submission made in this paper rests on this assumption that it is possible to make certain inferences from what is unsaid based on certain pragmatic principles-and in this case, the Cooperative Principle (CP) is one of such.

The Cooperative Principle

The Cooperative Principle (CP) is one of the basic elements of understanding and interpreting conversations. The Cooperative Principle means that in conversation people can be expected to cooperate with one another because they have things to say to one another (Mey 71-27). It is this particular expectation that shape how efficient, cooperative, meaning making is achieved. Grice’s Cooperative Principle can be summarized thus:

The Maxim of Quantity

1. Make your contributions as informative as required
2. Do not make contribution more informative than required

The Maxim of Quality

1. Do not say what you believe to be false
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

The Maxim of Relation

Make your contribution relevant

The Maxim of Manner

Be perspicuous, and specifically:

1. Avoid obscurity
2. Avoid ambiguity
3. Be brief
4. Be orderly

To balance the argument above, Mey (269) remarks that “based on the assumption that nobody is willing, able or obliged to cooperate, in certain cases, a maxim may be violated in the name of a higher-order principle which tells us to avoid a taboo or not to smite somebody with the language equivalent of the ‘evil eye’ or a ‘manual curse’. Besides, “cooperation is realized in different cultures” (Mey269). Therefore, Grice’s Cooperative Principle is only a proposition: “Grice proposes that conversations are cooperative endeavours where participants may be expected (unless they indicate otherwise) to comply with the general principles of cooperation, such as making the appropriate contribution to the conversation” (Akmajian, Demers, Farmer and Harnish401). There are, however, instances in which cooperation is difficult (Yule 145). Besides, people may not necessarily feel obliged or compelled to observe the maxims at least not in its textbook written form (Tallard 247; Sperber and Wilson 162). To this end, this paper does not consider Grice theory as the ideal model but only as a working tool for data analysis.

Statement of the Problem

In the outbreak of a virus, it is not uncommon for medical personnel in collaboration with the government or foreign bodies to initiate programmes for rural communities in order to enlighten the rural populace about the nature of the virus, mode of transmission, medication and preventive measures to adopt. In other instances, individuals, groups or cooperate bodies take the initiative. In this case, however, a group took the initiative to educate the people about the dreaded hepatitis virus in what has been termed Theatre for Development (TFD). Nevertheless, the language of the participants in such a programme are hardly analyzed as part of the feedback programme in order to determine the effectiveness or otherwise of the programme. This is, therefore, the focus of this paper.

Significance of the Paper

This paper is beneficial in that it primarily addresses the interdependence, inter-relationship or inter-relatedness of different academic fields of study or human endeavours. Consequently, this paper specifically shows how Theatre Art, Medicine and Language can be used to address one single subject: the hepatitis virus. It is hoped that an investigation like this will help explain how learning can cut across different areas of interest and how it tells on real life situations.

Methodology

Ten (10) responses from the participants of a *Focused Group* which is the sample population for this paper are collected and analyzed. Each of the data is numbered from 1 to 10 for easy identification and reference, and also highlighted. After this, the paper subjects each statement to Grice’s Cooperative Principle to find out if they contain the four maxims: The maxim of quantity, quality, relevance and manner. Also, where necessary, a particular datum can be re-quoted or re-stated while discussing the pragmatic content of any datum in order to substantiate a given argument. On the whole, the analysis is meant to measure the level of cooperation realizable or achievable during the Theatre for Development initiative against hepatitis.

Data Presentation and Analysis

Datum 1 (Medical):

Our job here is to come and administer drugs to patients who are sick. We come weekly and sometimes after two weeks, and climbing to this community is never an easy task. So, you don't expect us to come up here and do extra work of bringing people together to educate them on hepatitis, we come we attend to those who are ill, but educating them will be a hectic thing to do. After all how many of them will be willing to leave the farms and attend the educative programmes. You can see that, it is not easy at all.

Maxim of Quality:

This maxim is flouted in the extract “but educating them will be a hectic thing to do. After all how many of them will be willing to leave the farms and attend the educative programmes. You can see that, it is not easy at all”. This is because the nurse gives a statement that is not true and lacks merit. The nurse assumes that an educative programme on hepatitis will be futile and that the farmers will not abandon their farms to attend such a programme but the grounds upon which this assumption is made is false because the programme indeed was held and a lot of farmers were present as other data proved.

Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quality as far as the researcher is concerned is upheld as the nurse unveiled the state of affairs in the community being that they are farmers, that there has not been any enlightenment programme in the community and that there is need to do a proper scheduling of the TFD so as not to interfere with the farming activities or season in the area because most of them are predominantly farmers. The maxims of manner and brevity are upheld too. This because the nurse's submission is relevant to what is being asked and everything agrees with the maxim of manner.

Datum 2 (Medical):

I don't think radio or television will be effective in Kagoro-Hill community with regards to educating the people on hepatitis. How many of them listen to radio, how many of them own a radio or how many are willing to listen if they have? Are there programmes on hepatitis for them to listen to on radio or television? Do they know about these programs and its implications? Is there availability of radio networks? These are questions that will tell you that, in a typical village like this, face to face communication is what is needed to educate these people on hepatitis, and it must be done in an informal way so that everyone can participate. (Key Informant Interview, 2016)

The Maxim of Quality

Again, just like datum 1, the medical practitioner has also faulted this maxim in datum 2. This is because it can be suggested that the data above is only an expression of what he or she feels about the present scenario hence not truthful enough. Besides given that radio is the most popular means of communication in rural communities (Soola, 2003; Moegekwu, 1990; Moemeka, 1985). These questions are considered inappropriate: “How many of them listen to radio, how many of them own a radio or how many are willing to listen if they have? Are there programmes on hepatitis for them to listen to on radio or television?”.

The Maxim of Quantity

This maxim just like the maxim of quality is also faulted. This is because the medical practitioner cannot say categorically that the ownership, listenership and the airing of programmes on hepatitis are completely non-existent in the Kagoro-Hill community; therefore, this view cannot be considered credible enough because there are no data to substantiate this claim.

The Maxim of Brevity and Manner

The information provided is brief and precise. Also, there are no cases of ambiguity or vagueness in the statement of the medical practitioner. It would not be out of place to assert that both maxims are upheld in this instance.

Datum 3: (Community member):

We have not really enjoyed any form of conventional communication in this community. Here in our community, it is obvious that we don't have good network services because of that we hardly listen to programmes on health issues like hepatitis. (Danladi Ayuba, focus group discussion, community member Kagoro Hill. 2016).

Manner of Quality

This data faults the information in datum 1 and 2. This community member believes that conventional means of communication can play a vital role if only people have access to it. Consequently, it is the “unavailability” of conventional media that makes it a daunting task to promote hepatitis awareness in the community and not that the people are intentionally unwilling to use them. He however agrees that the absence of accessible “network” is one of the banes of this community. Based on this, the maxim of quality has been upheld because it is factual. It is factual in the sense that the people would have taken advantage of conventional media if they had access to it.

Maxim of Quantity

The submission in datum 3 above is factual and contains relevant information; therefore, it is informative enough, and further justifies why TFD is needful given the absence of conventional media. Thus, TFD in this context is expected to fill the void where conventional media have failed. The statement also proves useful in this context because it can be used to appraise the usefulness of a Focus Group and the TFD's suitability to this local environment.

The Maxim of Brevity and Manner

Again, both maxims are upheld.

Datum 4 (community member):

I listen to Hausa programmes only whenever I am fortunate to get connected to any channel, Hausa is the only language I understand on radio so, even if hepatitis programme is broadcast in English language you don't expect me to understand because it is the white man's language not mine, so I don't even listen to it at all.

The Maxim of Quality

This maxim is factual and gives a more accurate description of the situation on ground and further makes a case for both radio and its listenership which has been

adjudged unsuccessful by medical practitioners already. Perhaps it is expedient to recount the medical personnel's submission once again in datum 2:

I don't think radio or television will be effective in Kagoro-Hill community with regards to educating the people on hepatitis. How many of them listen to radio, how many of them own a radio or how many are willing to listen if they have? Are there programmes on hepatitis for them to listen to on radio or television? Do they know about these programs and its implications? Is there availability of radio networks? These are questions that will tell you that, in a typical village like this, face to face communication is what is needed to educate these people on hepatitis, and it must be done in an informal way so that everyone can participate. (Key Informant Interview, 2016)

Clearly, this statement contrasts with the information presented in datum 2 which has already been faulted on the ground of wrong assumption. This paper shares the view expressed by the community member in his submission in datum 4:

I listen to Hausa programmes only whenever I am fortunate to get connected to any channel, Hausa is the only language I understand on radio so, even if hepatitis programme is broadcast in English language you don't expect me to understand because it is the white man's language not mine, so I don't even listen to it at all.

This is a true reflection of the state of affairs concerning the use of radio in the Kagoro-Hill community. Moreover, that the major problem is network and connection issues (Meyers, 2011).

Maxim of Quantity

The information provided by the community member is informative enough. Also, the community member gives the information just as it is and therefore has not provided more information than is required.

The Maxim of Relevance and Manner

The information provided above is relevant to the ongoing discussion and is also in consonance with one of the objectives in this paper that conventional media like radio is still in use in rural communities. Also, the information given is brief, orderly and it is lucid.

Datum 5 (Community Member):

The veil of darkness covering the people on health issues needs to be removed by strategically educating them towards enhancing their well-being. The issue here is that; is the government ready to sponsor such programme? Because such programmes have to do with money. It is not easy to go to a rural area like KagoroHill to educate people on hepatitis without sponsorship from the government or somewhere. Perhaps that is the reason why many health communicators shy away from such programmes.

Maxim of Quality

This maxim is upheld in that it gives enough evidence to support why people in the Kagorao-Hill community are ignorant of the existence of this epidemic. Typically, he blames the government, the cost implication of such health-related programmes and the lack of sponsorship. These are real and pressing issues. Also, he makes a case for health personnel to the effect that their effort is often frustrated because of the paucity of funds and Nigeriangovernment's slackadaisical attitude towards the health of its people.

The Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity as highlighted earlier rests on two basic principles: 1. *Make your contributions as informative as required*, and 2. *Do not make your contribution more informative than required*. The first principle seems to have been upheld but it appears that the second is flouted. This is because it seems that the community member's contribution is more informative than required; and hence, he gives some unnecessary information that cannot be proven right or wrong. For example, except if he or she has been part of a government's programme on hepatitis that has failed, or a part of people who looked for sponsorship and failed, he or she cannot prove that government is handicapped in its fight against hepatitis by virtue of bankruptcy; therefore, the maxim of quality has been grossly flouted.

To put it more aptly, the community member works on the assumption that the government is not doing enough but what if somebody is sabotaging the effort of the government, embezzling the money meant to sponsor such health programmes? Therefore, to say that the government does not have the financial power to sponsor enlightenment programmes for hepatitis is a wrong assumption.

Maxim of Relevance and Manner

The contribution is relevant and perspicuous, and specifically directed.

Datum 6 (Community Member/Participant):

This kind of thing has never happened in this community before, that a group of people from outside our community will come and stay with us for days eating and drinking and also making friends with us. Our conversation and information sharing was great and educative especially the drama performances. I personally learnt a lot about hepatitis virus and I believe many people in our community were educated on hepatitis after the drama performance (Focus Group Discussion, Kagoro Hill, 2016).

The Maxim of Quality

The speaker above upheld this maxim and therefore gave a factual account of what transpired in the community. Besides, the conversation above shows that cooperation was achieved between the community and the TFD initiators in the community. This affirms Grice's position when he proposes that conversations are cooperative endeavours where participants may be expected (unless they indicate otherwise) to comply with the general principles of cooperation, such as making the appropriate contribution to the conversation". The participants in this context showed a willingness to be part of the process and they did.

The Maxim of Quantity

The information is informative as required. As matter of fact, it so informative that it summarizes all that happened in a single paragraph: visitation, fellowship, performance and impact all of which are encapsulated in the quotation above. For the TFD initiators, it can be guessed that this is certainly the kind of positive impact they had hoped for and which they got in the end. To this end, the maxim of quality is upheld and accounted for in the excerpt presented above. Again, the participant was also careful about making sweeping statements that may appear vague or ambiguous like this one: "I personally learnt a lot about hepatitis virus and I believe many people in our

community were educated on hepatitis after the drama performance (Focus Group Discussion, Kagoro Hill, 2016)".

The Maxim of Relevance and Manner

Again, these two maxims are upheld as the information presented by the participant is relevant to what is asked. Also, the manner in which the message is presented gives no room for any doubt or misunderstanding of any kind.

Datum 7 (Community Member/Participant):

This community will be happy to receive another drama group in order to experience this workshop again; this is because we now understand the power of this theatre programme, it has the capacity to educate our people not only on hepatitis but also on other issues. The visit to our community has opened our eyes to understand ways of contacting and also preventing hepatitis, which we were not aware of before. What we could not learn in schools, or anywhere perhaps because we are in the village, we were able to learn it through this workshop (Key Informant Interview, Kagoro Hill Community 2016).

The Maxim of Quality

This maxim is upheld in the quotation above. In the first four lines, the participant highlighted the positive impact of TFD in the community and its ability to educate and enlighten the people in this community about hepatitis. It can be concluded from this statement that the TFD's campaign against hepatitis in this community is a success. The last three lines also affirmed that without TFD, they would not have learnt anything about hepatitis: "What we could not learn in schools, or anywhere perhaps because we are in the village, we were able to learn it through this workshop (Key Informant Interview, Kagoro Hill Community 2016)".

It seems like he exaggerated the scenario just a little bit more. Not learning about the hepatitis virus in school could be true but the use of "anywhere" is misleading and vague, and can only be measured against the time in which the TFD programme was held in Kagoro-Hill community. Also, teaching and learning does not necessarily occur in the four walls of the classroom (Colley, Hodgkinson and Malcolm; Golding, Brown and Foley; Hager and Halliday).

Given this premise therefore, the position of this paper is that for "any other time", the statement is untrue. This is because the participant is not in a position to tell what is likely to happen tomorrow or in the nearest future. And to say that the reason why the villagers are uninformed is because they are in the village is not completely true because several rural based programmes that are health related have always targeted the rural populace.

The Maxim of Quantity

In addition, this maxim is first upheld then flouted because it appears as if the participant was more informative than required. The participant flouts the maxim in the last three lines that seems to suggest that they are to be considered primitive and unreachable. He, however, seems to affirm that it is only the TFD programme that successfully opened up this community to the world of information on hepatitis. And based on the datum 1 above, this is true:

Our job here is to come and administer drugs to patients who are sick. We come weekly and sometimes after two weeks, and climbing to this community is never an easy task. So, you don't expect us to come up here and do extra work of bringing people together to educate them on hepatitis

The Maxim of Relevance and Manner

Both maxims upheld the submission by the participant above.

Datum 8 (Community Member/Participant):

We have never experienced a workshop like this before. When the theatre group came it was indeed a learning process and entertaining process. I personally before now did not know that hepatitis can be this dangerous and it can be easily contacted. But it is a good thing that after the workshop I now know more about hepatitis and have always been mindful of myself against this dangerous disease (Focus Group Discussion, Kagoro Hill, 2016).

Maxim of Quality

The maxim is flouted because the participant gives two conflicting views:

1. "I personally before now did not know that hepatitis can be this dangerous and it can be easily contacted..."
2. ...have always been mindful of myself against this dangerous disease.

If he didn't know about the disease, how come he is always conscious of it?

Thus, this information is confusing and misleading which explains why it is suggested that the maxim of quantity has been flouted.

Maxim of Quantity, Manner and Relevance

All these maxims are upheld in datum 8 above.

Datum 9 (Community Member/Participant):

In the case of Kagoro hill theatre workshop experience, the entire process from the first day of asking of questions (data collection) to the final day of performances, we (community members) were actively involved in the process. We came to realize that it was only right, that we take part actively in identifying issues that concerns us. It also means that the process is true to us since the problems identified together with us belong to us. I think the process simply means exchange of information (Focus Groups Discussion Kagoro Hill Community, 2016).

The Maxim of Quality

The community representative flouted this maxim in the extract where he claimed that "all" of them were actively involved during the workshop. This very difficult to prove because being active to a large extent is a cognitive process that is personal. Therefore, this statement is questionable: "we (community members) were actively involved in the process". Nevertheless, he upheld the same maxim where he said: "We came to realize that it was only right, that we take part actively in identifying issues that concerns us...."

The Maxim of Quantity

It seems that this maxim was upheld. This is because the community representative was as informative as required. Consequently, his statement clearly shows that indeed the programme took place, that there was mutuality between the host community and the TFD initiators, that the performers were strangers, that the performance delivered on the subject matter and that many issues were raised and addressed during the entire programme. Thus his statement is certainly informative enough and sums up the major preoccupation of TFD in the said community.

The Maxim of Relevance and Manner

The information is precise and it is not in any way vague or ambiguous. Most importantly, what he said was relevant to validate the need for TFD in rural communities to complement health programmes.

Datum 10 (Community Member/Participant):

I was one of the active participants during the workshop. During the workshop, with the visitors (students) we shared games, songs, and dances from our own culture. It was a great experience because this process helped build good rapport and sense of togetherness between us and the visitors. I believe the visitors during this process of sharing of songs, dances also learnt something from our culture (Focus Group Discussion Kagoro Hill Community, 2016).

The Maxim of Quality and Quantity

Given the outcome of the various participants in the ongoing discussion so far, it is right to say that this last submission, by all intent and purposes, is both informative and truthful. The evidences in support of this claim have been given in the ongoing discussion. He also seems to suggest that it was a “win-win situation” in the extract “I believe the visitors during this process of sharing of songs, dances also learnt something from our culture”.

The Maxim of Manner and Relevance

The pieces of information given here are precise or straight to the point. It does not leave any doubt or misconception in the mind of the reader neither is it vague or ambiguous.

Conclusion

In this paper, the Cooperative Principle as proposed by Grice (1975) which has four maxims (quality, quantity, relevance and manner) was relied upon as the primarily tool for data analysis. The data was sourced from a Focused Group. It was further shown that the maxims were either flouted or upheld. While the maxim of relevance and manner remain constant others were not. The methodology employed in this paper has proven that a thorough analysis of linguistic data using linguistic tools of analysis is needful. Through this means, other silent issues can easily be identified and addressed whether explicitly or implicitly stated.

Works cited

Akinfeleye, Ralph. *Contemporary Issues in Mass Media Development and National Security*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited, 2008. Print.

- Akmajian, A., Demers .A. R., Farmer, K.A, and Harnish, M. R. *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001. Print.
- Asiyanbola, A.A. “Democracy, National Development and Globalization: The Roles of Different Tongues in a Biligual/Multilingual Country” in Ayo Ogunsiji, AyiKehinde and Akin Odebunmi (Ed) *Language, Literature and Discourse*.Orugun: Stirling-Horden Publishers Limited, 2013. Print.
- Colley, H., Hodkinson, P., and Malcolm, J. *Informality and Formality in Learning: A Report for the Learning and Skills Research Centre*. London: The Learning & Skills Research Centre, 2003. Print.
- Daramola, C. A. “Role of Communication in Social Change” in Akinfeleye Raph (Ed).*Contemporary Issues in Mass Media Development and National Security*. Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited, 2008. Print.
- Gee, J.P.*An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London: Rutledge, 1999. Print.
- Goddard, C. *Semantic Analysis*. USA: Oxford University Press, 1997. Print.
- Golding, B., Brown, M, & Foley, A. “Informal Learning: A Discussion around Defining and Researching its Breadth and Importance”. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, 49.1(2009):34-56. Print.
- Hager, P., and Halliday, J. *Recovering informal Learning: Wisdom, Judgement and Community*. Dordrecht: Springer, 2006. Print.
- Halliday, M. A. K. *Language as Social Semiotics*. London: Edward Arnold. 1978. Print.
- Huang, Y. *Pragmatics*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2007. Print.
- Ladegaard, H.J. “Pragmatic Cooperation Revisited: Resistance and Non-Cooperation as a Discursive Strategy in Asymmetrical Discourse”. *Journal of Pragmatics*, in Press. 2008. Print.
- Longe, V.U, and Ofuani, O. A.*English Language and Communication*. Benin City: Ilupeju, 1996. Print.
- Meyers, D.G. *Exploring Psychology*. USA: Worth Publishers, 2008. Print.
- Mey, L. Jacob.*Pragmatics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2006. Print.
- Meyers, M.*Voices from Villages: Community Radio in Developing World. A Report to the Centre for International Media Assistance*. Washington: Center for International Assistance (CIMA), 2011. Print.
- Moemeka, A. *Local Radio Communication Education for Development*. Zaria: ABU Press, 1985. Print.
- O’Gardy, W., Achibald, J. and Katanda, F.*Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction*. Ediburgh Gate Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2011. Print.
- Osunkentan, G. O. “Literature, Education and National Development” in LekanOyeleye (Ed) *Language and Discourse in Society*. Ibadan: Hope Publications, 2004. Print.
- Soola, E.O. (2003). *Communication for Development Purposes*. Ibadan: Kraft Book Limited, 2003. Print.
- Sperber, D., and Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986. Print.
- White, S. “Depoliticizing Development: The Use and Abuses of Participation”. *Development in Practice*, 6.1 (1996): 6-15.
- Williams, G. “Evaluating Participatory Development: Tyranny, Power and (Re) Politicisation”.*Third World Quarterly* 25.3 (2004):557-578. Print.
- Yule, G.*The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. Print.