

Grice's Cooperative Principle in *Talk Active 2* Textbook Dialogues

 <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v11i3.2527>

*Elvaretha Lintang Novita, Christianti Tri Hapsari^{ab} 

¹²Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: lintangnovita@students.unnes.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Pragmatic competence is essential in EFL learning because students need to understand how meaning is used appropriately in context. Although many studies have examined pragmatics in English textbooks, limited research has investigated the representation of Grice's maxims in Indonesian EFL textbooks, particularly *Talk Active 2*. This study aims to examine how Grice's Cooperative Principle is represented in the dialogues of *Talk Active 2* and to identify cases of maxim observance and non-observance. A descriptive qualitative design with content analysis was used. The data consisted of all 18 dialogues found in the textbook, which were analyzed based on the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. The findings show that most dialogues observe the maxims, while limited cases of non-observance appear as flouting and opting out. The study concludes that *Talk Active 2* mainly presents cooperative and pedagogically simplified communication for EFL learners.

Keywords: *Grice's Cooperative Principle, Conversational Maxims, Textbook Dialogue, EFL Textbook, Pragmatic Competence*

Article History:

Received 08th April 2026

Accepted 19th June 2026

Published 23rd June 2026



INTRODUCTION

Pragmatic competence is a crucial part of communicative competence because successful communication depends not only on grammatical accuracy but also on the ability to interpret intended meaning, adjust language to context, and respond appropriately to others. In EFL settings, learners may produce grammatically correct utterances but still experience pragmatic failure when they misunderstand what is meant by what is said. Recent review research also indicates that pragmatics pedagogy contributes positively to learners' communicative development, which makes pragmatic representation in teaching materials an important object of study (Thomas, 1983; Yalaw et al., 2024).

In the Indonesian context, pragmatics is also important for English teaching. Ariani, Basthomi, and Prayogo (2021) found that Indonesian EFL teachers considered pragmatic socialization important because learners need to understand sociocultural norms in order to communicate appropriately. However, Berutu and Daulay (2023) reported that teachers still face many barriers in teaching pragmatics, such as students' low English proficiency, limited classroom support, and weak attention to pragmatic competence in teaching materials. These findings show that pragmatics is valued in Indonesia, but it is still not always supported well in classroom practice.

Because of that, textbooks become very important. In many EFL classrooms, textbooks are one of the main sources of language input, so the dialogues inside them can shape how students understand English communication. If textbook dialogues mostly show clear, relevant, and direct exchanges, students may learn that this is the normal model of communication. On the other hand, if pragmatic features are limited, students may get only a narrow picture of how real communication works. Recent international studies show that textbook pragmatics has become an important field of research. Lin, Chen, and Rau (2025)

found that Taiwanese junior high school English textbooks showed patterned and limited representations of pragmatic content such as requests, apologies, and compliments. Li and Chen (2025) also showed that textbook conversation openings and closings may differ from naturally occurring interaction. In Vietnam, Bui and Nguyen (2023) found a limited representation of disagreement in EFL textbooks. These studies suggest that textbook dialogues are often shaped by teaching goals rather than by full natural conversation.

Indonesian studies point in a similar direction. Sersanawawi and Dauly (2023) examined intercultural pragmatic perspectives in an Indonesian junior high school textbook, while Erlinda, Afrinursalim, and Dinarta (2023) studied positive politeness strategies in *English for Nusantara*. Nur Ardini et al. (2022) also reported that teachers and students need pragmatics-based textbooks. In addition, Meiratnasari, Wijayanto, and Suparno (2019) analyzed politeness strategies in Indonesian English textbooks, including *Talk Active 2*. These studies show that Indonesian textbooks can be studied pragmatically, but they mostly focus on politeness, intercultural aspects, or general material needs.

One useful way to study textbook dialogue is through Grice's Cooperative Principle. Grice (1975) explains that conversation usually works through the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. This framework is useful for textbook analysis because textbook dialogues often teach students how to ask for help, give advice, express opinions, and respond appropriately. Recent work by Hu (2024) also reminds researchers that apparent departures from the maxims should not automatically be labeled violations; they may instead be understood as flouting or opting out, depending on the speaker's communicative intention and the transparency of the refusal or indirection.

Despite extensive studies on pragmatics in EFL materials, few studies specifically investigate how Grice's maxims are represented in Indonesian EFL textbooks such as *Talk Active 2*. However, there is still limited research that examines *Talk Active 2* through Grice's Cooperative Principle. Previous studies related to this textbook have focused more on politeness than on the cooperative principle, so they do not show clearly whether the dialogues mainly follow the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. They also do not explain carefully how cases of non-observance in the textbook should be understood. This study addresses that gap by analyzing the complete set of 18 dialogues found in *Talk Active 2*.

Therefore, this study aims to analyze how Grice's Cooperative Principle is represented in the dialogues of *Talk Active 2*. More specifically, the study examines how the four maxims appear in the dialogues, identifies utterances that show observance and non-observance, and explains what these patterns suggest about the way the textbook models communication for learners. By doing so, the study contributes to research on discourse analysis, language in education, and textbook pragmatics in the Indonesian EFL context.

METHOD

Research Design

This study used a descriptive qualitative design with content analysis. It was descriptive because the study aimed to describe how Grice's Cooperative Principle is represented in the dialogues of the textbook. It was qualitative because the data were in the form of words, sentences, and meanings found in the dialogues, not numerical data. The study focused on identifying and interpreting how the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner appeared in the conversations based on Grice's Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice (1975).

This design was suitable because the purpose of the study was not to test a hypothesis or measure students' performance, but to examine and explain pragmatic patterns in textbook dialogues. As Bengtsson (2016) explains, qualitative content analysis is useful for organizing textual data, identifying meaning, and drawing conclusions from the data systematically. This design is also suitable for textbook research because textbook studies often examine how language, content, and learning values are represented in teaching materials. Pan and Zhu

(2022) show that textbook research can reveal important patterns in textbook production, implementation, and evaluation.

Data Collection

The data of this study consist of all 18 dialogues found in the textbook *Talk Active 2*. The data were collected through documentation technique because the source of the data was a written textbook. In this process, the researcher identified, read, and compiled all dialogue texts contained in the textbook and used them as the research data.

The collected dialogues cover several communicative functions commonly found in English learning materials, such as sharing experiences, expressing opinions, giving advice, asking for and giving directions, offering help, and expressing agreement and disagreement. Since this study focuses on the representation of Grice's Cooperative Principle in the textbook, all 18 dialogues were included in the analysis. Therefore, this study did not use sampling, because the complete set of dialogues in the textbook was analyzed. This means that the data were not selected randomly or partially. Instead, the study analyzed the complete dialogue data in the textbook to provide a fuller description of how cooperative communication is represented in *Talk Active 2*.

After the data were collected, each dialogue was numbered according to its order in the textbook. This step helped the researcher organize the data more clearly and made the analysis easier to follow.

Instruments

The main instrument of this study was the researcher. The researcher read and interpreted all 18 dialogues in the textbook and analyzed them using Grice's Cooperative Principle. To support the analysis, the researcher used a coding guide based on the four maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner (Grice, 1975). Quantity was used to see whether the speaker gave enough information, Quality to see whether the utterance was truthful or reasonable, Relation to see whether the response was relevant, and Manner to see whether the utterance was clear and orderly.

In addition, this study used the categories of observance and non-observance. An utterance was categorized as observance when it followed the relevant maxim appropriately. It was categorized as non-observance when it did not follow the maxim. Following later discussion of Gricean pragmatics, non-observance may appear in different forms, such as flouting, violation, and opting out (Hu, 2024). In this study, these categories were used to help the researcher classify the utterances consistently and explain how cooperative communication was represented in the textbook dialogues. The coding guide was used to make the classification more consistent and transparent. Elo et al. (2014) explain that clear organization and transparent reporting are important for trustworthiness in qualitative content analysis.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis. According to Bengtsson (2016), qualitative content analysis is used to identify meaning in texts through a systematic process of reading, coding, grouping, and interpreting the data. In this study, the analysis was conducted in several steps.

First, all 18 dialogues were read repeatedly to understand their context and communicative purpose. Second, each dialogue was divided into relevant utterances. Third, the utterances were coded based on Grice's (1975) four maxims, namely Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Fourth, each utterance was classified as either maxim observance or non-observance. An utterance was classified as observance when it followed the relevant maxim appropriately. It was classified as non-observance when it did not fully follow the maxim.

Fifth, the non-observant utterances were further interpreted as flouting, violation, or opting out. This step was supported by Hu (2024), who explains that non-observance of the

maxims may appear in different forms and should not always be treated in the same way. Finally, the researcher grouped the findings, compared the patterns across all 18 dialogues, and drew conclusions from the overall tendency of the data. To support the trustworthiness of the analysis, examples of utterances and explanations of the coding decisions were provided.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Application of Grice's Maxims in the dialogues

The analysis shows that the dialogues in *Talk Active 2* are dominated by maxim observance. Most conversations are organized around clear instructional goals, such as asking for help, giving advice, giving directions, or expressing opinions. In these dialogues, speakers generally provide sufficient information, stay relevant to the topic, and express themselves in clear and manageable language. In many cases, the utterances show observance of more than one maxim at the same time. Non-observance is present, but it appears only in limited and functionally motivated cases.

This pattern shows that the dialogues are designed to be easy for learners to follow. The frequent use of clear answers, direct explanations, and step-by-step advice suggests that the textbook gives learners-controlled examples of English communication. This finding is relevant to Schauer's (2022) view that materials can support young learners' pragmatic development, especially when they provide examples that help learners notice how language is used in context. In this study, the textbook mainly supports pragmatic learning by presenting conversations that are clear, relevant, and cooperative.

In Dialogue 1, Anita generally observes the maxims when she explains her trip. Her statement, "*Yes, that's right. We spent our time mostly at Ubud, but we also visit Lombok for a week,*" fulfills Quantity because it gives enough information about the destination and fulfills Relation because it directly answers Jake's question. Another utterance, "*It's very beautiful, especially at Ubud,*" also supports Manner because the description is clear and understandable.

In Dialogue 2, Dave observes the maxims when he clarifies his idea of a good friend. His utterance, "*Sure. I enjoy friends who like to go out and have fun together,*" fulfills Quantity because it gives examples that clarify his earlier answer. It also fulfills Manner because the explanation is easy to follow.

In Dialogue 3, Laura observes the maxims in the early part of the conversation. Her utterance, "*A good friend helps you when you have a problem,*" fulfills Relation because it answers Jenny's question about friendship and fulfills Quality because it is presented as Laura's sincere opinion. However, her final response becomes a case of opting out because she refuses to share personal information.

In Dialogue 4, Stanley observes the maxims by giving a clear opinion and a reason. His statement, "*I completely agree. Friends need to be completely honest,*" fulfills Relation because it directly answers Jenny's question, while his later explanation about being lied to fulfills Quantity because it supports his opinion with sufficient information.

Dialogues 5 to 12 show strong maxim fulfillment in help-giving, advice-giving, consultation, and direction-giving contexts. For example, Anita's offer, "*You can use mine if you want to,*" in Dialogue 5 fulfills Relation because it directly responds to Bill's problem. Fani's advice, "*You'd better start by choosing the subject,*" in Dialogue 6 fulfills Manner because it is sequential. The doctor's instruction in Dialogue 7 and the security officer's direction in Dialogue 12 also fulfill Quantity and Manner because they provide enough information in a clear order.

Dialogues 13 to 15 show that speakers can remain cooperative even when they express uncertainty or limit information. In Dialogue 13, the sister's statement, "*I think it's at 8,*" fulfills Quality because she marks uncertainty honestly. In Dialogue 15, the business colleague's response, "*I believe we're beginning the project next month,*" also fulfills Quality because the speaker signals the level of certainty rather than presenting the answer as absolute.

Dialogues 16 and 17 show that disagreement does not automatically mean non-cooperation. In Dialogue 16, the father and daughter disagree about what television program to watch, but they still give reasons related to the topic. In Dialogue 17, Lea's statement, "I agree with that, but not under the park," fulfills Relation because it responds directly to Johnny's argument. These examples show that disagreement can still be cooperative when the speakers remain relevant and provide reasons.

In Dialogue 18, the dialogue begins with maxim fulfillment before the final sarcastic response. Nick's utterance, "I think playing active video games is much better than not doing any exercise at all," fulfills Relation because it responds to Joe's disagreement and fulfills Quantity because it gives a clear reason. Sarah's question, "What is an interactive video game?" also fulfills Relation because it asks for clarification related to the discussion.

To present the findings more clearly, the dialogues were grouped into three main patterns. The first category refers to dialogues that mostly show maxim observance. The second category refers to dialogues that mainly observe the maxims but contain minor cases of non-observance. The third category refers to dialogues that show a mixed pattern, where non-observance appears more clearly. The percentage was calculated by dividing the number of dialogues in each category by the total number of dialogues analyzed, which is 18, and then multiplying the result by 100.

Table 1. Distribution of Main Patterns in the Dialogues

Category	Dialogues	Number of Dialogues	Percentage
Mostly observance	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17	12	66.7%
Mostly observance with minor non-observance	1, 2, 13, 15	4	22.2%
Mixed / clearer non-observance	3, 18	2	11.1%
Total	1-18	18	100%

As shown in the table, 12 dialogues, or 66.7%, belong to the category of mostly observance. This indicates that the majority of the textbook dialogues follow Grice's maxims. Four dialogues, or 22.2%, show mostly observance with minor non-observance, while only two dialogues, or 11.1%, show a mixed pattern with clearer non-observance. This distribution confirms that cooperative communication is the dominant pattern in Talk Active 2.

Frequency of Maxim-Fulfillment

Table 2 presents the dialogue-level frequency of each maxim found in the data. The total is more than 18 because one dialogue may fulfill more than one maxim. The table is intended to show which maxims are most visible across the dialogues, not to count every single utterance.

Table 2. Dialogue-Level Frequency of Maxim Fulfillment

Maxim	Number of Dialogues	Percentage	Explanation
Relation	18	100%	All dialogues contain responses that are connected to the topic or question.
Quantity	15	83.3%	Most dialogues give enough information to answer questions or support opinions.
Manner	11	61.1%	Many dialogues use clear, orderly, and understandable responses.
Quality	4	22.2%	Some dialogues clearly mark sincerity, truthfulness, or uncertainty.

The frequency table indicates that Relation is the most dominant maxim because all dialogues are organized around relevant responses. Quantity also appears strongly because many speakers provide enough information to answer questions or explain opinions. Manner is visible in dialogues that present directions, advice, and procedures in an orderly way. Quality appears less frequently as an explicit category because not every dialogue contains utterances that clearly require the speaker to mark truthfulness, certainty, or sincerity.

Representative Cases of Non-Observance

Although observance dominates the data, several utterances display limited non-observance. These cases are important because they add interpersonal texture to the dialogues. However, they are neither pervasive nor random; each appears to serve a recognizable communicative function.

In Dialogue 1, Anita says, *"It was totally amazing! The holiday of a lifetime"* and later says, *"Tons"* when asked about souvenirs. These utterances can be understood as flouting the maxim of Quality because they use exaggeration to express strong enthusiasm rather than literal factual meaning. In this case, the speaker is not necessarily being dishonest, but is using hyperbole for emphasis, which is consistent with Grice's (1975) idea that a maxim may appear not to be followed while still creating extra meaning.

In Dialogue 3, Laura responds, *"Well, that's kind of personal,"* when Jenny asks what kinds of problems her best friends help her with. This utterance can be understood as opting out of the maxim of Quantity because Laura openly refuses to give the requested information. A similar case appears in Dialogue 15, when the business colleague says, *"I'm afraid I can't answer that. Perhaps you should speak to my director."* This also shows opting out, because the speaker clearly states that he cannot provide the answer and redirects the question to a more appropriate person. As Hu (2024) explains, non-observance should be treated carefully because different forms of non-observance have different communicative meanings.

Another example appears in Dialogue 13, when the sister says, *"You're so lazy. Just a second."* This utterance can be seen as a minor flouting of Relation or Manner because the teasing comment is not necessary to answer the question, although it still fits the interpersonal context of the conversation. The clearest case of stronger non-observance appears in Dialogue 18, when Joe says, *"Sarah, dear, there are a lot of things you need to learn. You know what, let me google it for you."* This response does not directly answer Sarah's question and instead uses sarcasm, so it weakens both Relation and Manner. Compared with the other examples, this is the strongest case of reduced cooperation in the data.

The examples above show that non-observance in *Talk Active 2* is limited and does not dominate the dialogues. The cases found in the textbook are not always direct violations of Grice's maxims. Some utterances are better interpreted as flouting, such as Anita's exaggeration in Dialogue 1 and Joe's sarcasm in Dialogue 18, while others are better understood as opting out, such as Laura's refusal to share personal information in Dialogue 3 and the business colleague's refusal to provide unavailable information in Dialogue 15. This finding supports the idea that non-observance can serve different communicative purposes, such as showing enthusiasm, protecting personal boundaries, giving polite limitation, or expressing sarcasm. Therefore, the textbook still mainly presents cooperative communication, while the limited cases of non-observance add interpersonal meaning to the dialogues.

The examples also show that the textbook gives only limited exposure to implied meaning. Yang (2022) explains that EFL learners may have difficulty understanding pragmatic meaning and conversational implicature because implied meaning is not always expressed directly. In the present study, most dialogues are direct and clear, while only a few utterances require learners to infer extra meaning, such as Anita's exaggeration in Dialogue 1 and Joe's sarcasm in Dialogue 18. This suggests that the textbook gives some examples of indirect meaning, but these examples are not dominant in the dialogue data.

Table 3. Types of Non-Observance in the Dialogues

Type of Non-Observance	Dialogue(s)	Example	Interpretation
Flouting	1, 13, 18	"The holiday of a lifetime"; "You're so lazy"; "Let me google it for you."	The speaker appears to depart from a maxim to add emphasis, teasing, or sarcasm.
Opting out	3, 15	"That's kind of personal"; "I'm afraid I can't answer that."	The speaker openly refuses or limits the requested information.
Violation	-	No clear case found	No utterance was classified as a clear covert violation in the data.

Table 4. Sample Dialogue Excerpts Used in the Analysis

Dialogue	Utterance	Maxim / Category	Reason for Coding
1	"We spent our time mostly at Ubud, but we also visit Lombok for a week."	Quantity and Relation	The speaker gives enough information and answers the question directly.
6	"You'd better start by choosing the subject. Then, you can try the activities."	Manner and Quantity	The advice is orderly and sufficiently informative.
12	"Just follow this corridor. At the end of this corridor you will find an escalator..."	Manner and Quantity	The direction is clear and complete enough for the listener.
3	"That's kind of personal."	Opting out / Quantity	The speaker openly limits the amount of information provided.
18	"Let me google it for you."	Flouting / Relation and Manner	The response uses sarcasm and does not directly answer the question.

Discussions

The findings show that maxim observance is the dominant pattern in the dialogues of *Talk Active 2*. The dominance of maxim observance can be explained by the nature of textbook dialogue. Textbook dialogues are usually designed to be clear, structured, and easy for learners to understand. Therefore, the speakers in the dialogues tend to provide direct answers, relevant responses, and orderly explanations. This makes the dialogues useful as models of basic cooperative communication for EFL learners. Most dialogues follow Grice's maxims because the speakers usually provide enough information, stay relevant to the topic, and express their ideas clearly. This pattern can be understood from the nature of textbook dialogue. Since textbooks are created for teaching, the dialogues are often designed to be clear, simple, and easy for learners to follow. Therefore, the dominance of Quantity, Relation, and Manner in this study suggests that the textbook presents cooperative communication as a model for students. This finding is in line with Grice's (1975) view that successful conversation depends on speakers' cooperative contribution through the maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner.

The dominance of maxim observance can also be related to the general function of textbooks as planned learning materials. Pan and Zhu (2022) explain that textbook research is important because textbooks reflect the design, implementation, and evaluation of language education. In this study, the dialogues in *Talk Active 2* appear to reflect this planned nature. The speakers usually answer in clear and organized ways, which makes the conversations useful for classroom learning. However, this planned structure also means that the dialogues may not fully represent the complexity of natural interaction.

This finding supports previous studies which show that EFL textbooks often present language in a controlled and pedagogical way. Lin, Chen, and Rau (2025), for example, found that pragmatic content in Taiwanese junior high school English textbooks was represented through some selected speech acts, such as requests, apologies, and compliments. Their study shows that textbook pragmatics is often organized around specific teaching goals rather than natural conversation. Similarly, Li and Chen (2025) found that conversation openings and closings in EFL/ESL textbooks may not fully reflect natural interaction. Compared with those studies, the present study also shows that textbook dialogues tend to be pedagogically shaped. However, while Lin et al. (2025) focused on speech acts and Li and Chen (2025) focused on authenticity, this study focuses on how cooperative communication is represented through Grice's maxims.

This result is also consistent with earlier textbook pragmatics research. Ren and Han (2016) found that pragmatic knowledge was under-represented in recent ELT textbooks, especially in relation to speech acts and metapragmatic information. Ton Nu and Murray (2020) also reported a lack of pragmatic information in Vietnamese national EFL textbooks. Similarly, Jiang and Deng (2022) found that speech acts were under-represented in Chinese senior high school textbooks and that contextual and metapragmatic information was not always sufficient. Compared with these studies, the present study shows a related but slightly different issue. *Talk Active 2* does provide clear cooperative dialogue models, but it gives limited examples of more complex pragmatic use such as indirectness, sarcasm, and non-literal meaning.

In the Indonesian context, the findings are also connected to Meiratnasari, Wijayanto, and Suparno's (2019) study, which analyzed politeness strategies in Indonesian English textbooks, including *Talk Active 1* and *Talk Active 2*. Their study found that different politeness strategies were represented in the textbooks. The present study supports their finding that *Talk Active* dialogues can be analyzed pragmatically, but it gives a different contribution because it does not focus on politeness. Instead, this study shows how the textbook represents cooperative communication through maxim observance and limited non-observance. In this way, the present study extends previous research on *Talk Active* by using Grice's Cooperative Principle as the main framework.

The finding also supports recent Indonesian textbook research. Sudartini, Sutrisno, and Roselani (2024) found that speech acts in Indonesian high school EFL textbooks were presented through speaking materials and dialogue examples, but they also emphasized the need to improve the representation of functional speech acts in Indonesian high school EFL education. The present study supports this concern from a Gricean perspective. Although the dialogues in *Talk Active 2* provide good examples of cooperative communication, they still offer limited variation in pragmatic complexity. This means that textbook dialogues can be helpful, but teachers may need to enrich them with additional examples of natural interaction.

The limited cases of non-observance are also important to discuss. In Dialogue 1, Anita's expressions such as "*the holiday of a lifetime*" and "*tons*" show exaggeration, which can be understood as flouting the maxim of Quality rather than direct violation. In Dialogue 3, Laura's response "*that's kind of personal*" shows refusal to share personal information, which is better understood as opting out. In Dialogue 13, the sister's comment "*You're so lazy*" adds a teasing tone, although the main information about the movie time is still given. These examples show that non-observance in the textbook does not strongly disrupt communication. Instead, it adds small interpersonal meanings such as enthusiasm, personal boundary, and teasing. Hu's (2024) explanation of non-observance is useful here because it shows that flouting, violation, and opting out should not be treated as the same category.

From a teaching perspective, this finding suggests that textbook dialogues should be used as starting points rather than the only source of pragmatic input. Ishihara and Cohen (2014) argue that pragmatics teaching should help learners understand how language choices are connected to social and cultural contexts. Halenko and Wang (2022) also show that pragmatic competence can be developed both inside and outside the classroom. Therefore, teachers can use the dialogues in *Talk Active 2* to introduce basic cooperative communication,

Grice's Cooperative Principle in Talk Active 2 Textbook Dialogues

but they can also ask students to compare textbook dialogues with more natural examples from videos, role plays, or real-life situations.

This study suggests that *Talk Active 2* mainly gives learners examples of ideal and cooperative communication. This can be useful for students because the dialogues model how to answer questions, give advice, express opinions, and ask for information clearly. However, the textbook gives limited exposure to more complex pragmatic features, such as indirectness, stronger sarcasm, misunderstanding, or more natural conversational problems. This means that teachers may need to add other materials, such as real conversations, videos, or classroom role plays, to help students understand how English is used in more natural contexts. Thus, the textbook is useful as a basic model of cooperative communication, but it should be supported with richer pragmatic input in classroom practice.

Finally, the findings have implications for learners' pragmatic development. Wang, Al-Shaibani, and Jiang (2024) show that pragmatic competence in EFL and ESL learning is influenced by different factors, including learning context and exposure. Yang (2022) also suggests that learners' beliefs and opportunities for pragmatic learning can influence their understanding of implied meaning. In relation to the present study, the clear and cooperative dialogues in *Talk Active 2* can support basic pragmatic awareness, but learners may still need richer exposure to different types of meaning, including indirect responses, hesitation, sarcasm, and disagreement. This makes the teacher's role important in expanding the pragmatic value of textbook dialogues.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the representation of Grice's Cooperative Principle in all 18 dialogues found in *Talk Active 2*. The findings show that the dialogues mostly present cooperative, orderly, and pedagogically shaped interaction. Most speakers provide sufficient information, stay relevant to the topic, and express their ideas clearly. Therefore, maxim observance becomes the dominant pattern in the textbook. The study also found that non-observance appears only in limited cases. These cases are not always direct violations of Grice's maxims. Some utterances are better understood as flouting, such as exaggeration and sarcasm, while others are better understood as opting out, such as refusing to share personal or unavailable information. This shows that the textbook includes some pragmatic variation, but the variation remains limited and controlled. The contribution of this study lies in showing that *Talk Active 2* mainly models ideal cooperative communication for EFL learners. Pedagogically, the textbook can support the teaching of basic pragmatic appropriateness because it provides clear examples of how speakers ask questions, give advice, express opinions, and respond relevantly. However, teachers may need to add more authentic materials to expose learners to richer pragmatic features, such as indirectness, misunderstanding, and natural conversational complexity. Future research may compare *Talk Active 2* with other Indonesian EFL textbooks or combine Grice's framework with speech act, politeness, or multimodal analysis.

REFERENCES

- Ariani, M., Basthomi, Y., & Prayogo, J. A. (2021). The role of pragmatic socialization in building learners' pragmatic competence from English teachers' perspectives. *Pegem Egitim ve Ogretim Dergisi*, 11(4), 197–208. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.11.04.19>
- Bengtsson, M. (2016). How to plan and perform a qualitative study using content analysis. *NursingPlus Open*, 2, 8–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.npls.2016.01.001>
- Berutu, H., & Daulay, S. H. (2023). Pragmatics teaching barriers in EFL classroom. *Tell-Us Journal*, 9(2), 348–363. <https://doi.org/10.22202/tus.2023.v9i2.6725>
- Bui, L. T. N., & Nguyen, M. T. T. (2023). A pragmatic analysis of Vietnamese EFL textbooks: The case of disagreement. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, 20(4), 754–772. http://journal.asiatefl.org/sub/journal_detail.html?code=441325
- Elo, S., Kääriäinen, M., Kanste, O., Pölkki, T., Utriainen, K., & Kyngäs, H. (2014). Qualitative

- content analysis: A focus on trustworthiness. *Sage Open*, 4(1), 2158244014522633. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014522633>
- Erlinda, R., Afrinarsalim, H., & Dinarta, F. (2023). The positive politeness strategies used in "English for Nusantara" textbook. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 8(3), 265. <https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v8i3.1158>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation* (pp. 41-58). Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811_003
- Halenko, N., & Wang, J. (2022). *Pragmatics in English language learning*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108894241>
- Hu, Y. (2024). A socio-cognitive reinterpretation of Grice's theory of conversation. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 21(1), 99-119. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/ip-2024-0004>
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. (2014). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833842>
- Jiang, S., & Deng, L. (2022). Pragmatic analysis of EFL textbooks: The explicit representation of speech acts in senior high textbooks in China. *European Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics Studies*, 126-145. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejll.v6i2.392>
- Li, M., & Chen, Y. (2025). In the wild? Evaluating the authenticity of conversation openings and closings in EFL/ESL textbooks. *Linguistics and Education*, 86, 101392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2025.101392>
- Lin, M.-F., Chen, Y., & Rau, M. (2025). Pragmatic content in Taiwan's EFL junior high school textbooks. *English Teaching & Learning*, 49(4), 651-681. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-024-00198-5>
- Meiratnasari, A., Wijayanto, A., & Suparno, S. (2019). An analysis of politeness strategies in Indonesian English textbooks. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, 2(4 SE-Articles), 529-540. <https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v2i4.8393>
- Nur Ardini, S., Senowarsito, S., Suwandi, S., & Musarokah, S. (2022). Pragmatics based textbooks: Do they fulfil the needs of teachers and students? *KnE Social Sciences*, 2022, 520-531. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v7i14.12005>
- Pan, M. X., & Zhu, Y. (2022). Researching English language textbooks : A systematic review in the Chinese context. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00156-3>
- Ren, W., & Han, Z. (2016). The representation of pragmatic knowledge in recent ELT textbooks. *ELT Journal*, 70(4), 424-434. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw010>
- Schauer, G. A. (2022). Teaching L2 pragmatics to young learners A review study. *Applied Pragmatics*, 2(April), 137-158. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ap.00006.sch>
- Sersanawawi, L., & Daulay, S. H. (2023). Indonesian junior high school EFL textbook: Intercultural pragmatic perspective. *Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature Studies*, 3(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.30984/jeltis.v3i1.2315>
- Sudartini, S., Sutrisno, A., & Roselani, N. G. A. (2024). Speech acts in Indonesian high school EFL textbooks: Representation and learning implications. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Penelitian Inovasi Pembelajaran*, 8(1 SE-Original Article), 67-82. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jk.v8i1.73925>
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 91-112. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.91>
- Wang, Y., Al-Shaibani, G., & Jiang, N. (2024). Pragmatic competence of EFL and ESL learners and its influencing factors: A systematic review. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 122-140.
- Yalew, M. Y., Amogne, D., & Simegn Chanie, B. (2024). The 'why', 'what' and 'how' of pragmatics pedagogy in EFL/L2: meta-analysis review. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 42(4), 467-494. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2024.2316678>
- Yang, H. (2022). *Second language learners' competence of and beliefs about pragmatic comprehension: Insights from the Chinese EFL context*. 12(January). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.801315>