



Making Sense of Flouting Conversation Maxims of Teacher-Student Interactions in Movies: A Mixed Methods

CRISTY GRACE A. NGO

Faculty, The University of Mindanao, Davao City, Philippines

JOHN HARRY S. CABALLO

Faculty, The University of Mindanao, Davao City, Philippines

john_caballo@umindanao.edu.ph

ANA LOUELLA N. NAVARRO

Faculty, The University of Mindanao, Davao City, Philippines

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v5i4.1430>

APA Citation: NGO, C.G., CABALLO, J. H., & NAVARRO, A. L. (2023). Making Sense of Flouting Conversation Maxims of Teacher-Student Interactions in Movies: A Mixed Methods. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*. 5(4).131-149. <http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v5i4.1430>

Received:

25/10/2023

Accepted:

14/12/2023

Keywords:

Flouting, Teacher Student Interaction, Conversation Maxim, Cooperative principle .

Abstract

This study aimed to ascertain the evident flouting maxim statements by the teachers and students during classroom interaction in movies and how teachers and students react to and use flouting maxim statements. It also aimed to determine the significant difference between the occurrence of observed and non-observed flouting in classroom interactions. Using the embedded mixed methods design, the quantitative phase was a descriptive study, and the qualitative phase employed phenomenology. In the qualitative phase, the identification of evident flouting maxim statements was collected through the transcribed utterances of observed and non-observed conversation maxims of the characters (teacher and students) in five selected movies, which are in a classroom setting. Thereafter, in finding out how the participants react and use flouting maxims, FGD and IDI were conducted. The FGD was composed of 7 members: 3 teachers and 4 students; while the IDI was composed of 14 members: 7 teachers and 7 students. In the quantitative phase, 100 participants – 80 students and 20 teachers – watched the films separately as a basis to figure out the frequency distribution of the observed and non-observed conversation maxims and the significant difference in the number of observed flouting maxims between the teachers and students. Results yielded that out of the 35 dialogues, 11 dialogues observed the cooperative principle and its conversation maxims while 24 dialogues deviated. The researchers unearthed the six essential themes in teachers' and students' reactions to and use of flouting maxim statements. Results revealed that there is no significant difference in the number of observed flouting maxims between teachers and students in terms of maxims of quality, quantity, relation, and manner.

1. INTRODUCTION

Human interaction relies significantly on a great amount of language. Daily, language is used to execute thoughts, deliver actions, and express emotions (Bradley, 2017). Ideally, to achieve these, interlocutors must be cooperative in the process of communication. However, in real communication, people are usually not conversationally cooperative. They do not provide the necessary amount of information, lack veracity, insert irrelevant topics, or are ambiguous; as a result, misunderstandings and arguments occur (Ayasreh & Razali, 2018). In Gricean pragmatics, this uncooperativeness is called flouting.

Numerous studies have examined how Grice's conversational maxims are intentionally flouted by speakers for various strategic communicative purposes. Abu-Joudeh and Fanoun (2018) analyzed two satirical plays. They found the characters frequently flouted the maxims of quality and relation to criticize the government and elicit laughter and humour. Through flouting these maxims in a satirical context, the characters were able to implicitly express criticism and mockery in a socially engaging way. Another study by Ayasreh and Razali (2018) focused on a political interview with Syria's president during the Arab Spring. Their analysis revealed the president flouted all four Gricean maxims - quality, quantity, relation, and manner - throughout the interview. The researchers concluded the president's motive was to portray his stance and the state's actions in a favourable light, implying he was not against the people's interests despite the unrest. Flouting the maxims allowed him to indirectly signal meanings that diverged from reality.

A study of the Pirates of the Caribbean film series by Apriyani et al. (2006) identified various cases of maxim flouting by the pirate characters. The motives included insulting, warning, boasting, conveying facts, informing plans, expressing emotions, demanding respect, creating humour, and avoiding sadness. This demonstrates the wide range of interpersonal and emotional goals that can be achieved through strategic maxim flouting in fictional conversations. Finally, Lestari's (2014) research specifically focused on flouting the quality maxim in the Twilight Saga films, which requires truthfulness in conversations. The most common strategy was violating the maxim entirely (25 cases). Characters also flouted through untruthfulness (8 cases), exaggeration (1 case), irony (1 case), and teasing (3 cases). Notably, there were no instances of metaphor flouting, suggesting this may not be an effective means of implicit communication in films.

In the academic milieu, these unfavourable conditions of flouting are also perceived during classroom discourses between teachers and students. Consequently, the flow of class discussion is disrupted. Flouting also affects the relationship between individuals and the atmosphere of the classroom. It confuses power relations or politeness and unnecessary irritation at the teacher's end (Kamila, 2014). Safitri, Seken, and Putra (2014) investigated the observance and non-observance of Gricean maxims within instructional contexts. Their research revealed that teachers frequently resorted to flouting the maxims by refraining from issuing direct instructions in the classroom, with the expectation that students would grasp the implicit meaning. Conversely, the students themselves displayed a lack of adherence to the maxims, primarily due to their challenges in expressing themselves clearly or their limited proficiency in the English language.

Divergent opinions among scholars are prevalent concerning the real-world applicability of Gricean pragmatics. For instance, McCarthy (1991), in his introduction to discourse analysis tailored for language educators, categorized Gricean pragmatics as quite interesting but noted its little practical adaptability in the context of language teaching. McCarthy further asserted that, throughout a decade of experience, he had encountered no situations where the Gricean maxims could be effectively employed. Conversely, Nunn (2014) presented a contrasting viewpoint, arguing that as an educator, he has discovered the significance of Gricean pragmatics. He contended that this discipline is indispensable for teachers, as it enables them to comprehend the content they are teaching and the dynamics within their classrooms. Furthermore, Nunn highlighted that it is difficult to perceive pragmatics as irrelevant to a profession that is fundamentally concerned with individuals, language, and language use.

The findings of this study may solidify the importance of effective communication, a profoundly humane skill. They underscore the vital role of communicative cooperation in preventing misunderstandings and arguments. Specifically, the findings can shape the identities and relationships of both teachers and students, quantify the observance of Grice's maxims, and complement the narrative results with statistical data. These findings may help in the awareness of the relationship and remind both parties to be cooperative to attain the goal of the conversation.

1.1. Research Questions

This study sought to answer the following research questions.

1. What flouting maxim statements are evident in the transcription of teacher-student classroom interaction as depicted in five selected movies?
2. How do the participants react to flouting maxim statements?
3. How do the participants use flouting maxim statements?
4. What is the frequency distribution of the observance and non-observance of Grice's conversation maxims?
5. What is the frequency distribution of flouting maxims?
6. Is there a significant difference in the number of observed flouting maxims between the teachers and students?
7. How do the qualitative data support the quantitative data?

2. RESEARCH METHOD

In this study, a mixed methods approach, particularly the embedded design, was employed. Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner (2007) define mixed methods research as a type of research in which a researcher combines elements from both qualitative and quantitative approaches to achieve a deeper and more comprehensive understanding, as well as to corroborate findings. Additionally, Creswell (2014) highlighted that mixed methods research offers advantages over using either qualitative or quantitative approaches alone; it leverages the strengths of both and compensates for their weaknesses.

The corpora of films centred on classroom interactions between teachers and students namely: *The Emperor's Club* (2002), *Dead Poet's Society* (1989), *Freedom Writers* (2007), *Dangerous Minds* (1995), and *The Ron Clark Story* (2006) were analyzed using Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle. The Cooperative Principle (CP) is an assumed basic concept in pragmatics (Davies, 2000), which describes how effective the flow of the conversation is when executing the said principle during an oral exchange. The CP explains how speakers and listeners should cooperatively and mutually accept each and one another or should observe the conversational maxims therein to be particularly understood (Morgan, 1975).

In the qualitative phase of this research, a phenomenological approach was adopted. Phenomenology was employed to capture and describe how individuals experience a specific phenomenon while striving to eliminate biases and preconceived assumptions regarding human experiences, emotions, and responses in a given situation. This method entails a direct exploration and portrayal of phenomena as they are consciously lived by the individuals undergoing those experiences. In this phenomenological study, the researchers used a combination of methods such as conducting interviews and watching movies to understand the

meaning participants place on what will be examined. They utilized focus group discussions (FGD) and in-depth interviews (IDI) with seven participants: three teachers and four students.

The quantitative phase of this study is descriptive. A descriptive study is a type of research in which information is collected without changing or manipulating the environment. The purpose of this is to 'describe' events, people, or subjects as they exist. It does not make accurate predictions and does not determine cause and effect. Further, it attempts to collect quantifiable information to be used for statistical analysis of the population sample. In this study, 100 participants were chosen. Specifically, 20 Senior High School (SHS) teachers and 80 students in a private non-sectarian academic institution. This involved students from Grade 12 Humanities and Social Sciences (HUMSS) and Accountancy and Business Management (ABM) students under the subjects which use English as the medium of instruction such subjects as English, Literature, Research, Mathematics, and Science. Frequency distribution was utilized in counting the evident flouting maxim statements extracted from the five selected corpora of films. Also, ANOVA was used in calculating the significant difference in the number of observed flouting maxims between the teachers and students.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section highlights the 24 evident flouting maxim statements in the dialogue transcription, the three essential themes, the frequency distribution of the observance and non-observance of conversation maxims, the significant difference in the number of observed flouting maxims, and the data integration of the salient quantitative and qualitative data from the careful scrutiny and analysis of data from the survey, in-depth interview, and focus group discussion.

Flouting Maxim Statements Evident in the Transcription of Teacher-Student Classroom Interaction as Depicted in Five Selected Movies

The corpora of films centered on classroom interaction are *The Emperor's Club* (2002), *Dead Poets Society* (1989), *Freedom Writers* (2007), *Dangerous Minds* (1995), and *The Ron Clark Story* (2006). Seven dialogues of classroom interaction between the teacher and the students were taken from each film. The word, phrase, or sentence that is written in bold and italicized is the specific statement that flouts a specific maxim. As reflected in Table 1, the flouting maxim statements are evident in the teacher-student classroom interaction as depicted in the abovementioned films.

In *The Emperor's Club*, dialogues one, two, four, and seven flout none of the maxims; whereas dialogues three, five, and six flout the maxim of quality. The flouting maxim statements show sarcasm (Maren, Olsen, & College, 2015), mockery, and no sincerity and his response does not correspond to reality (Brown & Yule, 1983 and Tupan & Natalia, 2008). For example, when the teacher asked to name the 41 Roman emperors, the student sarcastically answered the names of the seven dwarfs. Further, the character provides an answer that he believes is false (Radford, 2009). Hence, he is not truthful and gives false information in the conversation.

In *Dead Poets Society*, dialogues one and two flout none of the maxims; whereas dialogues three, four, five, and seven flout the maxim of quantity. The flouting maxim statements indicate 'no answer' as the response. According to Ephratt (2012), when an individual is silent or does not respond to a certain statement or question addressed to him/her, it can be considered as a way of flouting the maxim of quantity since it contributes less amount

of information than the required (Parker & Riley, 2010). As a result, they do not achieve the goal of the conversation (Spector, 2015). On another note, in dialogue six, the response "never mind" is an indication of interjecting or cutting off the ongoing topic resulting in stopping the conversation which flouts the maxim of relation (Imelda, 2003).

In *Dangerous Minds*, dialogues two and four flout none of the maxims; whereas dialogues one, three, five, six, and seven flout the maxim of quantity. First, in dialogues one, three, six, and seven, the flouting maxim statements contribute more information than the required and are deemed unnecessary (Parker & Riley, 2010) which results in impoliteness because the added responses than the required are curses. Second, in dialogue five, the flouting maxim statement does not achieve the goal of the conversation since it provides less information than the required in the form of silence (Ephratt, 2012).

In *Freedom Writers*, dialogue six flout none of the maxims; whereas dialogues one, five, and seven flout the maxim of quantity. The flouting maxim statements contribute more and less information than the required (Parker & Riley, 2010) which leads to disrespect since they add verbal insults that are unnecessary rather than simply answering 'yes' or 'no' to the teacher. On another note, in dialogues two, three, and four, the flouting maxim statements manifest irrelevant and misleading responses (Mehawesh & Jaradat, 2017) which flout the maxim of relation.

In *The Ron Clark Story*, dialogues three and seven flout none of the maxims; whereas in dialogues one and six, the flouting maxim statements flout the maxim of relation by blatantly avoiding the topic or the focus to the topic at hand. On another note, in dialogues two, four, and five, the flouting maxim statements flout the maxim of quantity by responding to more information than required (Parker & Riley, 2010).

TABLE 1

Flouting Maxim Statements Evident in the Transcription of Teacher-Student Classroom Interaction as Depicted in Five Selected Movies

Evident Flouting Maxim Statements	Conversation Maxim
<p>Dialogue 3 S: The sign said this was a boy's school.T: It is a boy's school. S: So why is everyone wearing dresses? T: These are not dresses. This is a toga. It is a loose outer garmentworn by— S: Worn by citizens of ancient Rome. <i>I know. I was just kiddingwith you.</i> T: The toga was bestowed on young men in recognition of theirtransition from childishness to manhood.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">-An excerpt from <i>The Emperor's Club</i> (2002)</p>	
<p>Dialogue 5 T: Can you, please, name any of the subsequent emperors whomwe've been discussing? There were 41. S: <i>I only know seven.</i> T: Very well. S: <i>Grumpy, Happy, Sleepy, Sneezey, (laughs) Dopey</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">-An excerpt from <i>The Emperor's Club</i> (2002)</p>	Maxim of Quality
<p>Dialogue 6 T: Seriously, though, can you in fact name any of the emperors? S: I know four. T: Very well. S: Uh, John, Paul, Ringo, and, uh, George.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">-An excerpt from <i>The Emperor's Club</i> (2002)</p>	

Making Sense of Flouting Conversation Maxims of Teacher-Student Interactions in Movies: A Mixed Methods

<p>Dialogue 3 T: Now, language was developed for one endeavor, and that is? Mr. Anderson? Come on, are you a man or an amoeba? S: (no answer) -An excerpt from <i>Dead Poets Society</i> (1989)</p>	
<p>Dialogue 4 T: Who will tell me where you are in the Pritchard textbook? S: (no answer) -An excerpt from <i>Dead Poets Society</i> (1989)</p>	Maxim of Quantity
<p>Dialogue 5 T: What is poetry? S: (no answer) -An excerpt from <i>Dead Poets Society</i> (1989)</p>	
<p>Dialogue 7 T: Do you hear me? Sit down. Sit down. S: (no answer) -An excerpt from <i>Dead Poets Society</i> (1989)</p>	
<p>Dialogue 6 T: What do you mean they're all ripped out? S: Sir, we... T: <i>Never mind.</i> -An excerpt from <i>Dead Poets Society</i> (1989)</p>	Maxim of Relation
<p>Dialogue 1 T: What happened to Miss Shepherd? S1: Ooh, no, <i>she ain't askin' about Miss triflin'-ass Shepherd.</i> S2: <i>We killed the bitch.</i> S3: <i>...Emilio ate her.</i> S4: <i>Fed her to my dogs.</i> -An excerpt from <i>Dangerous Minds</i> (1995)</p>	
<p>Dialogue 3 T: Okay, anybody else know any karate? What about you? S: Durrell Chang Chang. I know some <i>motherfuckin'</i> karate. -An excerpt from <i>Dangerous Minds</i> (1995)</p>	
<p>Dialogue 5 T: "I will not go down underground 'cause somebody tells me that death's comin' round" Okay, this is another Dylan poem. now, is that a code, or does that just mean what it says? S: (no answer) -An excerpt from <i>Dangerous Minds</i> (1995)</p>	Maxim of Quantity
<p>Dialogue 6 T: Do you wanna talk about this? S: On you, <i>shit. Whatever floats your boat, teach.</i> -An excerpt from <i>Dangerous Minds</i> (1995)</p>	
<p>Dialogue 7 T: Do the rest of you agree with that? S: <i>Well, I kinda agree with it, but I think it just means that heain't gonna help death out, you know? It's not like he's just gonna lay down and wait for it. I think he's gonna choose – No, I think he's gonna make the choice – to die hard.</i> -An excerpt from <i>Dangerous Minds</i> (1995)</p>	
<p>Dialogue 1 T: Jamal Hill? S: <i>Man, what am I doing in here? This whole ghetto-ass class has got people in here looking like a bad rerun of Cops and shit.</i> T: Are you Jamal? S: Yeah. -An excerpt from <i>Freedom Writers</i> (2007)</p>	
<p>Dialogue 2 T: I have this idea. We're gonna be covering poetry. Who here like Tupac Shakur? S: <i>It's 2Pac.</i> -An excerpt from <i>Freedom Writers</i> (2007)</p>	Maxim of Quantity
<p>Dialogue 5 T: So why don't you explain it to me? S: I ain't explaining <i>shit</i> to you! -An excerpt from <i>Freedom Writers</i> (2007)</p>	

<p>Dialogue 7 T: You don't feel respected. Is that what you're saying, Eva? Well, maybe you're not. But to get respect, you have to give it. S: That's <i>bullshit</i>.</p>	-An excerpt from <i>Freedom Writers</i> (2007)	
<p>Dialogue 3 S1: You have no idea what you're doing up there, do you? You ever been a teacher before? S2: <i>And teacher gets nailed, y'all!</i> T: All right, Jamal, enough. Jamal! That's enough!</p>	-An excerpt from <i>Freedom Writers</i> (2007)	Maxim of Relation
<p>Dialogue 4 T: Gloria? Please read the first sentence on the board. S: <i>Why me?</i></p>	-An excerpt from <i>Freedom Writers</i> (2007)	
<p>Dialogue 1 Mister Ron Clark (Teacher/T): Take your seats. S1: <i>Yo, teacher. Shameika's feeling sick today.</i> S2: Yeah, sick of damn teachers.</p>	-An excerpt from <i>The Ron Clark Story</i> (2006)	Maxim of Relation
<p>Dialogue 6 T: You want to get a detention? S: (Ignores the teacher. Talks to a classmate) <i>Yo, I really, really like your nail polish.</i></p>	-An excerpt from <i>The Ron Clark Story</i> (2006)	
<p>Dialogue 2 T: Shameika, don't do that. S: (drops a book on the floor) T: Shameika, don't. S: <i>Or what? What are you gonna do? Suspend me? Go ahead. Suspend me. I wanna leave.</i></p>	-An excerpt from <i>The Ron Clark Story</i> (2006)	
<p>Dialogue 4 T: If you break one of these rules, your name will go up on the board. S: <i>So stupid!</i></p>	-An excerpt from <i>The Ron Clark Story</i> (2006)	Maxim of Quantity
<p>Dialogue 5 T: Why are you all doing this? S: Got better things to do, yo. <i>Oops, my bad. Forgot to say, "Yo, Sir." Guess I get a check.</i></p>	-An excerpt from <i>The Ron Clark Story</i> (2006)	

The conversation maxims that were evidently flouted in the transcription of the teacher-student classroom interaction depicted in five selected movies were maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, and maxim of relation. In flouting the maxim of quality, the characters in the movies were sarcastic or mocking, responding with no apparent sincerity, and answering deliberately with information that they knew was untrue or unreal. This is consistent with the study of Brumark (2003) on authentic interactions by family members. He found out that the quality maxim was flouted by the father through sarcasm in order to regulate his child's behavior. Additionally, he defined sarcasm as a ruder and more hostile kind of irony since the sarcastic comments made by the father had little effect on the child. In the same study, the family members flout the quality maxim to create humor that was mainly social. Humor, as a result of flouting the quality maxim, is supported by Kusuma (2006) and Jorfi and Dolatabadi (2015). Additionally, Levinson (1983) explained that in flouting the quality maxim, the speaker intentionally misrepresents his information in order to make the hearer understand the intended meaning of the utterance. However, in the selected movies in this study, the characters portray sarcasm just because of plain arrogance and immaturity.

In flouting the maxim of quantity, the characters in the movies were giving either more or less information than the required amount of rightful information. Sometimes, they gave exaggerated answers by adding unnecessary words or phrases such as curses or verbal taboos. This aligns with the study of Rohaniyah (2013) on flouting maxims through gender categories in classroom interaction. The results showed that among the four maxims, the quantity maxim was the most frequently flouted by both genders. When asked why, the male representative explained that he flouted the maxim because he wanted to provide more in-depth information

for his idea. In contrast, the female representative stated that she flouted the maxim because she wanted to express her feelings in her statements, making their conversations more interesting. Additionally, Adawiyah (2016) emphasized that when a speaker flouts the quantity maxim, they are making an exaggerated statement or repeating a remark that is portrayed as too much and too strong for what is needed, categorizing it as an overstatement.

In flouting the maxim of relation, the characters in the movies were interjecting the person who is currently speaking, stopping the conversation, and saying something immaterial to the present topic. This reinforces the study of Adawiyah (2016). The speakers flout the said maxim because they want to change the topic, to avoid talking about something that is embarrassing or humiliating, or just to end the conversation. These reasons reflect the negative aspects of flouting. However, this diverges from the findings of Wherrity (2005), which revealed that the said maxim was flouted to produce varied comical or dramatic situations. This connotes that flouting the relation maxim also has its corresponding positive aspects depending upon the current situation the speaker is in. In flouting the maxim of manner, the characters in the movies did not flout the last maxim. No character made ambiguous language, vague facial expressions, or obscure statements. All characters spoke in such a way that their listener understood them and that their message was conveyed.

Participants' Reactions to Flouting Maxim Statements

Table 2 shows the thematic analysis based on the participants' responses in the IDI and FGD which were transcribed verbatim. Three emergent themes were obtained: Neutral Reactions towards Flouting Maxims, Awareness towards the Negative Aspects of Flouting Maxims, and Awareness towards the Positive Aspects of Flouting Maxims. The emergent themes can be supported by the four theoretical perspectives: Context Principle (Frege, 1953), Communicative Rationality (Grice, 1983), Politeness Theory (Brown & Levinson, 1978), and the concept of Strategic Conflict Avoidance (Leech, 1983).

TABLE 2

Participants' reactions to flouting maxim statements

Issues Probed	Core Ideas	Essential Themes	Supporting Theoretical Perspective
Reactions to Flouting Maxims in Classroom Interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flouting maxims appear to be inherent in speeches in normal situations. Flouting maxims are not an indication of a bad speech. Speakers and listeners are tolerant of flouting maxims. 	Neutral Reactions towards Flouting Maxims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Context Principle
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A huge cause of misunderstandings. It does not satisfy the person asking the question. It stops the momentum of the class. It is a waste of time. It makes the conversation confusing, and the person irritated and frustrated. It degrades the quality of the interaction. It is mistaken for sarcasm and disrespect. 	Awareness towards the Negative Aspects of Flouting Maxims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communicative Rationality Politeness Theory Concept of Strategic Conflict Avoidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It makes the conversation fun and lively. It is an exercise of a creative mind or speech. It makes the interaction light and informal. 	Awareness towards the Positive Aspects of Flouting Maxims	

Neutral Reactions towards Flouting Maxims. In this reaction, the participant does not care whether the one he is talking to flouts or not. Flouting maxims appear to be inherent in speeches in normal situations and not an indication of bad speech. Further, speakers and listeners are tolerant of flouting maxims. During the IDI and FGD, it is observed that some teachers and students are impartial or disinterested in it, which is manifested in their respective answers:

I think flouting maxims is actually a natural thing. (PT 1)
I would not really say totally 'no', I would not really say totally 'yes'. (PT 1)
Flouting maxim is not bad or it's not that good, too. (SP 2)
I think it's okay to flout maxims because people are unconsciously used to it. (SP 5)
If it's okay with the person, then good; if not, then it's not good. (SP 5)
It can be useful for teachers but it can also be their downturn. (TP 4)
Flouting is sometimes good; it is sometimes bad. (PS 3)

Understandably, some participants viewed flouting as a regular or a common thing. They did not think that it is neither good nor bad in a conversation. Moreover, they thought that the identification of whether it is good or not depends upon the listener's reaction and interpretation during the interaction.

Awareness towards the Negative Aspects of Flouting Maxims. During the IDI and FGD, it was observed that most teachers and students do not tolerate flouting in a conversation because of its adversative results reflected in their responses:

For me, a huge cause of a lot of misunderstandings and it does not satisfy the person who asked the question. Then, it would actually stop the momentum of the class. (SP 1)
I feel very awkward and very confused. (SP 1)
Usually, it takes the attention of the students away from the main topic; it takes the discussion much longer than it should. What I don't like is the fact that it takes away the time from focusing on our main point. (TP 1)
It's (flouting) an insult for me as well. (TP 2)
I usually get irritated because I always want the person to answer me directly. (PS 1)
Avoid flouting them because it lessens the quality of the interaction. (SP 3)
I just noticed that flouting maxims are some kinds of sarcasm and you know, being sarcastic inside the classroom is not that good and it might spark confusion. (SP 2)

In their reactions, the participants comprehensively viewed flouting as detrimental and inconvenient. Specifically, they did not favor its effects on the person's feelings and reactions. Such unfavorable feelings and reactions are insult, disrespect, misunderstanding, confusion, awkwardness, to name a few. Several studies are supported by this result. Ayasreh and Razali (2018); Radford et. al (2009), and Brown and Levinson (1978) all stated that misunderstandings, arguments, conflict, and impoliteness are the general negative effects of flouting. Moreover, they deemed flouting as a waste of time or time-consuming since direct responses were not given by the interlocutor, which is consistent with the study of Kamala (2014), which emphasized how flouting can result in disruption of classes.

Awareness towards the Positive Aspects of Flouting Maxims. During the IDI and FGD, it was observed that few teachers and students tolerate flouting in a conversation because of its favorable results, which are manifested in their respective answers:

Just make sure that it's fun, it's okay and not offending. (SP 2)
Because of flouting sometimes conversations could really become more colorful. (TP 6)
You flout in order to lighten up the mood. (PS 3)
For my side, it releases my creative juices. (PS 2)

Clearly, a few participants considered flouting as affirmative and helpful. The conversation becomes entertaining especially when speakers retort indirectly which raises an interesting implication. Aside from this, flouting is one way to showcase one's inventive mind.

This supports the study of Wijayana (1996) and Detrianto (2018), which underscored that making the conversation enthusiastic, fun, and lively are a few effects of flouting maxims.

Participants' Use of Flouting Maxim Statements

As shown in Table 3, The act of flouting maxims is oftentimes done deliberately, accidentally, or habitually. It usually depends upon the speaker's manner of answering or engaging in a conversation.

TABLE 3

Participants' Use of flouting maxim statements

Issues Probed	Core Ideas	Essential Themes	Supporting Theoretical Perspective
Personal Usage of Flouting Maxims in Classroom Interactions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is used as an escape from answering the question. It is a personal style or usual tendency of the speaker. It is caused by cluttered minds and lack of focus. 	Intentional Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Context Principle Communicative Rationality Politeness Theory
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It results from other's influence. It is unconsciously committed for no apparent reason. 	Accidental Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concept of Strategic Conflict Avoidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a developed habit. An indication of a less-serious talk. 	Habitual Use	

Intentional Use. In this reaction, the participant recognizes the deliberate use of flouting maxims. Participants flout to escape from the current situation they are in or to avoid giving a direct answer to the question raised. It can also be a brand of personal style or manner of talking, yet they tend to flout in specific conditions because their thoughts and ideas are disorganized and their focus is disturbed. During the IDI and FGD, it is observed that few teachers and students purposely flout a conversation because of personal reasons which is manifested in their respective answers:

They (students) would not try to answer directly just to escape from answering the question. (PT 1)
Personally, I flout. (PT 1)
I flout because I have so many things in mind to say directly but I just want it to uhm.. like, I don't want it to share directly because I want that person to analyze what I said. (PS 2)

Apparently, the participants purposefully flouted during the course of the discussion because they wanted to provide further information related and unrelated to the present topic, to challenge the understanding of their listener, and to hide information just for themselves.

Accidental Use. In this reaction, the participant recognizes the unintentional use of flouting maxims. Participants sometimes flout accidentally because flouting has been in their subconscious mind, a result of their surroundings, or peer influence. During the IDI and FGD, it is observed that a few teachers and students inadvertently flout in a conversation which is manifested in their respective answers:

I accidentally flout while talking to my friends or during the lecture in the classroom. (SP 6)
I flout accidentally. So ahm... I didn't mean or I didn't realize the thing that I already flout because sometimes ahm, I think the words that I have used are just an accidental thing but I didn't mean to offend or to imply such words on the person that I have a conversation with. (SP 7)

In the classroom, I think there are some accidental instances in which I kind of flout but it's not really intentional. I mean, I just realized that it's a flout after immediately I said it. Something like that. (TP 6)

Obviously, participants shared their personal experiences wherein they flouted unintentionally. They blurted out statements which later they realized were flouting statements; however, since their listeners did not react negatively, they just let it pass.

Habitual Use. In this reaction, the participant recognizes the usual use of flouting maxims. Participants tend to flout because it is a developed convention especially during in informal talk exchanges. During the IDI and FGD, it is observed that few teachers and students routinely flout in a conversation which is manifested in their respective answers:

*Almost every day I experience flouting- students flouting different kinds of maxims. (PT 1)
I always flout even when it is not necessary. (PS 2)*

Realistically, flouting has been an established part of the participants' daily lives and has always been incorporated into their interactions. This circumstance was observed and executed in informal and formal talk engagements.

Flouting of maxims occurs when one deliberately ceases to apply the Cooperative Principle to persuade his listener to infer the implied meaning behind the utterances (Levinson, 1983). However, the results of this study show that flouting does not only happen deliberately but also habitually and accidentally. Teacher and student participants intentionally flout to and at the same time, habitually to deliver a message. These occurrences are evident in their responses such as admitting that they flout every day and, in every situation, even if they find unnecessary. Also, the participants shared that there were also instances that they were unconsciously and unintentionally flouting during class discussions; that it took them a while to realize what they said was actually not the exact information that their listener was looking for. In this instance, they flouted accidentally.

Frequency Distribution of the Observance and Non-Observance of Grice's Conversation Maxims

Frequency distribution shows the number of student participants and teacher participants who have and have not correctly identified the flouting maxim statements evident in the transcription of teacher-student classroom interaction in the abovementioned corpora of movies. Shown in Table 3 is the frequency distribution of the observance and non-observance of conversation maxims.

Observance of Grice's Conversation Maxims is composed of 11 items, which entails that 11 out of 35 dialogues do not flout any of the maxims; hence, they observe Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle. Results show that 57 out of 80 student participants and 13 out of 20 teacher participants scored 0 to 5 (lower half); while 23 out of 80 student participants and 7 out of 20 teacher participants scored 6 to 11 (upper half). To sum it up, 70 out of 100 respondents scored 0 to 5 (lower half) while 30 out of 100 respondents scored 6 to 11 (upper half). Thus, more respondents cannot and only a few can identify the non-flouting maxim statements correctly because they are flouting maxims intentionally, are already used to receiving or hearing flouted responses in formal or informal talk exchanges, or are trying to deliver another set of messages (Paltridge, 2006).

TABLE 3.

Distribution of scores in identifying observance and non-observance of Grice's conversation maxims

OBSERVANCE				NON-OBSERVANCE			
CLUSTERS				CLUSTERS			
SCORES	Student	Teacher	Total	SCORES	Student	Teacher	Total
0	5	1	6	0	2	0	2
1	7	3	10	8	1	0	1
2	9	1	10	12	0	1	1
3	12	1	13	14	0	1	1
4	12	2	14	15	2	0	2
5	12	5	17	16	0	1	1
6	6	0	6	17	6	0	6
7	10	2	12	18	4	3	7
8	4	2	6	19	5	1	6
9	3	2	5	20	15	1	16
10	0	1	1	21	4	1	5
11	0	0	0	22	12	2	14
				23	10	6	16
				24	19	3	22
Total	80	20	100	Total	80	20	100

Non-Observance of Grice's Conversation Maxims is composed of 24 items which entails that 24 out of 35 dialogues do flout any of the maxims; hence, they do not observe Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle. Results show that 3 out of 80 student participants and 1 out of 20 teacher participants scored 0 to 12 (lower half); while 77 out of 80 student participants and 19 out of 20 teacher participants scored 13 to 24 (upper half). To sum it up, 4 out of 100 respondents scored 0 to 12 (lower half) while 96 out of 100 scored 13 to 24 (upper half). Thus, more respondents can identify the flouting maxim statements correctly which means that people can detect whether the person's response is appropriate or not, direct or indirect, and implicit or explicit. This leaves the hearer to interpret what he hears as if it conforms to the Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975) or in the context of the conversation (Raceanu, 2013). These results are opposite to the results of Dwi (2015) wherein 98% observed the maxim and 2% did not which concludes that generally, all of their speakers followed the cooperative principle and did not generate any conversational implicature.

Frequency Distribution of Flouting Maxim Statements in terms of Maxim of Quality and Maxim of Quantity

Frequency distribution shows the number of student participants and teacher participants who have and have not correctly identified the flouting maxim statements evident in the transcription of teacher-student classroom interaction in the abovementioned corpora of movies. Shown in Table 4.1 is the frequency distribution of the flouting maxim statements in terms of quality and quantity.

TABLE 4.1.

Distribution of scores in identifying the maxim of quality and maxim of quantity

QUALITY MAXIMS		QUANTITY MAXIMS	
CLUSTERS		CLUSTERS	

SCORES	Student	Teacher	Total	SCORES	Student	Teacher	Total
0	2	1	3	3	1	0	1
1	2	0	2	4	0	2	2
2	3	1	4	5	5	1	6
3	10	2	12	6	1	1	2
4	8	2	10	7	6	2	8
5	14	2	16	8	8	2	10
6	6	0	6	9	12	1	13
7	14	4	18	10	9	0	9
8	6	2	8	11	7	2	9
9	6	2	8	12	7	1	8
10	3	1	4	13	9	3	12
11	4	2	6	14	3	2	5
12	2	1	3	15	3	0	3
13	0	0	0	16	2	0	2
14	0	0	0	17	3	1	4
				18	3	1	4
				19	0	0	0
				20	1	0	1
				21	0	1	1
				22	0	0	0
				23	0	0	0
				24	0	0	0
				25	0	0	0
				26	0	0	0
				27	0	0	0
Total	80	20	100	Total	80	20	100

In the Maxim of Quality, 14 is the highest possible score of the participant in identifying correctly whether or not the dialogue does or does not flout the maxim of quality. Results show that 59 out of 80 students and 12 out of 20 teachers scored 0 to 7 (lower half); whereas 21 out of 80 students and 8 out of 20 teachers scored 8-14 (upper half). To sum it up, 71 out of 100 students scored 0 to 7 (lower half) and 29 out of 100 respondents scored 8 to 14 (upper half). Thus, only a few can identify whether or not the dialogue flouts the quality maxim, which means that they tend to fail or neglect to scrutinize the veracity of the information provided to them. Moreover, they tend to welcome sarcasm, banter, and jokes.

TABLE 4.2.

Distribution of scores in identifying the maxim of quality and maxim of quantity

RELATION MAXIMS				MANNER MAXIMS			
CLUSTERS				CLUSTERS			
SCORES	Student	Teacher	Total	SCORES	Student	Teacher	Total
0	1	0	1	0	3	1	4
1	2	0	2	1	3	1	4
2	4	3	7	2	3	1	4
3	3	0	3	3	10	3	13
4	4	1	5	4	17	0	17
5	11	1	12	5	14	4	18
6	13	0	13	6	10	1	11
7	16	1	17	7	5	4	9
8	6	4	10	8	8	1	9
9	8	5	13	9	5	3	8
10	4	2	6	10	2	1	3
11	5	0	5	11	0	0	0
12	2	2	4				
13	1	1	2				
14	0	0	0				
15	0	0	0				
16	0	0	0				
Total	80	20	100	Total	80	20	100

Shown in Table 4.2 is the frequency distribution of the flouting maxim statements in terms of relation and manner. In Maxim of Relation, 16 is the highest possible score of the participant in identifying correctly whether or not the dialogue does or does not flout the relation maxim. Results show that 60 out of 80 students and 10 out of 20 teachers scored 0 to 8 (lower half); whereas 20 out of 80 students and 10 out of 20 teachers scored 9 to 16 (upper half). Thus, only a few can identify whether or not the dialogue flouts the relation maxim which means that they do not meticulously care whether they shift the focus to the main topic or not as long as they obtain the right information and gain new ones as they alter and move from one topic to another.

In Maxim of Manner, 11 is the highest possible score of the participant in identifying correctly whether or not the dialogue does or does not flout the manner maxim. Results show that 50 out of 80 students and 10 out of 20 teachers scored 0 to 5 (lower half); whereas 30 out of 80 students and 10 out of 20 teachers scored 6 to 11 (upper half). Thus, only a few can identify whether or not the dialogue flouts the manner maxim. Eighty students and 10 out of 20 teachers scored 9 to 16 (upper half). Thus, only a few can identify whether or not the dialogue flouts the manner maxim which means that they disregard how the information is delivered as long as they obtain their desired facts, or data; or if ambiguity arises in the conversation, they ignore the manner of delivering the information as long as the person will immediately clarify and provide further information to achieve the goal of the conversation.

Based on the results, more students get the three highest scores in correctly identifying the dialogues that have and have not flouted the maxim of quality. This means that students are more sensitive than teachers in detecting the quality maxim. Students can quickly detect sarcasm, irony, lies, banter, or joke in a conversation. According to Adawiyah (2016), the quality maxim is flouted because someone tells a lie or speaks something that he understands to be false. He added that there are two reasons for flouting this maxim: first, the interlocutor wants to conceal something and second, the interlocutor does not want the listener to know about the real condition or feeling.

On one hand, an equal number of students and teachers got the three highest scores in correctly identifying the dialogues that have and have not flouted the maxim of quantity. Adawiyah (2016) explained that the quantity maxim is flouted for the following reasons: to expound, to express feelings, to show confusion, to convince, to advise, to provide additional information, to provide unnecessary information, to expect something, and to hide something.

On another note, based on the results, more students got the three highest scores in correctly identifying the dialogues that have and have not flouted the maxim of relation. Characters in the five selected films flout the relation maxim by interjecting and ending the conversation. Adawiyah (2016) posited that this maxim is flouted because the interlocutor wants to change the topic to avoid talking about something that is embarrassing or he just wants to plainly end the talk or he just wants to add unnecessary information to the topic being talked about.

Lastly, based on the results, still more students got the three highest scores in correctly identifying the dialogues that have and have not flouted the maxim of manner. Flouting this maxim happens when the interlocutor's input is not transparent and it may be incomprehensible, vague, and not directly reasonable (Dwi, 2015).

TABLE 5.

Significant Difference in the occurrence of the observed flouting maxims

Maxims	Clusters	Mean	S.D.	p-value	Remarks
Quality	Teachers	6.60	3.28	0.35	No Significant
	Students	5.92	2.80	(> 0.05)	Difference
Quantity	Teachers	10.75	4.75	1.00	No Significant
	Students	10.75	3.55	(> 0.05)	Difference
Relation	Teachers	7.80	3.27	0.11	Almost Significant
	Students	6.65	2.74	(> 0.10)	Difference
Manner	Teachers	5.55	2.86	0.38	No Significant
	Students	5.01	2.36	(> 0.05)	Difference

The significant difference in the number of observed flouting maxims between the teachers and the students in terms of maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner is shown in Table 5.

In Maxim of Quality, teachers obtained a mean of 6.60 and a standard deviation of 3.28; while students yielded a mean of 5.92 and a standard deviation of 2.80. As a result, the quality maxim attained a p-value of 0.35. In Maxim of Quantity, teachers obtained a mean of 10.75 and a standard deviation of 4.75; while students yielded a mean of 10.75 and a standard deviation of 3.55. As a result, quantity maxim attained a p-value of 1.00. In Maxim of Relation, teachers obtained a mean of 7.80 and a standard deviation of 3.27; while students yielded a mean of 6.65 and a standard deviation of 2.74. As a result, the relation maxim attained a p-value of 0.11. In Maxim of Manner, teachers obtained a mean of 5.55 and a standard deviation of 2.86; while students yielded a mean of 5.01 and a standard deviation of 2.36. As a result, quantity maxim attained a p-value of 0.38. In totality, the p-value of the maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, and maxim of manner is greater than the cut-off level of significance (0.05). Hence, there is no significant difference in the number of observed flouting maxim statements between the teachers and the students; whereas the p-value of the maxim of relation is close to the cut-off level of significance (0.10). Hence, there is an almost significant difference in the number of observed flouting maxim statements between the teacher and the students. Generally, the statistical results suggest that there is no substantial variance in the occurrence of observed flouting maxims between the teacher participants and the student participants. Both participants can and cannot quickly detect flouting in a conversation depending upon the context or situation; both do and do not mind whether they do or do not flout as long as the goal of the conversation is eventually achieved; and both do and do not care whether the speaker does or does not flout as long as the answers satisfy their concern.

It is apparent that in the five corpora of films utilized in the study, students have a higher tendency to flout the conversational maxims – quality, quantity, and relation maxims only – than teachers. The same situation was reflected in the data taken by Agung (2016) in a TEFL class the responses of the students violated the teacher's questions. In parallel, his study also concluded that the maxims flouted by the students were maxims of quality, quantity, and relation only; the maxim of manner was not flouted. This further implies that in an interaction between the teacher and the students, students may answer something that lacks enough evidence, may provide an exaggerated or timid amount of information than the required rightful amount, or may opt to change the topic or insert other things which are unrelated to the present subject; nevertheless, they still respond clearly or in ways which the teacher or their listener can comprehend.

TABLE 6.

Joint Display of Salient Qualitative and Quantitative Findings

Making Sense of Flouting Conversation Maxims of Teacher-Student Interactions in Movies: A Mixed Methods

Aspect or Focal Point	Quantitative Findings	Qualitative Findings	Nature of Data Integration	Axiological Implications
The sensitivity of students over teachers in detecting flouting maxims	From Table 1 on <i>Non-Observance</i> , more students got a score of 22, 23, and 24 than teachers, (12/2=22; 10/6=23; 19/3=24) respectively.	Table 2 on Personal Usage of Flouting Maxims in Classroom Interactions has codes <i>Intentional Use</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Personally, I flout." • "I flout because I have so many things in mind today." • "I always flout even when it is not necessary." <i>Habitual Use</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "I always flout." • "I always flout even when it is not necessary." 	Embedding – Supplementing	Students have the tendency to engage in informal speeches and unintentionally neglect the rules of formal classroom interaction or conversation.
No Significant Difference in the Detection of Flouting Maxims in a Classroom Interaction	From Table 5 on the <i>Significance of Difference</i> , the p-values 0.35 (quality maxim), 1.00 (quantity maxim), and 0.38 (manner maxim) show that there is no significant difference (p-value > 0.05=NS) between the teacher and the students.	Table 2 on Personal Usage of Flouting Maxims in Classroom Interactions has codes <i>Habitual Use</i> , and <i>Accidental Use of Flouting Maxims</i> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Sometimes, yes. I accidentally flout while talking with my friends or during the lecture in the classroom." • "I flout accidentally. I didn't mean or I didn't realize the thing that I already flout." 	Embedding – Supplementing	Teachers and students tolerate flouting in classroom interactions when it serves a purpose.
Teacher and Student almost significantly differ in detecting the maxim of the relation	From Table 5, Relation Maxim obtained a p-value of 0.11, which is closest to the 0.10 p-value level of significance of difference. Teacher yielded a mean of 7.80 while student yielded a mean of 6.65, respectively which means that teachers are more sensitive in detecting the relation maxim than students.	Table 2 on Reactions to Flouting Maxims in Classroom Interaction has a code Negative Reactions towards Flouting Maxims: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "It takes away the time from focusing on our main point." • "It stops the momentum of the class." 	Embedding – Supplementing	Teachers are more particular with discussing one idea first before diverting or changing the current topic.

Joint Display of Salient Qualitative and Quantitative Findings

Students have the tendency to engage in informal speeches and unconsciously neglect the rules of formal classroom interaction or conversation. In an authentic setting, Agung (2016)

gathered data to conclude that students flouted the quality, quantity, and relation maxims when answering the teacher's questions during their class discussion. An example of this is when the teacher asked about the language skills or components their former English teachers used to teach; one student answered if they should recall their junior or senior high school teacher. The student's insignificant clarification interrupted the teacher's momentum; hence, the maxim of relation was flouted. Similarly, in the film *Freedom Writer*, the teacher asked the student to read what was written on the board, but the student asked back as to why it had to be her, which also flouts the relation maxim. These examples imply that even in formal talk exchanges, young people, such as students, tend to reply informally or neglect the rules of formal conversation.

Teachers and students tolerate flouting in classroom interactions when it serves a purpose. Flouting is deliberately the absence of observing one or more maxims during communication (Jia, 2008) to deliver another set of meanings or implicature (Paltridge, 2006). In short, when an interlocutor intentionally violates a maxim, the purpose may be to communicate a message effectively. It is for this reason that teachers and students tolerate flouting in classroom interactions because they see the underlying idea the speaker wants to convey. For example, in *Dangerous Minds*, when the teacher asked if the class agreed with the answer of their classmate, one student raised his answer with verbosity, thus flouting the quantity maxim. Nonetheless, though the student provided more information than required by expounding his answer, the teacher understood what he wanted to say and his standpoint on the topic.

Teachers are more particular about discussing one idea first before diverting or changing the topic. The last axiological implication is connected to the maxim of relation. Grice (1975) defines the maxim of relation as expecting the interlocutor's contribution to be appropriate to the immediate needs at each stage of the conversation. Correspondingly, it necessitates the utterance to be directly and honestly relevant to the topic at the moment (Mehawesh & Jaradat, 2017). For example, one teacher participant particularly pointed out how she disliked students who always asked questions that were irrelevant to the present lesson, which always resulted in commotion amongst the students. Not only it took their focus away, but it also took away the time they could have done something more meaningful. Hence, teachers mind when students flout this maxim.

4. CONCLUSION

From the findings and analyses, the researchers conclude the following: The quality, quantity, and relation maxims were the flouted maxims. In a conversation, people tend to flout the maxim of quality because they opt to lie to conceal information or to answer that lacks evidence just to look smart intentionally; to flout the maxim of quantity to explicate an idea or to keep information by themselves deliberately; and to flout the maxim of relation to escape from the current topic to avoid humiliation, embarrassment, or being the center of attention. Furthermore, flouting occurs not only informally but also formally. It happens during a class discussion between a teacher and a student. However, there are cases wherein the speaker accidentally flouts because it has become a developed habit or a common norm in his social circle and holds himself back before flouting because he is afraid of its effects. On another note, the maxim of manner is quite challenging to flout because people always speak understandably regardless of whether they lie, exaggerate, keep silent, divert the topic, or stop the conversation. More so, when asked, people reply using comprehensible language and expression.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Joudeh, M., & Fanoun, J. (2018). Flouting the Gricean maxims in satire. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 8(12), 73–79. doi: 10.30845/ijhss.v8n12p9
- Adawiyah, R. (2016). *Flouting maxim used by the main characters in 'Focus' movie*. <http://etheses.uin-malang.ac.id/4004>
- Agung, winatu K. S. (2016). *on Students' Responses Toward Teacher*. 10, 33–56.
- Apriyani, K., Sembodo, T. J. P., & Mada, U. G. (2006). *Pirates of the Caribbean*. *Architectural Review*, 7(1313), 68. <https://doi.org/10.5621/sciefictstud.41.1.0229>
- Ayasreh, A., & Razali, R. (2018). *The flouting of Grice's conversational maxim: Examples from Bashar Al-Assad's interview during the Arab Spring*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 23(5), 43–47. <https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2305014347>
- Bradley, E. (2017). *Because language is essential to human interaction*. <http://www.whysocialscience.com>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brumark, Å. (2003). *What do we do when we talk at dinner*. Working Papers, Södertörn University College.
- Creswell, J. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Davies, B. (2000). *Grice's cooperative principle: Getting the meaning across*. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, 8, 1–26.
- Detrianto, B. (2018). *Humorous effects on flouting conversational maxims found in Indonesian drama comedy: A study of humor in language*. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(2), 1262-1276.
- Ephratt, M. (2012). "We try harder" – Silence and Grice's cooperative principle, maxims, and implicatures. *Language and Communication*, 32(1), 62-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2011.09.001>
- Grice, H. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol 3, pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
- Imelda, A. (2003). *The flouting in conversational maxims in 'Friends'*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.
- Jia, L. (2008). *The violation of the cooperative principle and the four maxims in psychological consulting*. *Canadian Social Science*, 4, 87-95.
- Johnson, R., Onwuegbuzie, A., & Turner, L. (2007). *Toward a definition of mixed methods research*. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(2), 112-133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689806298224>
- Jorfi, L., & Dowlatabadi, H. (2015). *Violating and flouting of the four Gricean cooperative maxims in 'Friends,' the American TV series*. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(3), 211-222.
- Kamila, N. (2014). *Analysis of cooperative principles in classroom interaction*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Kusuma, S. (2006). *Humor resulted from the flouting of conversational maxims in the drama comedy TV series "Bajaj Bajuri Salon Oneng Edition"*. [Unpublished bachelor's thesis]. Petra Christian University. http://dewey.petra.ac.id/dgt_res_detail.php?knokat=5734
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Maren, J., Olsen, H., & College, C. (2015). *Sarcasm detection using Grice's maxims*. Proceedings of the 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Denver, Colorado. <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N15-1017>

- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mehawesh, M., & Jaradat, A. (2017). *Inshallah: Extensive flouting of Grice's maxim of quality*. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 17(3), 319–327. <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2017-1703-22>
- Morgan, J. (1975). *Grice's conversational maxims*. In *Syntax and semantics* (Vol 3). Academic Press.
- Nunn, R. (2014). *The pragmatics of cooperation and relevance for teaching and learning*. *Linguistics Journal*, 9(1). <https://www.linguistics-journal.com/2014/01/09/the-pragmatics-of-cooperation-and-relevance-for-teaching-and-learning/>
- Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis: An introduction*. Continuum.
- Parker, F., & Riley, K. (2010). *Linguistics for non-linguists*. Pearson.
- Radford, A., Atkinson, M., Britain, D., Clahsen, H., & Spencer, A. (2009). *Linguistics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Rohaniyah, J. (2013). *Socio-pragmatic study; The obscurity of Gricean maxims (Cooperative Principle Rules): The study of flouted maxims in conversation through gender categories* [Unpublished master's thesis]. State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.
- Spector, B. (2015). *Maxims of conversation*. Oxford University Press
- Tupan, A., & Natalia, H. (2008). *The multiple violations of conversational maxims in lying done by the characters in some episodes of 'Desperate Housewives'*. [Unpublished bachelor's thesis]. English Department, Petra Christian University.
- Wherrity, M. (2005). *Emma Dornerus breaking maxims in conversation: A comparative study of how scriptwriters break maxims in 'Desperate Engelska'*. [Unpublished bachelor's thesis]. Engelska Institutionen.

AUTHORS' BIOS

Cristy Grace A. Ngo is a Ph.D. Applied Linguistics Student at the University of the Immaculate Conception. She holds a master's degree in English from the same university. Currently, she is a faculty of the University of Mindanao, College of Teacher Education, Davao City.

John Harry S. Caballo holds a Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from the University of the Immaculate Conception. Currently, he is the assistant dean of the College of Teacher Education at the University of Mindanao, Davao City.

Ana Louella N. Navarro is a Ph.D. Applied Linguistics Student at the University of the Immaculate Conception. She holds a master's degree in English from the same university. Currently, she is a faculty of the University of Mindanao, College of Arts and Sciences Education, Davao City.