

Violating the Maxims: A Gricean Analysis of Selected Episodes from *Mind Your Language* Season 1 (1977)

Bachtiar Abdullah¹, Raihan Athallah Makarim¹, Mia Perlina¹

¹Universitas Pamulang
*bhaqtiyar1@gmail.com**

ABSTRACT

This research aims to examine the violation of maxim in the selected episodes of the sitcom *Mind Your Language* season 1 (1977). The series shows people from different countries with different countries, social backgrounds, religions, and languages learning English as a foreign language in the same classroom taught by Mr Brown. The research method used is descriptive qualitative, using Grice's theory. The researchers analyze the data thoroughly, with observations, to find data results and explanations that will be compiled in conversational dialogue. This study identifies the maxim violations of quality, quantity, relation, and manner in the dialogue between the main characters, Mr. Brown, and the selected students, Maximillian Papandrious, Ali Nadeem, Juan Cervantes, and Giovanni Capello. The study found 3 violations of maxim quality, 14 violations of maxim quantity, 22 violations of maxim relevance and 6 violations of maxim manner.

This is an open access article under [CC-BY-NC 4.0](#) license.



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

conversational dialogue;
cooperative principles;
Grice's theory;
maxim violation;
sitcom

Article History:

Received: 10 January 2025

Revised: 20 May 2025

Accepted: 20 May 2025

Published: 24 May 2025

How to Cite in APA Style:

Abdullah, B., Makarim, R. A., & Perlina, M. (2025). Violating the Maxims: A Gricean Analysis of Selected Episodes from *Mind Your Language* Season 1 (1977). *Lexeme : Journal of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.32493/ljal.v7i2.46823>

INTRODUCTION

Individuals should avoid initiating or participating in interactions with others, whether through verbal or nonverbal communication, in everyday contexts. This is a tool of human connection (Hardianti et al., 2023). Effective communication is essential to getting the point across effectively and making it easy for other speakers to understand. The speakers hope to cooperate to make the conversation run smoothly. Presenters are expected to follow a cooperative principle when speaking as part of the guidelines to prevent misunderstandings.

H. Paul Grice proposed the idea. It outlines the proper way for people to interact with other speakers. According to Grice (1975), the speaker who wishes to use this concept must adhere to every maxim category—precisely, quantity, quality, relation, and manner. By adhering to these guidelines, the speaker should be truthful, concise, pertinent, and free of ambiguity while providing the necessary information. However, people occasionally break the rules in their day-to-day lives. The speakers purposefully break the maxims. According to Grice (1975), when a speaker disobeys the maxims, they are said to have violated them.

Speakers in everyday conversation typically insinuate rather than explicitly state ideas. They use indirect communication for the implications that will help the listeners understand what is

being conveyed (Hardianti et al., 2023). Conversations will be hard to comprehend if speakers or listeners purposefully give too little information, stating something repetitious, dishonest, irrelevant, or confusing. The failure to apply certain maxims in the conversation will also result in a misunderstanding of communication, raising the question of what kinds of maxims are broken in the selected episodes of the sitcom *Mind Your Language* season 1 (1977).

Many people engage in violations during conversations for various reasons in real life. According to Tupan & Natalia (2008), these include concealing the truth, preserving one's reputation, feeling envious of something, gratifying and encouraging the hearer, avoiding hurting them, establishing one's beliefs, and persuading them. Therefore, this research seeks to analyze the types of maxims (maxim of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner) violated in the conversation of a selected episodes of the sitcom *Mind Your Language* season 1 (1977) and why the students violated it. The show is set in an adult education college in London and focuses on the ESL (English as a Second Language) class taught by Mr Jeremy Brown, who teaches a group of enrolled foreigners. The genre of this movie is a sitcom. The researcher focuses on some characters in this show, including the main character, Mr. Brown, and the selected students, Maximillian Papandrius from Greece, Ali Nadeem from Pakistan, Juan Cervantes from Spain, and Giovanni Capello from Italy. The researcher aims to analyze this show because of how the barrier of language violates the conversation between Mr. Brown and his male students and leads to a different meaning from the conversation topics. We can also see their development in order to improve their English.

Previous research has discussed maxim violation, including "The Analysis of Maxim Violation in All The Bright Place The Movie" by Setiawati et al., (2024); "An Analysis of Maxim Violation: A Case in Werewolf Game" by Wijaya & Haristiani (2023) and "Maxim Violations on "The Lion In Winter" Movie" by Ningsih & Ambalegin (2022). This research analyzes what are the maxim violations using Grice's theory, especially on maxim violations contained in the dialogue of the selected episodes of *Mind Your Language* (1977) TV show season 1. The topic of the dialog is the relationship between teachers and students, education, and friendship. The maxim violation that occurs can be seen from the inability of the Mr Brown's students. Then, the study determines the maxim violation that occurs in the character's speech. To find answers to these problems, the title of the research is "Violating of Maxims in Selected Episodes of *Mind Your Language* Season 1 (1977)", by utilizing Grice's principle of cooperation.

It is anticipated that academics, educators, and students will find value in the research findings. This study may provide instructional material for language studies, particularly pragmatics. Students who use the audio-visual method can also benefit from knowing the maxim violation. It will assist students in comprehending the significance and message conveyed by the speakers in each conversation. This research can also serve as educational material for English language learners who wish to better understand maxim violations in TV shows. It may also serve as a resource for other scholars interested in pragmatics.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Language and Linguistics

While language and linguistics are two distinct concepts, they are related. Humans use language—spoken and written symbols—to communicate their thoughts, emotions, and opinions to other people (Hardianti et al. 2023). Language is the foundation of our social relationships. People who use a language to interact with one another create a society, such as the English-speaking community, according to Kreidler (1998). Our capacity for sophisticated communication is one trait that sets us apart as humans. According to Fasold & Linton (2006), sending complicated or significant amounts of information to talk, share ideas, and communicate feelings is impossible.

Despite being a scientific study of language, linguistics makes assumptions about how humans acquire, utilize, and abuse language by applying rigorous research and the scientific

process. As communication is essential to the understanding and practice of linguistics, Scholz, Pelletier, and Pullum (2015, p. 17), cited in Haugh (2018), contended that the element of linguistics research is not only a historical, geographical entity but is also defined by our understanding of communication. The definition of languages and the explanation of the basic knowledge that all speakers have about their language are the goals of linguistics. The field of study that is based on languages is called linguistics.

Pragmatics

Yule (1996) defines pragmatics as examining a speaker's meaning. The focus is on the listener's interpretation of the speaker's statements. Pragmatics examines the meaning derived from context. It pertains to how listeners draw inferences from spoken language to interpret the speaker's intended meaning. The unspoken elements are acknowledged as integral to the communication process. Pragmatics examines how communication conveys more meaning than the literal words used. Pragmatics examines how listeners derive inferences from spoken language to interpret the speaker's intended meaning. The listener must analyze the implicit meaning conveyed by the speaker. Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance, which indicates that the speaker must assess the listener's proximity to determine the appropriate number of words to convey. For instance, the phrase "lend me your pen!" may be appropriately directed towards a friend or a younger sibling, but it is not suitable for addressing a teacher in that manner. It is advisable to phrase the request: "May I borrow this pen, miss?" This approach is more acceptable. Levinson (1983) defines pragmatics as the examination of the relationships between language and context that are grammaticalized or encoded within a language's structure. It indicates that the spoken content must adhere to grammatical standards, enabling the listener to comprehend the speaker's intended message accurately.

Based on the aforementioned definition, it can be inferred that pragmatics pertains to the utilization of language by individuals within certain contexts for particular purposes, as well as the comprehension of language in real-world scenarios. In pragmatics, we shall discover methods designed to examine the speaker's intended meaning.

Grice's Cooperation Principles

The speaker and listener are the two most crucial players in a discussion. They require cooperation in the discussion. Their collaboration is referred to as the Cooperative Principle. Grice (1975) proposed that one should tailor one's conversational contributions to align with the acknowledged purpose or direction of the ongoing dialogue. To guarantee that both parties (Speaker and Listener) possess a comprehensive understanding of the discussed topic, they must adhere to two principles: (1) Provide adequately informative information, and (2) Avoid excessive information beyond what is necessary.

Communication is an interaction that involves both the speaker and the listener. Hasson et al. (2012) asserted that communication exemplifies the significant impact of others on an individual's cognitive processes. Effective communication occurs when the speaker and listener share information using language appropriately, ensuring that both parties achieve a clear grasp of the transmitted content.

Cooperative Principle in Conversation

Grice (1975) identifies four categories of conversational maxims. They are the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. When applying the maxim of quantity, the speaker should provide clear information. The speaker should provide neither insufficient nor excessive information. The speaker who provides little information may cause the listener's comprehension of the intended message. Excessive information may lead the listener to dislike the talk. The next is a maxim of quality; the speaker must provide accurate facts during the discourse. A maxim of relation indicated that each participant's contribution should be closely aligned with the topic of

discussion. The speaker is anticipated to contribute remarks pertinent to prior statements. The final principle is a maxim of manner. The speaker must avoid obscurity, avoid ambiguity, maintain brevity, and ensure orderliness when applying this rule in discourse.

From this study perspective, individuals occasionally disregard the rules governing the use of maxims in everyday discussion. If the speaker engages in such behavior, it indicates an attempt to contradict the maxims.

Violating Grice's Maxim

Violating Grice's maxims refers to occasions in communication where speakers deliberately diverge from the principles established by H. Paul Grice. These infractions can fulfill multiple pragmatic functions, including conveying implicit meanings, generating humor, or indirectly displaying politeness. Speakers might leverage the cooperative essence of communication by deliberately contravening the maxims to impart supplementary information or to influence the discourse in particular manners.

The maxim of quality mandates that speakers furnish truthful and dependable information. Nonetheless, there are instances where speakers deliberately contravene this maxim to impart concealed meanings. A prevalent illustration is the employment of irony or sarcasm, wherein speakers articulate the contrary of their true intent. Irony facilitates the articulation of criticism, humor, sarcasm, or satire. The breach of the maxim of quality is essential for irony to function effectively. For example, when an individual states, "Nice weather we're having!" during inclement weather, the intention is to convey the opposite meaning, suggesting that the weather is unfavorable.

The maxim of quantity posits that one should furnish the appropriate amount of information required for a dialogue. Nonetheless, speakers may deliberately contravene this principle for multiple reasons. A prevalent example is the employment of euphemisms or understatement to mitigate or soften the effect of specific information. For instance, when an individual states, "I'm a little disappointed," rather than "I'm extremely disappointed," they contradict the maxim of quantity by offering insufficient information. It can also alleviate the emotional impact or preserve decorum in delicate circumstances.

The maxim of relation asserts that speakers need to provide information relevant to the subject of discourse. Sometimes, speakers deliberately diverge from the subject to attain particular communicative outcomes. It may happen in dialogues where interlocutors seek to introduce a pertinent yet peripheral subject, redirect attention, or subtly communicate a message. Speakers might draw attention to alternative concerns by contradicting the precept of relevance or covertly conveying their perspectives.

The maxim of manner is deliberately contravened for many goals, including creating humor or conveying societal significance. It may also entail utilizing wordplay and adopting ambiguous language or nonliteral speech acts such as hyperbole or metaphor. Speakers can enhance meaning and stimulate the listener's interpretive abilities by straying from direct and literal communication. Grice (1975) argued that these maxims constitute an implicit social compact that regulates discourse. Speakers who contravene these maxims may be regarded as uncooperative, ambiguous, or deceitful.

METHOD

Researchers conduct research with qualitative descriptive research methods because researchers analyze data thoroughly, with observations to find data results with explanations that will be compiled in the form of conversational dialogue. The researchers used an analytical approach and observed the dialog in the TV show *Mind Your Language* (1977) of the main players, and selected 4 students. The data is in the form of written text, so it is suitable for this research as Creswell (2013) said that qualitative research is defined as an investigative process to understand a social or human problem based on building a complex, holistic picture formed with

words, reporting informants' views in detail and conducted in a natural setting. To find data using this Qualitative Descriptive method, the researchers look for every dialogue of the main character's conversation and the 4 selected students in the TV show *Mind Your Language* (1977), collect every part of utterance that uses maxim violations, and analyze it.

The study collects all dialog data in the form of a table, in the composition of each character, and how many maxim-violating sentences are contained in the dialog. In this TV Show, several dialogues from each scene are analyzed with their offending sentences in bold marks. The last step is that the study analyzes the dialogue using the theory of Cooperative Principle by Grice, which is displayed and analyzed in Finding and Discussion.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The researcher found violations of all kinds of conversational maxims throughout the film. According to Grice (1975) theory, the data refers to violations of four conversational maxims quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. The table below displays the data study findings.

Table 1. The number of maxim violation		
No.	Type of Maxim Violation	Frequency
1.	Violation Maxim of Quality	3
2.	Violation Maxim of Quantity	14
3.	Violation Maxim of Relevance	22
4	Violation Maxim of Manner	6
Total		45

Table 1 indicates that the maxim of relevance was violated most frequently, occurring 22 times, followed by the maxim of quantity with 14 occurrences, the maxim of manner with 6 occurrences, and the maxim of quality with the least frequency at 3 occurrences. In conclusion, the series has exhibited 45 maxims of violation, with the maxim of relevance being the most frequently violated at 22 instances, while the maxim of quality was the least violated, occurring 3 times. Subsequently, the researcher will explain each instance and provide explanations for each maxim violation below.

Types of Maxim Violation

The following are examples of each maxim violation previously discussed, as identified in the TV show, which addresses the initial research issue. All statements are derived from the TV show *Mind Your Language* (1977) in Episode 1 to 11, Season 1.

Violation of Maxim Quality

According to Grice (1975), speakers must offer facts they firmly believe to be accurate and support them with evidence. They should refrain from saying things that are untrue or for which there is little support. This expression encourages communication that is honest and truthful.

Excerpt 1

Mr. Brown : "I checked your homework last night. And I have a feeling there have been some sort of chicanery going on."

Giovanni : "We not know what you mean."

Mr. Brown : "No, Giovanni, well I'll tell you. Firstly, the fact that five of them are written in the same handwriting."

Giovanni : **"It's a sherr coincidence!"**

[Data 13, Episode 3, 00:22:21-00:22:28]

This dialogue above happens in the minute 00:22:21-00:22:28 in episode 3, season 1, when Giovanni, as the speaker, violated the maxim quality because he did not tell the truth. Giovanni

lied to the interlocutor, Mr. Brown, that all of his classmates' answers coincidentally had the same answers and handwriting. However, Giovanni sold the homework book and the answers he wrote using his hand to all his classmates who still needed to do their homework. Because he was caught lying, Mr. Brown gave additional assignments to Giovanni and his classmates as punishment.

Excerpt 2

Mr. Brown : "Oh very close! What's that?"
Giovanni : "Uhh, It's some... It's some..."
Max : **"It's water."**
Giovanni : **"Sure, it's water"**
Mr. Brown : "Water? That's wine."
Giovanni : **"Wine? Santa Maria! Another miracle!"**
Mr. Brown : "I don't want to see that in this class again."

[Data 16, Episode 6, 00:01:39 - 00:07:43]

This scene occurred in the minute 00:01:39 - 00:07:43 in episode 6, season 1, when Mr. Brown, the interlocutor, caught Giovanni, the speaker 1, and Max, the speaker 2, drinking an alcohol in Mr. Brown's class. In Mr. Brown's class, alcoholic beverages are not allowed, so Max and Giovanni violate the maxim of quality by lying to Mr. Brown and saying that all they drank was plain water. Mr. Brown doubted what they said, so he checked Max and Giovanni's drinks. It turned out that what they drank was wine, and then Giovanni violated the maxim of quality again by dishonest that the water they drank turned into wine, which was all a miracle.

Excerpt 3

Giovanni : "Come on, Max!"
Mr. Brown : "Where are you going?"
Giovanni : "We go to spend two p."
Mr. Brown : "Where the phrase is 'spend a penny' "
Giovanni : "Sure. I spend the penny, he spend the penny. That's two p."
Mr. Brown : "You won't go to the classroom I hope."
Giovanni : **"No, Professori!"**
Mr. Brown : "I mean I just left the answers on my desk. And I wouldn't want to you to be looking at them and copying them down."
Giovanni : **"Would we do that, Max?"**
Max : **"No."**

[Data 37, Episode 8, 00:19:06 - 00:19:33]

This conversation took place in the school corridor in the minute 00:19:06 - 00:19:33 in episode 8, season 1, when Giovanni and Max, the speakers, wanted to return to Mr. Brown's class to find the answer key for the assignment Mr. Brown gave, they happened to meet Mr. Brown, the interlocutor, who had just arrived at the cafeteria. Mr. Brown unconsciously told Giovanni and Max where the answer key was for the assignment he gave to all his students, that it was right on Mr. Brown's desk while forbidding Giovanni and Max from entering the classroom. Here, Giovanni and Max violated the maxim of quality by lying to Mr. Brown and saying they would not enter the classroom. However, they managed to get Mr. Brown's answer key for the assignment he gave.

Violation Maxim of Quantity

According to Grice (1975), speakers should avoid giving insufficient or excessive information, providing only just enough to be relevant to the discussion. They should try to avoid being excessively long while still being as informative as necessary. This maxim makes sure that speakers add the material that is required to the discussion without overwhelming the audience with unnecessary information.

Excerpt 4

Mr. Brown : "Your name?"
Giovanni : "Giovanni Cupello! Italian."
Mr. Brown : "What do you work?"
Giovanni : "I work inna Ristorante dei Populi."
Mr. Brown : "A waiter?"
Giovanni : **"No, not a waiter. A cookada."**
Mr. Brown : "A cookada?"
Giovanni : "I cookada raviolo, dasapaggetti, dalasagne. I cookada everything."
Mr. Brown : "A chef."
[Data 3, Episode 1, 00:07:43 - 00:08:10]

This scene occurred in minute 00:07:43 - 00:08:10 in episode 1, season 1, when Mr. Brown, the interlocutor, has just become a new teacher in the class and wants to record each student's name, jobs, and citizenship individually. When it is Giovanni's, the speaker, turn to fill in the data, as the interlocutor, he violates the maxim of quantity by providing unclear information when asked about his job while using difficult and complex vocabulary, such as a combination of English and Italian.

Excerpt 5

Mr. Brown : "And finally your name?"
Juan : "Por favore"
Mr. Brown : "Your name, what is your name?"
Juan : "Por favore."
Giovanni : "Nome"
Juan : "Ah nome, si. Juan Cervantes para Seville, senor."
Mr. Brown : "No need to ask what nationality you are."
Juan : "Por favore."
Mr. Brown : "Spanish."
Juan : "Por favore."
Mr. Brown : "What is your job?"
Juan : "Por favore."
Giovanni : "Trabje."
Juan : **"Ah, si! Tree lagers."**
Mr. Brown : "Tree lagger. What you like tree?"
Juan : "1 jeentonic, 2 whisky, 3 coka. Tree lagers."
Mr. Brown : "Three lagers."
Juan : "Si."
Mr. Brown : "You work in the bar."
Juan : "Bar, si."
[Data 5, Episode 1, 00:12:19 - 00:12:59]

The conversation above is a continuation of Data 3 for its context at minute 00:12:19 - 00:12:59 in episode 1, season 1, when Mr. Brown, the interlocutor, wants to add student data in his class, Juan, the speaker, is a student who has a language barrier and always answers Mr. Brown's questions using his native language, Spanish, and Juan violates the maxim of quantity because he uses a term that is very foreign in English plus his pronunciation uses his native accent, making Mr. Brown as the interlocutor misinterpret what Juan means as a speaker when asked by Mr. Brown what his job is.

Excerpt 6

Giovanni : "Buena serra"

Mr. Brown : "Giovanni, what time do you call this?"
 Giovanni : "Uhh... Ten past seven!"
 Mr. Brown : "You're late. Haven't you got a watch?"
 Giovanni : **"I had a watch. It was a beautiful watch! It was rustproof, shockproof, waterproof. Everything!"**

[Data 39, Episode 10, 00:02:34 - 00:02:49]

This conversation happens at 00:02:34 - 00:02:49 minutes in episode 10, season 1, when Giovanni, as the speaker, arrived late to enter Mr. Brown's class. Then Mr. Brown, the interlocutor, asked Giovanni if he had a watch so he would not be late again. Here, the speaker violated the maxim of quantity by answering interlocutor's question with an excessive answer along with details that were not important for Mr. Brown to know as the interlocutor.

Violation Maxim of Relevance

According to Grice (1975), in the relevance maxim, speakers should provide information that is relevant to the conversation's subject. They should avoid from bringing up irrelevant or side topics. This adage encourages effective information sharing and keeps participants' attention on the conversation's primary topic.

Excerpt 7

Ali: "Oh dear, I am not going where I am looking."
 Mr. Brown: "No, no! I wasn't looking where I was going."
 Ali: **"That makes the two of us! Excuse me, sir."**
 [Data 1, Episode 1, 00:02:29 - 00:02:38]

The dialogue above occurred at 00:02:29 - 00:02:38 in episode 1, season 1, when Ali, as the speaker, first met Mr. Brown as the interlocutor. They met accidentally when Ali had just come out of the Principal's room and accidentally bumped into Mr. Brown in front of the Principal's door. Ali apologized for accidentally bumping into him while using English with poor grammar, and then Mr. Brown tried to correct Ali's English grammar. This is where Ali violated the maxim of relevance by giving irrelevant input. Ali, as the speaker, thought that Mr. Brown, the interlocutor, also made the same mistake, so the speaker left while saying what they did was the same, and the problem was solved. The interlocutor could only be silent and confused about the speaker's response, which had just been explained as the correct use of grammar.

Excerpt 8

Mr. Brown: "I want you to give me a sentence using 'you are' "
 Ali: "I am."
 Mr. Brown: "No, not 'I am', 'you are'! For example, 'you are from Pakistan' "
 Ali: "I am from Pakistan."
 Mr. Brown: "Yes, but now use 'you are' "
 Ali: **"But, I cannot say you are from Pakistan because you are not, are you?"**
 Mr. Brown: "Repeat after me. 'You are English' "
 Ali: **"No, I'm not! I'm from Pakistan"**
 Mr. Brown: "What am I?!"
 Ali: **"You are confusing me!"**
 [Data 7, Episode 1, 00:21:10 - 00:21:22]

The conversation above occurred at 00:21:10 - 00:21:22 in episode 1, season 1, when Mr. Brown, as the interlocutor, asked Ali, as the speaker, to make a sentence using the clause "you are." Ali violated the maxim of relevance because when asked to make a sentence, Ali, as the interlocutor, thought that Mr. Brown, as the speaker, wanted to be called. He is from Pakistan. The speaker's answer was irrelevant to what the interlocutor expected because the speaker refused to call the speaker from Pakistan because of his white skin. Then, there was a complicated

miscommunication that caused Ali, as the speaker, to be confused with what Mr. Brown, as the interlocutor, wanted, which was that he was only asked to make a simple sentence from a clause "you are."

Excerpt 9

Mr. Brown: "Ali Nadeem"

Ali: **"Gift!"**

Mr. Brown: "Gift?"

Ali: "I'm surprising you, no?"

[Data 9, Episode 2, 00:19:25 - 00:19:34]

The scene above occurred at 00:19:25 - 00:19:34 in episode 2, season 1, When Mr. Brown's class is about to start, Mr. Brown, as the interlocutor, checks his students' attendance by calling them one by one, and they have to answer "present" when their names are called. As the speaker, Ali violates the maxim of relevance because the answer he gives when his name is called is very irrelevant. Although the vocabulary "gift" is a synonym of "present," the word "gift" is less relevant in the situation.

Violation Maxim of Manner

According to Grice (1975), The manners maxim places a strong emphasis on communication that is coherent and clear. One guideline of this maxim is that speakers should make an effort to communicate their thoughts in an organized and understandable way, steering clear of ambiguity, cryptic terms, or too complicated language. This adage encourages speakers to choose language that is simple enough for listeners to understand.

Excerpt 10

Mr. Brown : "Right! For the rest of this period we're going to talk about shopping."

Giovanni : **"Wah, I like him! He's very good!"**

*Mr. Brown confused

Mr. Brown : "Pardon?"

Giovanni : **"Shoppin! I like Polonaise. Pam papam... Papa papapap papam... Pam papam... Brrap papam!"**

Mr. Brown : "No, Giovanni, that's Chopin."

[Data 13, Episode 4, 00:05:12-00:05:33]

The dialogue above occurred at 00:05:12 - 00:05:33 in episode 4, season 1, when Mr. Brown, as the interlocutor, will start the learning material for the day with the theme of terms commonly used when shopping. Giovanni violates the maxim of manner as the speaker because the speaker thinks the interlocutor will discuss about Chopin, not shopping. The speaker also thinks that the pronunciation of Chopin is "shoppin" /'ʃɒpɪn/, and it creates an ambiguous impression when the interlocutor says that he likes Chopin, while what the interlocutor is discussing the term shopping.

Excerpt 11

Mr. Brown : "Balls, yes, but that not exactly the national sport! That honor goes to cricket."

Max : "Please, I not understand cricket."

Mr. Brown : "Well, it's quite straightforward! There are two teams of eleven men each. One side goes in and the other side have to try and get them out."

Max : "I didn't know you could play it indoor."

Mr. Brown : "It's not played indoors"

Max : "But, how can somebody be out when he is already out?"

Mr. Brown : **"I'll try to explain, the team who is bowling is out on the field, then the**

team who is battling is in the Pavillion. Now the first two batsman come out to go in. And then the first one to be out, goes back in and another batsman comes out to go in... Is that clear so far?"

Max : "Oh, sure. When he is in, he's not really in, he's out. And when he's out, he's not really out, he's in."

Mr. Brown : "That's right."

Max : "It's crazy."

[Data 25, Episode 5, 00:16:41 - 00:17:37]

The scene above occurred at 00:16:41 - 00:17:37 in episode 5, season 1, when Max, the speaker, asked Mr. Brown, the interlocutor, to explain the concept of cricket to Max because he did not know what cricket was. Here, the interlocutor violated the maxim of manner because the way the interlocutor explained the concept of cricket was too convoluted and used complicated language.

Excerpt 12

Mr. Brown: "The feminine of the monkey is monkey. There is no difference between masculine and feminine."

Ali: **"Excuse me, you are mistaken. I've seen them at zoo and there is very big difference."**

Mr. Brown: "I'm talking about the word itself not their physical appearance."

[Data 36, Episode 8, 00:10:25 - 00:10:41]

The conversation above occurred at 00:10:25 - 00:10:41 in episode 8, season 1, when Mr. Brown, the interlocutor, teaches about the differences in the words used in animal names. If the animals are of different genders, then the names of the animals are different even though their forms remain the same, and monkeys do not have specific terms even though they are of different genders. Ali, the speaker, violates the maxim of manner because he says something ambiguous and says that Mr. Brown, the interlocutor, made a mistake. The speaker thinks that male and female monkeys have no physical appearance differences, while the interlocutor is discussing only the form of the word itself, not the form in class.

To compare this study with prior research, the investigators utilized three relevant studies as a framework for their investigation. According to previous study by Setiawati et al. (2024), which examined the violation of maxims in the film "All The Bright Places." The researchers identified 9 violations of the maxim of quality, 3 violations of the maxim of number, 13 violations of the maxim of relevance, and 6 violations of the maxim of manner. The researcher utilized the qualitative descriptive approach to evaluate data in order to discover the maxim of violation present in the film, referencing Grice's (1975) theory of Logic and Conversation. Another Previous studies have employed the research conducted by Wijaya & Haristiani (2023), which analyzes maxim violations in the context of the Werewolf Game played by the Japanese idol group, Snow Man. The research identifies three violations of the maxim of number, three violations of the maxim of quality, two violations of the maxim of relevance, and two violations of the maxim of manner. The researcher use qualitative content analysis, informed by Grice's cooperation principle (1975) and Christoffersen's lie category (2005), to analyze the data. The last related studies that utilized this research were conducted by Ningsih & Ambalegin (2022), which analyzed the violations of maxims in the film "The Lion in Winter." The researcher identified seven violations of the maxim of number, three violations of the maxim of quality, four violations of the maxim of relevance, and four violations of the maxim of manner. The researchers utilized descriptive qualitative analysis, supported by Grice's theory (1989), to examine the data. This study examines the violation of maxims in selected episodes of the series Mind Your Language, specifically in its first season. The research will utilize Grice's (1975) Cooperation Principles theory. There are a total of 45 violations of maxims, comprising 3 violations of quality, 14 violations of quantity, 22 violations of relevance, and 6 violations of manner. To identify each type of maxim of violation

the researcher employed the descriptive qualitative research.

CONCLUSIONS

This study classified the categories of maxim violations according to Grice's theory. The maxim influenced conversations in episodes one to eleven of the TV series *Mind Your Language*, season 1 (1977). The study revealed that the participants had contravened all of Grice's maxims. The findings include four maxims of quantity, three maxims of quality, twenty-two maxims of relevance, and six maxims of way. The maxim of quality was the least contravened. Understanding the violation of maxims was essential to analyzing the study's findings and conclusions. This prevented misunderstandings between the speaker and the interlocutor during the conveyance of information. Speakers and interlocutors should minimize the violation of maxims and enhance comprehensibility by effectively applying cooperative principles. Participants were expected to discern the concealed message that the speaker sought to convey in this study. Several analytical domains in this study require further development. Consequently, the researchers proposed using an alternative object and indicated that a subsequent study may be performed employing a different hypothesis. The insights acquired from this study can be utilized by other researchers aiming to examine the same topic to provide improved outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. SAGE Publications, 11.
- Fasold, R., & Linton, J. C. (2006). An Introduction to Language and Linguistics. In *Estudios filológicos* (Issue 37). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0071-17132002003700022>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In *The Logic of Grammar* (Donald Dav, pp. 41–58). Dickenson Pub. Co. <https://doi.org/10.2307/324613>
- Hardianti, S. D., Fitrisia, D., & Nasir, C. (2023). An Analysis of Maxim Violations in Stan and Ollie Movie. *Research in English and Education*, 8(1), 20–27. <https://jim.usk.ac.id/READ/article/view/24113/11297>
- Hasson, U., Ghazanfar, A. A., Galantucci, B., Garrod, S., & Keysers, C. (2012). Brain-to-brain coupling: A mechanism for creating and sharing a social world. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16(2), 114–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2011.12.007>
- Haugh, M. (2018). Linguistics. In Klaus Bruhn Jensen (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy*, 1073–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118766804.wbiect182>
- Kreidler, C. (1998). Introducing English Semantics. In *Introducing English Semantics*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315886428>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=SJXr9w_IVLUC
- Setiawati, B., Rachel, A. J., Kamaluddin, A. D., Sholihah, & Rochmah, A. N. (2024). *The Analysis of Maxim Violation in All The Bright Places The Movie*. 5(2), 85–92. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.47701/frasa.v5i2.3981>
- Tupan, A. H., & Natalia, H. (2008). the Multiple Violations of Conversational Maxims in Lying Done By the Characters in Some Episodes of Desperate Housewives. *K@Ta*, 10(1), 63–78. <https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.10.1.63-78>
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. OUP Oxford. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=E2SA8ao0yMAC>

