## Appendix

### The Data Sources for Chapter IV in Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| 1 | Qn1 | **George**: "Well, I'm tired, dear … it's late … and besides …"<br>**Martha**: "*I don't know what you're so tired about ... you haven't done anything all day; you didn't have any classes or anything …*" | √ | | | | **Conflictive** | Martha **flouts the Maxim of Quantity** because she provides excessive information that is not needed. George's statement about being tired is simple and direct, but Martha's response adds unnecessary details, such as commenting on what George has or hasn't done all day, which is irrelevant to his original point. The extra information about his lack of classes and activities goes beyond what is necessary, making it an example of providing too much information.<br><br>In this case, George's goal is likely to seek some sympathy or understanding by stating that he is tired. However, Martha's response directly opposes this goal by accusing him of not having done anything all day, which dismisses his tiredness. Instead of offering empathy or understanding, she counters his claim, essentially dismissing his feelings of tiredness by reprimanding him with unnecessary details. Martha accuses George of not doing anything all day. She counters his tiredness by focusing on what he didn't do, which is a form of reprimanding. This creates a **Conflictive** speech act, as Martha's response undermines the social function of George's statement, which is to express his feelings of tiredness and likely gain some sympathy or understanding from her. |
| 2 | Qn2 | **George**: "You're obsessed with that phrase, Martha … It's ugly."<br>**Martha**: "*You stay right where you are ... you stay right at the ... meat of things*." | √ | | | | **Competitive** | Martha **flouts the Maxim of Quantity** because she provides excessive details that are not necessary in response to George's comment. Her response is more about reaffirming the idea of "staying" rather than addressing George's criticism about her phrase. The extra information she adds about staying at the "meat of things" goes beyond what is required to respond to George's simple point, making it an example of providing too much information.<br><br>Martha's response is **competitive** in nature because it is a direct challenge to George's statement. Instead of acknowledging or responding to George's opinion about the phrase being "ugly," Martha shifts the conversation into a confrontation by ordering George to "stay right where you are." This use of ordering is competitive because it opposes the |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | social function of George's statement (which is to express his displeasure) by redirecting the focus onto a commanding and assertive directive. The imperative "stay" shows Martha's attempt to assert control over the situation, positioning George in a passive role. By using this ordering language, Martha challenges George's point, not by engaging with his criticism, but by attempting to dominate the conversation, disregarding his feelings entirely. The focus on "the meat of things" further emphasizes her refusal to compromise and her determination to impose her stance, which highlights her competitive and commanding nature in the exchange. |
| 3 | Qn3 | **George**: "*You know, when you've had as many of these faculty parties as I have …*"<br>**Martha**: "I *married the S.O.B., and I had it all planned out …*" | √ | | | | **Competitive** | George's statement is quite simple; he is reflecting on his experience attending faculty parties. However, Martha's response goes beyond simply acknowledging or engaging with George's statement. Instead, she provides **excessive information** by diverting the topic to her own experience of marriage, saying, "I married the S.O.B., and I had it all planned out." This response is not directly relevant to George's original point about faculty parties. **Martha provides too much information** by bringing up her marriage to "the S.O.B." and focusing on her personal plans, which does not address or expand upon George's experience at faculty parties. This is an example of **flouting Maxim of Quantity** because Martha offers unnecessary details about her personal life and plans, which are irrelevant to the original topic. She gives more information than needed, creating a shift in the focus of the conversation and deviating from the simple context of George's statement about faculty parties. This is a classic case of providing too much information, which is why her response flouts the Maxim of Quantity.<br><br>Martha's response is **competitive** because it directly challenges George's statement in a confrontational manner. When George says, "You know, when you've had as many of these faculty parties as I have ...", Martha immediately retorts, "I married the S.O.B., and I had it all planned out ...". Her response is **demanding**, as she is asserting her viewpoint forcefully, claiming ownership over the situation with her bold statement about marrying "the S.O.B." and having everything planned out. By doing so, she shifts the focus from George's comment about faculty parties to her own perspective, turning the conversation into a power struggle. Martha is not responding politely or trying to understand George's point; rather, she **demands attention** on her own viewpoint, emphasizing her control over the situation. This response undermines the social purpose of George's statement, which is to express frustration or tiredness about attending |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | faculty parties, by redirecting it with her own aggressive stance. Therefore, her use of a **demanding** tone is a competitive speech act that challenges George's expression. |
| 4 | Qn4 | **Nick**: "She really shouldn't drink."<br>**George**: "*Martha? Oh, no, Martha hasn't been sick a day in her life, unless you count the time she spends in the rest home ...*" | √ | | | | **Competitive** | George's response flouts the **Maxim of Quantity** by providing more information than necessary in response to Nick's simple statement, "She really shouldn't drink." Instead of directly addressing the concern about Martha's drinking, George elaborates excessively by saying, "Martha hasn't been sick a day in her life, unless you count the time she spends in the rest home." This adds unnecessary details about Martha's health and her time in the rest home, which are irrelevant to Nick's point about her drinking. George's response shifts the conversation from the original concern to personal and unrelated information, providing too much detail that does not contribute to the issue at hand. As a result, George flouts the Maxim of Quantity by overloading the conversation with information that was not required to respond to Nick's comment.<br><br>George's response can be seen as **demanding** because he asserts that Martha's drinking is not an issue, dismissing Nick's concern altogether. By saying, "Martha hasn't been sick a day in her life," George challenges Nick's suggestion in a dismissive manner, as if to command the situation by rejecting the idea that Martha's drinking is a problem. Additionally, when George mentions, "unless you count the time she spends in the rest home," it is an attempt to redirect the concern into a sarcastic remark, instead of directly acknowledging or addressing Nick's point. This response is not just a rebuttal, but a demanding dismissal of Nick's advice, making George's response **competitive** as it attempts to control the direction of the conversation and assert his perspective over Nick's. This aligns with the competitive speech act type because George is ordering the conversation in a way that dismisses Nick's concern about Martha's drinking without truly engaging with it, focusing instead on his own critical viewpoint. |
| 5 | Qn5 | **George**: "Well, I'm tired, dear … it's late … and besides …"<br>**Martha**: "*I don't know what you're so tired about ... you haven't done anything all day.*" | √ | | | | **Conflictive** | Martha flouts the **Maxim of Quantity** by providing **too much information** in her response. George's statement about being tired is simple and to the point. However, Martha's response goes beyond what is necessary by providing excessive details about George's activities, saying, "I don't know what you're so tired about … you haven't done anything all day." This comment brings up irrelevant information about what George has or hasn't done, which has nothing to do with his tiredness or the current conversation. Martha adds more detail than needed, making her response an example of |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | providing **too much information**. Instead of offering a brief reply that acknowledges George's tiredness, she shifts the conversation toward unnecessary criticism, which goes beyond what is required to respond to George's original statement.<br><br>Martha's response is **conflictive**, as it directly challenges George's statement and undermines his feelings. Instead of acknowledging or empathizing with George's tiredness, Martha **accuses** him of having no reason to be tired by saying, "you haven't done anything all day." This is a form of accusation, as she shifts the blame onto him for his fatigue, implying that he has no right to feel tired because he didn't engage in any strenuous activity. By doing this, she invalidates his feelings and counters his expression of tiredness with criticism, which is characteristic of a **conflictive speech act**. Rather than providing understanding or support, Martha's response is accusatory and confrontational, challenging George's emotional state. |
| 6 | Qn6 | **Nick**: "Well … no … I don't imagine so … now."<br>**George**: "*Oh, yes … I know*." | √ | | | | **Conflictive** | In this case, **George's response flouts the Maxim of Quantity** by providing too little information. Nick's statement is somewhat hesitant, where he seems unsure and is trying to express doubt about something. He says, "I don't imagine so ... now," which is a reasonable, concise response. However, George's reply—"Oh, yes ... I know"—is minimal, and it does not address or elaborate on Nick's statement in any meaningful way. George's response does not offer additional context, clarification, or engagement with Nick's doubt. Instead, it simply asserts his certainty in a way that cuts off any further discussion or explanation. This makes his response an example of flouting the Maxim of Quantity, as he provides too little information—just a brief acknowledgment—without adding anything relevant or necessary to move the conversation forward. George's answer does not provide the level of detail or engagement that would typically be expected in this type of dialogue, which creates a sense of minimalism that is unnecessary and overly curt.<br><br>George's response, "Oh, yes ... I know," can be seen as **conflictive** because it indirectly challenges or diminishes Nick's statement. While Nick initially expresses uncertainty or hesitancy with, "I don't imagine so ... now," George's response comes across as somewhat dismissive and condescending. By saying, "Oh, yes ... I know," he dismisses Nick's point without truly engaging with it or offering any clarity, implying that he already has control over the situation or the knowledge at hand. The keyword that |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | applies here is **"reprimanding"**. Though George doesn't directly reprimand Nick, the tone of his response suggests a subtle form of reprimand by asserting his certainty and knowledge in a manner that shuts down further conversation. Instead of continuing the exchange in a collaborative manner, George's response suggests that Nick's statement is less important or doesn't need further elaboration. This serves to undermine Nick's earlier hesitation, effectively creating a **conflictive** speech act by challenging Nick's implied doubt with unnecessary finality. |
| 7 | Qn7 | **Nick**: "My wife had one."<br>**George**: "*Yes. Martha doesn't have pregnancies at all*." | √ | | | | **Conflictive** | In this case, George's response **flouts the Maxim of Quantity** by providing too much information that is unnecessary and irrelevant to Nick's simple statement. Nick's statement, "My wife had one," likely refers to a specific situation (possibly a pregnancy or an event related to his wife), and it's a brief, to-the-point remark. However, George's response, "Yes. Martha doesn't have pregnancies at all," adds a great deal of unnecessary information about Martha's personal situation, which does not contribute to Nick's original point. The inclusion of "Martha doesn't have pregnancies at all" is excessive because it provides irrelevant details about Martha's fertility or health, which is not related to the topic at hand. George could have simply acknowledged Nick's statement without adding a personal, and potentially sensitive, comment about Martha's situation. This is an example of providing too much information, as George unnecessarily brings up a topic that was not part of Nick's original statement, thereby **flouting the Maxim of Quantity** by overloading the conversation with irrelevant details.<br><br>George's response can be seen as **accusing**. When Nick says, "My wife had one," he likely refers to a pregnancy or a situation involving his wife. However, George responds by saying, "Yes. Martha doesn't have pregnancies at all," which is a **direct contradiction** and an **accusation** against Martha, implying something about her fertility or situation. This statement seems unnecessary and out of place in the context, making it not only **accusatory** but also **reprimanding** in tone. George's comment doesn't contribute constructively to Nick's simple statement but rather creates a conflict by highlighting a sensitive and personal detail about Martha, one that may not need to be mentioned. It can be interpreted as accusing Martha of something, possibly suggesting an issue with her fertility, which is **conflictive** because it undermines Nick's statement while attacking Martha. The use of "doesn't have pregnancies at all" seems to serve the |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | purpose of making an unnecessary point about Martha, thus challenging the social function of Nick's statement and turning the conversation into an uncomfortable or confrontational situation. |
| 8 | Qn8 | **George:** "What made you decide to be a teacher?"<br>**Nick:** "*Same things that motivated you, I suppose*." | √ | | | | Competitive | Nick's response flouts the Maxim of Quantity because he provides too little information in response to George's question. George asks a direct and open question, "What made you decide to be a teacher?" This question invites Nick to elaborate on his personal motivations or reasons for becoming a teacher. However, Nick's response, "Same things that motivated you, I suppose," is vague and unelaborative. Instead of providing his own reasons or offering some depth, Nick redirects the question and provides a minimal answer that doesn't answer George's query in a meaningful way.<br><br>Nick's response provides too little information by not giving any insight into his own motivations for becoming a teacher. Instead, he gives a generic response that references George's motivations, leaving the conversation unfinished and uninformative. This is an example of flouting the Maxim of Quantity because Nick fails to provide the expected level of detail, choosing instead to offer an answer that doesn't fully engage with George's question or provide the necessary information.<br><br>Nick's response is competitive because he avoids answering George's direct question and shifts the focus of the conversation back onto George in a way that demands a reflection of George's own motivations. By saying, "Same things that motivated you, I suppose," Nick refuses to give a direct response and instead challenges George by implying that the answer to the question about his motivations is the same as George's, putting George on the spot without directly addressing the question himself. Nick's use of "I suppose" adds a layer of passive demand, as he forces George to think about his own motivations, rather than giving a straightforward answer. In this way, Nick is demanding that George reflect on his own reasons without explicitly saying so. This creates a competitive dynamic, as it turns the question back onto George, making Nick's response more about asserting control over the conversation than engaging with George's inquiry. |
| 9 | Ql1 | **George**: "*Martha is a hundred and twenty-five … years old. She weighs* | | √ | | | **Competitive** | George's statement flouts the **Maxim of Quality** because it lacks evidence and is likely untrue. When George says, "Martha is a hundred and twenty-five years old," this is an exaggeration, as it is highly unlikely that anyone would live to be that age (unless it's in |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | *somewhat more than that*."<br>**Nick**: "Your wife weighs…?" | | | | | | a fictional or extreme context). The statement seems to be more of a sarcastic exaggeration rather than a factual claim. Moreover, the second part of George's statement, "She weighs somewhat more than that," is also vague and lacks any specific evidence. There is no factual basis for George's claim about Martha's weight, and it is unclear what "somewhat more" refers to. This lack of precision further weakens the statement and makes it unfounded. Therefore, George's response can be considered as flouting the Maxim of Quality because it provides untrue information or, at the very least, lacks the necessary evidence to support the claim. This type of exaggeration or vagueness makes George's statement unreliable and untrue, which is why it flouts the Maxim of Quality.<br><br>Nick's response is **competitive** because it directly challenges George's statement in a way that shifts the focus of the conversation. When George makes a somewhat exaggerated comment about Martha's age and weight, Nick questions George's statement by asking, "Your wife weighs ...?"<br><br>This can be seen as **asking** for further clarification, but the way Nick asks the question implies challenge. Instead of simply accepting George's statement, Nick's inquiry challenges the validity of George's comment about Martha's weight. The use of the ellipsis and the questioning tone emphasizes Nick's disbelief or surprise, making it a competitive act where Nick indirectly questions George's perception of his wife. The **asking** here becomes competitive because it pushes against George's earlier statement, calling it into question, and shifts the tone of the conversation into one where Nick is challenging George's claims. |
| 10 | Ql2 | **George**: "Martha says you're in the Math Department, or something."<br>**Nick**: "No … I'm not."<br>**George**: "*Martha is seldom mistaken … maybe you should be in* | | √ | | | **Competitive** | George's statement flouts the Maxim of Quality because it is untrue and lacking evidence. When George says, "Martha says you're in the Math Department, or something," he is repeating something Martha supposedly said without providing any solid evidence or verification of that claim. The phrase "or something" further weakens the statement, as it introduces vagueness and suggests that George may not be certain about Martha's statement. This lack of clarity and evidence makes George's statement unreliable and untrue. Furthermore, in George's follow-up, "Martha is seldom mistaken … maybe you should be in the Math Department, or something," George implies that Martha's claim is correct because she "is seldom mistaken," but this is a weak argument |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | *the Math Department, or something."* | | | | | | without any solid justification. Simply saying someone is "seldom mistaken" does not provide proof of the truth of the claim. Therefore, George's statement lacks the necessary evidence to support the assertion that Nick should be in the Math Department, making his response untrue and unsupported.<br><br>George's response is competitive because it challenges Nick's denial and attempts to assert control over the conversation. After Nick denies being in the Math Department, George counters with, "Martha is seldom mistaken … maybe you should be in the Math Department, or something." This response is demanding in nature, as George suggests, albeit indirectly, that Nick should consider the possibility of being in the Math Department, despite Nick's earlier denial. The phrase "maybe you should be in the Math Department" can be seen as a demand because George is essentially telling Nick, albeit in a more subtle way, that he may be wrong or should reconsider his position. This not only challenges Nick's initial rejection but also places the conversation under George's control by suggesting a new perspective on the matter. It subtly demands Nick to accept the possibility of being in the Math Department, which makes George's response competitive by asserting his viewpoint over Nick's. |
| 11 | Ql3 | **George**: "If you were married to Martha you would know what it means."<br>**Nick**: "*Yes … I know."* | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | George's statement, "If you were married to Martha, you would know what it means," is a hypothetical claim about Nick's potential understanding of something based on the assumption of him being married to Martha. The statement lacks evidence or concrete facts to support the claim. George is presuming that being married to Martha would automatically result in an understanding of something that is not clearly defined. The lack of clarity about "what it means" makes George's claim unfounded and speculative, therefore flouting the Maxim of Quality by not providing sufficient evidence or truth to back the statement. Nick's response, "Yes ... I know," further exemplifies **the flouting of the Maxim of Quality**. Nick is agreeing with George's claim without any substantiating evidence to confirm that he truly understands or knows what George is referring to. His response does not challenge George's unverified statement, and he affirms a claim that he cannot substantiate. Nick's agreement here seems to be more of an acknowledgment rather than a truthful response, which implies that he might be agreeing for the sake of avoiding conflict, rather than providing any real validation of the statement. The dialogue **flouts the Maxim of Quality** because George's statement is speculative and not grounded in factual evidence, and Nick's agreement with this |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | claim lacks any substantiation or truth. Both characters are engaging in communication that is not supported by verifiable facts, which makes this a clear example of flouting the Maxim of Quality.<br><br>George's statement, "If you were married to Martha, you would know what it means," can be viewed as an **accusation** directed at Nick. It indirectly implies that Nick lacks the necessary experience to fully understand a situation because he is not married to Martha. This statement can be perceived as confrontational, as George is accusing Nick of being incapable of understanding the situation due to his lack of marital experience with Martha, which is an unfair assumption. This form of **accusation** flouts the Maxim of Quality by presenting a claim that lacks evidence. George is presuming to know how Nick would behave or what he would understand if he were married to Martha, yet he has no real way of knowing this. It is speculative and not based on facts or experience. Nick's response, "Yes ... I know," acknowledges George's claim but does not challenge it. In this context, Nick is essentially **accepting the accusation** without offering a counterclaim. His response might suggest that he concedes to the judgment George has placed on him, thereby not directly confronting or disputing the accusation. His reply could be interpreted as passive acceptance, which adds to the **conflictive nature** of the conversation, where George accuses and Nick simply agrees, rather than defending himself. The dialogue is **conflictive** because George's statement involves an **accusation** that lacks evidence and unfairly judges Nick's understanding of a situation. Nick's passive response does not challenge the accusation but instead accepts it, further amplifying the conflict in the interaction. |
| 12 | Ql4 | **Martha**: "He's in the math department … about thirty, blond, and …"<br>**George**: *"... and good-looking ..."*<br>**Martha**: "*Yes ... and good-looking."* | | √ | | | **Competitive** | This exchange can be analyzed as **flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which emphasizes that statements should be truthful and backed by sufficient evidence. Martha's initial statement ("He's in the math department ... about thirty, blond, and ...") provides some basic descriptive traits about a person. However, she doesn't provide concrete details or evidence that can verify the accuracy of her description. The statement is vague, particularly because she doesn't know if the person is actually "blond" or "about thirty." She makes assumptions based on general appearance but doesn't explain how she knows these facts for sure. Such generalized, unspecific claims without clear evidence or context make the statement potentially unreliable. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | George's addition, "... and good-looking ..." contributes further to the vagueness. It introduces a subjective characteristic (looks) without offering any objective criteria to substantiate why this person is "good-looking." The term "good-looking" is highly subjective, depending on individual perspective, and it's not something that can be objectively confirmed. It's based purely on George's opinion and doesn't provide factual evidence to support this claim.<br><br>Martha's final confirmation, "Yes ... and good-looking," similarly lacks clear evidence or support for the claim. While she agrees with George, she doesn't provide further explanation or justification to back up her statement. It remains a subjective assessment, with no grounding in evidence or observable facts. This dialogue flouts the **Maxim of Quality** because both characters make subjective and unverifiable statements about the person they are describing. They provide information that is vague and unsubstantiated, making it unclear whether the description is true or merely based on opinions. The absence of concrete evidence or specific details renders these statements unreliable, and thus, they fail to meet the standard of truthfulness required by the Maxim of Quality.<br><br>The **competitive** behavior here is marked by George's assertiveness and repetition in completing Martha's description. When Martha pauses with "about thirty, blond, and ...," George quickly jumps in to complete the sentence by adding "and good-looking." His addition of "good-looking" is not a suggestion or a question; it is a directive or an assertion. He is taking control of the conversation by finishing the description on his own terms, without waiting for Martha to provide the final detail. This can be viewed as a form of **competitive** behavior, where George is pushing the narrative forward and asserting his own perspective. Martha's response ("Yes ... and good-looking") is not a fully agreeing confirmation but a reluctant acceptance of George's addition. By simply affirming what George said without offering more information or changing the narrative, she also engages in a subtle form of compliance that aligns with George's competitive tone. Martha does not challenge or expand upon George's assertion, but rather accepts it passively. In this interaction, George's assertion about the person being "good-looking" and his immediate completion of the description demonstrate a form of **ordering** or **demanding** in a competitive manner. Martha's simple affirmation ("Yes ... and good-looking") also supports this competitive tone by acquiescing to George's control of the conversation without challenging or elaborating. Therefore, the |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | interaction exemplifies competitive dynamics through assertive statements and passive acceptance. |
| 13 | Ql5 | **George**: "He has blue eyes, Martha."<br>**Martha**: "*GREEN*!" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | This exchange can be analyzed as flouting the **Maxim of Quality**, which states that one should not say anything that is false or for which one lacks sufficient evidence. George's statement, "He has blue eyes, Martha," is a claim about the color of someone's eyes. For this statement to be truthful, George must have reliable evidence or knowledge of the person's eye color. However, Martha immediately challenges the statement by responding with "GREEN!" suggesting that George is mistaken about the color of the eyes. Her reply is a correction, indicating that the eyes are green, not blue, which would imply that George's statement is untrue, or at the very least, lacking accurate evidence. Martha's response, "GREEN!", despite being a correction, is delivered in a forceful manner, and it implies that George's statement is incorrect. Given that Martha provides no further explanation or evidence, her response is essentially denying George's claim without offering direct support for her own claim, thus flouting the **Maxim of Quality** by making a definitive statement about the eye color, while potentially lacking sufficient evidence. In this case, George makes a statement without providing sufficient evidence (or clear proof) of the eye color, and Martha responds by forcefully contradicting him with the statement "GREEN!" which may be true, but she offers no support or justification for her claim. This makes the dialogue flouting the **Maxim of Quality**, as both characters present information that could be untrue or unsupported.<br><br>George's statement, "He has blue eyes, Martha," could be seen as making a claim about someone's physical traits. However, Martha immediately contradicts him by shouting "GREEN!" in a forceful and abrupt manner. This response can be interpreted as an **accusation**, where Martha challenges George's accuracy or knowledge regarding the person's eye color. Her response implies that George is wrong, and she **reprimands** him by asserting that the eyes are not blue, but green. Martha's use of the term "GREEN!" is strongly worded and may be seen as an assertive challenge to George's claim, effectively accusing him of being incorrect or careless in his observation. The tone of her response, especially the single-word answer, escalates the tension in the dialogue, creating a sense of conflict. In this case, Martha's quick, emphatic correction of George can be considered **conflictive** because it involves **accusing** George of being wrong and **reprimanding** him for his statement. Her tone and choice of words add to |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | the confrontational nature of the interaction, making it a clear example of a **conflictive** dialogue. |
| 14 | Ql6 | **George**: "I know something about history. I know when I'm being threatened."<br>**Nick**: "I'm a biologist."<br>**George**: "*I know something about history. I know when I'm being threatened."* | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | This exchange can be analyzed as **flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which asserts that communication should be truthful and based on evidence. George begins with the statement "I know something about history. I know when I'm being threatened." His claim about being able to recognize when he is being threatened appears to lack evidence or justification. There is no context provided to support his statement that he knows when he's being threatened. The repetition of this claim, with no concrete details or examples, makes it difficult for the audience to believe or verify George's assertion. Furthermore, George's declaration of knowing when he is being threatened seems somewhat exaggerated and speculative, as it doesn't provide any explanation of how or why he recognizes such a threat. It could be argued that George's statement is unfounded because it doesn't offer any proof of his ability to recognize when a threat is being made. Nick's response, "I'm a biologist," does not directly address George's statement, which makes the conversation more confusing. Nick does not challenge George's unverified claim, but his response is unrelated to the subject, which may be an attempt to deflect the conversation or highlight the lack of evidence in George's statement. George's repeated assertion that he knows when he is being threatened, without offering any evidence or specific details, flouts the Maxim of Quality by saying something untrue or lacking evidence. The absence of supporting facts makes his claim questionable, and the conversation becomes less meaningful due to this lack of substantiation.<br><br>George starts by stating, "I know when I'm being threatened." This can be seen as an **accusation**, as he is indirectly accusing someone, presumably Nick or another person, of threatening him. The accusation itself is somewhat vague because there is no clarification or context as to who is threatening him or why. Nevertheless, it carries a tone of confrontation and implies that George perceives a threat from someone. Additionally, the repetition of the phrase "I know when I'm being threatened" emphasizes George's feeling of being under threat and reinforces the tension. By repeating the statement without elaborating further, George implies that the threat is serious or persistent, which can heighten the conflict. Nick's response, "I'm a biologist," might seem disconnected at first, but it could be interpreted as a deflection or an attempt |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | to distance himself from the accusation. By introducing a different topic—his professional background—Nick avoids addressing the threat or the accusation directly, which could be a subtle way of defusing the tension or avoiding conflict. George's statement of knowing when he's being threatened introduces an **accusation** and implies a threatening situation, creating a conflictive dynamic between him and Nick. The repetition of this statement increases the tension and makes the dialogue more charged with emotional intensity. |
| 15 | Ql7 | **GEORGE:** "Martha's father has not been robbing this place blind for years, and Martha does not have any money. OK?"<br>**NICK:** "*No, he hasn't. He has not."* | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | This exchange can be analyzed as **flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which states that communicators should only convey information that they believe to be true, and should provide evidence for their claims. In the first statement, George says, "Martha's father has not been robbing this place blind for years, and Martha does not have any money." George's statement about Martha's father is unverifiable and accusatory, implying that he has been stealing from the place. However, there is no evidence provided to back up this claim. The accusation is simply presented as fact, without offering any supporting details or proof of the alleged theft. This lack of evidence for the assertion causes George to **flout the Maxim of Quality** by stating something untrue or unsupported. Moreover, George asserts, "Martha does not have any money." This statement also comes without any evidence. While it may be true that Martha does not have money, George does not provide any supporting evidence to substantiate this claim, which makes his statement questionable and potentially untrue. Nick's response, "No, he hasn't. He has not," functions as a counter-argument to George's claim. Nick is denying George's statement about Martha's father's behavior. However, like George, Nick does not provide any evidence or reasoning to support his counterclaim. He simply asserts the opposite, which makes his response equally questionable. While Nick's denial may be true, it still does not provide any factual support to clarify the matter. Both George and Nick **flout the Maxim of Quality** in their statements. George's claim about Martha's father is unsubstantiated, and Nick's denial lacks supporting evidence. Both parties are making statements that lack factual backing, causing the dialogue to flout the maxim by presenting unproven claims. This leads to a breakdown in the quality of information being conveyed.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **conflictive**, particularly focusing on **accusing** behavior. George's statement begins with an **accusation** against Martha's father. He |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | says, "Martha's father has not been robbing this place blind for years," which is a serious and pointed claim. Even though George is using the negative form "has not been robbing," the language still implies that Martha's father has been involved in wrongdoing — specifically, robbing. The use of "robbing this place blind" is a strong **accusation** that suggests illegal or immoral activity, which could create tension or hostility in the conversation. George's statement is not just about providing information but is **accusatory** in nature, implying wrongdoing without providing evidence. In addition, George follows this up by claiming that "Martha does not have any money." While this could be a factual statement, the way it is phrased right after the accusation creates a connection between the two points. By associating Martha's lack of money with the accusation against her father, George is implicitly **accusing** Martha of being involved in something shady or problematic, even though no direct evidence is presented. This further builds the **accusatory tone** of the conversation. Nick's response, "No, he hasn't. He has not," is a **counter-accusation** or **denial**, rejecting George's claim. Although Nick is attempting to refute George's statement, his response does not offer an alternative explanation or evidence either, but simply contradicts George's statement. This reinforces the conflict by maintaining the **accusatory** nature of the conversation, where both parties are accusing each other (directly or indirectly) without providing evidence to support their claims. The dialogue between George and Nick **includes a conflictive** dynamic with an emphasis on **accusations**. George accuses Martha's father of wrongdoing, and by extension, Martha is implicated. Nick responds by denying George's accusation, but without offering any clarification or evidence of his own. The lack of supporting details in both George's accusation and Nick's denial fuels the **conflictive nature** of the interaction, making it an example of **accusing** behavior in a competitive context. |
| 16 | Ql8 | **MARTHA:** "He has blue eyes, Martha." **GEORGE:** *"He does not! Your father has tiny red eyes … like a white mouse."* | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | This exchange can be analyzed as **flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which suggests that speakers should provide information that is true and supported by evidence. Martha's statement about the color of the person's eyes ("He has blue eyes") is presented as a factual assertion, which, on its own, could be true. However, George's response, "He does not! Your father has tiny red eyes ... like a white mouse," **flouts the Maxim of Quality** by making an **untrue or exaggerated statement**. George is contradicting Martha by claiming that the individual in question does not have blue eyes. Instead, he asserts that the person has "tiny red eyes," a description that seems exaggerated and |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | highly **improbable** or **untrue** in a literal sense. The comparison to "like a white mouse" adds a further layer of **unreality** or **absurdity** to the claim. This is a false statement without evidence to support it. The lack of supporting evidence or any factual basis for George's description makes his statement unreliable. Rather than providing proof of the eye color, George opts for a hyperbolic and unsubstantiated comparison that lacks credibility. By doing so, George is **flouting the Maxim of Quality** by making a statement that is **untrue** or at least highly unlikely. This is a clear example of **flouting the Maxim of Quality**, where George's statement is not grounded in truth or evidence but is instead a false claim made for the sake of contradicting Martha's assertion.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **Conflictive**, particularly focusing on **accusing** and **reprimanding** behavior. George's statement, "He does not! Your father has tiny red eyes ... like a white mouse," can be classified as an **accusation** and **reprimand**. He not only disagrees with Martha's statement about the eye color but attacks her description with an exaggerated and derogatory comparison. By claiming, "Your father has tiny red eyes ... like a white mouse," George is effectively **reprimanding** Martha's assertion, dismissing her perspective, and emphasizing that her belief is wrong or misguided. His **accusation** is not just about the eye color, but about questioning Martha's perception, making her feel like she is mistaken or deceived about a simple fact. The metaphor George uses ("like a white mouse") is belittling, adding a layer of mockery to the conversation. Thus, this exchange falls under the **Conflictive** category because it involves an attack on Martha's statement, creating a conflict where George tries to assert dominance by **reprimanding** and **accusing** her of being wrong, rather than discussing the topic in a calm or respectful manner. |
| 17 | Ql9 | **GEORGE:** "*Well, I think that's very nice."*<br>**NICK:** "Yes." | | √ | | | **Convivial** | The conversation you referenced, where George says "Well, I think that's very nice," followed by Nick's "Yes," occurs after Martha comments about Nick's physique, particularly his body, implying admiration. This happens after Martha has asked Nick if he's kept his body in good shape, noting how he still looks fit. She says this in a playful, flirtatious manner, and Nick responds somewhat self-consciously but proudly. George, however, responds with his typically sarcastic tone, indicating both his disdain for the way Martha engages with Nick and his general dissatisfaction with the situation, George's comment appears overly generic and doesn't provide concrete reasoning or evidence for why he thinks "that's very nice." He might be saying it in a polite, social |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | context where such compliments are often given without any specific reason or may not be entirely sincere. If George does not genuinely believe it is "very nice" but instead says it out of social convention or politeness, it could be considered lacking sincerity or evidence. The statement lacks specific details or justification for why something is "nice," which is essential in a conversation where truthfulness and evidence should be prioritized. George could have explained why he thinks it's nice or what exactly he finds nice about it, but he does not, leaving the comment open-ended and vague. Thus, George flouts the Maxim of Quality because he makes a statement that lacks the necessary evidence or specificity to fully support the claim.<br><br>George's statement, "Well, I think that's very nice," is an example of offering a compliment or expressing approval. By saying that something is "very nice," George is acknowledging something positively, which is often seen in convivial interactions that aim to maintain or foster friendly relations. His tone reflects an intention to appreciate or commend whatever topic or action has been discussed, fitting the convivial category of offering praise or positive acknowledgment. Nick's brief response, "Yes," is a concurring and agreeing statement, which contributes to the conviviality of the exchange. While Nick does not offer a new compliment, his acknowledgment of George's comment shows agreement, maintaining the polite, positive tone of the conversation. This is a conversational exchange where both participants are engaging in a friendly, agreeable manner, typical of convivial speech acts like offering compliments or affirming positive remarks. |
| 18 | Ql10 | **GEORGE:** "*Martha says you're in the Math Department, or something."*<br>**NICK:** "No … I'm not." | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | This exchange can be analyzed as **Flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which states that communication should be truthful and based on evidence. In George's statement, "Martha says you're in the Math Department, or something," there is an imprecision in his language. The phrase "or something" introduces ambiguity, implying that George is unsure about the information he's passing on. This lack of clarity can be seen as a flouting of the Maxim of Quality, as George doesn't offer a direct or reliable statement about Nick's position. Instead, he relies on what Martha says but does so with an element of uncertainty, which diminishes the truth value of his statement. Nick's response, "No ... I'm not," is a rejection of the implied truth in George's statement. Nick directly contradicts George's suggestion, reaffirming that the information is inaccurate. The flouting here occurs because George doesn't provide sufficient evidence or a clear |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | statement about Nick's position in the Math Department. Instead, his phrasing introduces doubt, and the uncertainty in his words creates a lack of confidence in the truthfulness of the statement, which is ultimately challenged by Nick. Therefore, this exchange exemplifies the flouting of the Maxim of Quality.<br><br>This exchange could be considered part of **Competitive (Conflictive)** discourse, particularly in the form of **accusations** and **reprimanding**. George's statement, "Martha says you're in the Math Department, or something," can be seen as a **subtle accusation** towards Nick, suggesting a lack of clarity or understanding about his position. George implies a sense of doubt about Nick's involvement in the Math Department. By using the phrase "or something," George casts doubt, making it sound like he's not entirely sure, but he's still placing the responsibility on Nick to clarify the situation. This can be perceived as an indirect **accusation**, as George is questioning Nick's role, leading to potential tension or defensiveness.<br><br>Nick's response, "No ... I'm not," directly refutes George's statement. His quick denial is a **reprimand**, asserting that the information being provided is incorrect. Instead of just calmly stating the truth, Nick's response challenges George's accusation, adding a layer of **conflict** to the conversation. George's suggestion carries an implicit accusation, while Nick's reaction involves a direct refutation, highlighting the conflictive nature of the exchange. Both parties are engaging in a **competitive** manner, trying to assert their own stance and challenge each other's position in the conversation. |
| 19 | Ql11 | **MARTHA:** "He's in the Math Department."<br>**HONEY:** "*Uh … biology.*" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | This exchange can be analyzed in terms of **Flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which states that speakers should only provide information that they believe to be true and supported by evidence. Martha's statement, "He's in the Math Department," is presented as a factual claim. However, Honey's response, "Uh … biology," casts doubt on the truth of Martha's claim. This interruption implies that the statement made by Martha may be incorrect. The use of "Uh …" suggests hesitation and uncertainty, signaling that Honey is not convinced by Martha's assertion or knows something that contradicts it. Honey's response is not necessarily based on clear evidence in the dialogue provided but rather on an alternative piece of information ("biology"). The ambiguity in Honey's statement and the hesitation ("Uh …") suggests that either Martha's information is incorrect or incomplete, or Honey is uncertain about the details. This creates a situation where Honey's response challenges Martha's claim, and **it flouts the Maxim of Quality** |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | because it introduces conflicting or potentially false information without clear evidence. Thus, the exchange involves a possible contradiction of information, with Honey offering an alternative suggestion that undermines the truthfulness of Martha's statement. Honey's reply casts doubt on Martha's certainty, raising questions about the reliability of her original statement. This dialogue flouts the **Maxim of Quality** because Honey challenges the truth of Martha's statement without providing substantial evidence, creating ambiguity and making the conversation less clear.<br><br>This exchange could also be analyzed as **Conflictive**, particularly under the category of **accusing** or **reprimanding** behavior, depending on the context and the underlying tone of the conversation. In this case, Honey's response, "Uh … biology," implies a disagreement with or correction of Martha's statement. Although it may not be a direct accusation, it suggests that Martha's claim might be incorrect. The hesitation ("Uh …") in Honey's response adds to the tension, indicating a possible conflict or discomfort about Martha's statement. Honey's correction implicitly challenges Martha's assertion that the person is in the Math Department, perhaps pointing out that they are actually in the Biology Department. This correction or contradiction can be seen as a mild **accusation** of inaccuracy or misunderstanding. By implying that Martha's statement is wrong or needs adjustment, Honey is subtly accusing her of not knowing or being mistaken. While the response is not overtly aggressive, the tension in the dialogue arises from the **underlying accusation** of error. Honey's response, with its correction and implication of inaccuracy, is an example of **accusation** in a **competitive** exchange, where the speaker challenges the information presented by the other party. This creates a conflictive moment in the dialogue where one speaker disputes the claim made by the other. |
| 20 | Ql12 | **GEORGE:** "*I'm forty-something. Aren't you surprised? I mean … don't I look older?"*<br>**NICK:** "I think you look … fine.". | | √ | | | **Convivial** | George's statement, "I'm forty-something. Aren't you surprised? I mean ... don't I look older?" is presented as a claim about his age and appearance. He is suggesting that he looks older than he actually is, using the phrase "forty-something" to imply a certain age. However, George's statement is not necessarily based on factual evidence but is more of a humorous, exaggerated observation. The way George phrases it suggests that he is not actually expecting Nick to agree with the claim of looking older, but is instead making a playful, untruthful remark about his appearance. This playful exaggeration of his age flouts the Maxim of Quality because it makes a statement that is not entirely true |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | or backed by any solid evidence about George's actual age or appearance. Nick's response, "I think you look ... fine," does not address the truthfulness of George's statement directly, but it acknowledges George's claim in a manner that suggests humor or light-heartedness. Nick's response is not a factual correction or an engagement with the reality of George's appearance but rather an indirect affirmation, which in itself further obscures the truth about George's appearance. Thus, this exchange **flouts the Maxim of Quality** because George makes an untruthful or exaggerated statement about his appearance for humorous effect, without providing any supporting evidence to substantiate his claim. The playful nature of George's remark invites Nick to respond in a way that maintains the conversational tone rather than challenging the factual accuracy of the statement. George's exaggerated comment about his appearance is untrue or at least not supported by evidence. His intention is to make a humorous claim, which flouts the Maxim of Quality, as he is not offering accurate information. Nick's response, while acknowledging George's statement, does not challenge the truth of the claim and further contributes to the humorous tone of the exchange.<br><br>While George's statement is exaggerated, it can also be seen as a form of **conviviality**, which involves engaging in friendly or social interactions through offering or joking. In this case, George is offering a humorous comment about his age and appearance to elicit a playful response from Nick. His intention is not to make a factual claim but rather to engage in light-hearted conversation and provoke a social response, which is characteristic of **convivial** behavior. Nick's response of "I think you look ... fine" can be interpreted as a polite and socially acceptable way to engage in the conversation without offending George. This is also a form of **convivial** interaction because it maintains the friendly tone of the conversation without directly challenging George's playful exaggeration. The dialogue shows **convivial** behavior where George **offers** a playful, exaggerated statement about his appearance, and Nick responds politely, maintaining the social and friendly nature of the exchange. |
| 21 | Ql13 | **MARTHA:** "*He's a housewife; she buys things ... and she comes home with the groceries."* | | √ | | | **Competitive** | Martha's statement, "He's a housewife; she buys things ... and she comes home with the groceries,**"** can be seen as **flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which dictates that communicators should only assert what they believe to be true and supported by evidence. Here, Martha makes a statement about a person, implying the person is a housewife and lists actions like buying things and coming home with groceries. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | **GEORGE:** "Are they married?" | | | | | | However, by using the term "housewife," Martha is potentially offering an inaccurate or incomplete description. This claim may not be true because the term "housewife" is gender-specific and outdated, particularly when referring to a man as a "housewife." Additionally, this statement is ambiguous because Martha doesn't clarify whether she's talking about a particular person or making a general assumption. Therefore, her use of the word "housewife" might be inaccurate or misleading, depending on the context or the person's actual role. eorge's question, **"**Are they married?" follows this up by seeking clarification, likely prompted by Martha's narrative about someone's daily routine. The ambiguity in Martha's statement regarding gender roles or relationship status could make George question whether the individuals mentioned are actually married, as no evidence is provided to support Martha's characterization of the situation. Martha's statement **flouts the Maxim of Quality** because it contains an unsubstantiated claim about someone's life. By making an assumption about another person's life without proper evidence (and possibly making an incorrect assertion about gender roles), Martha's statement lacks truthfulness and clarity, thus flouting the principle of providing truthful and well-supported information.<br><br>George starts by stating, "You're a housewife; she buys things … and she comes home with the groceries." This statement is a general description of someone's life but does not provide full clarity. George is indirectly requesting more detailed information from Martha, hinting at dissatisfaction with the vagueness of her initial statement. His statement lays the groundwork for the next query, where he seeks clarification. George's follow-up question, "Are they married?" can be interpreted as **demanding** clarification. He forces Martha to provide a specific answer to confirm or correct the assumption in her earlier statement. This question implies that George feels Martha's description is incomplete or inaccurate, and he wants to make sure he has the right understanding. Martha's initial description lacks specificity, so George's questioning serves to **demand** a more exact and truthful response. The competitive nature of the exchange comes through in George's assertion of control over the conversation—he is setting the agenda by asking direct, probing questions. The **competitive** dynamics in this exchange are evident because George insists on gaining clarity from Martha. Rather than passively accepting her description, he demands a more precise response by questioning the validity of what she has said. His questioning, especially in the form of "Are they |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | married?", places pressure on Martha to provide a definite answer. This interaction shows how George asserts his position and pushes for more information, not merely engaging in casual conversation but seeking to dominate the exchange through his demand for accuracy. George's statement and follow-up question illustrate **competitive** behavior, as he demands further clarification of Martha's general description. His insistence on knowing whether the individuals in question are married exemplifies an attempt to steer the conversation and assert control over the flow of information. |
| 22 | Ql14 | **GEORGE:** "*Your father's been robbing this place blind for years."*<br>**NICK:** "No, he hasn't. He has not." | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | This exchange can be analyzed in terms of **Flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which states that speakers should only provide information that they believe to be true and supported by evidence. George's statement, "Your father's been robbing this place blind for years," is presented as a factual claim, implying that Martha's father has been engaging in illegal or dishonest activity for an extended period. However, George offers no evidence to support this strong accusation. The use of the phrase "robbing this place blind" is a serious accusation, and without providing evidence or specifics, it comes off as an unsubstantiated statement, which directly **flouts the Maxim of Quality**. For communication to follow this maxim, statements must be grounded in verifiable truth or evidence, and George's claim does not fulfill this criterion. Nick's response, "No, he hasn't. He has not.", serves to refute George's statement, emphasizing that it is false. Nick is directly denying the accusation, claiming it to be untrue. However, his reply also lacks supporting evidence. He does not offer any reason or proof to counter George's accusation, which makes his denial somewhat weak. Instead of presenting any factual information, he simply repeats his denial, "He has not," which further adds to the ambiguity of the exchange. This back-and-forth between George and Nick flouts the Maxim of Quality because both parties are engaging in statements that lack clear evidence. George makes an unsubstantiated claim, and while Nick denies it, his denial is equally unsupported, making the dialogue unclear in terms of truthfulness and verifiability. This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quality because George makes an untrue or unsubstantiated statement about Martha's father, and while Nick denies it, he does so without providing supporting evidence either. This creates ambiguity in the conversation and leaves the truth of the statements unclear, which undermines the principle of providing only truthful and evidence-based information. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | This exchange can be analyzed as **Conflictive (Accusing)**, specifically focusing on the act of accusing. George's statement, "Your father's been robbing this place blind for years," is a direct accusation against Nick's father. By using the phrase "robbing this place blind," George is making a very serious charge, implying that Nick's father has been involved in stealing or taking advantage of the situation for an extended period. This is a harsh accusation that introduces conflict into the conversation. The use of "blind" emphasizes the severity of the allegation, suggesting that the actions have been ongoing and unnoticed, which is intended to provoke a strong response. Nick's response, "No, he hasn't. He has not.", is a direct rebuttal to George's accusation. He denies the claim in the strongest terms, emphasizing that George's statement is false. By repeating "He has not," Nick is not only rejecting George's accusation but also asserting that George's claim is untrue. His response is a defensive stance, pushing back against the accusation made against his father. The conflict is heightened by the nature of George's accusation and Nick's firm denial. George's accusation is confrontational, and Nick's response is equally firm in negating it. This creates a tense dynamic, where both individuals are locked in a verbal struggle: George trying to assert blame and Nick trying to defend his father's integrity. This dialogue is an example of **Conflictive (Accusing)** behavior because George makes a strong accusation against Nick's father, and Nick responds by denying it vehemently. The exchange creates tension and conflict, as both individuals engage in a verbal struggle over the truth of George's claim. |
| 23 | Ql15 | **George:** "*Martha, you've pushed it… there was no need… there was no need for this. I mentioned him… all right… but you didn't have to push it over the EDGE. You didn't have to… kill him."*<br>**Martha:** "You can't do that!" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | George's statement, **"**You didn't have to push it over the EDGE. You didn't have to... kill him.", is an exaggerated claim. The use of "kill him" is hyperbolic — a rhetorical tool that overstates the situation to emphasize George's frustration. He is not literally accusing Martha of having killed someone, but his use of the word "kill" exaggerates her actions, making it sound more extreme than it is. The exaggeration creates ambiguity in George's words, as it is an untrue, exaggerated statement that lacks evidence of any actual harm or violence. Martha's response, "You can't do that!", is an expression of disbelief and a rebuttal to George's exaggerated claim. She is rejecting the idea that her actions could have led to such an extreme outcome. Martha's reaction also suggests that George's claim is not credible, further emphasizing the lack of truth in his statement. In this case, George's use of "kill him" **flouts the Maxim of Quality** because it says something untrue or unsubstantiated. It is a statement that is not based on actual evidence or facts but rather an emotional outburst designed to express his frustration, |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | which makes the conversation unclear and misleading. This dialogue flouts the **Maxim of Quality** because George exaggerates Martha's actions to an absurd level, claiming she "killed him" when there is no actual evidence or truth behind this statement. His hyperbole makes his communication less truthful, which is why it flouts the maxim that requires speakers to only say things that are true and supported by evidence.<br><br>George's statement, "You didn't have to push it over the EDGE. You didn't have to... kill him," includes both an accusation and a reprimand. First, George accuses Martha of going too far with her actions — implying that her behavior has led to extreme consequences. The phrase "push it over the edge" suggests that Martha has caused a situation to escalate, implying a sense of blame. This is followed by the **accusation** of killing someone, a very strong and serious accusation, though it is hyperbolic and not meant to be taken literally. Nonetheless, it serves as a reprimand for her actions, highlighting George's disapproval. The accusation of "killing him" amplifies George's frustration and can be seen as an emotional outburst. It's a form of reprimanding Martha for her role in the situation, though it's clearly an exaggeration used to convey George's anger and sense of being wronged. Martha's response, "You can't do that!", serves as a rebuttal to George's accusation. By denying his claim and refuting it with "You can't do that!" she confronts the idea that her actions could have had such extreme consequences. It's not just a defensive response but also a challenge to George's behavior and accusation, which is **competitive** in nature. In this case, George's statement is **conflictive** because he is **reprimanding** Martha by accusing her of pushing a situation too far and exaggerating the consequences. He uses strong language that heightens the conflict, accusing her of an exaggerated and untrue action ("killing him"), which is both threatening in its implication and reprimanding in its tone. The dialogue is **conflictive** because **George accuses** Martha of an extreme and unfounded action and **reprimands** her for it. His use of hyperbole ("killing him") adds emotional intensity and creates tension, while Martha's response challenges George's accusation, further escalating the conflict. |
| 24 | Ql16 | **George:** "*Well, Martha… I'm afraid our boy isn't coming home for his birthday."* | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | George's statement, "I'm afraid our boy isn't coming home for his birthday", introduces a claim that lacks evidence or substantiation. While George suggests that their son won't return, he does not provide any supporting information to back up his statement. He presents this as a truth, yet there is no clear reason or explanation given as to why their |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | **Martha:** "Of course he is." | | | | | | son wouldn't be coming home. The phrase "I'm afraid" implies that George is uncertain or possibly imagining the situation, yet he presents it as fact. This can be interpreted as **flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which states that speakers should provide information that they believe to be true and supported by evidence. George's assertion lacks concrete evidence, and he presents it as an unsettling fact to provoke a reaction from Martha. Martha's response, "Of course he is," directly contradicts George's claim. She confidently asserts the opposite, believing that their son will come home as planned. This is a straightforward refutation of George's statement, but the conflict arises from the fact that George has made a speculative, unverified claim. Martha challenges George's narrative, implying that she trusts the idea of their son's arrival, and her response is intended to dismiss his uncertainty. George's statement is untrue or at least speculative, as it introduces a scenario without evidence. It creates a narrative of their son's absence based on fear or an emotional reaction, rather than factual information. This type of statement flouts the Maxim of Quality because George does not provide any factual support for his claim, instead relying on an unfounded assumption. His aim appears to be to unsettle Martha, creating a false and unverified narrative to evoke an emotional reaction. This dialogue flouts the **Maxim of Quality** because George makes an unsubstantiated claim about their son's absence, creating a narrative that may not be true. He presents his worry as a fact, without evidence, intending to unsettle Martha. Martha's immediate dismissal of the claim reinforces the conflict, as she refuses to accept the unverified information George has introduced.<br><br>George starts by stating, *"Well, Martha... I'm afraid our boy isn't coming home for his birthday."* This can be seen as **accusing** Martha of not being aware of the situation regarding their son. George indirectly accuses Martha of being uninformed or possibly naive about their son's plans, presenting his statement as a fact without supporting evidence. The accusation carries a tone of **confrontation** as George implies that Martha is unaware of something important, potentially creating an emotional conflict. Additionally, the wording "I'm afraid" contributes to a **threatening** undertone. By saying it in this way, George creates an air of uncertainty and impending bad news, making the situation sound more dire than it may actually be. The implication that their son will not return home could be seen as an emotional threat to Martha, threatening her expectations for their family and their son's return. Martha's response, *"Of course he* |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | *is,"* can be seen as a **reprimanding** or denial of George's accusation. Instead of addressing the possibility that their son won't come home, she rejects the idea outright, confidently asserting that George is wrong. Her tone suggests rejection of George's negative statement and a refusal to accept the implied accusation. Martha's response dismantles the tension that George tries to create by turning it back on him, denying the accusation that their son won't return. This exchange represents a **conflictive** dynamic where **George accuses** Martha of being unaware of the truth, while at the same time, **threatening** her perception of their son's future. His use of vague language and implications heightens the tension, creating a more emotionally charged atmosphere. On the other hand, **Martha's response** serves as a **reprimand**, directly rejecting George's accusation and asserting her own truth. The interaction between George and Martha exemplifies how accusations and subtle threats can intensify a conversation, increasing emotional conflict and disagreement between the characters. |
| 25 | Ql17 | **George:** "*Our son is dead. He was… killed… late in the afternoon… on a country road."* **Martha:** "No, no! You can't decide this!" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | George's statement, "Our son is dead. He was... killed... late in the afternoon... on a country road," presents a serious and emotional claim that lacks clear evidence or verification. While George speaks with certainty, there is no corroborative information to support his statement. His use of "was killed" suggests a tragic and final event, yet he doesn't provide any proof or explanation for how he knows this or why he is making such a definitive claim. The hesitations ("...") indicate uncertainty or emotional distress, further implying that George may not have factual grounds for his assertion, but rather an emotional reaction. This is a clear instance of flouting the Maxim of Quality, which advises speakers to provide information that they believe to be true and backed by sufficient evidence. Martha's response, "No, no! You can't decide this!" reflects her rejection of George's unverified statement. She challenges his claim, indicating disbelief and the refusal to accept such a harsh truth without proper evidence. Martha is not accepting the information at face value, and her reaction demonstrates her discomfort with George's assertion. She insists that George cannot claim this without knowing the full truth, implying that the claim lacks sufficient factual foundation. George's statement is presented as a fact, yet it lacks supporting evidence or details to confirm its truth. He makes a severe and emotionally charged declaration without any clear source or rationale, creating a narrative that may not be grounded in reality. This flouts the Maxim of Quality, which expects speakers to offer information that they genuinely believe to be true, based on evidence. George's claim relies on emotional |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | speculation and fear, not on verifiable information, flouting the conversational principle of truthfulness. This dialogue **flouts the Maxim of Quality** because George makes an unverified and emotionally driven claim about their son's death, without providing evidence or justification. His statement is presented as truth, yet it lacks the necessary support to be considered factual. Martha immediately rejects this claim, reinforcing the conflict and highlighting the uncertainty surrounding George's statement. The emotional nature of the exchange further emphasizes how George's unsubstantiated words challenge the conversational maxim of quality.<br><br>George begins by stating, "Our son is dead. He was... killed... late in the afternoon... on a country road." This can be seen as an **accusation** directed at Martha, suggesting that she is unaware or in denial about the situation regarding their son. George's statement presents his emotional reaction as an established fact, indirectly accusing Martha of not facing the truth about their son's death. By presenting such a tragic and final statement, George imposes a harsh reality on Martha, which could create emotional conflict, as she might not be ready to accept or process the information in the way he has. Additionally, the phrasing "late in the afternoon... on a country road" is used to evoke a sense of finality and emotional weight. While not explicitly threatening, George's words carry a threatening undertone by describing a situation that is irreversible and devastating. His declaration suggests an unavoidable truth that Martha must face, thereby indirectly threatening her peace of mind and disrupting any hope she may have had regarding their son's fate. Martha's response, "No, no! You can't decide this!" can be interpreted as a reprimand, rejecting George's claim and challenging his authority to determine the outcome. Her words suggest that George's emotional decision is not valid and that he does not have the right to make such a final judgment about their son's death. Martha confronts him by denying his authority to declare such a fate, implying that George's emotional state has clouded his judgment and that he cannot simply impose this conclusion on her. This exchange represents a conflictive dynamic, where George accuses Martha of being uninformed or unprepared to accept the harsh reality of their son's death. His emotional and declarative tone creates tension, as it suggests that Martha must come to terms with a truth that may not be aligned with her current state of mind. By presenting this tragic situation as an established fact, George indirectly threatens Martha's sense of hope or denial. Martha's immediate response serves as a |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | reprimand, rejecting George's claim and challenging his authority to decide such a devastating fate. The emotional intensity and disagreement between George and Martha highlight how accusations and indirect threats can escalate tension and conflict in a conversation. |
| 26 | Ql18 | **George:** "*I certainly was! My mommy and daddy took me there as a college graduation present."*<br>**Martha:** "You were never in the goddamn Mediterranean at all." | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | In this exchange, George claims, "My mommy and daddy took me there as a college graduation present," specifically referring to a trip to the Mediterranean. George asserts that he went to the Mediterranean as a graduation gift from his parents, presenting it as a fact. However, Martha immediately contradicts this statement with "You were never in the goddamn Mediterranean at all." Her response suggests that George's claim is false or unsubstantiated.<br><br>George's statement flouts the Maxim of Quality because he presents a potentially untrue or unverifiable fact. The way George speaks confidently about the Mediterranean trip implies that it happened, but there is no evidence provided to support it. Martha's rebuttal directly challenges this claim, indicating that George either fabricated the story or made an incorrect statement. The lack of supporting details or evidence makes George's assertion speculative or untrue, thus flouting the principle that speakers should only say things they believe to be true and can substantiate. George makes a definitive claim without providing any concrete evidence to back it up. Martha immediately refutes it, which implies that George's memory of the event is either faulty or intentionally misleading. By stating something confidently that is later proven false, George is **flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which emphasizes the importance of truthful, evidence-based communication. In this case, George's statement lacks verification and creates an untruthful narrative that Martha immediately challenges. This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quality because George makes a claim about an event (a trip to the Mediterranean) that is unverified and likely untrue. He presents it as a factual memory, but Martha denies it outright, suggesting that George is either mistaken or fabricating the story. The lack of supporting evidence and the immediate refutation from Martha emphasize the flouting of the Maxim of Quality in George's statement.<br><br>In this dialogue, George says, "I certainly was! My mommy and daddy took me there as a college graduation present." This can be seen as George asserting a fact about a personal experience — a trip to the Mediterranean. However, Martha quickly responds, "You were never in the goddamn Mediterranean at all." Martha's response is |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | **accusatory** and **cursing** in nature. By saying, "You were never in the goddamn Mediterranean at all," she directly challenges George's assertion, accusing him of lying or misremembering the event. The use of the curse word "goddamn" adds an aggressive tone to her accusation, intensifying the emotional conflict. Martha's tone implies that George's statement is not just inaccurate but deliberately false, accusing him of dishonesty. Furthermore, Martha's use of the curse word is a **reprimand**, suggesting disapproval of George's behavior or statement. It indicates that she not only disagrees with what George said, but she also feels strongly enough about it to resort to cursing, showing frustration or anger toward his claim. This interaction is conflictive because it involves Martha **accusing** George of fabricating a story, calling into question his truthfulness. Her use of strong language ("goddamn") adds an element of **threatening** tone, making the exchange more emotionally charged. The reprimanding nature of her response shows that Martha is not merely correcting George but also expressing her anger, rejecting his version of events, and confronting him in a direct and forceful manner. This dialogue exemplifies a **conflictive** interaction where Martha accuses George of lying about an event and reprimands him using harsh language. The **accusation** and **cursing** create an emotionally charged atmosphere, escalating the conflict between the two characters. |
| 27 | Ql19 | **George**: "*Once… when I was sailing past Majorca… the moon went down… thought about it for a little… and then, POP, came up again. Just like that."* **Martha:** "That is not true!" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | In this exchange, George makes a claim about an event that is highly improbable: "the moon went down... thought about it for a little... and then, POP, came up again." This statement is presented as if it were a factual memory, yet the description of the moon's behavior is scientifically inaccurate. The moon doesn't "go down" or "pop up again" in the way George describes. The moon's rising and setting are governed by predictable celestial mechanics, not by thought or sudden changes that could be perceived in the manner George suggests. By presenting this as a true personal experience, George is **flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which requires speakers to provide information that they believe to be true and can substantiate. The claim about the moon is untrue, lacking any evidence or reasonable explanation to back it up. George's use of "POP" to describe the moon's reappearance is an exaggeration and is not grounded in factual evidence. Thus, he makes a statement that is speculative and unverified, flouting the principle that information should be truthful and substantiated. Martha's response, "That is not true!" directly challenges the veracity of George's statement. She rejects George's account, pointing out that his description of the moon's behavior is false. This shows that she |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | does not accept George's unverified and inaccurate claim. Martha's rejection highlights the lack of factual support behind George's statement.<br><br>George's description of the moon's behavior is not based on factual information, making it untrue. He provides no supporting evidence or scientific basis for his claim, and his use of exaggerated language ("POP") further distances the statement from reality. Since the statement lacks substantiation, it flouts the Maxim of Quality, which expects speakers to make truthful claims based on evidence. This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quality because George makes a highly improbable claim about the moon's behavior that lacks any supporting evidence or factual basis. He presents the event as though it were a personal experience, but his description is scientifically incorrect and exaggerated. Martha's immediate rejection of George's statement underscores the falseness of his claim and further emphasizes how the Maxim of Quality is flouted when untrue or unsupported statements are made.<br><br>In this dialogue, George says, "Once... when I was sailing past Majorca... the moon went down... thought about it for a little... and then, POP, came up again. Just like that." George presents a story about an event involving the moon, describing it in a way that is improbable and inaccurate. He presents it as a personal experience, creating a sense of confidence in his words, but it is scientifically untrue. His claim could be seen as **accusatory** toward reality, as it misrepresents a natural phenomenon and could be interpreted as George attempting to establish control over the situation by asserting an impossible narrative. Martha's response, "That is not true!" is **reprimanding** in nature. She immediately rejects George's claim, confronting him and calling attention to the falsehood of his statement. Her response suggests that she does not tolerate George's exaggeration or inaccuracy. By bluntly stating that his story is untrue, Martha reprimands George for making an absurd or incorrect claim, showing a clear disagreement with his version of events. The lack of hesitation in her response further emphasizes her frustration or disbelief. Martha's use of **"**That is not true!" can also be seen as a **direct reprimand**. She is not merely pointing out that George's statement is incorrect, but she is also rejecting his behavior in presenting something so far-fetched as a truth. By doing so, Martha asserts her stance and challenges George's authority in narrating the event. This rejection carries a forceful undertone, showing her disapproval and refusal to accept George's exaggerated or false story. This exchange is conflictive |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | because it involves **accusation** and **reprimand**. George makes an unsubstantiated claim about the moon, presenting it as fact, while Martha directly challenges this by calling the statement untrue. The use of blunt language, "That is not true!" is an active reprimand, showing that Martha is not just rejecting the claim, but actively confronting George for presenting such an unfounded statement. The conversation creates tension, with Martha rejecting George's narrative and calling him out for fabricating an event that doesn't align with reality. This dialogue illustrates a **conflictive** dynamic where George makes an improbable and unsubstantiated claim, and Martha **accuses** him of lying or being inaccurate. Her direct response, "That is not true!", serves as a **reprimand**, expressing her frustration with George's false story. The interaction highlights how accusations and reprimands escalate the conflict between the two, as Martha challenges the legitimacy of George's statement, creating an emotionally charged exchange. |
| 28 | Ql20 | **George:** *"I thought you should know. Our son is dead!"*<br>**Martha:** "No! NO! You can't do this!" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | In this exchange, George makes a very serious statement: "Our son is dead!" However, George does not provide any evidence or supporting details to validate this claim. The statement is delivered in a very definitive way, but it is presented without any verification or explanation of how George knows this or why he believes it to be true. The Maxim of Quality dictates that a speaker should only present information they believe to be true and that can be substantiated with evidence. George's statement, while emotionally charged, lacks any supporting evidence, which makes it an unverified claim. The absence of any corroborating details or factual basis makes George's statement speculative and emotionally driven, rather than a factual communication. This is a **flouting of the Maxim of Quality** because George is stating something as if it were a fact, but there is no evidence provided to back it up. Martha's response, "No! NO! You can't do this!" indicates disbelief and rejection of George's statement. She challenges George's claim, suggesting that she does not accept it as true. Her reaction emphasizes the lack of evidence behind George's claim. Instead of accepting the information, Martha is refuting it, implying that George is either mistaken or intentionally presenting unverified information. George's claim about their son's death is made without any factual basis or supporting evidence, which makes the statement untrue or, at the very least, unverifiable. Since George presents it as a fact, it flouts the Maxim of Quality, which emphasizes that speakers should only communicate information that they can substantiate and believe to be true. By stating something as a |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | definitive fact without evidence, George is flouting this conversational principle. This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quality because George makes a serious and unverified claim about their son's death without providing any evidence. The lack of supporting facts or details makes the statement speculative and potentially false. Martha's immediate rejection highlights the lack of evidence and her disbelief in George's claim, reinforcing how the Maxim of Quality is flouted when unsubstantiated statements are made.<br><br>In this dialogue, George says, "I thought you should know. Our son is dead!" This statement can be seen as **threatening** in nature. George is presenting a harsh and emotional truth about their son's death, which can be perceived as a threat to Martha's emotional stability or peace. The sudden and forceful delivery of such a devastating piece of information imposes an emotional burden on Martha, forcing her to confront the painful reality of their son's death, whether she is prepared for it or not. The way George delivers the statement can be seen as an indirect emotional threat, as it forces a traumatic realization upon Martha without any forewarning. Martha's response, "No! NO! You can't do this!" can be interpreted as a **reprimand**. She rejects George's statement outright, indicating that she does not accept the emotional blow he has just delivered. The repetition of "No!" and the phrasing "You can't do this!" conveys a sense of accusation and frustration. Martha accuses George of doing something harmful—bringing unbearable news in a harsh manner. By saying "You can't do this!" Martha reprimands George for delivering such a traumatic and shocking statement without considering the emotional toll it might take on her. This phrasing suggests a demand for George to stop, challenging his right to assert such a painful truth in this way. This exchange is conflictive because it involves both **threatening** and **accusatory** behavior. George delivers an emotionally overwhelming statement that can be seen as a **threat** to Martha's emotional well-being. It is a sudden imposition of devastating news that leaves her little room to prepare or react. Martha's immediate response of rejecting George's words is an **accusation** and a **reprimand**, where she accuses George of being inconsiderate and harsh. The emotional intensity of Martha's reaction highlights the conflict created by George's statement and emphasizes the tension between them. This dialogue demonstrates a **conflictive** interaction in which George imposes a traumatic emotional truth on Martha, which can be seen as **threatening** to her emotional state. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | Martha immediately **reprimands** George for presenting the information in such an abrupt and damaging way, accusing him of being inconsiderate. The exchange showcases how both **threatening** language (through the delivery of painful news) and **accusatory** and **reprimanding** responses can escalate emotional conflict between two people. |
| 29 | Ql21 | **Martha:** "*I had a child. And I had my child."* **George:** "Our child." | | √ | | | **Collaborative** | George's response, "Our child," flouts the Maxim of Quality because it lacks evidence and is ambiguous in the context provided. While Martha begins with the statement "I had a child," which is a factual assertion of her experience, she then adds, "And I had my child." Her second statement could be interpreted as emphasizing her personal connection to the child, which is valid and understandable. However, George's response—"Our child"—seems to take liberties with the situation without providing evidence for the collective ownership he asserts. In the absence of further context or clarity, George's statement is unsubstantiated. He simply shifts the phrasing from "my child" to "our child" without acknowledging or explaining the basis for this shared claim. Without additional clarification, this could be seen as flouting the Maxim of Quality, because George is presenting a statement as true (the child is "our" child) without providing any evidence or reasoning to support the shared responsibility or involvement implied by "our." In essence, George's response may lack the necessary evidence or clarity about what "our child" means, making it untrue or at least unproven within the given context, thus flouting the Maxim of Quality by asserting something without support.<br><br>The interaction between Martha and George exemplifies collaborative communication, particularly through asserting and reporting. Martha begins by asserting her individual experience, saying, "I had a child," and further emphasizes her personal involvement with, "And I had my child." This highlights her ownership of the experience. However, George responds by saying, "Our child," which shifts the perspective from an individual to a shared experience. By using "our," George reports a more collective view of the situation, indicating that the child belongs to both of them. This exchange shows how George collaborates with Martha's assertions, adjusting the perspective to a more inclusive, shared understanding of their child, reflecting the collaborative nature of the conversation. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| 30 | Ql22 | **George:** "*Our son ... he is dead."*<br>**Martha:** "NO! YOU CAN'T DO THAT!" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | In this exchange, George says, "Our son... he is dead." This statement, while extremely serious, lacks any supporting evidence or explanation. George presents this claim as a fact, but there is no further context or verification provided, making it unsubstantiated. The Maxim of Quality dictates that speakers should only state information they believe to be true and that can be supported by evidence. However, George's claim is presented with uncertainty (the pause marked by "...") and without any explanation, implying that it might not be fully grounded in verifiable facts. George does not provide any supporting details, making his statement speculative and unverified. **The Maxim of Quality is flouted** here because George is making an emotionally charged and definitive claim about their son's death, but there is no evidence or verification to back it up. He does not present any reasoning, proof, or explanation for why he believes their son is dead, making the statement untrue or at least unsubstantiated. Martha's response, "NO! YOU CAN'T DO THAT!" rejects George's statement. Her reaction suggests disbelief and the refusal to accept what George has just said. By exclaiming "YOU CAN'T DO THAT!" Martha challenges George's authority to declare such a painful truth, implying that George either does not have sufficient grounds for making such a claim or that his statement is not valid. Martha's immediate denial further emphasizes the lack of evidence behind George's assertion. George's statement is unsubstantiated, and he does not provide any concrete evidence to support his claim. The Maxim of Quality requires that information should be presented based on factual belief and evidence. George makes a definitive statement without any supporting facts, which flouts this maxim. His emotionally charged declaration of their son's death lacks the necessary details to be considered a truth, leading to a flouting of the conversational principle. This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quality because George makes an unverified and emotionally driven claim about their son's death. The statement lacks any evidence or context to support its truth, making it speculative and unsubstantiated. Martha's immediate rejection of the claim emphasizes the lack of evidence and her refusal to accept such an unverified statement, highlighting how the Maxim of Quality is flouted when unproven claims are made.<br><br>In this dialogue, George says, "Our son... he is dead." This statement can be seen as emotionally heavy and **threatening** in nature. The way George delivers this news creates an emotional impact on Martha, forcing her to confront a painful reality that she |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | may not be ready to accept. The statement carries a sense of finality and severity, which can be perceived as **threatening** to Martha's emotional stability. George's delivery, especially with the pause ("..."), seems designed to shock Martha, making the emotional toll of the statement even more intense. While it's not a direct threat in the traditional sense, it's a **threat** to her peace of mind and forces her into a confrontation with an overwhelming emotional truth. Martha's response, "NO! YOU CAN'T DO THAT!" is a **reprimand**. She rejects George's statement outright, accusing him of being insensitive or inappropriate in delivering such devastating news. The repeated "NO!" reflects her **accusation** that George is either mistaken or unjust in making such a definitive statement about their son's death. By shouting, "YOU CAN'T DO THAT!", Martha reprimands George, challenging his right to declare such a painful truth without sufficient proof or consideration for her emotional state. Her response implies that George's declaration is not only untrue but also inappropriate in how it was presented, emphasizing her emotional denial and her accusation that George is imposing an unbearable truth on her. This exchange is conflictive because George makes a devastating statement that can be seen as a **threat** to Martha's emotional well-being. His declaration forces her to confront an unbearable reality, creating a significant emotional impact. Martha's immediate reaction is an **accusation** and **reprimand**, where she challenges George's words and rejects the truth he is trying to impose. Her response is strong, emotional, and confrontational, reinforcing the conflict between them. This dialogue represents a **conflictive** interaction where George delivers an emotionally charged and **threatening** statement about their son's death, and Martha responds with an **accusation** and **reprimand**. Martha rejects George's statement as inappropriate and challenges his authority to make such a definitive claim. The exchange highlights how emotionally intense statements can lead to conflict, with one party accusing and reprimanding the other in response to what is perceived as an unjust or harmful assertion. |
| 31 | Ql23 | **George:** "*We never spoke of it; that's all. I could kill him any time I wanted to."*<br>**Martha:** "You broke our rule, baby. You | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | In this exchange, George says, "I could kill him any time I wanted to." This statement appears to be an exaggerated, unsubstantiated claim, likely made out of anger or frustration. While George presents this as a possible action, it lacks evidence, logic, or any supporting details that would make it credible. The Maxim of Quality suggests that speakers should only provide information that they believe to be true and that is supported by evidence. George's statement, however, is not based on any factual |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | mentioned him … you mentioned him to someone else." | | | | | | support or evidence. He presents a hypothetical scenario in an extreme and dramatic manner, without substantiation, which is highly speculative and untrue. The phrase "I could kill him any time I wanted to" is also likely hyperbole, used to emphasize George's feelings rather than reflect any reality. There's no indication that he has the intent, means, or opportunity to do so. Therefore, George's statement **flouts the Maxim of Quality** because it is an unverified, exaggerated claim that lacks factual foundation. Martha's response, "You broke our rule, baby. You mentioned him … you mentioned him to someone else," is a reprimand and a challenge to George's statement. While Martha acknowledges George's claim indirectly, her response shifts focus to the flouting of a "rule," accusing him of sharing sensitive information (likely about "him"—the person mentioned). Martha doesn't directly dispute George's exaggeration, but she reprimands him for breaking an unstated agreement by revealing something that was supposed to be kept secret. Her focus on the flouting of their rule implies that George's actions (mentioning "him" to someone else) are the real issue at hand, rather than George's unsubstantiated and exaggerated statement about killing someone. George's statement about killing someone is highly exaggerated and lacks any supporting evidence. The Maxim of Quality expects that only information believed to be true and backed by facts should be conveyed. Since George's statement is not based on factual evidence, it is speculative and exaggerated, flouting the Maxim of Quality. Martha's reprimand focuses on breaking a rule, indirectly pointing out that George's exaggerated claim has led to a breach of trust, further emphasizing the lack of truth in George's original statement. This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quality because George makes an untrue and exaggerated claim about being able to kill someone. The statement lacks evidence and presents a hypothetical scenario as a reality, which is unsubstantiated. Martha's reprimand draws attention to the rule flouting, rather than directly challenging the untruth of George's statement. This reinforces how unverified and exaggerated statements flout the Maxim of Quality by presenting something speculative as though it were true.<br><br>In this dialogue, George says, "We never spoke of it; that's all. I could kill him any time I wanted to." This statement can be seen as **threatening** in nature. George expresses his power and control over the situation by claiming that he could kill someone whenever he desires. The phrase "I could kill him any time I wanted to" is not only a dramatic and |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | exaggerated claim but also carries a threatening tone, implying that George has the ability and the desire to harm someone. The way this statement is phrased serves to intimidate or unsettle the listener, emphasizing George's potential for violence. Martha's response, "You broke our rule, baby. You mentioned him … you mentioned him to someone else," can be interpreted as a **reprimand**. She does not directly challenge George's claim of being able to kill someone but instead shifts focus to accuse him of breaking a personal rule. By saying, "You broke our rule," Martha reprimands George for revealing something that was meant to remain confidential. The repetition of "you mentioned him" emphasizes her frustration and the seriousness of the rule he flouted. This response shows her disapproval of his actions, challenging the way he handled the situation. This exchange is **conflictive** because it involves both **threatening** and **reprimanding** behavior. George's statement about being able to kill someone is a **threat** that asserts power and control, making Martha confront an imagined or exaggerated danger. On the other hand, Martha's response is a **reprimand**, where she accuses George of breaking a rule and disapproves of his actions, though she does not directly address the truth of his claim. The conflict escalates through these opposing responses: George using **threatening** language to dominate the conversation, and Martha **reprimanding** him for breaking their agreement, further adding tension between them. This dialogue highlights a **conflictive** dynamic where George uses a **threatening** statement to assert control, implying that he has the power to harm someone. Martha's response, on the other hand, is a **reprimand** that challenges George's actions and accuses him of breaking an important rule. The combination of George's threat and Martha's reprimand intensifies the emotional conflict, as both characters clash over their respective emotional responses and moral stances. |
| 32 | Ql24 | **George:** "*I can kill him, Martha, if I want to."* **Martha:** "HE IS OUR CHILD!" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | In this exchange, George states, "I can kill him, Martha, if I want to." This statement is highly exaggerated and unsubstantiated. George claims that he has the ability to kill someone, but there is **no supporting evidence** or reason for him to make such a dramatic assertion. The Maxim of Quality suggests that speakers should only make claims they believe to be true and that can be supported by evidence. George's claim lacks both verifiable facts and evidence. It's an emotional and unprovable statement, and it presents a hypothetical situation (killing someone) without any factual backing. George is using this statement as a form of exaggeration or emotional outburst, rather than a grounded fact. Since there is no evidence or reason to believe that he has the |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | intent or ability to follow through with such a claim, it flouts the Maxim of Quality by presenting something untrue or speculative as a fact. Martha's response, "HE IS OUR CHILD!" challenges George's claim emotionally, emphasizing the importance of their relationship with their child. Martha's statement is a reaction to George's exaggeration and implies that George is making an untrue, inappropriate, or exaggerated claim. While Martha does not directly refute the possibility of George's claim, her words serve as a defense against his emotionally charged statement, rejecting the idea of harm coming to their child. George's statement "I can kill him" is not grounded in truth or evidence. It's an emotional and exaggerated claim that lacks any factual support. The Maxim of Quality expects speakers to convey information they believe to be true and can back up with evidence, which George fails to do in this case. The statement is speculative and serves more as an emotional expression than a factual claim, making it an example of **flouting the Maxim of Quality**. This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quality because George makes a claim about his ability to kill someone that is not true or supported by any evidence. His statement is an exaggerated emotional outburst rather than a factual assertion. Martha's response highlights the untruth of George's statement and serves as an emotional defense, rejecting the inappropriate or exaggerated nature of his claim.<br><br>In this dialogue, George says, "I can kill him, Martha, if I want to." This statement is **threatening** in nature. George asserts that he has the power to kill someone (presumably their child), making an extreme claim meant to assert control, intimidate, or shock Martha. Even though it's likely an exaggerated or emotional outburst, it still serves as a **threat** because it implies George has the ability and willingness to commit a violent act. His words are intended to unsettle Martha and convey a sense of dominance or power over the situation. Martha's response, "HE IS OUR CHILD!" is a **reprimand** and a **rejection** of George's statement. She strongly denies and challenges George's claim, emphasizing the relationship they share with their child and reminding him of the gravity of his words. By shouting "HE IS OUR CHILD!", Martha is reprimanding George for making such a violent and unprovoked statement. Her reaction is a direct response to the **threat** George has made, asserting that their child should be off-limits and that such actions are unacceptable. Martha's words convey both shock and anger, emphasizing that George has crossed a boundary by even suggesting harm. This exchange is **conflictive** because it involves **threatening** language from George and a |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | **reprimanding** reaction from Martha. George's statement is meant to intimidate or control, using violence as a tool to exert power, while Martha immediately pushes back, accusing George of overstepping by even suggesting such an action. Her reprimand challenges the emotional intensity of George's statement and asserts her own stance on the issue. The confrontation heightens the emotional tension between them as Martha rejects George's threatening words and reminds him of the emotional and moral weight of their relationship with their child.<br><br>This dialogue demonstrates a **conflictive** interaction where George uses **threatening** language to assert control and instill fear, and Martha responds with a **reprimand** that calls out his behavior. The clash between these two responses escalates the emotional conflict, highlighting a breakdown in communication and mutual understanding. |
| 33 | Ql25 | **George:** "*You must not call everything a lie, Martha."*<br>**Martha:** "Liar!" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | In this exchange, George says, "You must not call everything a lie, Martha." While this might appear as advice or a reprimand, it lacks any supporting evidence or substantiation. George is making a broad, unverified claim about Martha's behavior — that she calls everything a lie — without providing specific examples or reasoning. The statement is presented as a general truth but is not backed up with any evidence, making it speculative and unsubstantiated. According to the **Maxim of Quality**, speakers are expected to only say things they believe to be true and can substantiate with evidence. George's statement, however, does not offer proof or justification for his assertion that Martha calls everything a lie. Martha's response, "Liar!" is a direct challenge to George's claim, accusing him of being untruthful. It can be seen as Martha rejecting George's statement and calling him out for making an accusation without any evidence to back it up. Her accusation of "Liar!" implies that George is the one being untruthful in his assessment of her behavior. George's claim that Martha calls everything a lie is made without evidence or examples to support it. This flouts the **Maxim of Quality**, as he presents a statement as if it were true, without providing any factual support or substantiation. Instead of offering a concrete basis for his statement, he generalizes Martha's actions without justification, making the claim untrue or lacking in verifiable evidence. This dialogue flouts the **Maxim of Quality** because George makes a broad, unsubstantiated claim about Martha's behavior without providing any supporting evidence. His assertion that Martha calls everything a lie is speculative and unverified, flouting the expectation that speakers should provide information they believe to be true |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | and that can be backed by evidence. Martha's response challenges this accusation by directly labeling George as a "Liar!", emphasizing the lack of truth in his claim.<br><br>In this dialogue, **George** says, "You must not call everything a lie, Martha." This can be seen as an **accusation** directed at Martha. George is accusing her of calling everything a lie, which suggests that he believes she is being dishonest or overly skeptical. This statement can create tension, as it calls into question Martha's truthfulness, potentially implying that her perceptions or statements are unreliable. George's tone may come across as reprimanding, as he is instructing Martha on how she should behave, suggesting that she has been wrong in labeling things as lies. Martha's response, "Liar!" is a **reprimand** and a **direct accusation** aimed at George. By calling George a "Liar!", Martha immediately counters George's accusation, flipping the charge back onto him. This is a strong reprimand, as she challenges George's characterization of her, implying that he is the one being dishonest in his statement. The word "Liar!" is an emotionally charged, direct confrontation that accuses George of being untruthful, and it immediately escalates the conflict. Her response denies George's criticism and directly accuses him of speaking falsely. This exchange is **conflictive** because it involves **accusations** and **reprimands**. George accuses Martha of calling everything a lie, which could be seen as attacking her character or behavior. Martha retaliates by accusing George of lying, shifting the blame back onto him. This creates a tense, confrontational exchange where both parties accuse each other of dishonesty. The **reprimand** from Martha, calling George a "Liar!", serves as an emotional and pointed challenge to George's authority in making such a judgment. This dialogue exemplifies a **conflictive** interaction where both parties are accusing each other of dishonesty. George's accusation that Martha calls everything a lie is met with a direct and emotional reprimand from Martha, who labels him a "Liar!" The exchange highlights how **accusations** and **reprimands** escalate the conflict, with both characters rejecting each other's versions of the truth. |
| 34 | Ql26 | **Martha:** "I have raised him as best I can against … vicious odds."<br>**George:** "*A son who is,* | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | George's response flouts the Maxim of Quality because it makes an unsubstantiated and exaggerated statement. Martha proudly asserts that she has raised her son well despite facing many challenges, calling the odds "vicious." This is a positive and self-assured statement about her efforts as a mother. However, George's response — "A son who is, deep in his gut, sorry to have been born" — contradicts Martha's positive assertion |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | *deep in his gut, sorry to have been born."* | | | | | | without providing any evidence or support. George claims that the son is "sorry to have been born," which is an extreme and unprovable statement. It implies a deep emotional truth about the son's feelings, which cannot be substantiated or known for certain by George, especially without any evidence or explanation. This makes George's statement not only untrue but also presumptuous. Since George has no way of truly knowing the inner thoughts of the son, especially to the extent that he can claim the son feels "sorry to have been born," his statement lacks evidence and flouts the Maxim of Quality by presenting something that is not verifiable or supported by any factual basis.<br><br>George's response is conflictive because it undermines Martha's statement in a hurtful and accusatory manner. Martha expresses pride and determination in how she has raised her child, especially considering the challenges she has faced ("against vicious odds"). However, George's reply directly challenges this by saying, "A son who is, deep in his gut, sorry to have been born." This is a reprimanding remark, as it implies that the child feels regret or sorrow for even existing, which is a sharp accusation that contradicts Martha's pride in her efforts. George's statement is not only reprimanding but also hurtful, as it dismisses Martha's efforts and creates emotional distance between her and the child. Instead of supporting or acknowledging Martha's positive statement, George's remark creates conflict by suggesting that the child feels bad about being born, which could lead to further tension. This is a conflictive speech act because it directly opposes the emotional tone and intent of Martha's original statement. |
| 35 | Ql27 | **George:** "*I told you… there was a moon."*<br>**Martha:** "There is no moon! The moon went down!" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | In this exchange, George says, "I told you... there was a moon." This statement presents an unsubstantiated claim. George asserts the presence of the moon, but does not provide any supporting evidence to prove it. The Maxim of Quality states that speakers should only provide information they believe to be true and that can be verified or backed by evidence. George's statement, as presented, lacks any corroborating details or proof that the moon was visible at that moment, making it speculative or unverified. He asserts something with certainty without providing any factual support, thus **flouting the Maxim of Quality**. Martha's response, "There is no moon! The moon went down!" challenges George's claim, refuting it by providing an alternative explanation: that the moon went down. While this contradicts George's statement, it still lacks evidence to back up Martha's assertion. Martha dismisses George's statement without providing any proof, and instead, offers a different interpretation without factual verification. This |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | further underscores the flouting of the Maxim of Quality, as both characters are presenting conflicting claims that are unverified and not supported by evidence. Both George's and Martha's statements are unsubstantiated. George's claim about the moon is made without evidence to support it, and Martha's counterclaim is also not backed by any proof. According to the Maxim of Quality, statements should be based on truth and verifiable evidence, but neither of these claims provides any solid backing. As a result, both statements flout the Maxim of Quality by presenting information as fact without any clear evidence. This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quality because both George and Martha make unverified claims about the moon. George's assertion that there was a moon is made without evidence, and Martha's counterclaim about the moon going down is also unsupported by any proof. The exchange emphasizes how both characters are making statements that cannot be verified, thus flouting the conversational maxim that requires truth and evidence in communication.<br><br>In this dialogue, George says, "I told you... there was a moon." This can be interpreted as a **reprimand** in a subtle way. George is asserting that his version of events is correct and that Martha should have acknowledged it. The phrase "I told you" implies that George has already made this point before, and now he is reinforcing it, perhaps with a sense of frustration or impatience. This could be seen as **accusing** Martha of not listening or understanding his earlier statement. By repeating this, George is not just stating a fact but implicitly accusing Martha of missing or dismissing his claim. Martha's response, "There is no moon! The moon went down!" is an **accusation** and **reprimand** directed at George. She directly challenges George's assertion that there was a moon, dismissing it outright by claiming, "There is no moon!" This is a strong rejection of George's statement. Martha is not just correcting George's factual inaccuracy, but she is forcefully denying his claim, which might suggest that she feels George is either mistaken or intentionally misrepresenting the situation. Her phrase "The moon went down!" further challenges George's narrative, offering her version of the truth and reprimanding him for not acknowledging the "reality" of the situation. This exchange is conflictive because it involves both **accusations** and **reprimands**. George accuses Martha, in a way, of not remembering or accepting his previous statement, while Martha directly accuses George of being wrong or lying about the moon. Her reaction is forceful, and the way she dismisses George's claim suggests that there is some |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | emotional conflict between them. The tension escalates as both characters reject each other's versions of the situation. This dialogue illustrates a **conflictive** dynamic where George and Martha accuse each other of being incorrect or not fully acknowledging the truth. George's statement can be seen as a reprimand of Martha for not accepting his previous words, while Martha's response is a clear reprimand of George, calling out his version of events as false. The emotional intensity and confrontation between them show how **accusations** and **reprimands** can increase conflict in communication. |
| 36 | Ql28 | **George:** "*If I wasn't in the Mediterranean, how did I get to the Aegean?"* **Martha:** "OVERLAND!" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | In this exchange, George says, "If I wasn't in the Mediterranean, how did I get to the Aegean?" This statement presents a hypothetical question implying that George has some knowledge of the Aegean region, and he uses the Mediterranean as a reference point. However, George's statement is made without factual evidence to support it. By asking how he could have gotten to the Aegean without being in the Mediterranean, he assumes a causal link (that the Mediterranean is a necessary precondition for reaching the Aegean), but he doesn't provide evidence or reasoning for why this would be true. This assumption lacks evidence and is speculative, thus **flouting the Maxim of Quality**, which states that speakers should only present information they believe to be true and can substantiate with evidence. Martha's response, "OVERLAND!" is an attempt to answer George's question, but it is given in an overly simplified and somewhat dismissive manner. While "OVERLAND" could be a valid suggestion (implying that George may have traveled to the Aegean via land instead of through the Mediterranean), the way it is presented seems unsubstantiated. Martha's answer, though direct, doesn't provide any evidence or explanation for how traveling overland could be a plausible route from the Mediterranean to the Aegean. Her response, therefore, lacks factual backing, making it speculative as well. George's question implies a factual scenario about travel between the Mediterranean and the Aegean, but neither George's question nor Martha's response offers evidence to support their claims. George assumes that the Mediterranean is a necessary part of reaching the Aegean, but this assumption lacks factual evidence. Martha offers "OVERLAND" as a possible solution, but it is presented without any context or factual verification. Both statements are speculative and unverified, thus flouting the Maxim of Quality by presenting unsubstantiated ideas as though they were facts. This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quality because both George and Martha make statements that are speculative and lack evidence. George's hypothetical question assumes a causal connection between the Mediterranean and the |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | Aegean without providing proof, and Martha's response, while a possible solution, lacks evidence or reasoning. This makes both statements untrue or unsubstantiated, flouting the conversational principle that information should be based on truth and evidence.<br><br>In this dialogue, George says, "If I wasn't in the Mediterranean, how did I get to the Aegean?" This statement can be seen as **accusatory** because George is indirectly accusing Martha of not understanding or being aware of the facts surrounding his travels. The phrasing "how did I get to the Aegean?" implies that there is a correct answer to his situation, and by framing the question this way, George challenges Martha's understanding or knowledge. It suggests that she might be mistaken or unaware, even though the premise is hypothetical and unproven. This creates a subtle **accusation** toward Martha, implying that she might not fully grasp the situation or is wrong in some way. Martha's response, "OVERLAND!" is a **reprimand**. Martha's response is abrupt and forceful, rejecting George's implied assumption that his question has a logical or factual basis. The use of "OVERLAND!" is not just an answer but a direct challenge to George's line of questioning, dismissing it as overly complicated or flawed. Martha is reprimanding George by simplifying the situation to a direct answer, perhaps in frustration, indicating that she feels George's question is unnecessary or incorrect. Her response implies that she doesn't need to entertain his accusation or hypothetical scenario because it is based on a false assumption. This exchange is conflictive because George's question can be seen as **accusing** Martha of not understanding the facts about his travels, implying that she should have known or agreed with his perspective. Martha, in turn, **reprimands** George, directly countering his question with a simplified and definitive answer ("OVERLAND!"). This creates an emotional confrontation, where both parties are challenging each other's assertions and understandings. George's indirect accusation of ignorance or misunderstanding leads to a sharp and forceful reprimand from Martha, escalating the emotional tension between them. This dialogue is conflictive because George's questioning comes across as **accusatory**, implying that Martha is mistaken or uninformed. Martha's immediate response is a **reprimand**, rejecting George's implied assumption and forcefully asserting her own view. The back-and-forth highlights how **accusations** and **reprimands** can heighten conflict in a conversation, increasing emotional tension and disagreement. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| 37 | Ql29 | **Martha:** "*You never sailed past Majorca."* **George:** "I certainly was!" | | √ | | | **Conflictive** | In this exchange, Martha asserts, "You never sailed past Majorca." This statement is presented as a fact, but without any clear evidence or reasoning behind it. Martha is making an assumption about George's travel history or experiences, but there is no proof offered to substantiate her claim. The Maxim of Quality expects that speakers provide information they believe to be true and can back up with evidence. Martha's assertion lacks supporting evidence or verification, making it speculative. George's response, "I certainly was!" is a strong, assertive claim that contradicts Martha's statement. However, George does not offer any evidence or reasoning to support his counterclaim either. His response is forceful, but like Martha's claim, it is unsubstantiated. **The Maxim of Quality** is flouted here because both Martha and George are presenting their respective claims as truths without providing factual support. George's statement, "I certainly was!" presents a definitive assertion about his actions but is unverified, making it another example of a statement lacking evidence. Both Martha and George make definitive statements about George's experience without offering any evidence to support them. Martha asserts that George never sailed past Majorca, while George asserts that he did, but neither statement is backed up with any facts or proof. The Maxim of Quality requires that information be presented based on truth and evidence, which is lacking here. Both characters are stating things with certainty, but there is no verification or factual support for either claim. This dialogue flouts the Maxim of Quality because both Martha and George make unsubstantiated claims. Martha asserts something about George's past that is not backed by evidence, and George responds with a definitive counterclaim, also lacking support. The absence of evidence makes both statements speculative, flouting the conversational principle that expects speakers to present information they can substantiate.<br><br>In this dialogue, Martha says, "You never sailed past Majorca." This statement can be seen as an **accusation** directed at George. By asserting that George has never sailed past Majorca, Martha is calling into question his experience or credibility. The statement implies that George is either mistaken or lying about his past, accusing him of not having done something he might have claimed. This accusation creates a confrontational tone and suggests a lack of trust in George's words or actions. **George's response**, "I certainly was!" is an **assertion** that directly contradicts Martha's accusation. While it is not explicitly threatening or reprimanding, George's forceful "I certainly was!" can be |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | interpreted as a **reprimand** in that it challenges Martha's statement and defends his own version of events. The tone of his reply suggests that he is adamant about his claim and refuses to accept Martha's assertion that he is wrong. In this context, George is not only defending himself but also confronting Martha's accusation, which heightens the emotional tension between the two characters. This exchange is conflictive because Martha's statement is an **accusation**, calling George's experiences into question, while George's response is a firm **reprimand**, denying Martha's accusation and asserting his own version of events. Both characters are challenging each other's claims, and the forceful tone of George's response shows his frustration with Martha's statement. The interaction intensifies the conflict between them, as both are unwilling to back down from their positions. This dialogue demonstrates a **conflictive** interaction where Martha accuses George of not having sailed past Majorca, and George responds by firmly defending himself and reprimanding her claim. The exchange creates emotional tension through the **accusation** and **reprimand**, escalating the conflict between the characters.. |
| 38 | R1 | **MARTHA**:<br>"What's that from? 'What a dump!'"<br>**GEORGE**:<br>"*How would I know what…"*<br>**MARTHA**:<br>"Aw, come on! What's it from? You know…" | | | √ | | **Competitive** | Martha's questioning about the quote, *"*What's that from? 'What a dump!'", is a direct inquiry. However, George's response of "How would I know what…" is **irrelevant** to the question, as it does not engage with the context of the conversation or provide any useful information. Instead of answering or addressing Martha's question, George gives a vague and evasive response, which is **not directly related** to her inquiry. Martha then repeats her question, "Aw, come on! What's it from? You know...", showing frustration with George's response and demanding an answer. However, her repeated questioning continues to be **irrelevant** because George has already indicated his lack of knowledge about the source, and Martha's insistence on pressing the same point does not contribute to a meaningful or productive conversation. Instead, she persists with a question that does not advance the discussion, making her statements **irrelevant** to the flow of the interaction. Thus, George's vague response and Martha's repeated questioning both contribute to **flouting the Maxim of Relation**, as they fail to stay relevant to the original question and derail the conversation, introducing **irrelevant** points that do not address the actual query about the quote's source.<br><br>Martha's behavior is **competitive** because she **demands** that George provide the source of the quote, even though George shows hesitation or disinterest with his response, *"How would I know what..."*. Instead of accepting George's uncertainty, Martha insists |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | with, *"Aw, come on! What's it from? You know..."*, which clearly reflects her **demanding** behavior. She is pushing for an answer despite George's reluctance to engage. Her persistence makes the exchange **competitive** because she is assertively controlling the direction of the conversation and refuses to let it move forward without receiving the information she wants. Martha's questioning becomes more about getting a response, regardless of George's unwillingness to answer, thereby creating a **competitive** interaction where her goal is to elicit a reply from George. In this way, Martha's repeated questioning and insistence demonstrate **competitive** behavior through **demanding** an answer, which shifts the conversation from a cooperative exchange to one focused on her goal. |
| 39 | R2 | **MARTHA**:<br>"What's the name of the picture? I want to know what the name of the picture is. She sits down in front of her dressing table…"<br>**GEORGE**:<br>"*What actor? What scar?"* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | Martha is asking a clear and direct question: "What's the name of the picture?" She repeats her question to clarify and provides additional context by describing the scene ("She sits down in front of her dressing table..."). This gives George clear context about the information she seeks, making her inquiry relevant and straightforward. However, George's response — "What actor? What scar?" — introduces **irrelevant topics** that do not relate to the question Martha asked. Instead of answering or engaging with Martha's inquiry about the name of the picture, George shifts the conversation to questions about an actor and a scar, which have no apparent connection to the picture or the context Martha provided. These questions are **irrelevant** because they do not address the topic that Martha raised. By bringing up unrelated subjects, **George flouts the Maxim of Relation**. His questions do not contribute to the flow of the conversation about the picture's name, making his response **irrelevant** and distracting from the point Martha is trying to make. This shift in focus flouts the expectation that contributions in a conversation should be directly related to the ongoing topic, which makes it a clear case of **flouting the Maxim of Relation**.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on the **competitive (asking and demanding)** nature of Martha's behavior. Martha's initial question, *"What's the name of the picture?"*, is a clear request for information. However, Martha's insistence—*"I want to know what the name of the picture is"*—**demonstrates a demanding** attitude. By repeating the question and emphasizing her need for the information, Martha is **demanding** a response from George, pushing for him to provide the answer she seeks. This **demanding** behavior shifts the conversation from a casual |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | exchange to one in which Martha is actively seeking control over the direction of the discussion. George's **irrelevant response**—*"What actor? What scar?"*—does not address Martha's request but instead deflects her demand with unrelated questions. Despite George's attempt to avoid the question, Martha's persistence in repeating her demand shows that she is trying to maintain control and force George to respond to her initial query. Her behavior exemplifies **competitive** interaction because she does not accept George's attempt to divert the conversation but continues to push for an answer, maintaining her **demanding** stance. Thus, Martha's repeated questioning and insistence make her response **competitive** as she seeks to assert control over the conversation and **demand** a direct answer from George, regardless of his reluctance. |
| 40 | R3 | **GEORGE**:<br>"*Well, maybe it isn't true."*<br>**MARTHA**:<br>"Liar!" | | | √ | | **Conflictive** | George's statement, "Well, maybe it isn't true," introduces uncertainty or doubt, but it is vague and does not directly engage with the preceding topic in a meaningful way. His statement is not irrelevant in its own right, but it does not fully address whatever was previously discussed or provide a clear position. The uncertainty he introduces causes a shift away from the topic at hand, making it a less relevant contribution to the conversation. Martha's response, "Liar!" is also an example of **flouting the Maxim of Relation** because it introduces an accusation that doesn't directly relate to George's uncertain remark. While George has left room for doubt by saying *"maybe it isn't true"*, Martha's response, accusing him of lying, is not a direct continuation or relevant elaboration of the previous statement. Instead, it shifts the focus from a discussion of the truth of a statement to an accusation about George's integrity. By calling George a liar, Martha is creating an irrelevant shift in the conversation, which moves away from addressing the core issue (the truth of the statement) and instead focuses on an emotional or confrontational accusation. This makes the interaction an example of **flouting the Maxim of Relation** because both George's and Martha's contributions deviate from the main issue and introduce unrelated elements, thus making their statements **irrelevant** to the ongoing discussion.<br><br>Martha's response, *"Liar!"*, is a clear **accusation**, which makes the dialogue **conflictive**. George's statement, "Well, maybe it isn't true," introduces doubt or uncertainty, but Martha immediately counters by accusing him of lying. This accusation is not just a disagreement but a direct challenge to George's honesty. By calling him a liar, Martha is **reprimanding** George for his uncertainty and implying that his statement is false, |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | questioning his integrity in the process. This is an example of a **conflictive** speech act because it escalates the conversation into a confrontation, focusing on George's perceived dishonesty rather than addressing the content of his statement. Martha's **accusing** language creates tension and an adversarial dynamic, as she directly attacks George's character by accusing him of dishonesty, which shifts the conversation from a neutral exchange to one marked by hostility. Therefore, this is a **conflictive** act, driven by **accusation** and **reprimand**, where Martha's strong response undermines the social goal of the conversation (which might have been to clarify the truth) and instead fosters conflict. |
| 41 | R4 | **MARTHA**:<br>"He used to run up to me when I'd get home, and he'd say, 'Mama's always coming at me.'"<br>**GEORGE**:<br>"*Liar!*" | | | √ | | **Conflictive** | Martha is recounting a personal memory, explaining how her child would run to her and express that she was always "coming at him." This is a clear, relevant narrative where Martha is sharing a past interaction with her child, giving context to her emotions or thoughts. Martha's statement is directly related to the topic at hand—likely discussing her relationship with her child or her emotional experience. However, George's response, "Liar!" is **irrelevant** to the story Martha is telling. Instead of engaging with the memory or providing a relevant reaction, George abruptly accuses Martha of lying without offering any explanation or justification. His accusation does not address the content of Martha's statement or contribute to the flow of the conversation. Rather than offering an appropriate follow-up or comment, George's response completely deviates from the context of the story, **flouting the Maxim of Relation** by making an **irrelevant statement** that shifts the conversation away from its original focus. George's statement is irrelevant because it does not relate to or engage with Martha's recounting of her past experience, thus flouting the **Maxim of Relation** by introducing something completely unrelated to the ongoing conversation.<br><br>George's response, *"Liar!"*, is a **clear accusation**, which makes this dialogue **conflictive**. Martha is recalling a personal memory about her child, sharing an intimate moment of how he would express his feelings. However, George's immediate response—calling her a liar—creates a **conflictive** atmosphere. Instead of engaging with Martha's story or offering any constructive feedback, George directly challenges the truth of what Martha is saying by **accusing** her of dishonesty. This accusation can be seen as a **reprimanding** act, where George **dismisses** Martha's experience and impugns her credibility. Instead of addressing the content of her statement, George shifts the |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | focus to a personal attack on her honesty, creating tension and disrupting the flow of the conversation. In this context, George's **accusation** of lying is a **conflictive** speech act because it escalates the interaction into a confrontation, turning what could have been a simple discussion into a hostile exchange. His use of the word "Liar!" is an **accusation** that challenges Martha's sincerity, making his response an example of **conflictive speech**.. |
| 42 | R5 | **MARTHA**:<br>"Back when I was courting George…"<br>**GEORGE**:<br>"*Oh, now, Martha…"* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | Martha begins by sharing a past experience, saying, *"*Back when I *was courting George..."*, which is relevant to the conversation. She is likely setting up a story or reflection about their past. However, George's response—"Oh, now, Martha*..."*—is **irrelevant** to the topic she is introducing. Instead of engaging with or building upon her statement, George **distracts** from the conversation by giving a vague, dismissive remark, *"Oh, now, Martha..."*. This response doesn't acknowledge or follow up on Martha's mention of courting and instead serves as an interruption. By not addressing the content of Martha's statement and instead offering a response that seems to shut down her attempt to share a memory, George **flouts the Maxim of Relation**. His response introduces an **irrelevant comment** that does not contribute meaningfully to the conversation or offer a relevant connection to Martha's point about their past, thus creating a disconnection in the flow of the conversation.<br><br>This exchange can be seen as **competitive**, particularly in the **competitive (demanding)** nature of George's response. George's response, *"Oh, now, Martha..."*, can be interpreted as **demanding** in nature because it directly interrupts Martha's attempt to recall or share a past memory. Instead of allowing her to continue with her statement, George challenges or **demands** that she stop, as his tone seems to suggest an unwillingness to engage with the direction of the conversation. By saying, *"Oh, now, Martha..."*, George is not asking for clarification or offering a polite response, but rather **commanding** or **demanding** that the topic be shut down or redirected. This creates a **competitive** dynamic in the conversation because George is not engaging with Martha's narrative but rather asserting control over the flow of the dialogue. Instead of allowing her to express herself, he **dismisses** her attempt to speak by making a brief, somewhat confrontational comment. Therefore, this exchange reflects **competitive** behavior through **demanding** control of the conversation. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| 43 | R6 | **GEORGE**:<br>"He was a healthy child, born with slippery, firm limbs and a full head of hair that later became blond as the sun."<br>**MARTHA**:<br>"*He loved the sun. He was tan before and after everyone."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | George begins by describing the child's physical attributes, focusing on health and appearance with vivid imagery, saying, "He was a healthy child, born with slippery, firm limbs and a full head of hair that later became blond as the sun." This is relevant to a description of the child and seems to be the main focus of the conversation at this point. However, Martha's response—"He loved the sun. He was tan before and after everyone."—introduces irrelevant details that do not directly address or expand on the description George has provided. While Martha's statement about the child loving the sun might seem related, it shifts the focus away from George's detailed description and brings up a tangent about tanning that doesn't connect directly to the physical attributes George mentioned.Instead of further elaborating on the child's features or engaging with George's description, Martha brings in an irrelevant fact about the child's behavior, which doesn't follow naturally from George's description. Her focus on the child being tan before and after everyone, while loosely related to George's statement about the sun, is still a diversion from the main point of George's narrative. This lack of direct connection or contribution to the core subject is an example of flouting the Maxim of Relation by making irrelevant statements that don't add meaningfully to the ongoing conversation.<br><br>Martha's statement, "He loved the sun. He was tan before and after everyone," can be seen as competitive because, instead of building on George's detailed description of the child, she interrupts with a new point that doesn't directly follow from what was said. Instead of engaging with the physical description George provided, she shifts the conversation by focusing on a different characteristic, making it about the child's love for the sun and his tan. Her response competes with George's narrative by introducing a different point that distracts from the topic he initiated. Rather than allowing George's description to finish, Martha redirects the conversation, which can be seen as demanding attention for her own point. She challenges the flow of the conversation by introducing a new topic that diverts the conversation from the original focus. This makes her response competitive, as she takes control of the direction of the discussion and demands that her point about the child's tan is acknowledged, despite it being irrelevant to George's original description. |
| 44 | R7 | **GEORGE**: | | | √ | | **Conflictive** | This exchange can be analyzed for **Flouting Maxim of Relation**, which occurs when a speaker makes **irrelevant statements** that do not contribute to the ongoing conversation |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | "Our son couldn't tolerate the slashing residue that called itself his mother."<br>**MARTHA**:<br>"*Liar!*" | | | | | | or fail to directly address the topic at hand. George's statement, "Our son couldn't tolerate the slashing residue that called itself his mother," is highly **irrelevant** and **disconnected** from the ongoing conversation. Instead of providing a meaningful response or addressing the emotional core of the discussion, George uses harsh and exaggerated language to insult Martha. His choice of words—"slashing residue that called itself his mother"—is **irrelevant** to any constructive conversation about their son and seems more intended to attack Martha personally, which derails the discussion. Martha's response, "Liar!", further compounds the issue of **irrelevance**, as it is a reaction to George's attack but does not engage directly with the specifics of what he said. Her use of the term "Liar" focuses on accusing George of being untruthful, which is **an irrelevant** response in the context of George's insult. Instead of providing a counterpoint or response that could help resolve or clarify the situation, Martha's accusation shifts the conversation into a personal conflict. Thus, George's insult and Martha's accusation both **flout the Maxim of Relation**, as they steer the conversation away from any productive or relevant discussion and instead introduce personal, emotionally charged statements that are unrelated to the issue at hand.<br><br>These remarks do not contribute meaningfully to the conversation and are distractions from the original topic. his exchange is an example of **conflictive** speech acts, particularly focusing on **accusing** and **reprimanding**. George's statement—"Our son couldn't tolerate the slashing residue that called itself his *mother"*—is a **reprimanding** remark that is **highly insulting** to Martha. The use of harsh language like "slashing residue" is meant to attack Martha's character, specifically her role as a mother. This is an act of **reprimanding** because George is scolding or criticizing her, essentially demeaning her in front of their son. His comment creates **conflict** by making a direct insult that undermines Martha's identity as a mother. In response, Martha's reply, *"Liar!"*, is an **accusation**. By calling George a liar, she is challenging his statement and accusing him of being untruthful. This is also **conflictive** because it shifts the focus from a potentially constructive conversation into a direct confrontation. Instead of addressing the insult in a calm or conciliatory manner, Martha accuses George of lying, which further escalates the conflict. The exchange becomes a verbal confrontation where both participants are engaging in **accusation** and **reprimand**, making the conversation **conflictive**. George's **reprimanding** insult and Martha's **accusing** response create a |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | **conflictive** dynamic, as both parties engage in negative, hostile speech acts that escalate the tension rather than resolve it. |
| 45 | R8 | **GEORGE**:<br>"Well, it's an allegory, really — probably — but it can be read as straight, cozy prose … and it's all about a nice young couple who come out of the Middle-west …"<br>**NICK**:<br>"*Just a minute here …"* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which requires that contributions in a conversation should be relevant to the ongoing discussion. George's statement is a detailed explanation that introduces a new topic about an allegory and a young couple from the Middle-west. However, the level of detail and the shift from a potential direct answer or relevant commentary causes **irrelevance** in the context of the conversation. The way George describes the allegory does not directly relate to the core discussion or any specific question that has been raised by Nick, causing the conversation to move off-topic. Instead of providing relevant information or directly responding to what was likely an implied inquiry, George dives into a long, somewhat unnecessary explanation about allegory and prose. This makes his response **irrelevant** and distracting. Nick's response, "Just a minute here ..." indicates that he feels the need to interrupt because George's long explanation is not addressing what Nick was expecting or interested in. The interruption suggests that Nick views George's statement as irrelevant to the conversation at hand, highlighting how George's contribution does not align with the expected focus. Thus, George's detailed explanation about the allegory, which goes off on a tangent about a young couple, **flouts the Maxim of Relation** because it introduces irrelevant information, deviating from the main point of the discussion.<br><br>Nick's response, *"*Just a minute here ...*"*, is **competitive** because it interrupts George's lengthy explanation, demanding that George stop or slow down. This indicates that Nick wants to take control of the conversation and steer it in a different direction. Instead of passively listening to George's detailed, possibly irrelevant explanation about the allegory, Nick asserts himself by asking for a pause, signaling that George's explanation is either too detailed, off-topic, or not addressing Nick's expectations. Nick's **asking** for a moment of pause shows **demanding** behavior, as he is trying to control the flow of the conversation by making an interruption. This shifts the dynamic from a cooperative exchange to a more competitive one, where Nick is asserting his preference for the conversation's direction. In this case, Nick's **demand** to stop the explanation can be seen as a **competitive** act, as he actively competes for control of the conversation by disrupting George's train of thought. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| 46 | R9 | **GEORGE**:<br>"Our son was so ashamed of his father, he asked me once if he was not our child."<br>**MARTHA**:<br>"*Lies!*" | | | √ | | **Conflictive** | This exchange can be analyzed for **Flouting Maxim of Relation**, which states that contributions to the conversation should be relevant to the ongoing discussion. George's statement, *"Our son was so ashamed of his father, he asked me once if he was not our child,"* introduces **irrelevant** information. While it may relate to his personal feelings about his relationship with their son, George's remark doesn't directly address the topic or provide information that follows from the ongoing conversation. It is a dramatic statement that introduces an emotionally charged moment, but it shifts the conversation away from the topic at hand. Instead of addressing the main point of the conversation or responding directly to a question or topic being discussed, George introduces an emotional anecdote that seems to derail the flow of the conversation. His statement about his son's feelings of shame and the question about his parentage is unrelated to whatever the focus of the conversation was at that point. Martha's response, "Lies*!*", further compounds the irrelevance, as it does not contribute directly to the content of George's statement. Rather than offering an explanation, a follow-up to the anecdote, or a relevant reaction, she interrupts with an accusation that doesn't address the emotional weight of George's comment, but shifts the focus to a confrontation. Thus, George's statement flouts the **Maxim of Relation** by introducing **irrelevant** details about his son's emotional state, which do not contribute to the context of the ongoing conversation, and **Martha's response** is also irrelevant as it doesn't directly engage with the substance of George's story.<br><br>This exchange is **conflictive**, particularly focusing on the **accusing** nature of the interaction. George's statement—*"Our son was so ashamed of his father, he asked me once if he was not our child"*—implies a **reprimanding** tone, as it **accuses** himself of failing as a father. By stating that his son was "ashamed" of him and questioned whether he was truly their child, George is essentially **accusing** himself of not being a good father, which creates an emotionally charged and confrontational moment. This is a **conflictive** speech act because George's words reveal dissatisfaction and regret, placing the blame on himself in a way that creates emotional tension within the conversation. Martha's response, "Lies!", is a direct **accusation** aimed at George. By calling George's statement a lie, Martha attacks his version of the events. This **accusing** response challenges George's emotional portrayal and flips the conversation into a confrontation, where Martha denies the truth of George's claim. She rejects his narrative and accuses |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | him of not being truthful, intensifying the conflict in the exchange. This dialogue represents a **conflictive** speech act because both parties engage in **accusation** and **reprimanding** behavior. George reprimands himself by acknowledging his son's shame, and Martha accuses him of lying, both actions escalating the tension between them. |
| 47 | R10 | **GEORGE**:<br>"Once, when I was sailing past Majorca, the moon went down and came back up."<br>**MARTHA**:<br>"*You never sailed past Majorca."* | | | √ | | **Conflictive** | George's statement — *"*Once, when I was sailing past Majorca, the moon went down and came back up*"* — introduces a story or memory that may or may not be relevant to the ongoing conversation. George's narrative about sailing past Majorca and the moon's movements seems unrelated to any topic that may have been previously discussed. The introduction of a personal anecdote that does not follow from the main subject or contribute meaningfully to the conversation makes it **irrelevant** and a flouting of the **Maxim of Relation**.<br><br>**Martha's response** — *"*You never sailed past Majorca*"* — addresses the relevance of George's statement, indirectly pointing out that the anecdote he shared may be untrue or **irrelevant**. By challenging the truth of George's story, Martha shifts the focus of the conversation back to questioning the **relevance and accuracy** of the claim, rather than engaging with the story's context or emotional content. Thus, George's irrelevant story and Martha's challenge to its accuracy both **flout the Maxim of Relation** because they divert the conversation away from the main topic and introduce unrelated statements, which don't serve to advance the discussion meaningfully.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **conflictive**, particularly focusing on **accusing** and **reprimanding**. Martha's response, *"You never sailed past Majorca,"* is a direct accusation that challenges the truth of George's statement. By saying this, she is implying that George is lying or being dishonest, accusing him of fabricating the story. This **accusation** is not just a simple disagreement; it implies a lack of credibility on George's part and attacks his honesty. Martha's sharp retort is also **reprimanding**, as she criticizes or scolds George for making what she perceives to be an **untruthful** or **implausible** statement. This creates a **conflictive** moment in the conversation because instead of accepting George's narrative, she challenges and **reprimands** him. The tone of this interaction shifts from a casual exchange to a more confrontational one, marked by **accusation** and **reprimand**, making it **conflictive**. Therefore, Martha's response not |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | only accuses George of lying but also **reprimands him** for what she perceives as a false or exaggerated claim, creating a **conflictive** exchange. |
| 48 | R11 | **GEORGE**:<br>"I'm afraid our boy isn't coming home for his birthday."<br>**MARTHA**:<br>"Of course he is."<br>**GEORGE**:<br>"*No, Martha ... our son is dead. He was killed late in the afternoon ... he swerved to avoid a porcupine and drove into a tree*." | | | √ | | **Conflictive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which states that each contribution to the conversation should be relevant to the ongoing topic. George's statement—"No, Martha ... our son is dead. He was killed late in the afternoon ... he swerved to avoid a porcupine and drove into a tree."—introduces a drastic and **irrelevant** shift in the conversation. Prior to this, Martha is talking about their son coming home for his birthday, a relatively light and casual topic. However, George's sudden and dramatic shift to discussing their son's death is **irrelevant** to the original concern about the birthday. The statement introduces new, unexpected, and highly emotional information that does not connect with the original conversation, which was about their son's plans for the birthday. By shifting the topic so abruptly and without any direct connection to Martha's statement, **George flouts the Maxim of Relation**. His comment about their son's death and the details about the accident are completely unrelated to the initial conversation and cause an **irrelevant** diversion from the topic of the son's birthday plans. Therefore, **George's response** is an example of **making irrelevant statements** that disrupt the conversational flow, creating a shift from a lighthearted topic to a heavy and unexpected one.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **conflictive**, focusing on **reprimanding** and **accusing**. George's statement—"No, Martha ... our son is dead. He was killed late in the afternoon ... he swerved to avoid a porcupine and drove into a tree."—is a **reprimanding** response that shifts the conversation in a dramatic, emotionally intense direction. In contrast to Martha's hopeful statement about their son coming home for his birthday, George's response shatters that hope by delivering an unexpected and harsh truth about their son's death. This creates a **conflictive** speech act because George's statement directly opposes Martha's positive belief, and by providing such a harsh truth, he **reprimands** her optimism or denial. Moreover, Martha's optimistic response—"Of course he is."—could be seen as a form of denial or refusal to accept the situation. George's reply, which is blunt and final, serves as an **accusation** of her inability to confront reality. He is essentially calling out Martha for clinging to false hope and rejecting the painful truth, which adds tension to the exchange. The conversation thus becomes **conflictive** due to George's **accusation** of Martha's refusal to face the truth and his **reprimand** of her |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | unrealistic expectation regarding their son. The shift from Martha's hopeful statement to George's harsh reality creates a tense and confrontational moment in their interaction. |
| 49 | R12 | **GEORGE**:<br>"I am a Doctor. A.B. … M.A. … Ph.D. … ABMAPHID!"<br>**NICK**:<br>"What's that?"<br>**GEORGE**:<br>"*Abmaphid has been variously described as a wasting disease of the frontal lobes, and as a wonder drug. It is actually both."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which states that each contribution in a conversation should be relevant to the ongoing discussion. George's initial statement, "I am a Doctor. A.B. ... M.A. ... Ph.D. ... ABMAPHID!", introduces **irrelevant information** that shifts the conversation from whatever topic was previously being discussed. By listing academic credentials and then introducing a term *ABMAPHID*, which appears to be something obscure or unrelated, George's statement doesn't provide any **relevant** information that builds on the conversation. Instead, it appears as an **irrelevant diversion**, especially since "ABMAPHID" is not explained or connected to the current discussion. Nick's response, "What's that?", indicates that he perceives George's comment as **irrelevant** or unclear, prompting him to ask for clarification. George's follow-up explanation of "Abmaphid" as a "wasting disease" and a "wonder drug" is a further **irrelevant** tangent that adds complexity and confusion without addressing the primary flow of the conversation. Instead of continuing with a meaningful or relevant point, George elaborates on a term that may have no direct connection to the topic or may not have been necessary at that moment. In conclusion, George's initial introduction of "ABMAPHID" and the subsequent detailed explanation are **irrelevant** to the context of the conversation, making them a clear example of **flouting the Maxim of Relation** by introducing statements that do not relate directly to the ongoing discussion.<br><br>In this context, George's response—"I am a Doctor. A.B. ... M.A. ... Ph.D. ... ABMAPHID!"—functions as a **competitive** assertion of his credentials. By listing his academic qualifications and introducing a term "ABMAPHID" in such a detailed manner, George is not simply providing information but **asserting his authority** and **demanding attention** for his expertise. The way he presents this information could be seen as an **attempt to dominate the conversation** by emphasizing his education and credentials, shifting the focus toward himself and his knowledge. When **Nick** asks, *"What's that?"*, this is an **invitation** for George to clarify his statement, but George's follow-up explanation is **demanding** in its complexity, as it introduces a highly technical term and an elaborate definition without clarifying why it was relevant in the conversation. George's explanation of Abmaphid is **competitive** because it extends the |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | conversation in a direction that he controls, demanding that Nick pay attention to the explanation, even though the topic was not directly tied to the prior exchange. George's introduction of "ABMAPHID" and his **demanding** explanation showcase **competitive behavior**, as he is asserting control over the direction of the conversation by focusing on his knowledge and making an elaborate point. |
| 50 | R13 | MARTHA:<br>"Our son, he used to say that when you came into the room, he'd start right in retching."<br>GEORGE:<br>*"Well, that's the way it was ... you were always coming at him."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which states that each contribution to the conversation should be relevant to the ongoing topic or inquiry. Martha's statement about their son, *"*Our son, he used to say that when you came into the room, he'd start right in retching*,"* introduces a specific memory or anecdote. While this might be an emotionally significant statement, it is still relevant to the broader conversation as it likely addresses issues in their relationship with their son. However, George's response—*"*Well, that's the way it was … you were always coming at him*."*—**flouts the Maxim of Relation** because it shifts the conversation in an irrelevant direction. Instead of addressing the emotional or factual core of Martha's statement (about their son's reaction), George deflects by making a general statement about Martha's behavior without providing any useful connection to the ongoing narrative about their son. His remark about Martha "always coming at him" seems to shift focus from the son's actions to an unrelated, generalized critique of Martha. Rather than continuing the conversation in a way that builds on or clarifies Martha's point, George's comment introduces an **irrelevant** criticism that derails the conversation from its original emotional focus. Instead of discussing the son's behavior or their relationship with him, George deflects by making a vague remark about Martha, which does not relate directly to the specific issue raised by Martha. This **irrelevant** diversion makes George's statement an example of **flouting the Maxim of Relation**.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on the **demanding** nature of George's response. George's response—*"*Well, that's the way it was … you were always coming at him*."*—is **competitive** because it **demandingly** shifts the focus of the conversation from the son's behavior to Martha's actions, implying that she is somehow at fault for the son's reaction. Instead of acknowledging the emotional weight of Martha's recollection, George redirects the conversation to blame Martha, demanding that she acknowledge her own behavior. This response introduces a **competitive** dynamic because George does not respond to the content of Martha's |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | statement about their son, but instead competes for control of the conversation by turning the focus onto Martha's supposed role in the situation. His response is more about **demanding** a shift in focus rather than contributing to a meaningful discussion of their son's behavior. In this way, George's remark is **competitive**, as it shifts the topic from a shared memory of their son to an indirect criticism of Martha's actions, demanding attention to her role in the situation. |
| 51 | R14 | **GEORGE**:<br>"Our son used to run up to me when I'd get home, and he'd say, 'Mama's always coming at me.'"<br>**MARTHA**:<br>*"Liar!"* | | | √ | | **Conflictive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which states that each contribution to a conversation should be relevant to the ongoing topic or question. George's statement is a personal anecdote about their son's behavior. He describes how their son used to react when George came home, saying the son would comment on Martha's actions. George's story is **relevant** to the topic of their son's feelings and behavior in the family dynamic. However, Martha's response, "Liar!", does not contribute to the conversation in a relevant way. Instead of responding to the content of George's story or engaging with it in a meaningful way, she dismisses it entirely with an accusation. By calling George a liar, Martha introduces **irrelevant** criticism that shifts the focus from their son's behavior to a personal attack on George's honesty. This disrupts the flow of the conversation, as it no longer focuses on the original topic of their son's feelings, but instead jumps to an accusation about George's truthfulness. Thus, Martha's "Liar!" is an **irrelevant** interruption, which flouts the Maxim of Relation by diverting the conversation away from its original point about their son and focusing on an accusation about George. This makes her response **irrelevant** to the ongoing discussion.<br><br>This exchange is a **conflictive** speech act, particularly focusing on **accusing** and **reprimanding**. Martha's response, *"Liar!"*, is a **direct accusation**. By calling George a liar, Martha is **accusing him** of being untruthful about what he just said. This is a **conflictive** speech act because it immediately shifts the tone of the conversation from a neutral statement about their son's behavior to an emotional and confrontational accusation. Instead of engaging with George's recounting of their son's reactions, Martha challenges the veracity of his statement, implying that he is fabricating the story or misrepresenting the situation. In addition, Martha's **accusation** can also be seen as a form of **reprimanding**. By calling George a liar, she is reprimanding him for making a statement she believes to be false, which intensifies the conflict between them. This type of **reprimanding** creates tension and disrupts the conversational flow, as it directly |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | targets George's honesty and creates an adversarial exchange. Martha's use of "Liar!" is both an **accusation** and a **reprimand**, making this dialogue a **conflictive** exchange. Her harsh response to George's statement escalates the interaction, shifting it from a casual recount of their son's behavior to a confrontation based on George's perceived dishonesty. |
| 52 | R15 | **GEORGE**:<br>"That was thirty years ago. He doesn't speak anymore."<br>**NICK**:<br>"*Is he still there?"*<br>**GEORGE**:<br>"*Oh, yes. He doesn't utter one sound."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which requires that each contribution in a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing topic. In this dialogue, George's initial statement—"That was thirty years ago. He doesn't speak anymore."—is relevant to some extent because it addresses the topic of the person no longer speaking. However, Nick's question, "Is he still there?", introduces a shift in focus. Nick's question directly addresses whether the person is still present, implying an interest in the person's current state or whereabouts. George's response, "Oh, yes. He doesn't utter one sound.", is **irrelevant** in the context of Nick's question about the person's current presence. Instead of addressing the question about whether the person is still "there" physically, George provides additional, unnecessary information about the person's silence. This shift in focus from the question of physical presence to silence is irrelevant to Nick's original query and deviates from the conversation's logical progression.<br><br>By responding with information about the person not speaking, George **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, as his response introduces **irrelevant** details that do not directly address the main concern of whether the person is still present.<br><br>Nick's question, "Is he still there?" is an **asking** behavior, as Nick is inquiring about the current state or presence of the person George is referring to. However, George's response—"Oh, yes. He doesn't utter one sound."—introduces **competitive** behavior by **demanding attention to the silence** of the person. Instead of just answering Nick's question about whether the person is still physically present, George shifts the focus to the silence of the individual, insisting on the importance of the silence as the defining feature of the situation. George's focus on silence instead of the more relevant issue of presence creates a **competitive** dynamic, as it subtly demands Nick to acknowledge that silence, making it the central point of the conversation. This behavior **competes** for attention by steering the conversation away from Nick's original query and highlighting something that wasn't explicitly asked for. In this case, George's response becomes **competitive** because he takes control of the direction of the conversation, emphasizing |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | a detail (the person's silence) that is not directly relevant to Nick's question, but instead competes for Nick's focus. |
| 53 | R16 | **GEORGE**:<br>"Martha's got money because Martha's father's second wife was a very old lady with warts who was very rich."<br>**NICK**:<br>"*She was a witch*." | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which states that each contribution in a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing discussion. George's statement is a detailed explanation regarding Martha's financial background, specifically how her father's second wife was wealthy. While this could be relevant in the context of discussing Martha's wealth, it is highly detailed and provides unnecessary information, such as describing the second wife's physical appearance (e.g., "very old lady with warts"). This extra detail, especially the focus on physical characteristics, is **irrelevant** to the central point about her wealth. Nick's response, "She was a witch," further **flouts the Maxim of Relation** by introducing an **irrelevant** and unrelated statement. Instead of responding directly to the information George provided about Martha's father's second wife, Nick shifts the focus entirely to a humorous or dismissive remark about her being a "witch." This shifts the topic from the discussion of wealth and inheritance to an unrelated claim that does not build on or respond to George's original point.<br><br>Therefore, both George's excessive detail and Nick's abrupt shift in topic contribute to **flouting the Maxim of Relation**. They both introduce **irrelevant elements** that divert the conversation from its logical flow.<br><br>**Nick's response**, *"She was a witch,"* is an example of **competitive** behavior, as he **introduces a new, more dramatic interpretation** of the information George has just provided. Rather than continuing with the topic that George has initiated about Martha's wealth and the background of her father's second wife, Nick **competes for attention** by making a provocative statement about the woman being a "witch." This creates a **competitive** dynamic in the conversation because Nick's comment diverts the focus from the original subject (the second wife's wealth) to something more sensational and potentially humorous. Instead of simply acknowledging George's statement, Nick takes control of the conversation by introducing a new angle that shifts the focus. His comment doesn't respond directly or relevantly to George's explanation, but rather redirects the conversation toward a playful or exaggerated interpretation. In this way, Nick's response demonstrates **competitive** behavior because it interrupts George's narrative and reasserts control of the conversation by introducing a new topic, even if it's unrelated or exaggerated. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| 54 | R17 | **GEORGE:** "Martha?... Martha?..."<br>**MARTHA:** "*The moon went down… thought about it for a minute… and then POP, came back up."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which states that each contribution in a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing discussion. George's question, "Martha? ... Martha? ...", signals his need to get Martha's attention. This is a simple, relevant inquiry based on the context of the ongoing conversation. However, Martha's response—"The moon went down... thought about it for a minute... and then POP, came back up."—introduces **irrelevant** information that does not address or respond to George's query. While the imagery of the moon "going down" and "popping back up" could be seen as part of a metaphor or a shift in the conversation, it doesn't actually contribute directly to the discussion. Instead of answering or responding to George's question, Martha introduces a new, abstract narrative that diverts the conversation to something unrelated. Martha's metaphorical statement about the moon does not logically follow from George's inquiry or the conversation's flow. It introduces an **irrelevant** tangent, which confuses the purpose of George's question and leads the conversation in a direction that does not build on what George was asking. Thus, Martha **flouts the Maxim of Relation** by making a statement that is **irrelevant** to George's direct question.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on **asking and demanding** behavior. George's statement, "Martha? ... Martha? ..." is a **demanding** call for attention. He is trying to get Martha's focus on himself, which makes it **competitive** in nature. Instead of waiting for a natural response, George repeatedly **asks** Martha's name, signaling a desire to take control of the conversation and demand her attention. However, Martha's response, "The moon went down... thought about it for a minute... and then POP, came back up." shifts the focus entirely away from George's question. Rather than directly addressing or responding to George's request for her attention, she takes control of the narrative by **offering** an unrelated story. Her response **demands** attention as she brings up an abstract and unrelated image of the moon's actions, **competing** for control of the conversation by directing the focus to herself and her statement. In this way, Martha's response represents a **competitive act** because it disregards George's attempt to get her attention and instead redirects the conversation, asserting her dominance in the dialogue. She doesn't provide an answer or clarification but competes for focus with a completely different narrative. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| 55 | R18 | **GEORGE:** "Come on, Martha… answer me." **MARTHA:** "*I'm cold."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which suggests that each contribution to a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing topic. George's statement, "Come on, Martha... answer me." is an urgent request for a response, implying that George is expecting an answer to a question or issue that was raised earlier. It is directly related to the conversation's flow, where George is seeking some kind of engagement or acknowledgment from Martha. However, Martha's response, "I'm cold," is **irrelevant** to George's request. Instead of providing an answer or addressing the topic George is asking about, she introduces a new, unrelated topic about her physical state. While it might be true that she's cold, her statement does not respond to George's request for an answer, thus derailing the conversation. Martha's focus on her physical discomfort instead of engaging with George's inquiry makes her statement **irrelevant** to the ongoing conversation, which is why it **flouts the Maxim of Relation**. Instead of continuing the conversation about whatever George wanted, she shifts the subject to something personal and unrelated, disrupting the conversational flow.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on **asking** and **demanding)** behavior. George's statement, "Come on, Martha... answer me,″ is **demanding**. He is actively **asking** for a response from Martha and expressing impatience. The **demanding** tone implies urgency and that George expects her to engage with him, which makes this a **competitive** act. By insisting that she answer, George is directing the conversation and **demanding** a response, trying to take control of the flow of the exchange. However, Martha's response, *"I'm cold,"* shifts the focus away from George's demand. Instead of answering his request directly or engaging with his query, she redirects the conversation to her physical state, thereby **competing** for attention. Martha is not engaging with George's demand for an answer but instead asserts her own need by mentioning that she is cold, which puts the focus back on herself. This creates a **competitive** dynamic in the conversation, where George **demands** a response and Martha **competes** for the conversation's attention by introducing a new topic unrelated to the original request. |
| 56 | R19 | **GEORGE:** "Do you want to sit?" **MARTHA:** "*He has the* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which suggests that contributions to a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing topic. George's question, "Do you want to sit?", is a clear, relevant inquiry. He is asking Martha if she wants to sit down, which |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | *most marvelous eyes, you know."* | | | | | | makes perfect sense in the flow of the conversation and likely ties into the context of their interaction.<br><br>However, **Martha's response**, *"He has the most marvelous eyes, you know."* is **irrelevant** to George's question. Instead of responding to George's practical query about whether she wants to sit, Martha introduces a completely unrelated topic about someone's eyes. This sudden shift in focus creates **irrelevance** because it does not answer George's question or provide any meaningful contribution to the current conversation. Martha's response diverts the conversation away from the direct topic (sitting) and instead brings up a new topic that has no connection to George's question. This type of response **flouts the Maxim of Relation** because it introduces a**n irrelevant** point that does not follow the expected conversational flow.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on the **competitive (asking)** nature of George's question and the redirection by Martha's response. George's question, "Do you want to sit?", is an **asking** behavior. He is directly inquiring whether Martha wants to sit down, which reflects an active request for her input or decision. The **competitive** aspect here is in George **asking** her to make a choice, thus steering the conversation toward a practical decision, which he expects her to respond to.<br><br>However, Martha's response, "He has the most marvelous eyes, you know," does not directly answer George's question. Instead, she shifts the focus of the conversation to a completely different topic, redirecting attention away from the practical question George posed. This shift demonstrates a form of **competitive** behavior because it competes for attention, choosing to highlight something unrelated to George's request. In essence, George competes for a response to his direct question, while Martha competes by shifting the subject to something entirely different, making her response more about asserting control over the direction of the conversation. |
| 57 | R20 | **GEORGE:** "What are you talking about?"<br>**MARTHA:** "*I can't remember."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which suggests that contributions to a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing topic. George's question, "What are you talking about?", is a clear and direct inquiry seeking clarification about what Martha is referring to. It is relevant to the conversation and directly engages with the topic at hand. However, Martha's response, "I can't remember." is **irrelevant** in the context of |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | George's request. Instead of clarifying or elaborating on what she was talking about, she introduces a statement that admits her inability to remember, but doesn't provide any useful information related to the conversation. Her response doesn't address the **relevant** inquiry George made and shifts the focus away from the current topic. In this case, Martha's inability to remember is **irrelevant** because it doesn't help to further the conversation or offer any meaningful clarification. Rather than continuing the conversation or answering George's question, she introduces **an irrelevant** comment about her memory, which **flouts the Maxim of Relation** by making an irrelevant statement. This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on **asking** behavior.<br><br>George's question, *"What are you talking about?"*, is a direct **asking** behavior. George is actively requesting clarification from Martha about what she is discussing. His question is straightforward and intended to bring relevance to the ongoing conversation. This **competitive** aspect is clear because George **demands** clarification in a direct manner, trying to steer the conversation back to a point of relevance. Martha's response, "I can't remember." introduces a shift in control, effectively redirecting the conversation in a way that doesn't provide an answer to George's direct question. Instead of continuing to engage with George's inquiry and explaining what she meant, she deflects by stating her inability to recall the information. This is competitive because she avoids providing a direct response, which competes with the intended purpose of George's question. Rather than engaging, she takes control of the narrative by shifting focus away from the topic and preventing further conversation on the matter at hand. Thus, Martha's response competes with George's **asking** by introducing an irrelevant explanation that prevents the conversation from continuing in the expected direction. |
| 58 | R21 | **GEORGE:** "Sit down, Martha."<br>**MARTHA:** "*He'd lose his way if he didn't have me to show him."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | George's statement, "Sit down, Martha.", is a clear command and relevant to the situation. It directly asks Martha to sit down, contributing logically to the flow of the conversation. However, Martha's response, "He'd lose his way if he didn't have me to show him," introduces an irrelevant statement. Instead of directly responding to George's request for her to sit down, she deflects with a statement that doesn't address his request. Martha shifts the topic away from the action of sitting down and instead speaks about someone else (likely a third party) and their reliance on her for guidance. This distraction moves the conversation away from the immediate context and does not |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | address the relevance of the command George has given. By introducing an unrelated point about someone else losing their way, Martha **flouts the Maxim of Relation** by making an irrelevant statement. Her comment does not serve to further George's request or engage with the current direction of the conversation, which was focused on her action of sitting down.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on **ordering** behavior. George's statement, "Sit down, Martha.", is a clear order. He **demands** that Martha sit down, which is a directive action that expects an immediate response. This is **competitive** because George is taking control of the conversation by **demanding** that Martha comply with his request. Martha's response, "He'd lose his way if he didn't have me to show him," diverts the conversation from George's direct order. Instead of simply acknowledging or following through on George's request to sit down, she redirects the conversation to talk about someone else, likely a third party, and their dependence on her. While her comment may be a defense or justification, it competes with George's directive by introducing an irrelevant point and shifting the focus away from George's request. In this way, Martha's response can be seen as **competitive**, as it not only sidesteps George's direct order but also asserts her own narrative, creating a tension in the flow of the conversation. Instead of directly engaging with the order to sit down, Martha competes for attention by introducing a new topic. |
| 59 | R22 | **GEORGE:** "Come on, Martha… try."<br>**MARTHA:** "*We both cry… all the time."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which states that each contribution in a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing topic. George's statement, "Come on, Martha... try.", is a direct **request** for Martha to attempt something, likely in response to a previous part of the conversation. It is **relevant** and focused, aiming to get Martha to engage with a specific action or effort. However, Martha's response, "We both cry... all the time," is **irrelevant** to George's request. Instead of responding directly to George's request to try, Martha shifts the focus of the conversation to an emotional statement about crying. This statement does not provide any meaningful response to George's request, and it introduces a personal emotional detail that seems disconnected from the action George is asking her to try. By introducing **irrelevant** information about crying, Martha **flouts the Maxim of Relation** by making a statement that does not address the task or effort George is asking her to engage in. Instead, she changes the |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | subject and does not engage with the original question or request, thus making her response irrelevant to the flow of the conversation.<br><br>George's statement, *"Come on, Martha... try."*, is a direct **order** or **demand**. He is urging Martha to make an effort or try something, showing **competitive behavior** by insisting she take action. The word "try" implies that George wants her to engage in an attempt, and the tone of the command suggests impatience or a desire for her compliance. George is actively ordering Martha to do something, taking control of the flow of the conversation.<br><br>Martha's response, "We both cry... all the time.", diverts the conversation away from George's direct command. Instead of addressing his request to try, Martha sidetracks the conversation with an emotional statement that doesn't respond to the **order** George just made. Rather than engaging with George's **demanding** tone, she **deflects** by talking about their shared emotional state, making her response **competitive** in that it shifts the focus away from George's command to her own feelings. Thus, **Martha's response** is **competitive** because it **avoids George's order** and introduces an entirely new subject, competing for attention in the conversation by deflecting the focus onto an emotional tangent. |
| 60 | R23 | **GEORGE:** "What are you doing?"<br>**MARTHA:** "*I'm reciting… my little monologue."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which suggests that contributions in a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing topic. George's question, "What are you doing?", is a direct inquiry about Martha's actions. It is **relevant** and clearly connected to whatever activity or situation is unfolding at that moment in the conversation. However, Martha's response, "I'm reciting... my little monologue.", introduces **irrelevant** information. Instead of providing a direct or more contextually relevant answer to George's question, she provides an elaborate statement about reciting a monologue, which does not directly engage with George's inquiry or the immediate context of the conversation. Martha's response shifts the topic to something unrelated and introduces **irrelevant** detail, specifically about performing or reciting something, which does not help clarify or answer George's question. Instead of offering a simple response about what she is doing, she offers an extended explanation that deviates from the conversational flow, making it **irrelevant** to George's original query. Therefore, Martha's statement is an example of **flouting the Maxim of Relation** because it |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | introduces **irrelevant** information that does not respond to the specific query posed by George.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on **asking** behavior. George's question, "What are you doing?", is an **asking** behavior. He is directly inquiring about what Martha is doing, which is relevant to the conversation and reflects a genuine request for clarification. This is a **competitive** act because George is actively seeking information and engaging with Martha to steer the conversation forward. However, Martha's response, "I'm reciting... my little monologue.", shifts the conversation's focus and introduces a new direction. By revealing that she is reciting a monologue, Martha essentially takes control of the conversation, shifting it to her own activity. This diverts the conversation away from George's simple question and turns it into an assertion of what she is doing. While her response might seem like an answer, it serves to distract from George's inquiry and compete for attention by highlighting her own action. Martha's response is **competitive** because she asserts control over the direction of the conversation, redirecting it to her monologue rather than directly addressing the purpose of George's question. This creates a **competitive** dynamic, where Martha takes charge of the conversation rather than simply answering George's straightforward question. |
| 61 | R24 | **GEORGE:** "Stop."<br>**MARTHA:** "*He didn't believe me."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | George's statement, "Stop.", is a clear and direct command. He is asking Martha to cease doing something, which is relevant and pertinent to the conversation at hand. George's instruction is relevant because it directly engages with whatever action or behavior Martha was involved in at that moment. However, Martha's response, "He didn't believe me.", introduces an **irrelevant** statement. Instead of addressing George's direct command to stop, Martha shifts the focus away from the issue at hand (why George wants her to stop) and talks about a separate issue: someone not believing her. This statement does not provide an answer or explanation related to George's request. Martha's comment about someone not believing her is **irrelevant** to George's direct request to stop. It introduces a new topic that doesn't answer George's instruction or explain why she cannot stop, but instead diverts the conversation toward a different issue, making it **irrelevant** to the flow of the conversation. Thus, Martha's response **flouts the Maxim of Relation** because it does not respond directly to George's command and shifts the focus away from the main topic. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | George's statement, "Stop.", is a direct **order**. He is commanding Martha to cease her actions, which makes it a **competitive** speech act. By giving a clear and concise instruction, George is asserting control over the situation, demanding that Martha stop whatever she is doing. The **ordering** nature of this statement indicates a level of authority or dominance in the conversation. However, Martha's response, "He didn't believe me.", does not directly engage with George's **demand**. Instead of complying with George's order to stop, she diverts the conversation by talking about someone else's disbelief in her. This shift in focus makes her response more about asserting her own emotional state or frustration rather than addressing George's order. While George's request is **competitive** by demanding Martha's action, Martha's reply is **competitive** in a different way. She avoids directly responding to George's demand and instead competes for attention by introducing a new point about someone's disbelief. This diversion creates a form of **competitive** behavior because it changes the subject and focuses on something unrelated, shifting control of the conversation. |
| 62 | R25 | **GEORGE:** "Listen to me."<br>**MARTHA:** "*We couldn't have… we couldn't have any.*" | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which suggests that each contribution in a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing topic. George's statement, "Listen to me.", is a clear and direct **request** for Martha's attention. He is demanding that she pay attention to him, which is relevant to the conversation and context. However, Martha's response, "We couldn't have... we couldn't have any," diverts the conversation away from George's request. Instead of responding directly to his request for attention or acknowledging what he's saying, Martha shifts the conversation to something else—likely about not being able to have something (unspecified in this snippet). This introduction of an unrelated topic makes Martha's statement irrelevant to the conversation at hand. By talking about not being able to have something, Martha is **flouting the Maxim of Relation** by making an **irrelevant** statement. Instead of focusing on George's request for her to listen, she introduces a new subject, thereby disrupting the conversational flow and not responding to George's direct call for attention.<br><br>George's statement, "Listen to me.", is a direct **order**. He is demanding that Martha pay attention to him, making it a **competitive** speech act because he is asserting control over the conversation. His use of the imperative "Listen" signifies his command, expecting Martha to act immediately and comply with his request. Martha's response, "We |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | couldn't have... we couldn't have any," introduces a **competitive** redirection of the conversation. Instead of complying with George's demand to listen, Martha deflects the conversation by focusing on her own perspective or situation, possibly about not being able to have something. While George **demands** attention, Martha shifts the focus to something entirely different. Thus, George's "Listen to me" is a **demanding** competitive action, and **Martha's response** can be seen as competing for control of the conversation by introducing an unrelated subject. She avoids engaging with George's demand and instead directs the conversation elsewhere, creating a **competitive** dynamic. |
| 63 | R26 | **GEORGE:** "Martha… please."<br>**MARTHA:** "*He was a good boy."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which suggests that each contribution in a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing topic or discussion. George's statement, "Martha... please," is a direct plea for Martha's attention, likely in response to something she has said or done. He is asking for her attention or compliance, and this is relevant to the conversation's current flow, which involves trying to engage with Martha. Martha's response, "He was a good boy," introduces **irrelevant** information that does not respond directly to George's plea. Instead of acknowledging or responding to George's **request** for attention, she shifts the focus entirely by talking about "he," referring to someone else. This statement does not address George's request, and its relevance to the current conversation is unclear, as it diverts the conversation away from George's plea to a new, unrelated topic. Martha's statement about "he" being a good boy **flouts the Maxim of Relation** because it does not relate to the subject George raised. Instead of responding to George's plea or providing an explanation, she changes the subject, making her response **irrelevant** to the original conversation.<br><br>George's statement, "Martha... please," is a plea or request, which can be seen as **demanding** attention or cooperation. The word "please" suggests a level of urgency or desire for Martha to comply with something. It's a **competitive** act because George is actively **asking** or **demanding** a response, expecting Martha to engage with him in some way. It shows **competition** for attention within the conversation, where George is asking for Martha to focus on his statement or action. However, Martha's response, "He was a good boy," is **irrelevant** to George's request. Instead of responding to George's plea, she diverts the conversation to an unrelated subject, likely referring to their son. This is **competitive** because she shifts the topic away from George's demand and asserts her |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | own narrative by introducing something else entirely. In this way, Martha's response competes for control of the conversation by redirecting it to her own perspective, avoiding the engagement George was asking for. This creates a **competitive** dynamic, where instead of following George's **demand** for attention, Martha takes control by changing the focus. |
| 64 | R27 | **GEORGE:** "Do you want some coffee?" **MARTHA:** "*My father… he'd be so ashamed."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which suggests that each contribution in a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing topic. George's question, "Do you want some coffee?", is **relevant** and directly related to the current context, likely about sharing a moment or offering a drink. It's a simple and straightforward question that aligns with the conversation's flow. Martha's response, "My father... he'd be so ashamed." introduces an irrelevant statement. Instead of answering George's question about coffee, Martha shifts the focus to an emotional or familial statement about her father's feelings. This **irrelevant** comment is disconnected from George's question and does not help move the conversation forward regarding coffee or the current topic. Martha's response does not provide any relevant information about the coffee or George's request and instead introduces an emotional or familial perspective, which **flouts the Maxim of Relation**. Her statement, therefore, diverts the conversation from the practical inquiry George made, making it irrelevant to the ongoing discussion.<br><br>George's question, "Do you want some coffee?", is an **asking** behavior. He is simply inquiring if Martha would like coffee. This is **competitive** because George is directly engaging with Martha, requesting her response. He is seeking to get her to either accept or reject the offer, placing the conversation under his control as he **asks** her to decide. However, Martha's response, "My father... he'd be so ashamed," shifts the conversation away from George's question. Instead of answering whether she wants coffee, Martha introduces an **irrelevant** emotional statement about her father, which diverts attention away from George's request. Rather than complying with George's question or directly responding, Martha competes for attention by bringing up something unrelated, making the conversation veer off course. Martha's response is **competitive** because it changes the focus of the conversation. Instead of answering George's inquiry, she asserts control by shifting to her own feelings and concerns about her father. This makes her response a form of **competitive** behavior, as she takes over the conversation and redirects the topic to something personal and unrelated. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| 65 | R28 | **GEORGE:** "You're not making sense."<br>**MARTHA:** "*I'm loud."* | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which states that each contribution in a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing topic. George's statement, "You're not making sense," is direct and relevant. He is commenting on Martha's previous statement or behavior, indicating that he doesn't understand what she is saying or that her thoughts aren't clear. His statement is relevant and seeks to address the current topic of their conversation. However, Martha's response, "I'm loud,″ introduces **irrelevant** information. Instead of addressing George's point about not making sense or providing clarification, she shifts the focus to a statement about her volume, which does not address George's concern. Her comment doesn't respond to the need for clarity raised by George, making it **irrelevant** to the ongoing conversation. By bringing up her loudness, Martha diverts the topic away from the issue George raised (her lack of clarity) and instead focuses on a personal trait (loudness) that doesn't contribute to resolving the misunderstanding. This shift makes her response **irrelevant** and **flouts the Maxim of Relation**.<br><br>George's statement, "You're not making sense," is a critical comment, which could be seen as **demanding** clarity. He is pointing out that Martha's words or actions are unclear, implying that he expects a more understandable response. This **demand** for clarity shows **competitive behavior** in the sense that George is attempting to **guide** the conversation toward something more coherent. He is **ordering** the conversation in a way that Martha's response should address the clarity issue. However, Martha's response, "I'm loud," diverts the conversation away from George's **demand** for clarity. Rather than addressing George's comment and trying to make her statement more clear, Martha introduces a self-characterization about her loudness, which is unrelated to the issue of clarity. She is asserting her own trait instead of responding directly to the demand for clearer communication, competing for attention by steering the conversation away from George's point. In this case, Martha's response is **competitive** because it takes control of the conversation by introducing an unrelated point, shifting the focus away from the demand for clarity. Instead of engaging with George's **demand**, she focuses on an attribute of herself (being loud), which redirects the conversation, making her response **competitive**. |
| 66 | R29 | **GEORGE:** "Why are you crying?" | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which suggests that contributions to a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing discussion. George's question, "Why |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | **MARTHA:** "*I don't... have any money.*" | | | | | | are you crying?" is direct and relevant. He is asking about the reason for Martha's emotional state, seeking an explanation that directly addresses the cause of her crying. It is a straightforward question intended to get an answer that relates to the reason behind her emotional reaction.<br><br>However, Martha's response, "I don't... have any money," introduces **irrelevant** information. Instead of addressing why she is crying in terms of her emotions, the cause, or any underlying factors, Martha talks about not having money, which may or may not be the direct cause of her emotional state. Her response seems to shift the focus away from the direct cause of her crying to a financial concern, which may or may not be relevant to why she is crying at that specific moment. Martha's statement does not logically follow George's question about the emotional reason for her crying, making it **irrelevant** to the ongoing conversation. By introducing a financial concern, Martha shifts the topic away from the emotional aspect George was inquiring about, **flouting the Maxim of Relation**.<br><br>George's question, "Why are you crying?" is an **asking** behavior. He is inquiring about the reason behind Martha's emotional state. His question is direct and seeks to gain clarity on why Martha is upset, making it a **competitive** act because he is actively engaging her to answer and clarify her emotional response. Martha's response, "I don't... have any money," does not directly address George's inquiry about why she is crying. Instead, she shifts the focus to a potential financial issue. While financial problems could be the reason behind her tears, Martha's response does not directly explain the emotional reason for her crying as George had asked. Instead, she competes for the direction of the conversation by focusing on a financial concern, rather than responding to the emotional question. By redirecting the conversation to the topic of money, Martha diverts the attention away from George's original **asking** question. This makes her response **competitive**, as she is changing the focus and preventing the conversation from continuing in the direction George was steering it (to understand her emotional state). Instead of simply explaining why she's crying, Martha takes control of the conversation by emphasizing a different concern. |
| 67 | R30 | **GEORGE:** "What do you want, Martha?" | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which suggests that each contribution to a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing discussion. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | **MARTHA:** "*I want the moon.*" | | | | | | George's question, *"What do you want, Martha?"* is a direct inquiry about Martha's desires or needs. It is relevant to the conversation and seeks to get an answer related to what Martha wants, whether it is something tangible or emotional. However, Martha's response, *"I want the moon,"* introduces an **irrelevant** statement. Instead of giving a practical or realistic response to George's question, she provides an exaggerated and metaphorical answer, which diverts the conversation away from a meaningful reply. Her statement about wanting "the moon" does not directly address George's question or provide any relevant information that contributes to the flow of the conversation. It shifts the focus from what George is asking (what she wants) to a fantastical or impossible desire, making the statement **irrelevant**. Martha's comment does not answer George's question in a meaningful way and instead shifts the conversation to an unrelated or impractical topic, which **flouts the Maxim of Relation**.<br><br>George's question, "What do you want, Martha?", is an **asking** behavior. He is actively inquiring about Martha's desires or needs, which is a **competitive** act because George is seeking a clear and direct response. He is asking Martha to provide an answer, giving her the opportunity to express her desires. Martha's response, "I want the moon," is a **competitive** deflection. Instead of answering George's question in a realistic or meaningful way, she diverts the conversation by introducing an unrealistic or metaphorical response. By saying "the moon," she shifts the conversation from George's direct inquiry to an exaggerated statement. This deflects the conversation away from the practical direction George had intended, competing for attention with her own focus. In this case, Martha's response is competitive because it does not engage directly with the **asking** behavior of George. Instead of addressing what she truly wants or needs, she asserts her own point by introducing a symbolic or fanciful idea, thereby redirecting the conversation's focus. |
| 68 | R31 | **GEORGE:** "Shall we go to bed?"<br>**MARTHA:** "*Truth and illusion, George… you don't know the difference.*" | | | √ | | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Relation**, which suggests that each contribution to a conversation should be **relevant** to the ongoing topic. George's question, "Shall we go to bed?", is a direct inquiry about whether Martha is ready to go to bed. It is a relevant and practical question in the context of their conversation, seeking her agreement or response on the matter at hand. However, Martha's response, "Truth and illusion, George... you don't know the difference," introduces **irrelevant** information. Instead of addressing George's question about going to bed, she shifts the focus entirely to a |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | philosophical statement about truth and illusion. This statement has no direct connection to George's inquiry, making it **irrelevant** to the conversation. Martha's comment does not answer George's simple request and instead moves the conversation in a completely different, unrelated direction. By introducing a deep, unrelated statement, Martha **flouts the Maxim of Relation** by making **irrelevant** statements that do not contribute to the ongoing discussion about whether they should go to bed. This shift in topic diverts from the practical concern raised by George and introduces an abstract idea, making the conversation less coherent and relevant.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on **competitive (asking)** behavior. George's question, "Shall we go to bed?", is a direct question asking Martha if she is ready to go to bed. It is an **asking** behavior because George is actively seeking a response from Martha, requesting her agreement or decision on the matter at hand. His inquiry is relevant and directly related to the ongoing conversation. However, Martha's response, *"Truth and illusion, George... you don't know the difference,"* does not directly address George's question about going to bed. Instead of answering or engaging with the question, Martha deflects the conversation with an abstract and philosophical statement about truth and illusion.<br><br>Martha's response is **competitive** because it avoids George's direct question and shifts the focus of the conversation toward her own perspective on a completely different topic. Rather than simply answering or engaging with George's request to go to bed, Martha asserts her own topic, which competes for control of the conversation, diverting the attention away from the original question. |
| 69 | Mn1 | **Martha:** "What's-their-name."<br>**George:** "Who?"<br>**Martha:** *"WHAT'S-THEIR-NAME!"* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | Martha's first statement, "What's-their-name," is **unclear** and **ambiguous**. She is asking for someone's name but does not specify who she is referring to. The phrase *"What's-their-name"* is vague and does not provide enough context for George to understand whom she is asking about, making her statement obscure. This lack of clarity makes the communication difficult to follow, as Martha does not explain what she means, leading to ambiguity. George's response, "Who?", indicates that he does not understand Martha's question due to its vagueness. George is asking for clarification because Martha's statement is not clear, which aligns with the **Maxim of Manner**, which advises clear and orderly communication. In Martha's second statement, *"WHAT'S-THEIR-NAME!"*, her attempt to clarify is still obscure because she repeats the same unclear |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | phrasing, now in capital letters, which indicates emphasis but does not resolve the ambiguity. Instead of providing a clear reference, she intensifies her vague question, which makes it even more difficult to understand and continues to **flout the Maxim of Manner**. Therefore, Martha's responses **flout the Maxim of Manner** because they are **ambiguous** and **obscure**, failing to provide the clarity necessary for effective communication.<br><br>Martha's first statement, "What's-their-name," is an **asking** behavior. She is asking for the name of someone but does so in an ambiguous and vague manner, which can be seen as **competitive** because she is **demanding** George to figure out who she is referring to. Instead of providing a clear reference, Martha competes for attention by expecting George to understand her question without any clarity. George's response, *"Who?"* indicates that he did not understand Martha's question because it was unclear. He asks for clarification, engaging in a **competitive** exchange by asking for the missing information that will allow him to respond appropriately. Martha's second statement, "WHAT'S-THEIR-NAME!" is an intensified demand, continuing the asking behavior but with more emphasis. While the tone has shifted from a simple question to an assertive demand, it still lacks clarity. The emphasis in her words shows frustration and a stronger desire for George to provide the correct response, competing for control of the conversation by pushing George to respond in the way she expects. Thus, Martha's responses are **competitive** because she asks for information in a manner that is unclear and demands a response, even when George is struggling to understand her question. Her behavior competes for attention and control of the conversation by shifting the focus to her frustration and intensifying her request without clarifying it. |
| 70 | Mn2 | **George:** "You're twenty-one!"<br>**Nick:** "Twenty-eight."<br>**George:** "*Twenty-eight! Perhaps when you're forty-something and look fifty-five, you will run the History Department ..."* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Manner**, which advises that communication should be clear, straightforward, and unambiguous. George's first statement, "You're twenty-one!", is clear and straightforward, expressing George's understanding of Nick's age. There is no ambiguity here, as he is making a clear statement. Nick's response, "Twenty-eight," is also clear, but it seems to counter George's assumption, revealing that Nick is actually twenty-eight. This shift is relevant to the conversation. However, George's follow-up, "Twenty-eight! Perhaps when you're forty-something and look fifty-five, you will run the History Department ...", introduces **ambiguity** and **irrelevant** information. While George is still talking about age, he shifts the focus to Nick's future, |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | making a vague prediction about his career and appearance. The phrase "perhaps when you're forty-something and look fifty-five" is obscure because it is unclear what George means by this statement. It introduces speculation and exaggeration that do not directly answer or relate to the initial question about Nick's age, making his comment **ambiguous**. Instead of providing a clear, straightforward response or further clarifying Nick's age, George introduces an irrelevant, speculative, and exaggerated statement about the future, which confuses the conversation and **flouts the Maxim of Manner**.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on **asking, demanding** behavior. George's statement, "You're twenty-one!", is an assertive declaration about Nick's age. While it isn't a direct command, it implicitly suggests a level of control in the conversation, assuming that Nick is indeed 21. George directly states something about Nick, which is competitive because it directs the flow of the conversation by making an assumption and establishing a focal point for the interaction. Nick's response, "Twenty-eight," is a correction to George's assumption, actively engaging with the conversation and competing with George's statement. Instead of passively accepting George's claim, Nick asserts his own position, providing the accurate information. This is a **competitive** act because Nick doesn't simply agree with George; he challenges the assumption and redirects the conversation back to his actual age. George's follow-up, "Twenty-eight! Perhaps when you're forty-something and look fifty-five, you will run the History Department ..." is a further demand for engagement. It's a **competitive** redirection of the conversation, where George expands on his comment and implicitly orders Nick to envision a future scenario that's exaggerated. This is still **competitive** because George takes the lead in steering the conversation forward with his imagination about Nick's future, despite Nick's previous correction. It's as if George is demanding Nick's participation in this future scenario, despite it being somewhat exaggerated and not entirely relevant to Nick's actual age. This exchange shows **competitive** behavior because both George and Nick assert their control over the conversation, with George making statements and redirecting the conversation, while Nick corrects George's initial claim and asserts his own information. The back-and-forth creates a **competitive** dynamic between the two participants. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| 71 | Mn3 | **Martha:** "*You didn't do anything; you never do anything; you never mix. You just sit around and talk."*<br>**George:** "*What do you want me to do? Do you want me to act like you? Do you want me to go around all night braying at everybody, the way you do?*"<br>**Martha:** (Braying) "I DON'T BRAY!" | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Manner**, which suggests that communication should be clear and unambiguous, avoiding any statements that are obscure or difficult to understand. Martha's statement, ″You didn't do anything; you never do anything; you never mix. You just sit around and talk,″ contains ambiguity. While it may seem clear on the surface, it is actually vague and general. Martha accuses George of doing nothing without providing specific examples or context for her claims. Her words are repetitive, which adds to the confusion and makes her point seem unclear. The lack of specificity in what she is accusing George of leaves room for confusion, which makes the statement ambiguous and obscure. George's response, ″What do you want me to do? Do you want me to act like you? Do you want me to go around all night braying at everybody, the way you do?″ is a deflection and an attempt to understand what Martha actually wants from him. His question tries to clarify, but his use of the word "braying" (which means loud, obnoxious yelling or complaining) makes his response exaggerated and somewhat unclear as well. He's asking Martha if he should act in the same way she does, but the word "braying" makes his query sound more dramatic and unclear, which adds to the obscurity of the conversation. Finally, Martha's reply, *"I DON'T BRAY!"*, is an intensified and defensive response. By repeating "I don't bray" and raising her voice, she introduces an obscure element to the conversation. Her overemphasis on the word "bray" makes the response feel like a reaction to an unclear accusation, further complicating the communication. In this exchange, both Martha's and George's statements contain ambiguity and exaggeration, making it difficult to understand the true intent behind their words. Martha's vagueness in accusing George of doing nothing and George's dramatic **response** using "braying" both **flout the Maxim of Manner** because they contribute to obscure communication. Instead of engaging in clear and direct dialogue, they both use exaggerated language and generalized claims that obscure the meaning of the conversation, making it difficult to follow.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on **asking, demanding** behavior. Martha's statement in the first line can be considered **demanding** because she is asserting multiple accusations towards George about his behavior. While not an explicit command, her repeated phrases like "you didn't do anything" and "you just sit around and talk" imply a critique and expectation that George should be more active or engaged. By emphasizing that George is doing nothing, Martha is **demanding** |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | that he change his behavior, even though this demand is not expressed as a direct order. George's response, ″What do you want me to do? Do you want me to act like you? Do you want me to go around all night braying at everybody, the way you do?″ is a **competitive act** of **asking** for clarification. George is not just asking for information; he is pushing back against Martha's accusations. His repetition of "Do you want me to...?" turns his response into a **demand** for clarity, but it also carries an implied challenge. He is asking Martha if she expects him to behave the way she does, turning the conversation into a competition for control. George is **asking** for a justification, not merely a yes or no answer, but a deeper explanation. Finally, Martha's response, *″I DON'T BRAY!″*, is an intensified denial. She is asserting her behavior and rejecting George's accusation, which again competes for attention in the conversation. Instead of simply accepting George's question, she emphatically deflects it, demanding that George acknowledge that she does not act the way he describes. Thus, the exchange is **competitive** because both participants engage in **asking and demanding** behavior, each trying to direct the flow of the conversation in their own way. Martha's initial accusations demand a response, while George's questioning is **a demand** for clarification, and Martha's final statement competes for control by rejecting George's characterization of her. |
| 72 | Mn4 | **George:** "I don't think I mind. I don't think I mind."<br>**Martha:** "*A nightcap? Are you kidding? We've got guests.″* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement, "I don't think I mind. I don't think I mind," is repetitive and ambiguous. While it may express George's uncertainty or indecision about something, his statement lacks clarity. He repeats the phrase "I don't think I mind" without offering more information, making it unclear why he doesn't mind or what he is referring to. The repetition adds to the vagueness, and without further context, it leaves George's feelings or stance on the issue quite obscure. This lack of specificity makes his statement unclear, flouting the Maxim of Manner. Martha's response, "A nightcap? Are you kidding? We've got guests," also introduces ambiguity in the conversation. While her response is a direct reaction to George's indecision, it introduces a new topic—the presence of guests—without clearly explaining how this relates to George's comment. She seems to be rejecting the idea of a nightcap because of the guests, but the exact connection between George's previous uncertainty and the need to consider guests is unclear. Martha's response doesn't directly address George's indecision, creating a shift in topic and contributing to obscurity in the conversation. Both George's repetitive statement and Martha's shift in topic contribute to the lack of clarity and ambiguity in this |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | conversation. This makes it an example of flouting the Maxim of Manner, as their communication is not clear and straightforward.<br><br>George's statement, "I don't think I mind. I don't think I mind.", is asking for validation, though indirectly. George seems unsure about something, possibly whether to proceed with an action (like having a nightcap), and is repeating his indecision to perhaps seek confirmation from Martha. His words may be interpreted as seeking approval or asking for reassurance in a roundabout way, asking Martha whether it's acceptable or fine to proceed with whatever he's considering. Martha's response, "A nightcap? Are you kidding? We've got guests.", is a demanding response. Instead of simply acknowledging George's indecision, she reprimands him for considering a nightcap when guests are present. Her statement contains an imperative tone, indirectly ordering George to reconsider his suggestion. By saying, "Are you kidding?" Martha forces George to recognize the inappropriateness of his suggestion, showing her authority in the conversation. Her demanding tone is further emphasized by her declaration that they have guests, implying that it would be improper or unacceptable to have a nightcap in this situation. The dialogue is competitive because George's asking for reassurance is met with Martha's demanding response, redirecting the conversation and challenging George's suggestion. Instead of calmly responding to his uncertainty, Martha takes control of the conversation and forces the discussion in a different direction. |
| 73 | Mn5 | **George**: "I'm numbed enough now to be able to take you when we're alone. I don't listen to you … or when I do listen to you, I sift everything."<br>**Martha**: "*Nuts*!" | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange flouts the Maxim of Manner, which suggests that communication should be clear, precise, and unambiguous. George's statement is **ambiguous** and **obscure**. When George says, *"I'm numbed enough now to be able to take you when we're alone,"* it is unclear what he means by "take you." The phrase is vague and leaves room for interpretation. Additionally, George's mention of *"I don't listen to you ... or when I do listen to you, I sift everything"* adds more confusion. The idea of "sifting everything" is also unclear because it's not explained what it means in this context. This lack of specificity makes his statement **obscure**, as it doesn't provide a clear picture of what he is describing or what he means by these actions. Martha's response, *"Nuts!"*, is a short and abrupt reply that further **obscures** the conversation. While it might be understood as an expression of frustration or disbelief, it doesn't clarify George's vague statements. It adds to the lack of clarity, reinforcing the ambiguity already present in the dialogue. Thus, George's use of unclear phrases and Martha's non-clarifying response create |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | **ambiguity** in the conversation, causing it to **flout the Maxim of Manner**, as the statements are not clear or direct, making it difficult for the listener (Martha, in this case) to fully understand George's meaning.<br><br>George's statement, "I'm numbed enough now to be able to take you when we're alone. I don't listen to you … or when I do listen to you, I sift everything.″ is a **competitive demand** in a more indirect way. George is asserting that he has reached a level of numbness that allows him to be around Martha, which implies that being with her requires tolerance. Additionally, when George says he "sifts everything," he is implicitly demanding attention or acknowledgment. His statement is an indirect **demand** that suggests a level of control and manipulation in their relationship, as he controls what he chooses to listen to or engage with.<br><br>Martha's response, *"Nuts!"*, is an assertion that challenges George's words. By saying "nuts," she is not directly **ordering** or **demanding** anything, but she does provide a **competitive** retort. She dismisses George's statement, implying that she does not take his words seriously. While not an explicit command, Martha is still asserting her opinion in the conversation, rejecting the claim made by George and creating a competitive dynamic in the exchange.<br><br>In summary, George's response can be seen as a **demand** in a more indirect way, while Martha's retort is **competitive** in that she rejects George's statement, creating a back-and-forth of asserting control over the conversation. Both participants are engaging in a **competitive** exchange, asserting their views without giving clear ground to the other. |
| 74 | Mn6 | **George**: "*You've got at me, George ... you don't have to do anything. Twenty-three years of you has been quite enough."*<br>**Martha**: "*You know what's happened, George? It's snapped, finally*." | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Manner**, which suggests that communication should be **clear, direct**, and **unambiguous**. George's statement is **unclear** and **ambiguous** because he uses the phrase *"You've got at me, George"* which doesn't provide a clear explanation of what he means. The phrase *"you've got at me"* could be interpreted in multiple ways (e.g., as an expression of frustration, defeat, or surrender), but it is not specific enough for George to effectively convey his feelings. In addition, *"Twenty-three years of you has been quite enough"* also lacks clarity, as it doesn't explain exactly what George is referring to about those twenty-three years. The statement is vague and uncertain, leaving room for multiple interpretations. The lack of direct context and detailed explanation makes George's speech **ambiguous** and |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | **obscure**. Martha's response, "You know what's happened, George? It's snapped, finally," is also **ambiguous**. When Martha says "It's snapped, finally," she does not specify what "it" refers to. It could mean that their relationship, a certain dynamic, or a particular situation has broken down, but there is no direct explanation. This lack of specificity makes Martha's statement **obscure** and unclear because she doesn't provide enough information for George (or the listener) to fully understand what has happened. Both George and Martha **flout the Maxim of Manner** because their statements are vague, unclear, and not fully explained. Instead of providing clear and understandable responses, they both use language that leaves room for confusion, making it difficult for the other person to grasp the exact meaning of what is being said.<br><br>George's statement, "You've got at me, George ... you don't have to do anything. Twenty-three years of you has been quite enough,*"* is indirectly **demanding** attention and acknowledgment. He is expressing frustration and possibly **demanding** a break or change in their dynamic. By saying "you don't have to do anything," George may be **demanding** a cessation of whatever behavior or actions Martha has been engaging in, showing a form of control over the situation. This type of assertion reflects a **competitive** dynamic, as George is establishing what he believes should be the end of a cycle or issue in their relationship. Martha's response, *"You know what's happened, George? It's snapped, finally,"* is also **competitive**. Although it is not a direct order, Martha's statement asserts dominance in the conversation by declaring that something has "snapped." This suggests that she has made a decision or observation and is commanding attention to the situation. The statement conveys a sense of finality, as if she is demanding George's acknowledgment of a significant shift or break in their relationship or a situation. Martha's assertive tone indicates that she is not just informing George but actively challenging his perspective, adding a competitive element to the exchange.<br><br>In summary, both George and Martha engage in **competitive** behavior. George **demands** a change or a stop to the behavior he perceives, while Martha asserts control over the situation with her declaration of something having "snapped," forcing George to confront her interpretation of events. Both are competing for control of the conversation and the dynamic between them. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| 75 | Mn7 | **George**: "*I've got to find some way to really get at you."*<br>**Martha**: "*You've got at me, George ... you don't have to do anything."* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement, "I've got to find some way to really get at you," is ambiguous and obscure. The phrase "get at you" is unclear—it could be interpreted in several ways depending on the context. It might imply frustration, an emotional confrontation, or even an attempt to manipulate or provoke Martha. The lack of specificity makes this ambiguous because it doesn't explain what George means by "get at you," leaving room for interpretation. The phrase is vague, and without further clarification, it doesn't directly communicate a clear, actionable idea. Martha's response, "You've got at me, George ... you don't have to do anything." is also ambiguous. She seems to acknowledge George's statement, but the idea of "getting at" someone remains unclear. By saying, "You've got at me," Martha could be responding to George's frustration, but she doesn't provide clarity on what George has "got" from her. Does she mean George has already frustrated her? Is she accepting or rejecting his attempt to get at her? The phrase "you don't have to do anything" adds further ambiguity, as it seems to respond to George's implied threat or frustration without directly addressing the core issue. Both George's vague expression and Martha's non-specific acknowledgment lead to a lack of clarity, making their statements obscure and ambiguous. Instead of providing clear and direct communication, both characters use language that flouts the Maxim of Manner by creating confusion and leaving their statements open to interpretation.<br><br>George's statement, "I've got to find some way to really get at you," can be seen as demanding in nature. While not explicitly commanding something, George is asserting that he has a need to take action in a way that affects Martha. The use of "I've got to find", combined with the idea of "getting at" someone, reflects a sense of urgency and a desire for control in the conversation. This demanding tone suggests that George wants Martha to respond to his feelings, or perhaps even act in a way that he feels is necessary to resolve the tension. Martha's response, "You've got at me, George ... you don't have to do anything.", can be seen as rejecting George's demand in a competitive manner. She dismisses his desire to "get at her" by implying that the effect has already occurred. By saying, "you don't have to do anything," Martha is asserting that George's actions (his desire to "get at her") are unnecessary and have already been achieved. This statement is competitive because she is actively pushing back against his implied need for action and instead commands the conversation to shift. George's demand for action and Martha's rejection of that demand creates a competitive exchange, where both |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | characters are vying for control of the situation. George expresses a need for action, while Martha challenges his need, ultimately asserting that no further action is required. This competitive dynamic shapes the way they interact in the conversation. |
| 76 | Mn8 | **George**: "*I'm trying to give you a survival kit. DO YOU HEAR ME?"* **Nick**: "*I hear you. You come in loud*." | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement, ″I'm trying to give you a survival kit. DO YOU HEAR ME?″, contains ambiguity in both its intent and its expression. On the surface, George is trying to communicate his intent to provide a "survival kit" to someone, likely in a metaphorical sense, but the context is unclear. It's not explicitly mentioned what a "survival kit" represents or why it's necessary. The emphasis on "DO YOU HEAR ME?" seems to be more about ensuring Nick's attention, but it doesn't clarify why George is trying to give the survival kit, or what it has to do with the current conversation or situation. The vagueness of this metaphorical language and the absence of additional explanation makes it obscure. Nick's response, ″I hear you. You come in loud,″ adds to the obscurity by introducing an unrelated focus on volume. Nick acknowledges George's message, but instead of addressing the meaning behind the survival kit, he focuses on the manner in which George is speaking ("loud"), which diverts the conversation away from the substance of George's statement. This creates ambiguity, as the response does not clarify anything about the "survival kit" but instead comments on the delivery. Both statements **flout the Maxim of Manner** because they are not direct and clear. George's message about the survival kit is obscure and vague, while Nick's comment about the loudness diverts the attention from the key point and adds irrelevant information. Together, they contribute to a lack of clarity in the conversation.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on **demanding** behavior. George's statement, ″I'm trying to give you a survival kit. DO YOU HEAR ME?″ is a **demand** for attention and understanding. The use of all caps ("DO YOU HEAR ME?") and the urgency in the phrasing convey that George is **demanding** acknowledgment from Nick. He is not simply trying to communicate; he is insisting that Nick listen and understand his offer. This demand for attention reflects **competitive** behavior, as George is actively trying to control the interaction and make sure Nick focuses on him. Nick's response, ″I hear you. You come in loud,″ is an assertion in return. Nick acknowledges George's demand for attention, but he does so by commenting on the delivery rather than directly addressing the content of George's |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | statement. This can be seen as a response to George's **demand** that still maintains an element of control over the conversation. By focusing on the volume of George's message, Nick is subtly reasserting his perspective in the dialogue. It's as if he's saying, "Yes, I hear you, but I'm not engaging with the content—only the manner in which you're delivering it." Thus, both George and Nick are engaging in **competitive** behavior. George **demands** Nick's attention and understanding, and Nick responds, maintaining his own control of the conversation by redirecting it to George's tone and delivery, not the substance. The dialogue reflects a power struggle, with both characters attempting to dominate the interaction in different ways. |
| 77 | Mn9 | **Martha**: "I've tried … I've really tried".<br>**George**: "*You're a monster ... you are."*<br>**Martha**: "*I'm loud, and I'm vulgar, and I wear the pants in this house because somebody's got to, but I am not a monster."* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement, "You're a monster … you are," is a clear accusation but is also somewhat **ambiguous**. The repetition of "you are" seems unnecessary, and while George is making a bold statement, the reasoning behind his accusation is unclear. He calls Martha a "monster" but doesn't provide specific details about what behavior or actions led him to this conclusion. This lack of explanation makes the statement feel vague, even though it's an accusation. His words are not entirely precise because we don't know exactly what he means by "monster." Martha's response, "I'm loud, and I'm vulgar, and I wear the pants in this house because somebody's got to, but I am not a monster," also **flouts the Maxim of Manner**. While she rejects George's label of "monster," her response is not direct and creates confusion. Martha lists several characteristics about herself—loud, vulgar, wearing the pants—but doesn't explain why these traits are being highlighted in response to George's accusation. The phrase *"I wear the pants in this house because somebody's got to"* adds further ambiguity. While she is defending herself by rejecting the label of "monster," the way she explains her behavior doesn't clearly counter George's accusation. It's an indirect rebuttal that doesn't offer a straightforward reason for why she is not a "monster," making her response **obscure**. Both George and Martha **flout the Maxim of Manner** in their statements. George's accusation lacks clarity and context, while Martha's defense is disjointed and unclear, making the entire exchange feel **ambiguous**. Instead of providing clear, precise explanations for their points, both engage in statements that lack the necessary clarity to fully understand their intentions or reasoning.<br><br>George's statement, "You're a monster … you are," can be seen as an indirect **demand** or **ordering**. George is asserting a judgment about Martha, labeling her a "monster." |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | Though not a direct command, his statement is **demanding** attention to his perception of her. The repetition of "you are" further emphasizes his insistence on this label, effectively demanding that Martha acknowledge or accept the characterization, even though it is a harsh judgment. This assertion is a form of **competitive** behavior, where George is trying to control the conversation and impose his viewpoint. Martha's response, "I'm loud, and I'm vulgar, and I wear the pants in this house because somebody's got to, but I am not a monster," is a direct rebuttal and can be seen as **demanding** George reconsider his characterization. She is asserting her own qualities and even reclaiming control of the conversation by responding to George's accusation. The phrase "I wear the pants in this house because somebody's got to" indirectly **demands** acknowledgment of her authority or role in their relationship. By emphasizing her position and rejecting the "monster" label, Martha is engaging in a **competitive** dialogue, where she is **demanding** George's understanding or acceptance of her stance. Both George and Martha exhibit **competitive** behavior. George **demands** that Martha accept his accusation, while Martha competes back, asserting her own identity and challenging his claim. This creates a power struggle where both are actively trying to dominate the conversation by **ordering** or **demanding** the other person's acknowledgment. |
| 78 | Mn10 | **George**: "You're a spoiled, self-indulgent, willful, dirty-minded, liquor-ridden …"<br>**Martha**: "*Snap! It went snap."* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Manner**, which advises communication to be **clear**, **precise**, and **unambiguous**. George's statement is extremely detailed and somewhat **obscure**. He provides a long list of negative attributes—spoiled, self-indulgent, willful, dirty-minded, liquor-ridden—but he does not explain why he attributes these qualities to Martha or what specific behavior prompted this judgment. The statement, while clear in its insult, is **ambiguous** in that it lacks context or specificity. These accusations could apply to various situations, but George does not elaborate on any particular actions or events that led him to make such a statement. This lack of explanation and the vague list of criticisms make his message feel **obscure**, and the **ambiguity** leaves room for multiple interpretations. Martha's response, "Snap! It went snap.", is also **ambiguous**. The term *"snap"* is **unclear** and non-specific. Martha is likely referring to something breaking or shifting, but she does not clarify what exactly "snapped". Is she talking about George's accusations, their relationship, or something else entirely? This lack of clarity and context creates an **obscure** message that doesn't directly explain what has changed, making it difficult for George or the listener to fully grasp the meaning behind |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | her response. Both George and Martha's statements contribute to **ambiguity** in the conversation. George lists negative traits without providing specific examples, and Martha's response to the situation is vague, making it unclear exactly what "snap" refers to. This lack of clarity and specificity makes the exchange **flout the Maxim of Manner** by being **ambiguous and obscure**.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on **ordering, asking, demanding** behavior. George's statement, "You're a spoiled, self-indulgent, willful, dirty-minded, liquor-ridden ..." is a **demand** in the form of a character judgment. George is asserting his view of Martha, **demanding** that she acknowledge or respond to these qualities he has attributed to her. This statement, while not an explicit order, carries a forceful accusation meant to impact Martha emotionally and psychologically. By listing multiple negative attributes, George is attempting to control the narrative of their conversation, demanding that Martha accept these labels or engage with them. Martha's response, "Snap! It went snap," can be seen as a **competitive** retort. Though not a direct command, she is asserting control of the conversation by dismissing George's accusations. Instead of acknowledging or engaging with the criticisms, she makes a statement of defiance that reorients the conversation. The use of "snap" implies a change or break in the situation, and by saying "it went snap," she takes the control away from George's accusations and places it on her own interpretation of the situation.<br><br>In summary, George is demanding attention and asserting his view of Martha, while Martha competes back by rejecting his accusations and asserting her perspective. Both characters are engaging in a **competitive** dynamic, where they are competing for dominance in the conversation, trying to control the direction and emotional tone of their exchange. |
| 79 | Mn11 | **George**: "I'd like to set you straight about something … while the little ladies are out of the room … I'd like to set you straight about what Martha said."<br>**Nick**: "*I don't ... make* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement, "I'd like to set you straight about something ... while the little ladies are out of the room … I'd like to set you straight about what Martha said." is **ambiguous** and **obscure** for several reasons. Firstly, the phrase *"set you straight"* is unclear about what exactly needs to be clarified. While George implies that there is a misunderstanding or a need for correction, he does not explain what the misunderstanding is or what part of Martha's statement needs to be clarified. The repetition of "I'd like to set you straight" adds to the ambiguity without offering any clear details or context. Additionally, the mention of "while the little ladies are out of |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | *judgments, so there's no need, really."* | | | | | | the room" is an odd, almost irrelevant statement in this context, which serves to distract from the main point of George's communication. This vagueness in George's language leaves room for interpretation and makes his intentions unclear, flouting the Maxim of Manner by not being precise. Nick's response, "I don't ... make judgments, so there's no need, really," also **flouts the Maxim of Manner**. While Nick is trying to deflect George's attempt to clarify or correct something, his statement is vague in nature. He says he doesn't make judgments, but it's unclear whether he means that he does not want to engage in George's argument or that he genuinely does not care about the clarification George is offering. Nick's statement doesn't provide a clear stance or explanation about why he believes there's "no need," leaving his response somewhat obscure and unclear. Both George and Nick contribute to **ambiguous** communication in this dialogue. George does not specify the misunderstanding he wants to clarify, and Nick's refusal is vague, which leads to a lack of clarity and precision. This vagueness in both speakers' language makes the conversation **obscure** and unfocused, thus flouting the Maxim of Manner.<br><br>George's statement, "I'd like to set you straight about something ... while the little ladies are out of the room … I'd like to set you straight about what Martha said," is an example of **demanding** attention and a **competitive** assertion. George is expressing a desire to correct Nick's understanding, implying that there's a need for clarification. The repetition of "I'd like to set you straight" emphasizes George's insistence on having this conversation, making it a **demand** for Nick to pay attention and listen to what George has to say. Furthermore, the mention of "while the little ladies are out of the room" adds a sense of urgency, indicating that George wants Nick's undivided attention at this moment, without distractions. This can be interpreted as George **demanding** Nick's full engagement in the conversation. Nick's response, "I don't ... make judgments, so there's no need, really," can be seen as resisting George's **demand**. By stating that he doesn't make judgments, Nick is indirectly refusing to engage with George's assertion that something needs to be set straight. Instead of simply acknowledging George's request, Nick challenges the necessity of the conversation, asserting that it's unnecessary to clarify anything. This response can be seen as **competitive** because Nick is not simply following George's lead, but instead opposes George's attempt to take control of the conversation. George is **demanding** Nick's attention and a willingness to hear what he |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | has to say, while Nick is resisting that demand by asserting that it's unnecessary to discuss it. This creates a **competitive** interaction, where both are vying for control over the direction of the conversation. |
| 80 | Mn12 | **George**: "*I'm going to read a book. Read. Read. Read? You've heard of it?"*<br>**Martha**: "What's the matter with you?" | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement is repetitive and **ambiguous**. The repetition of the word *"Read"* adds confusion, as it doesn't provide any new information with each mention, creating an **obscure** and **unclear** message. Instead of directly stating that he is going to read a book, George's repetition makes it seem like he is **doubting** his own statement or trying to emphasize something in an unclear way. The phrase "You've heard of it?" adds another layer of ambiguity—what does George mean by "it"? Is he referring to reading in general, the specific book, or something else entirely? His comment raises more questions than it answers, making the message unclear, which is **flouting the Maxim of Manner** by failing to deliver a straightforward message. Martha's response, "What's the matter with you?" is an equally vague reply. Instead of addressing the substance of George's statement (about reading the book), Martha questions George's state of mind. Her response doesn't offer clarity or engage with the actual topic George introduced. It also adds to the confusion, as we don't know what Martha finds strange or confusing about George's statement. This contributes to the lack of clarity and **ambiguity** in the exchange. Both George and Martha engage in **obscure** communication, with George's repetitive phrasing and vague reference to reading, and Martha's unfocused question that doesn't address the substance of the conversation directly. This **obscurity** in both their statements makes the conversation **flout the Maxim of Manner**.<br><br>This exchange can be analyzed as **competitive**, particularly focusing on **demanding** behavior. George's statement, "I'm going to read a book. Read. Read. Read? You've heard of it?" can be interpreted as **demanding** attention and a response. By repeating the word "Read" and then asking "You've heard of it?", George is insisting that Martha engage with him on the subject of reading. His repetition and questioning can be seen as a way to assert that he wants to be heard and wants Martha to respond to his statement. The repetition creates a sense of urgency, emphasizing his desire for her attention and potentially **demanding** that she acknowledge what he is saying. The question "You've heard of it?" further reinforces this, as George is **demanding** an acknowledgment from Martha about his choice to read. Martha's response, "What's the matter with you?" can be seen as a **competitive** retort to George's demand for attention. Instead of simply |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | responding to the question or engaging in the conversation about reading, Martha challenges George's behavior. She pushes back against his assertiveness, questioning his mental state rather than engaging with the content of his message. This is a competitive response, as she is not just passively listening to George but is also asserting her own perspective on his behavior. In summary, George is **demanding** attention with his repetitive statements and questioning, insisting that Martha engage with him. Martha responds competitively by challenging George, questioning his behavior instead of directly responding to the subject he introduced. This creates a **competitive** interaction where both parties are trying to assert their own perspectives and claim control over the conversation. |
| 81 | Mn13 | **George**: *"You want me to act like you? Do you want me to go around all night braying at everybody, the way you do?"*<br>**Martha**: *"I don't bray!"* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Manner**, which emphasizes clarity, precision, and directness in communication. George's statement is **ambiguous** and **obscure** for several reasons. First, the use of the word "braying" is unclear. "Braying" typically refers to the loud cry of a donkey, but it's being used here as a metaphor for Martha's behavior. George's comparison is vague because it does not explain what "braying" specifically refers to in the context of Martha's actions. Is he referring to loud talking, complaining, or something else entirely? The metaphor creates ambiguity because it does not clearly define the behavior being criticized. Furthermore, George's repetition of the question — "Do you want me to go around all night braying at everybody, the way you do?" — adds to the confusion. He's asking Martha if she wants him to act in a way that mirrors something he perceives her doing, but the lack of specific details and the metaphorical language make it unclear what exactly he means by "braying". This forces the reader to make assumptions about what George is referring to, which flouts the Maxim of Manner by making the communication more **obscure** than it needs to be.<br><br>Martha's response, "I don't bray!" is also **ambiguous**. She is rejecting George's characterization, but she doesn't clarify what she actually does or provide any specific counter-argument to George's metaphor. Her response adds to the **obscurity** because it does not engage with the underlying issue that George has raised (whatever the metaphor of *"braying"* is intended to represent), leaving the conversation somewhat unclear. George's use of the metaphor "braying" creates a lack of clarity in communication, and Martha's brief response does little to clear up the ambiguity. Both |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | characters are speaking in a way that **obscures** the true meaning of their statements, making this dialogue a clear example of **flouting the Maxim of Manner**.<br><br>George's statement is a **demanding** question. He is **asking** if Martha wants him to act in a way that is exaggerated and harsh (by "braying" at people), which indirectly demands her response. The repetition of "Do you want me to ...?" emphasizes George's need for validation or an answer. This is a **competitive** move as George is trying to assert control over the direction of the conversation by putting Martha in a position to respond. His use of the term *"braying"* adds force to his demand by describing the behavior he finds objectionable, indirectly criticizing Martha's way of acting. Martha's response, "I don't bray!" is a defensive and **competitive** response to George's demand. Instead of simply answering his demand or engaging with the substance of his question, Martha rejects his characterization of her behavior in a direct and assertive manner. By stating, "I don't bray!" she denies George's claim and refuses to accept his framing of her actions, turning the conversation back onto George's behavior. Thus, George's **demand** and Martha's counter-response both create a **competitive** dynamic, where George is **demanding** an acknowledgment of his frustration with Martha's actions, and Martha is asserting her independence by rejecting his view. This back-and-forth reinforces the **competitive** nature of the exchange, with both participants competing for control over the narrative. |
| 82 | Mn14 | **George**: "We drink a great deal in this country, and I suspect we'll be drinking a great deal more, too … if we survive."<br>**Nick**: "*We should be Arabs or Italians ... the Arabs don't drink, and the Italians don't get drunk much, except on religious holidays*." | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Manner** due to **ambiguity and obscurity** in both speakers' communication. The Maxim of Manner emphasizes clarity and the avoidance of obscurity or ambiguity, but in this case, both George's and Nick's statements can be considered unclear. George's statement, "We drink a great deal in this country, and I suspect we'll be drinking a great deal more, too ... if we survive," is vague in nature. The phrase "if we survive" is an unclear qualifier, introducing ambiguity about the situation and making it unclear what exactly George is referring to. Is he speaking about the effects of excessive drinking, or is it a broader comment on the country's survival or health? The phrase "drinking a great deal" is also somewhat open-ended and could refer to alcohol consumption, but it's not specific. The inclusion of "if we survive" adds an extra layer of uncertainty about the cause of their potential drinking increase, making George's statement somewhat ambiguous. Nick's response, "We should be Arabs or Italians ... the Arabs don't drink, and the Italians don't get drunk much, except on |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | religious holidays," introduces further ambiguity and lack of precision. The statement is unclear because it presents an oversimplified and vague comparison of two nationalities without explaining why they should emulate these groups. His focus on the drinking habits of Arabs and Italians lacks clarity: Is he implying that this is the solution to the problem George mentioned? What does it mean to "be Arabs or Italians" in this context? It is not entirely clear, and his claim about Italians not getting drunk except on religious holidays is a generalization that lacks specific evidence, making his statement obscure and imprecise. Both George and Nick's statements fail to offer clear, direct information. Instead, they introduce ambiguity through their phrasing, creating confusion about what they mean or what their point is. This failure to communicate with clarity and specificity makes the dialogue an example of **flouting the Maxim of Manner** by being ambiguous and obscure.<br><br>This dialogue includes **Competitive** communication, which involves ordering, asking, demanding, or begging, and here, Nick's response can be understood as competitive in nature. Nick's statement, "We should be Arabs or Italians," is a **demand** or directive. He's suggesting that George should take on the characteristics of another culture in terms of drinking habits, essentially giving an order for George to emulate a different way of life. The phrasing "We should be..." implies that Nick is instructing George on how to act or behave. Moreover, Nick continues with, "the Arabs don't drink, and the Italians don't get drunk much, except on religious holidays." This further emphasizes his **competitive** stance. He is **demanding** that George consider these other cultural norms, suggesting that by imitating these groups, they could avoid the excess drinking George is concerned about. It is not simply a suggestion or a conversation point but rather a directive with an underlying tone of **ordering** how things should be done. George's statement doesn't involve ordering, demanding, or begging directly, but it sets the stage for Nick to compete by offering a solution or alternative, which involves suggesting that George adopt a completely different behavior, thus reflecting a competitive dynamic. This exchange illustrates a competitive type of communication because Nick is **demanding** that George change his approach or behavior based on cultural comparisons, positioning himself as the one directing the course of action in the conversation. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| 83 | Mn15 | **George**: "*You can go right on with it."*<br>**Martha**: "*What's the matter with you?"* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Manner** by making the conversation unclear or ambiguous. George's statement, "You can go right on with it," is **ambiguous** because the phrase "it" is not clearly defined. The listener is left uncertain about what George is referring to when he says "it." In the context of the conversation, "it" could refer to a variety of things, and George doesn't specify what action or topic he is addressing. This ambiguity makes his statement **obscure** and unclear, forcing the listener to guess what he means. Martha's response, "What's the matter with you?" does not address or clarify George's unclear statement, but instead, it shifts the conversation to George's behavior or mental state. This response adds to the confusion because instead of asking for clarification on what George meant by "it," Martha immediately questions George's condition, which doesn't resolve the vagueness in George's original statement. In this case, George's vague language and Martha's unrelated response contribute to a conversation that lacks clarity and directness. Both speakers avoid providing clear answers or further explanation, making the dialogue an example of flouting the Maxim of Manner by being **ambiguous** and **obscure**. The conversation is unclear because George fails to clarify what he is talking about, and Martha does not seek clarification but instead shifts the focus elsewhere. This makes the dialogue **ambiguous** and an example of **flouting the Maxim of Manner**.<br><br>This exchange is a **competitive** one, specifically a form of **demanding**, because both parties are trying to assert control or make their own point in the conversation. George's statement, "You can go right on with it," can be understood as a form of **demanding**. He's not merely asking for permission or offering a suggestion; he is allowing or commanding Martha to continue with whatever "it" refers to. Even though it's framed as a permission ("you can"), the tone and structure imply a command. By telling Martha she can "go right on with it," George asserts control over the situation, directing the conversation in a particular way. Martha's response, "What's the matter with you?" is competitive as well, but it serves as a **reprimanding** or questioning demand. Instead of addressing George's direction or providing clarity on what he meant, Martha challenges George by questioning his mental or emotional state, implying that his previous statement was out of place or unreasonable. This counters George's command and shifts the power dynamic in the conversation by questioning his authority or reasoning. It's a |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | **demand** for an explanation or justification, which makes the conversation more competitive.<br><br>In summary, both George and Martha are engaging in **competitive** speech acts — George through a form of **demanding** permission or action, and Martha through a **reprimanding** challenge to George's behavior. Both exchanges demonstrate a competitive interaction where each party is trying to assert control over the conversation in different ways. |
| 84 | Mn16 | **George**: "*You don't want to play that now, hunh? You want to save that game till later?"*<br>**Nick**: "*Well, what'll we play now? We gotta play a game."* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This dialogue flouts the **Maxim of Manner**, which dictates that communication should be clear, direct, and free from ambiguity. However, this exchange contains **obscurity** and vagueness in the conversation that makes it unclear and indirect, which leads to a flouting of this maxim. George's initial statement is somewhat ambiguous. He starts with a question about whether they want to save the game for later, but it is not clear why this question is being raised in the first place. His phrasing, "You want to save that game till later?" creates some vagueness about the reason for postponing the game. The intention behind asking about saving the game is unclear, and it could be seen as an indirect way of questioning Nick's priorities or interests in the game. The lack of further explanation about why the game should be saved for later introduces uncertainty and a lack of clarity. Nick's response, "Well, what'll we play now? We gotta play a game," adds to the vagueness. While he's responding to George's question, he introduces an ambiguity of his own by not specifying what game he has in mind or why he feels the need to play any game immediately. Nick's urgency, "We gotta play a game," is somewhat vague as it doesn't provide context on why they must play now or what game they should play. His response doesn't clearly address George's statement about postponing the game; instead, it shifts the focus onto the necessity of playing, without explaining further details or clarifying the reasoning. Both characters are being unclear in their communication, using vague references without providing adequate explanation, making the conversation unclear and obscure. This ambiguity flouts the Maxim of Manner because it could have been expressed more clearly.<br><br>In this exchange, **George's question** about saving the game for later is somewhat **ambiguous**. By asking, "You want to save that game till later?" George is **asking** in a **competitive** way that introduces uncertainty. It's not clear why George is asking about postponing the game, nor does he clarify the context or his reasoning behind the |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | suggestion. His phrasing, "You want to save that game till later?" could be perceived as an indirect challenge or a **demand** to focus on something else, which leads to a lack of clarity in communication. Nick's response further exacerbates the ambiguity by asking, "What'll we play now? We gotta play a game." While Nick acknowledges the need to play, his urgency—"We gotta play a game"—is vague because it doesn't specify which game or why playing is so important at that moment. By shifting the conversation to the necessity of playing without addressing the underlying question about postponing the game, Nick **orders** the conversation to focus on playing, without providing the clarity needed. Both characters engage in **competitive** communication—George through a questioning **demand**, and Nick through an urgent shift in focus—without offering the clear and direct information that the Maxim of Manner would require. The lack of explanation and context in both their statements introduces **obscurity**, making the conversation unclear and ultimately flouting the Maxim of Manner. |
| 85 | Mn17 | **George**: "*I won't tell you."*<br>**Nick**: "All right." | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Manner**, which emphasizes clarity and directness in communication. The conversation here is **ambiguous** and somewhat unclear, creating a situation where the communication could be more direct and straightforward. George's statement, "I won't tell you," is ambiguous in its intent. While George is making a clear decision to withhold information, he doesn't explain why he is doing so or what information he is referring to. The lack of context or clarity regarding what George won't tell Nick creates an **obscure** statement. There is no explanation about the subject or reason for his refusal, making the statement vague. Nick's response, "All right," does little to clarify the situation. While it acknowledges George's refusal, it does not express any further questioning, seeking of clarification, or attempt to resolve the ambiguity. Nick simply accepts the statement without challenging it or asking for an explanation, which adds to the **obscurity** of the exchange. In this case, the lack of further explanation or clarification from either party makes the conversation unclear. George's refusal to tell Nick is ambiguous, and Nick's agreement to accept that refusal without probing creates an interaction where **ambiguity** dominates the communication. This lack of specificity in their dialogue leads to a **flouting of the Maxim of Manner**, which values clear and unambiguous communication.<br><br>George's statement, *"I won't tell you,"* is an example of demanding or refusing in a competitive manner. By saying he won't tell Nick something, George is asserting |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | control over the information, effectively placing himself in a dominant position. The refusal itself is a form of **demanding** because George is explicitly choosing not to share something, thus exercising authority in the conversation. Nick's response, *"All right,"* might seem passive, but in the context of the conversation, it can be seen as a **competitive** reply as well. Nick acknowledges George's refusal but does not challenge or question it. Instead, he seems to acquiesce to George's demand to withhold information. This could be interpreted as Nick not pushing back, which is a **competitive** response in a situation where he could have demanded clarification or argued against George's decision. Instead, Nick accepts the situation, possibly signaling a tactical retreat in the conversation. George demonstrates competitive behavior by refusing to provide information, asserting control over the conversation. Nick, on the other hand, responds competitively by accepting George's demand without challenging it, which further maintains the competitive tone of the exchange. |
| 86 | Mn18 | **George**: "*This is my game! You played yours … you people. This is my game!"*<br>**Nick**: "Just a minute here …" | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Manner**, which requires communication to be clear, direct, and unambiguous. The dialogue contains obscure statements and unclear references that create confusion and indirectness. George's statement, "This is my game! You played yours ... you people. This is my game!" is somewhat **ambiguous** because George uses vague references that don't fully clarify the situation. The phrase "you people" is particularly unclear, as it doesn't explain who exactly George is referring to. It seems to imply a group of people who have played their game, but George doesn't elaborate further on who these people are or what the specific context is. Additionally, his repetition of "This is my game" lacks any clear explanation about why he is asserting control over the game or what his game entails. These ambiguities in his speech force listeners to interpret his meaning without the direct clarity that the Maxim of Manner would encourage. Nick's response, "Just a minute here ...", also adds to the vagueness. He does not directly address George's statement or clarify the situation. Instead, Nick's statement is somewhat disjointed and unclear in this context, as it doesn't explain what he wants to interrupt or what part of the conversation needs attention. It feels like an incomplete thought, adding further ambiguity to the exchange. Both George and Nick's statements create confusion and vagueness. George's use of ambiguous phrases like "you people" and his repetition without clarity, combined with Nick's disjointed interjection, **flouts the Maxim of Manner** by being unclear and obscure. The exchange |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | could have been more straightforward, but instead, it leaves room for interpretation and confusion.<br><br>George's statement, ″This is my game! You played yours ... you people. This is my game!", is an example of **demanding** behavior. George is not merely suggesting or proposing, but rather insisting on his control over the game. By repeatedly stating "This is my game," he is asserting ownership and dominance in the situation, creating a **competitive** tone. His use of the phrase "you people" adds an element of exclusion, positioning himself in opposition to others, as if his game is more important or authoritative. This creates a direct challenge to the previous statement or actions, further emphasizing his demand for control. Nick's response, "Just a minute here ...", is also **competitive**, although in a different way. By saying "Just a minute here," Nick is pushing back against George's dominance, requesting a pause or a moment to address the situation. It's a subtle challenge to George's dominance in the conversation, signaling a need to slow down or reconsider the approach. While Nick is not as direct as George in his demand, his interjection still disrupts the flow of George's assertion, making the conversation more **competitive**. George's repetitive **demand** for control over the game and Nick's interjection both serve to create a competitive dynamic in the conversation. George is ordering or demanding attention and compliance, while Nick challenges that control, adding a layer of competition to the interaction. |
| 87 | Mn19 | **George**: "You've got history on your side, and all …"<br>**Nick**: "*You've got history on your side ... I've got biology on mine.*" | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange flouts the **Maxim of Manner**, which suggests that communication should be clear, direct, and free from ambiguity. In this case, the statements are ambiguous and obscure, making the communication unclear. George's statement, "You've got history on your side, and all …", is vague because it leaves the conversation unfinished. The phrase "and all" is unclear, and George does not specify what he means by it. By trailing off without completing the thought, he creates **ambiguity** and **obscures** the full meaning of his statement. The lack of elaboration on how "history" is connected to the subject being discussed leaves Nick (and the audience) uncertain about George's full point, making the message less clear. Nick's response, "You've got history on your side … I've got biology on mine," introduces another layer of ambiguity. While Nick is trying to counter George's point by referencing "biology" on his side, the connection between "history" and "biology" is unclear. The two topics seem unrelated, and without any explanation of why these fields are being compared or how they are relevant to the |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | conversation, Nick's statement becomes obscure. It adds to the confusion, as the audience may not understand the underlying significance of these fields in this context. Both George and Nick are not being straightforward or clear in their statements. George's trailing off and Nick's introduction of an unrelated subject (biology) lead to ambiguity, making it difficult for the audience to follow the conversation clearly. This **flouts the Maxim of Manner** by obscuring the intended message and leaving the conversation vague.<br><br>George's statement, "You've got history on your side, and all …" could be interpreted as him trying to make a point or give a command in a competitive manner, suggesting that Nick has history on his side while George is implying that he may have some advantage of his own. However, George leaves his thought unfinished with "and all," making it unclear. This can be seen as a **demand** for response or command, prompting Nick to engage with the conversation or challenge his statement. By not completing his sentence, George is subtly asserting his dominance in the conversation and expecting Nick to fill in the gaps or respond. Nick's response, "You've got history on your side … I've got biology on mine," directly addresses George's incomplete statement, possibly competing with George's assertion. Nick could be **asking** George for clarification about the comparison or **demanding** a response by contrasting history with biology, which may not seem like an equal comparison. This line can be interpreted as a competitive retort, where Nick is trying to engage George in a way that challenges George's assertion, as he is indirectly questioning the relevance of what George said. Both characters are engaged in a **competitive** exchange, with George asserting his point in an incomplete and ambiguous manner and Nick responding by competing with that assertion, seeking a response or clarification. The **competitive** nature of the interaction comes from their back-and-forth in asserting their views, creating tension and prompting a reply.. |
| 88 | Mn20 | **George**: *"I thought you should know*."<br>**Martha**: "What?" | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement, "I thought you should know," is somewhat **ambiguous** because it does not provide clear or direct information. By saying "you should know," George implies there is something important that Martha needs to be informed about, but he doesn't specify what that is. This statement lacks specificity and leaves Martha uncertain about what George is trying to communicate. The vagueness in George's remark causes a lack of clarity, which *flouts the Maxim of Manner*, which states that |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | communication should be clear, direct, and free of ambiguity. Martha's response, "What?" is an attempt to clarify the ambiguity in George's statement. She directly asks for more information because George's initial statement was unclear. Martha's question shows that she is trying to get a direct answer from George, but George's original statement was obscure, which is why she is confused and demands further explanation. George's statement is ambiguous because it does not specify what Martha should know, and Martha's response highlights the lack of clarity. This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Manner** because George's communication is not clear and leaves room for confusion.<br><br>In this exchange, George's statement "I thought you should know" can be seen as an indirect way of demanding attention from Martha. Though he is not overtly *demanding*, his phrasing suggests he expects Martha to care about the information he's about to share. By framing the statement as something she "should know," George is subtly asserting that this information is important and that Martha must listen to him. Martha's response, "What?" is a direct request for clarification. By **asking** "What?" Martha is **demanding** more information from George. Her response is a form of competitive asking, as she's directly pressing for more details in a straightforward manner. She doesn't provide any other commentary or passive response, but instead focuses on getting a clear answer to the ambiguous statement George made. George's statement can be seen as a subtle demand for attention and engagement, while Martha's response is a clear demand for more information. Both characters are engaging in a **competitive** manner by asserting their need for specific communication and information. |
| 89 | Mn21 | **Martha**: "*I've got windshield wipers on my eyes, because I married you ... baby!"*<br>**George**: "Martha, you'll be a songwriter yet." | | | | √ | **Competitive** | Martha's statement, "I've got windshield wipers on my eyes, because I married you ... baby!" is a metaphor that is **obscure** and unclear. The use of "windshield wipers on my eyes" is a figurative expression that is not immediately understandable. Martha's comparison seems to suggest that she is constantly wiping away something from her eyes, possibly tears or frustration, but the metaphor does not directly explain what exactly she means. The phrase is vague, and it's unclear whether she's referring to emotional distress, physical exhaustion, or something else entirely. By using an **obscure** metaphor, she is **flouting the Maxim of Manner**, which calls for clarity and directness in communication. George's response, "Martha, you'll be a songwriter yet," is also somewhat ambiguous. While it may be an attempt to lighten the mood or make a joke, it does not directly address the metaphor Martha used. Instead, he turns her statement |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | into a compliment or a playful remark about her ability to create expressive, poetic statements. The response is vague because it does not clarify what George thinks about Martha's metaphor or the underlying feelings she may have expressed. Together, both characters engage in a form of communication that relies on unclear metaphors and indirect responses, which **flouts the Maxim of Manner**. Martha's metaphor is ambiguous and unclear, and George's response further obscures the meaning without addressing the metaphor directly. This results in a conversation that lacks clarity, making it an example of flouting the Maxim of Manner.<br><br>In this exchange, George's statement, "Martha, you'll be a songwriter yet," can be interpreted as a somewhat **competitive** remark. While it may not seem like a direct **order** or **demand**, it can be seen as George downplaying Martha's emotional state and turning it into a more lighthearted comment. The phrase "you'll be a songwriter yet" could be viewed as dismissive, implying that Martha's emotional outburst or frustration is something that could be turned into creative output, which could potentially diminish the seriousness of her feelings. On the other hand, Martha's statement, "I've got windshield wipers on my eyes, because I married you ... baby!" could be seen as her expressing a kind of frustration and need for attention. While she's not directly demanding something from George, she is communicating her emotional discomfort and potentially seeking acknowledgment or response. Her choice of words and metaphor indicates some level of intensity, making it a competitive remark as she seeks validation or a reaction from George. Both characters are engaged in a type of **competitive** communication, where George lightly dismisses Martha's frustration and attempts to assert a control over the situation, and Martha, in turn, expresses her frustration in a way that also demands attention or acknowledgment. This creates a subtle power struggle in the dialogue, fitting the competitive dynamic of ordering, asking, and demanding, even if it is not expressed in direct commands or requests. |
| 90 | Mn22 | **George**: "*I'll give all you bastards five to come out from where you're hiding!!"*<br>**Martha**: "Fat chance." | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement, "I'll give all you bastards five to come out from where you're hiding!!", is unclear and **ambiguous**. First, the term "bastards" is emotionally charged and can make it difficult to determine exactly who George is addressing. The term is vague and generalized, which could leave the listener (and the audience) unsure about the specific individuals or group he is referring to. Additionally, George says, "I'll give all you bastards five," but the meaning of "five" is unclear. Is he referring to five |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | minutes, five dollars, or five of something else entirely? This lack of clarity creates **ambiguity** and confusion about his intentions or the specific action he is referring to. The phrase "to come out from where you're hiding" is also unclear — why is it necessary for these individuals to come out? What does George mean by "hiding"? These **ambiguities** make George's statement obscure and difficult to fully understand. Martha's response, "Fat chance," further adds to the lack of clarity. While the meaning of "fat chance" is generally understood as sarcasm or a way of indicating something is highly unlikely, its exact implication in this context remains ambiguous. Is Martha dismissing George's challenge, or is she implying that there is no chance anyone will comply with his request? The sarcasm behind "fat chance" is understood, but the lack of specificity makes Martha's response unclear in terms of what she is really saying about George's statement. Both George's statement and Martha's response **flout the Maxim of Manner** because they are filled with vague, unclear, and indirect language. George's metaphorical use of "five" and Martha's sarcastic "fat chance" make the communication unclear, requiring interpretation and leaving ambiguity in their interaction. This creates confusion and disrupts the clarity of the conversation.<br><br>George's statement, "I'll give all you bastards five to come out from where you're hiding!!", is a direct and **demanding** command. By saying, "I'll give all you bastards five," George is ordering the individuals to reveal themselves, setting a clear expectation for them to come out. The phrase "five" likely refers to a time limit, which further adds to the commanding tone. He is forcing action through his words, demanding that the people in question reveal themselves within a specific time frame. This kind of directive is an example of ordering, where George is asserting control over the situation and commanding others to comply with his demands. Martha's response, "Fat chance," is a brief and dismissive reply, challenging George's command. While George has issued a **demand**, Martha undermines it with a sarcastic comment, indicating that she doesn't believe the action will take place. This response may not directly confront George's demand but rather mocks its possibility, creating a **competitive** tone between the two characters. Martha's response is not passive; instead, it subtly contests George's authority and deflates his directive. George is demanding action by ordering the people to come out, and Martha responds in a **competitive** manner, challenging the likelihood of success. Both characters are involved in a **competitive** exchange where they assert |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | their positions in the conversation, with George taking control through his demand and Martha challenging the efficacy of his request. This creates a back-and-forth dynamic driven by **competitive** communication. |
| 91 | Mn23 | **George**: *"I think we've been having a … a real good evening … all things considered*."<br>**Martha**: "*Clink?*" | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement, "I think we've been having a ... a real good evening ... all things considered," is ambiguous due to the use of the ellipses ("...") and the vague phrasing. By leaving the sentence unfinished, George creates an unclear and obscure expression. The ellipses signal hesitation, which makes his meaning uncertain and not direct. Instead of clearly stating why the evening has been good, George leaves his point hanging, forcing the listener to infer what he means. The vagueness of the phrasing makes it difficult to fully grasp his sentiment and leads to ambiguity in communication. This vagueness **flouts the Maxim of Manner**, as it fails to express the message in a clear, direct, and unambiguous way. Martha's response, "Clink?" adds to the ambiguity. She's asking for clarification, possibly because she did not understand the context or the intention behind George's incomplete statement. The word "Clink?" is also somewhat unclear—it's a single word question that seems out of place or disconnected from the rest of the conversation, adding to the lack of clarity. By responding with "Clink?", Martha is requesting more specific information, but her response is still ambiguous because she does not directly address what she wants clarified or why she is asking this particular question. George's use of ellipses and vague phrasing makes his statement ambiguous, while Martha's unclear question further obscures the communication. Both characters are not communicating clearly, which flouts the Maxim of Manner by making the conversation indirect and uncertain.<br><br>George's statement, "I think we've been having a ... a real good evening ... all things considered," is not directly ordering, asking, demanding, or begging, but it does carry an implicit **asking** for confirmation or acknowledgment. By saying, "I think we've been having a real good evening," George is not just making an observation; he is seeking validation from Martha about how their evening has been going. He is indirectly prompting Martha to agree with his assessment or to confirm his feelings. The hesitation marked by the ellipses ("...") implies uncertainty, and by leaving the statement open-ended, George is subtly asking for her input or feedback, even though he does not directly demand it. This indirect manner of asking can be interpreted as a **competitive** approach to see if Martha concurs with him. Martha's response, "Clink?" represents a |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | **demanding** and somewhat **questioning** approach. By responding with "Clink?" she is asking George to clarify what he means. The word "Clink?" seems to be Martha's attempt to break George's vague statement into something concrete. She may be demanding clarification of what George meant by his statement, which is ambiguous due to the hesitation and vague phrasing. In this case, Martha's response can be seen as her **demanding** more clarity and specificity from George, which shows an active push to shift the conversation into more direct communication. George is **asking** for confirmation of his assessment of the evening, albeit in an indirect way, while Martha is **demanding** clarification of his unclear statement. Both are engaging in competitive communication, where George seeks validation, and Martha pushes for clarity, asserting control over the direction of the conversation. |
| 92 | Mn24 | **Martha**: "*Just when the going gets good ... you say ... something ..."* **George**: "*You say it! Now you say it!"* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | Martha's statement, "Just when the going gets good ... you say ... something ..." is a perfect example of **flouting the Maxim of Manner** because her language is vague and unclear. The phrase "something ..." is deliberately ambiguous, leaving the sentence unfinished and thus obscuring its meaning. This creates confusion and a lack of clarity, as Martha is referring to something that George supposedly says when things improve, but she doesn't specify what it is. The ellipses ("...") further emphasize the incomplete thought, which only adds to the obscurity. Instead of providing a clear and direct explanation, Martha's phrasing leads George to wonder what exactly she means, forcing him to fill in the gap and interpret her vague statement. George's response, "You say it! Now you say it!" is competitive in nature, as he is demanding that Martha take responsibility for finishing the statement she began. By commanding, "Now you say it," George is turning the ambiguous statement back on Martha, demanding that she complete what she started. However, his request doesn't clarify the original ambiguity in Martha's statement, and instead, he amplifies the confusion by not directly addressing or completing her thought. Martha flouts the Maxim of Manner by leaving her statement vague and unclear, and George further adds to the ambiguity by demanding that Martha finish it without addressing the lack of clarity. Their exchange becomes a clear example of how ambiguity can be used competitively, where neither party provides direct answers but instead engages in a back-and-forth that maintains the lack of clarity.<br><br>George's response, "You say it! Now you say it!" is an example of **competitive** behavior, specifically **demanding**. He is ordering Martha to finish her statement. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | Instead of directly clarifying what she means or addressing the ambiguity, George pushes the responsibility back onto her, demanding that she complete the thought she left unfinished. His use of "Now you say it!" adds a sense of competition, as he forces Martha to take action and resolve the unclear situation, thereby intensifying the back-and-forth rather than resolving the ambiguity. This exchange flouts the Maxim of Manner in two ways: **Martha** introduces ambiguity with her incomplete statement, and **George** reinforces the vagueness by demanding that Martha finish it. The competition lies in the fact that George is ordering Martha to clarify her own unclear statement, instead of addressing the issue directly. Martha is ambiguous in her communication, and George competes by demanding that she finish what she started, leaving the conversation unclear and full of indirectness. |
| 93 | Mn25 | **George**: "*I'll bet! Chippie-chippie-chip-pie, hunh?"*<br>**Martha**: "*Well, I certainly hope not; he's been acting awful funny, if he is."* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement, "I'll bet! Chippie-chippie-chip-pie, hunh?" is an example of **ambiguity**. The term "chippie-chippie-chip-pie" is unclear and lacks direct meaning. This expression is obscure and does not offer any clear communication. The phrase itself doesn't explain what George is referring to, nor does it provide any understandable context for Martha or the audience to grasp. It is an unclear or playful expression that creates confusion rather than clarity, flouting the Maxim of Manner, which stresses the need for direct and unambiguous communication. Martha's response, "Well, I certainly hope not; he's been acting awful funny, if he is," addresses George's unclear question, but her own statement introduces additional vagueness. She hopes that whatever George is referring to is not the case, but instead of providing a clear explanation of why she hopes it isn't true, she simply comments that "he's been acting awful funny." The use of the word "awful funny" here is also somewhat ambiguous. "Funny" could mean a variety of things (odd behavior, humorous actions, strange, etc.), and without further clarification, it doesn't provide a clear understanding of what she is referencing. Her statement adds to the lack of clarity in the conversation.<br><br>George is **asking** for a response with his unclear and playful statement, "Chippie-chippie-chip-pie, hunh?" He is pushing for an answer or reaction from Martha, but the phrase doesn't clearly communicate anything. His demand for a response without offering clarity leads to a **competitive** interaction where Martha has to interpret and respond to an ambiguous statement. Both George's and Martha's statements flout the Maxim of Manner. George uses a vague and obscure expression ("chippie-chippie-chip- |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | pie"), and Martha responds with another ambiguous phrase ("awful funny"). The conversation lacks clarity and leaves the audience uncertain about the true meaning of the statements, creating an unclear interaction**.** George's statement, "I'll bet! Chippie-chippie-chip-pie, hunh?" contains an implicit **demand** for response or engagement from Martha. While George is using playful language with "Chippie-chippie-chip-pie," he is effectively **asking for a reaction**. His choice of words suggests an expectation that Martha will engage with him, either by confirming or responding to the phrase. The use of "hunh?" at the end of the statement further emphasizes the demand for a response, pushing Martha to reply. Martha's response, "Well, I certainly hope not; he's been acting awful funny, if he is," while addressing George's question, reflects a reaction that continues the competitive nature of the dialogue. She rejects George's playful comment about the situation (likely referring to the situation they are discussing), and provides her own perspective on the behavior of someone else (likely their son, in context). Her response shows an assertive engagement with George's statement, reflecting her own point of view, but in a way that doesn't directly agree with him. Instead of playing along with the playfulness of the "chippie-chippie-chip-pie," she shifts the focus to something more serious, highlighting the difference in their tones and positions. In this case, the dialogue is **competitive** because George is seeking a response or reaction (demanding engagement) through his playful question, and Martha responds assertively, engaging with his words but redirecting the conversation toward her own perspective. |
| 94 | Mn26 | **George**: "*The moon went down, thought about it for a little … considered it, you know what I mean? … and then, POP, came up again."*<br>**Martha**: "*That is not true! That is such a lie!"* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement about the moon going down, thinking about it, and then coming up again is **ambiguous** and **obscure**, which flouts the Maxim of Manner. The details George provides are unclear and do not give a specific or direct explanation of what he means. He uses metaphorical or unclear language, such as "the moon went down," "thought about it," and "considered it," without providing any clear or precise context. These expressions are vague and leave the listener unsure of what he is actually describing. The mention of "POP" coming up again further adds to the ambiguity, as it does not specify what exactly is happening or what the "POP" refers to in this context. George's use of "you know what I mean?" is an attempt to get Martha (and the audience) to accept his vague explanation, but it adds to the ambiguity because he's asking for confirmation of something that is not clear in the first place. This forces the listener to guess what he actually means, which is a prime example of **flouting the Maxim of Manner** — the communication is indirect, unclear, and lacking in precise detail. |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | Martha's response, "That is not true! That is such a lie!" is a direct rejection of George's statement. However, she does not clarify what part of George's statement is untrue or provide a clear counterargument. Instead, her response remains broad and non-specific. She rejects George's vague metaphor, but without engaging with the content of his metaphor in detail. This lack of clarity in both parties' communication makes the exchange ambiguous and a clear **flouting of the Maxim of Manner**. George's vague metaphor about the moon is unclear and ambiguous, and Martha's equally vague response does not provide a clear, direct counter-argument. Both characters are speaking in a way that makes it difficult for the listener to understand the true meaning of their words, flouting the Maxim of Manner.<br><br>George's statement, "The moon went down, thought about it for a little ... considered it, you know what I mean? ... and then, POP, came up again," reflects an indirect **demand** for Martha's attention and engagement. By saying, "you know what I mean?" George is asking for confirmation or an acknowledgment, essentially demanding that Martha engage with his statement. While he's not explicitly ordering her to respond, the phrasing implies that he expects her to understand and engage with his story, making it a subtle form of **asking** for affirmation. He wants Martha to process and validate what he's saying about the moon. Martha's response, "That is not true! That is such a lie!" is **competitive** because it directly challenges George's statement. Instead of engaging with the metaphor or continuing the conversation in a collaborative way, Martha **reprimands** George by accusing him of lying. This is a form of **demanding** a correction. She is not simply letting his statement slide; she's demanding that he take responsibility for what she believes to be a falsehood. Her response is forceful and direct, asserting her own perspective in opposition to George's claim. Both characters in this dialogue are engaging in **competitive** behavior: George by indirectly demanding attention and confirmation through his metaphor, and Martha by directly challenging his statement with an accusatory response. This exchange reflects an interaction where both individuals are asserting their own viewpoints and competing for control of the conversation. |
| 95 | Mn27 | **Martha**: "*You're going to take over the world, hunh?"* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange flouts the **Maxim of Manner**, which advises that communication should be clear, precise, and not ambiguous. Here, both Martha and Nick's statements are unclear and **obscure**, creating confusion in the conversation. The **ambiguity** is further |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | **Nick**: "*I know when a man's had his back broken; I can see that."* | | | | | | compounded by the informal phrasing and the use of "hunh?" which seeks confirmation or a reaction, but it doesn't provide clarity on what exactly Martha means. Her statement could be interpreted in multiple ways, and that makes it unclear for Nick and the audience. Nick's reply, "I know when a man's had his back broken; I can see that," is even more **ambiguous**. What does Nick mean by "a man's had his back broken"? Is he speaking literally, or is he using this phrase metaphorically? His response doesn't directly address Martha's question or clarify the context of "taking over the world." Instead, he introduces a new metaphor without explaining it, making it unclear how it connects to the conversation. This metaphor, "back broken," is vague and leaves the audience unsure about its intended meaning, creating a lack of clarity. The dialogue **flouts the Maxim of Manner** because both characters are speaking in a way that is **ambiguous and unclear**. Martha's question lacks context, and Nick's metaphorical response doesn't clarify anything but rather introduces more confusion. Both speakers fail to communicate their ideas directly, making this exchange an example of how communication can become **obscure and unclear**, thereby flouting the Maxim of Manner.<br><br>Martha's line, "You're going to take over the world, hunh?" is an **asking** statement with a competitive edge. She is **demanding** a response from Nick, implying sarcasm and a challenge in her question. By framing the question in this way, she is pushing for Nick to react, almost as if she's setting up a challenge for him to answer. The tone of the question suggests that Martha is not just inquiring but also positioning herself to either provoke a reaction or test Nick's response. Her rhetorical question, "You're going to take over the world, hunh?" carries a sarcastic weight, demanding some form of acknowledgment or explanation from Nick, thus creating a competitive dynamic in the conversation. She's seeking a response that will engage her further, and this statement could be seen as a form of **demanding** Nick to react to the challenge she posed. Nick's reply, "I know when a man's had his back broken; I can see that," can be seen as **competitive** in its own right. By saying this, Nick **responds** to Martha's challenge but does so in a way that suggests he is asserting his understanding of something, perhaps metaphorically referring to his own struggles or responses to Martha's challenge. This creates a **competitive** exchange where both are vying for control of the conversation and offering their perspectives, whether sarcastically or seriously, without directly |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | answering or engaging with the original query. This exchange illustrates **competitive** behavior primarily through **asking** and **demanding** in a way that pushes for control of the conversation. Martha **demands** a reaction from Nick by challenging him with her sarcastic question, while Nick responds with his own competitive statement, which doesn't directly address the original challenge but instead asserts his own understanding, maintaining the competitive dynamic. The conversation is driven by each speaker trying to maintain control, making this an example of competitive interaction. |
| 96 | Mn28 | **George**: "*I'm not a god. I don't have the power over life and death, do I?"*<br>**Martha**: "*YOU CAN'T KILL HIM! YOU CAN'T HAVE HIM DIE!"* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange **flouts the Maxim of Manner**, which emphasizes that communication should be clear, straightforward, and free of ambiguity. In this case, both George and Martha's dialogue introduces **ambiguity**, and their expressions are unclear in their intent, thus creating confusion in the interaction. George's line, "I'm not a god. I don't have the power over life and death, do I?" seems like a rhetorical question that is metaphorically questioning whether he has control over something, likely referring to a situation where someone is at risk of harm or death. However, George's rhetorical nature doesn't provide enough clarity or context. The phrase "I don't have the power over life and death" might imply a deeper moral or existential question, but the lack of further context around the statement makes it somewhat **ambiguous**. Is he implying that he is in control of life and death in a literal sense, or is he simply referring to his role in a specific event? The ambiguity of the statement makes it unclear whether he's asking a direct question or making a broader philosophical comment. Martha's response, "YOU CAN'T KILL HIM! YOU CAN'T HAVE HIM DIE!" is emotionally charged but also **ambiguous**. While it is clear that Martha is reacting strongly to something George said, it's not immediately clear what "him" refers to. Is she talking about a specific person or a hypothetical situation? The lack of clarity in her response adds to the **ambiguity**. Her repetition of "YOU CAN'T" suggests urgency and anger, but it doesn't explain why she is asserting this point or provide any specifics about the circumstances George might be referring to. The all-caps tone adds emphasis, but it doesn't contribute to clarity, instead leaving room for interpretation about the nature of the conversation. Both George and Martha's statements are indirect and unclear. George's rhetorical question and lack of explanation lead to ambiguity in his statement, and Martha's dramatic and ambiguous response further contributes to the vagueness. This exchange flouts the Maxim of Manner because the dialogue is not as clear as it could be. It leaves the listener or reader |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | to make inferences about what "him" refers to, as well as the broader context of their conversation.<br><br>This exchange demonstrates competitive communication, particularly in the form of **demanding** behavior, as both characters assert their own positions forcefully, seeking control over the conversation. George's statement, "I'm not a god. I don't have the power over life and death, do I?" is an indirect demand for validation or acknowledgment from Martha. By asking, "do I?" George is essentially requesting confirmation from Martha that he does not have ultimate power. This question carries an implicit demand for Martha's acknowledgment, and the rhetorical nature of the statement suggests that George is trying to assert his viewpoint by drawing Martha into agreeing with him. It can be seen as George trying to **demand** agreement from Martha on his lack of divine power and control. Martha's retort, "YOU CAN'T KILL HIM! YOU CAN'T HAVE HIM DIE!" is an aggressive and forceful **demand**. By using all capital letters, she emphasizes the urgency and strength of her response. Martha is asserting her view in a competitive manner, directly contradicting George's implied suggestion of having power over life and death. Her statement implies that George should not even have the option to "kill" or "have someone die," further reinforcing her dominance in the conversation. Martha is not simply responding to George's rhetorical question; she is **demanding** that he acknowledge the moral impossibility or the unacceptability of such actions. This dialogue reflects **competitive** behavior because both George and Martha are using language to assert control over the conversation. George subtly demands recognition of his limited power, while Martha responds with a forceful, commanding statement that challenges George's implied suggestion. Both characters are attempting to dominate the interaction, making it a clear example of **competitive** behavior, particularly in terms of **demanding** what they want from the other. |
| 97 | Mn29 | **George**: *"We are going on, and I'm going to have at you."*<br>**Martha**: "*Stop it!"* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange flouts the **Maxim of Manner**, which advises that communication should be clear, direct, and free from ambiguity. Both characters in the dialogue are not entirely clear, leading to an obscure understanding. George's statement, "We are going on, and I'm going to have at you," is vague and ambiguous. The phrase "have at you" is colloquial and typically means to aggressively confront or criticize someone. However, George does not specify the nature of this confrontation or what he means by "having at" Martha. This **ambiguity** leaves his intentions unclear. While "having at someone" |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | usually implies an argument or confrontation, the lack of further detail or context makes it an obscure and unclear statement. George's use of vague language without elaboration confuses the direction of the conversation and makes it less precise. Martha's response, "Stop it!" is a clear directive, but it also adds **ambiguity** because it's not clear what exactly she is asking George to stop. Given that George's statement is ambiguous, Martha's command could apply to any number of things: the conversation itself, George's tone, or the implied confrontation. Her demand to stop could be in response to the unclear aggression George is hinting at, but it remains open to interpretation because she does not clarify what she wants George to stop doing. Both George and Martha's statements contribute to **ambiguity**. George's statement "have at you" is an unclear threat or challenge, lacking specificity, and Martha's response "Stop it!" does not resolve the **ambiguity**, instead adding to it by leaving the intended action that should stop open to interpretation. This lack of clarity and the open-ended nature of both statements **flout the Maxim of Manner**, as their communication is neither precise nor unambiguous.<br><br>George's statement, "We are going on, and I'm going to have at you," is an assertion with an underlying **demand**. He is not directly asking for anything, but his use of the phrase "I'm going to have at you" suggests an upcoming confrontation or **demand** for attention. This statement implies that George is about to act in a certain way toward Martha, potentially with aggression or force, as indicated by the phrase "have at you." Although not a direct order, this can still be categorized under competitive behavior because George is asserting his position and preparing for a confrontation, which involves imposing his will on Martha. Martha's response, "Stop it!" is a direct command, which falls squarely under **demanding** behavior. She is telling George to cease whatever he is about to do, issuing an order in return for George's implied confrontation. In contrast to George's indirect assertion, Martha gives a clear and direct response. This is a typical competitive reaction, where she is asserting control over the situation by demanding that George stop his actions. In this exchange, George's use of assertive language combined with an implied **demand** for action ("I'm going to have at you") makes his statement competitive. Martha responds in kind, with a direct **demand** for George to stop ("Stop it!"). This creates a dynamic where both parties are asserting |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | their power and influence, making the interaction **competitive** in nature, specifically through **ordering** and **demanding**. |
| 98 | Mn30 | **George**: "*You don't make it in the sack, you're a houseboy."* **Nick**: "I AM NOT A HOUSEBOY!" | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange flouts the **Maxim of Manner**, which encourages clarity and directness in communication. Both speakers contribute to ambiguity, making it unclear and obscure. George's statement, "You don't make it in the sack, you're a houseboy," is **ambiguous** and **obscure**. The phrase "make it in the sack" is a vague metaphor that generally refers to performance in a sexual context, but George does not clarify what exactly he means by it. The term "houseboy" is also somewhat unclear, as it traditionally refers to a male servant or domestic worker, but George uses it in a figurative sense. The lack of elaboration on both terms leaves George's intention ambiguous. He seems to be using these terms to criticize Nick, but his exact meaning is unclear. The metaphorical language makes it difficult for the listener to understand the exact nature of George's criticism. Therefore, George flouts the Maxim of Manner by being unclear and indirect in his communication. Nick's response, "I AM NOT A HOUSEBOY!" is a rejection of George's statement, but it does not clarify the original meaning behind George's metaphor. While Nick's outburst is direct, it does not address the obscurity of George's words. Nick is responding to the accusation but does not ask for clarification or provide any specifics on why he disagrees with the label "houseboy." His response adds to the ambiguity because it doesn't clarify what George's metaphor refers to or what Nick's actual position is. Both George's and Nick's contributions to the dialogue create ambiguity. George's metaphorical language introduces vagueness, making his criticism unclear. Nick's response, while direct, does not help in clarifying George's metaphor. Both speakers flout the Maxim of Manner because they do not offer clear and straightforward communication. The obscurity in their exchange leaves the listener uncertain about their true intentions and makes the conversation less clear than it could have been.<br><br>George's statement, "You don't make it in the sack, you're a houseboy," carries an implicit **demand** and a **competitive** challenge. By saying, "you're a houseboy," George is imposing a label on Nick that suggests Nick is inadequate or subordinate in some way. He is **ordering** Nick to accept a certain characterization, using the term "houseboy" to assert dominance in the conversation. This phrase is **competitive** because George is not only making a statement but also imposing an insult that challenges Nick's |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | pride or sense of self. It is a form of competitive dominance, asserting superiority and undermining Nick. Nick's reply, "I AM NOT A HOUSEBOY!" is a defensive response but also **competitive**. By shouting, "I AM NOT A HOUSEBOY," Nick is **demanding** that George retract or rethink his statement. This is a clear counter to George's challenge, as Nick seeks to regain control over how he is perceived. His response, while defensive, is also assertive in nature. He is not passively accepting George's characterization; instead, he is directly challenging George's accusation in an attempt to reassert his dignity. In this exchange, both characters are engaging in a **competitive** interaction. George starts with a **demanding** statement, using the insult "houseboy" to assert control over the conversation and undermine Nick. Nick, in turn, responds by **demanding** that his dignity be respected, rejecting the label that George has imposed on him. The interaction is competitive because both characters are trying to assert their positions and control the narrative, with George using an insult to attack and Nick fighting back to defend himself. |
| 99 | Mn31 | **George**: "*I'm running this show*."<br>**Martha**: "*What are you talking about?"* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | George's statement, "I'm running this show," is **ambiguous** and **obscure** because it is not immediately clear what "this show" refers to. George uses the phrase "running this show," but there is no context provided. What show is George referring to? Is it a literal event or a figurative expression about controlling the situation? His statement is **vague** because it lacks necessary clarification, making it unclear what exactly George means. This vagueness **flouts the Maxim of Manner** because it does not give a clear picture of the situation. Martha's response, "What are you talking about?" is a request for clarification. She clearly does not understand what George means by "running this show," indicating that George's statement was **ambiguous** and needed further explanation. Martha is asking for more details because the original statement left too much open to interpretation, reinforcing the idea that George's communication was not sufficiently clear. George's comment is an example of **flouting the Maxim of Manner** because it is **unclear** and **obscure**. He makes a broad statement without explaining what he means by "show" or "running it," leaving Martha confused and requiring her to ask for clarification. The lack of specificity in George's words makes the conversation unclear, flouting the principle of clarity that the Maxim of Manner advocates.<br><br>This exchange focuses on the **competitive** nature of communication, where each participant is asserting themselves in different ways. **Competitive communication** |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | refers to moments where individuals assert control, request, demand, or seek recognition in a conversation. In this instance, the exchange reflects both **asking** and **demanding** behaviors. When George says, "I'm running this show," it is an assertive statement where he is **demanding** recognition for his role or position. The phrase "running this show" can be understood as George asserting that he is in control, whether metaphorically or literally. It's a **demand** for acknowledgment, aiming to position himself as the one in charge of the situation. This is a **competitive** act because George is asserting authority without providing any context for what exactly the "show" is. It's a form of **ordering** the conversation into a certain direction, expecting Martha to understand or acknowledge his control. Martha's question, "What are you talking about?" serves as an inquiry into the legitimacy of George's claim. She is essentially **asking** for clarification, challenging George's assertion. Her response is competitive in its own right because she is indirectly questioning the validity of George's claim and seeking a clearer answer. While George's statement is assertive and commanding, Martha's question forces him to provide context or justify his statement. The conversation is competitive because George is demanding acknowledgment of his control or role, while Martha is asking for clarification, challenging his statement. George is **ordering** the conversation by asserting dominance ("I'm running this show"), and Martha, through her question, asserts her own need for clarity. Both are engaging in a **competitive** exchange as they assert their respective positions in the conversation. |
| 100 | Mn32 | **George**: "*You don't know anything. IF the moon went down, then it came back up."*<br>**Martha**: "*There is no goddamn moon!"* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange can be interpreted as **flouting the Maxim of Manner**, which emphasizes clarity and precision in communication. The conversation contains ambiguity and indirectness that makes the communication unclear or difficult to interpret, particularly George's statement. George's statement, "You don't know anything. IF the moon went down, then it came back up," is ambiguous. The conditional clause "IF the moon went down, then it came back up" is unclear for several reasons. First, George is making an assertion about an event (the moon going down and coming back up), but he uses "IF," which introduces uncertainty. The use of "IF" creates vagueness, as it suggests that George is either unsure about the event or is merely speculating about a possible situation rather than stating a factual occurrence. This indirectness creates confusion, and it leaves room for misinterpretation. He doesn't clarify whether he believes the moon actually went down or whether he is just presenting a hypothetical situation. As a result, his communication lacks the directness and clarity that the Maxim of Manner |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | advocates. Martha's reply, "There is no goddamn moon!" is an emphatic, direct response, but it's also somewhat indirect in its own way. She is rejecting George's claim about the moon's behavior, but rather than addressing George's specific point in detail, she simply dismisses the entire notion by stating that there is "no goddamn moon." While her response is more direct than George's, it still does not provide clarity on what exactly George was referring to. Martha's comment does not offer an explanation of why George is wrong or clarify any specifics about the moon. Instead, she uses an outright negation that makes her statement somewhat unclear, especially in relation to the context George was referring to. Both George and Martha are **flouting the Maxim of Manner** in different ways. George's statement is ambiguous due to the use of the conditional "IF," leaving the conversation open to interpretation. His lack of clarity makes his communication obscure. Martha, on the other hand, responds with an emotionally charged and definitive statement but does not explain why George's claim is false, creating a sense of vagueness. This interaction, therefore, lacks the clarity and directness necessary for effective communication, exemplifying the flouting of the Maxim of Manner.<br><br>**George's statement**: "You don't know anything. IF the moon went down, then it came back up." George's statement can be seen as an **ordering** or **demanding** form of communication. By saying "You don't know anything," he is asserting dominance in the conversation and indirectly demanding that Martha accept his view or knowledge. He also uses the hypothetical phrase "IF the moon went down," which puts forward an assumption in a commanding tone, forcing Martha to engage with his reasoning. Even though it's a conditional statement, the way it's presented — in a blunt and somewhat dismissive manner — conveys an **assertive** and **competitive** stance. Martha's response: "There is no goddamn moon!"Martha's response is a **competitive** retort. She refuses to accept George's assertion by providing an immediate and emphatic rejection of his statement. By saying, "There is no goddamn moon," she is not just passively disagreeing with him; she is forcefully asserting her own perspective. The use of the word "goddamn" adds intensity, showing a **demanding** tone and a refusal to acknowledge George's point. In this dialogue, George is **ordering** or **demanding** that Martha accept his statement by dismissing her knowledge ("You don't know anything"). Martha counters with a **competitive** response, rejecting his claim and asserting her own view |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | forcefully ("There is no goddamn moon!"). Both speakers engage in a **competitive exchange**, where each is trying to assert their own point of view and dominance in the conversation. |
| 101 | Mn33 | **George**: "*You see, Martha, here, stops just when the going gets good … now, Martha, here, is a misunderstood little girl."*<br>**Martha**: "*Lies! Lies!!"* | | | | √ | **Competitive** | This exchange flouts the **Maxim of Manner**, which advises that communication should be clear, precise, and not ambiguous. In this conversation, the statements made by both George and Martha are vague and unclear, creating **ambiguity** and **obscurity** in communication. George's statement is unclear for several reasons. First, when he says, "You see, Martha, here, stops just when the going gets good," it is **ambiguous**. What does "stops" mean in this context? Is he referring to her giving up, hesitating, or retreating at a moment of challenge? He doesn't provide enough context to clarify this. Additionally, the phrase "when the going gets good" is also vague because "good" here lacks a clear definition. What does "good" refer to? The statement could be interpreted in many ways depending on how "good" is understood in this context. George's description of Martha as a "misunderstood little girl" is similarly unclear. What is he implying with "misunderstood"? Does he mean emotionally, in her behavior, or in terms of her character? His explanation is ambiguous because he uses a vague metaphor without offering more specifics. Martha's response, "Lies! Lies!!" is also **ambiguous**. While she is clearly rejecting George's statement, her response doesn't clarify what specifically she is denying. She simply says "Lies," but it's not clear whether she is addressing the entire statement, the characterization of her as a "misunderstood little girl," or something else that George mentioned. Her response adds to the obscurity by not providing a specific counterpoint to George's words, leaving her reaction open to interpretation. Both George and Martha are flouting the **Maxim of Manner** by making ambiguous and vague statements. George's metaphorical language creates confusion without explaining what he means by "stopping" or "good," and Martha's vague rejection of his statement with "Lies!" leaves the audience unsure of exactly what she is disputing. This lack of clarity makes the communication obscure and hard to understand, thereby flouting the Maxim of Manner.<br><br>George is displaying competitive behavior by asserting control over the conversation through his **ordering** and **demanding** language. He begins his statement with a command: "You see, Martha, here." The phrase "You see" implies that he is teaching or explaining something to Martha, asserting his position as the one who knows or controls |

| No. | Data Code | Utterances | Flouting of Maxims | | | | Reason | Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Qn | Ql | R | Mn | | |
| | | | | | | | | the narrative. Additionally, when he describes Martha as a "misunderstood little girl," he is **demanding** a particular interpretation of her character. His choice of words is designed to define her in a particular way and influence how she is perceived, which is a form of **competitive** assertion.<br><br>Martha's response, "Lies! Lies!!" is a direct rebuttal, a competitive challenge to George's statement. Her repeated use of the word "Lies" is an assertion of her own stance, and she demands that George's characterization of her be dismissed. Her refusal to engage in the specifics of George's claims and instead labeling them as "lies" is a way of pushing back and asserting her own position in the conversation. It is a **competitive** strategy to reclaim control and reject George's authority over the dialogue. Both George and Martha are engaging in competitive behavior through their **ordering**, **demanding**, and assertive statements. George is asserting control by giving a metaphorical explanation of Martha's behavior and defining her as a "misunderstood little girl," while Martha rejects George's characterization with a firm **rejection** of his claims, demanding that they be disregarded. This creates a competitive interaction in which both parties are vying for control over the conversation. |
| Jumlah | | | 8 | 29 | 31 | 33 | | |