



Intercultural communication and Positioning of Maxims: An Analysis of 'The Terminal'

Durdana Rafique¹, Dr. Nighat Shakur², Dr. Saba Zaidi³

¹Assistant Professor of English, Department of English, University of Turbat
durri_86@ yahoo.com

²Assistant Professor of English, International Islamic University Islamabad
nighat.shakur@iiu.edu.pk

³Assistant Professor of English, Sardar Bahadur Khan Women's University Quetta
sabaazaidi@gmail.com

Abstract

Language is crucial in comprehending people's lives. Intercultural pragmatics focuses on communication. According to Kecskes (2000), intercultural communication involves persons from diverse cultural origins speaking different languages. They interact via a shared language. In intercultural communication, when individuals from various cultures speak different languages, it is challenging to understand one another. The study aimed to investigate how the main characters from the movie construct the current sense of emergent common ground from the perspective of the socio-cognitive approach. For the purpose of generating successful communication, (Grice, 1975), proposed four maxims that must not be ignored. The findings of the study indicated that in intercultural interaction between the two selected characters Frank and Viktor, Frank co-constructs a common ground because both of them come from different cultural backgrounds. He formulated the utterances in such a way that Viktor was able to comprehend the information with relative ease. The study also showed that Grice maxims, which include maxims of manner, maxims of quality, maxims of quantity, and maxims of relevance, were both followed and sometimes ignored during an intercultural interaction between Frank and Viktor, i.e., maxims were positioned in a specific context.

Keywords: intercultural communication, common ground, current sense, shared sense

Introduction

Intercultural Pragmatics is the only branch of pragmatics that incorporates intercultural interaction aspects. According to Cohen (2012), intercultural pragmatics is about pragmatic behavior and how that behavior changes when language and culture come together. Commonalities, customs, shared ideas, norms, beliefs, and religion all contribute to common ground on which interaction is based. When the core common ground seems to be restricted, as in intercultural communication, people cannot deal with it appropriately. As discussed by Kecskes and Zhang (2009) suggest an emergent common ground that refers to "the shared sense and current sense, mainly derived from the interlocutors' individual knowledge of the prior or current experience that is pertinent to the current situation" (p. 333). This study focuses on the current sense proposed by Kecskes and Zhang (2009), which states that "the participants in the speech situation inherently share the current sense. In case, they do not perceive it in the same manner due to their different angles of perception, available resources, and other factors, the interlocutors



cooperate in a joint effort to construe the current sense” (p. 349).for granted. Instead, they need to co-create it or follow Grecian maxims, at least for a short time. The study aims to investigate how the main characters from the movie construct the current sense of emergent common ground from the perspective of the socio cognitive approach. For the purpose of generating successful communication, (Grice, 1975), proposed four maxims that must not be ignored. The first maxim is referred to as the maxim of quantity, and it is primarily concerned with the quantity of information express in a specific discourse. Grice, as cited in (Yule, 1996, p. 37) defines it as follows:

- Quantity
 1. Provide as much information as possible in your contribution. Be careful not to speak too much or too little.
 2. Make the most powerful statement possible.
- Quality
 1. Do not convey any information that you know to be false.
 2. Do not make claims for which you lack sufficient evidence.
- Relevance
 1. Be relevant in your relationship. (Remain focused.)
- Manner
 1. Avoid obscurity in expression and ambiguity in your demeanor.

The cooperative principle elucidates the relationship between the literal meaning of the discourse and its intended meaning, as well as the process by which the meaning in the conversation is formed and comprehended. However, this does not explain why people break conversational rules in order to communicate their feelings and thoughts in a covert way. The study further analyses the positioning of maxims in intercultural communication, and it also analyses how these maxims are supplemented from the perspective of intercultural communication.

Statement of the Problem

Language is crucial in comprehending people's lives. Intercultural pragmatics focuses on communication. According to Kecskes (2000), intercultural communication involves persons from diverse cultural origins speaking different languages. They interact via a shared language. In intercultural communication, when individuals from various cultures speak different languages, it is challenging to understand one other. It is important to explore how individuals comprehend one another and co-create common ground without a shared language or cultural experience. Here, culture is crucial not just in intercultural communication but also in how individuals react and respond to current situations based on their past knowledge and experiences.

Grice (1975), maxims of cooperative principle have been well studied in the point of view of intracultural communication and pragmatics in terms of maxims that are followed and violated in intercultural communication. So, it is important to point out if the maxims are used by the people talking to each other across cultures to find a common ground.



Research Objectives

1. To explore the co-construction, comprehension and production executed in the process of communication in the terminal.
2. To analyze the positioning of Gricean maxims during inter-cultural communication by the selected characters in 'The terminal'.

Research Questions

1. How are co-construction, comprehension and production executed in the process of Communication in 'The Terminal'?
2. How are Grecian maxims positioned during inter-cultural Communication by the selected characters in 'The Terminal'?

Significance of the Study

The study is significant as it aims to focus Intercultural communication and positioning of maxims during the process of communication in collaboration with the current sense proposed by Kecskes and Zhang (2009). The study is also innovative because it aims to understand how two characters belonging to different cultural and social background speaking different languages construct a common ground to be mutually intelligible and cooperative. The two main characters are Frank Dixon, the Acting Field Commissioner of the airport, and Victor, a traveler who is the focus of the study. Their core common ground seems to be limited as they come from different cultural backgrounds and social positions, i.e., an American and a Krakozhian encounter each other unexpectedly at the terminal. Intercultural communication also helps to develop harmony and clarity among the people belonging to different cultural background speaking different languages.

Delimitation

The study is limited to the analysis of the conversation of two major characters from the movie of 'The Terminal (2004)' by Steven Allan Spielberg. The study focuses only on one sub type of emergent common ground that is current sense from the perspective of the Kecskes and Zhang (2009). The study is also delimited to the four maxims of Grice classical theory of cooperative principle that is the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of manner and the maxim of relevance in order to find out the positioning of maxims.

Theoretical Framework and Research Methodology

The researcher focuses on the kecskes and Zhang (2009), emergent common ground current sense. According to them SCA (Socio cognitive ground) considers both the core common ground and emergent common ground in consideration. Core common ground deals with the generalized common knowledge which belongs to certain speech community and it is further divided into cultural sense, common sense and formal sense. Whereas on the other hand emergent common ground is dynamic this is created during the intercultural communication process. Emergent common ground is also divided into two subcategories the shared sense and the current sense (Kecskes and Zhang, 2009). The researcher focuses only on the current sense of the

emergent common ground. It deals with perceptions and evaluation of the current situation according to the perspective of the interlocutors. In intercultural interaction the interlocutors need to co construct the actual situation when they perceive the current situation in a different manner. It is because of their different angles and perceptions; availability of attentional resources and other factors are also involved. In intercultural communication emergent common grounds deals with intercultural.

Grice (1975), maxims plays a very important role to understand how communication is done effectively in our everyday life. Grice maxims deal with four maxims that is of maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of manner and maxim of relevance. Grice maxims are used by the researcher to find out the positioning of maxims by the selected characters of the movie and how these maxims are supplemented from the perspective of intercultural perspective.

Qualitative research methodology has been employed. According to Creswell (2001), the qualitative mode of inquiry as a research design which is descriptive, creative, and interpretative.

Literature Review

It is not easy to construct correctly given information during the course of an encounter; both the speaker and the listener make mistakes or have misunderstandings at some point. The term "flouting maxim" is used to describe the mistakes that people make when they speak, and these mistakes can happen without them even realizing it at times.

Hlavac & Yong (2015), states that in "intercultural interaction involving people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds with different values, beliefs, schemas, and traditions, the exploration of what is unsaid but communicated in intercultural interactions is of critical importance, because, essentially, intercultural interaction is about how people understand one another when they do not share a common cultural experience".

Wolf and Polzenhagen (2006), explored the usage of English in intercultural communication in context of global Englishes and examined the findings of research show second language (L2) speakers from diverse cultural origins that emphasized disparities in conceptualizations of family, age, and ancestors. These disparities may lead to intercultural misunderstandings. From this cognitive-pragmatic level, they also used instances to emphasize the flaws of functionalist pragmatics and show how cognition with its conceptual and semantic focus, might improve our comprehension of intercultural communication.

García-Gómez (2020), mentioned in the study that the interactions among British and Spanish university students on WhatsApp, show new vistas to the understanding of intercultural pragmatics. The findings of the study show the participants have negative attitudes towards conflict talks. The study further shows that the interactants are not able to comprehend and understand each other in the intercultural interaction.

Moeschler (2004), in Intercultural communication deals with cognitive approach, studied intercultural pragmatic misunderstandings and helped to determine the minimum conditions for



effective intercultural communication. According to him, misconceptions are really not caused by difficulties in drawing the desired implicature but by lack of access to the right explanation, as the difference between implicit and explicit meaning is important to pragmatic misunderstanding. This argument is founded on Relevance Theory assumptions about language communication's ostensive-inferential nature and the distinction between explicature and implicature and that the audience's language competence raises the chance of misinterpretation. The more the audience knows about the speaker's language, the more likely it is that they will misunderstand. Because the speaker prefers to ascribe to non-native speakers a cultural background proportional to their own language mastery, which may not always suggest the appropriate explanation.

In intercultural interaction common ground deals with the construction of the ground in order to understand one another (Clark, 1996). Common ground deals with the economy of expression including values, shared values, shared beliefs, norms, situational context and world views. (Enfield, 2008).

According to Hank (1996), the people having different cultural backgrounds it is not necessary that they should share same grammar but what is important is that they should comprehend each other message physically and conceptually by creating a common ground. Another study was conducted by Arkoudis (2013), on the national and international university students in Australia. The findings of the study show that teachers play a very important role in developing common ground for the students belonging to different cultures. The new technological tools can be used to enhance learning among the students owing their own culture. According to Koole (2001), intercultural communication should be treated as ordinary communication because it deals with the construction and reconstruction of the common ground. He further says that interactants in intercultural communication needs a shared common for mutual understanding and communication and he named this intercultural communication as intercultural discourse.

In accordance with Grice, as mentioned by (Cutting, 2002), a flouting maxim arises when the speakers, either knowingly or unknowingly, strive for their counterpart to comprehend or search for the intended meaning of the message they are communicating, according to the speaker. Gumperz (1982), says that when either the listeners or the speaker can't agree on what to do next because they didn't follow certain rules in the interaction, this is called a failure to come to a conclusion.

Aziz, Mustafa, and A'la (2019), discovered a plethora of flouting maxims in Indonesian speech acts that were delivered with a sense of humour. The flouting maxim is used in about 30% of humour speeches, with the flouting maxim of manner being the most frequently used of the bunch. According to a study conducted by Wahyuni, Arifin, and Lubis (2019), the flouting of maxims in the La La Land film occurred even though everyday speech was not employed. On the other hand, the flouting maxim could appear in any verbal contact, whether it is part of a professional or casual conversation. Tupan and Natalia (2008), examined various violations committed by the various characters in the television series "Desperate Housewives," they

conducted an investigation into the causes of the violations committed by each of the characters. Their findings reveal that the primary incentive for reviling the maxims is to minimize the potential of the speaker's responses. Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2012), investigated violations or rejections of quantity maxim by the protagonist in *Dinner for Schmuck*. Many people are still trying to break the rules in order to achieve their goals, but the process of talking must be seamless for everyone. As Jacobs and Shapiro (2000) pointed out, their research also revealed how politicians decided to collect their words in order to produce specific levels of meaning that are not necessarily understood by everyone. Politicians commonly attempt to get people's support or to gain social power by employing the tactic of playing with language and violating the rules of cooperative principle in order to gain public favour or to gain power and influence.

Ibrahim et al. (2018), investigated the violations of maxims violated by the individuals in the *Seven* movie script, as well as the intentions of the characters who flouted them. The mode of qualitative inquiry was applied in this study. The information gathered during the research was in the form of statements that were in violation of a maxim.

Two horror films, *Insidious* and *Insidious 2*, were investigated by two researchers Kurniati & Hanidar (2018), for their violations of Gricean maxims. The researchers explored the role of the flouting that the characters employed when conversing with one another. For the purposes of data analysis, the mix method was employed. It looks like people in these movies break the rules for a variety of reasons, but the main ones are to keep the main characters happy, give detailed explanations, persuade the listener, and critique their own actions.

Referring to the literature review, the co-construction of common ground in the current sense with reference to socio cognitive approach and positioning of maxims and how they are unveiled in an intercultural context has not been carried out to date. As a result of the foregoing justifications, the researcher is interested in doing a research study on the characters who positioned the maxim in intercultural communication and the reasons for doing so in *The Terminal* (the movie). The study focuses on two main characters, named Frank Dixon, the Acting Field Commissioner of the airport, and Victor, a traveler, who are the focus of the study. They come from different cultural backgrounds, i.e., an American and a Krakozhian encounter each other unexpectedly at the terminal.

Analysis

Objective 1.

According to Kecskes (2000), intercultural communication entails the use of multiple languages by individuals of distinct cultural backgrounds. Similarly, Krakozhian citizen Viktor Navorski is making his first trip to New York City in his life. Here, he meets Frank, an American who speaks English, as opposed to Viktor, who speaks Bulgarian. Initially, due to the language barrier, he is unable to produce and comprehend communication. In order to fully comprehend the



conversation he is having with Frank, he learns a second language, namely English, so that he may co-construct a common ground that corresponds to the current sense throughout the communication process.

The socio-cognitive approach considers both the core common ground and emergent common ground in consideration. The emergent common ground is a dynamic that is created during the intercultural communication process. It is also divided into two subcategories: the shared sense and the current sense (Kecskes and Zhang, 2009). In this case, the shared sense is that Krakozhia is an east European country whose people speak Bulgarian and New York City is the capital of the United States, where people speak English to communicate. In the current sense, it refers to the disposition of Krakozhia while Viktor is travelling to New York City, and no nation recognizes the new dictatorship, of which Viktor is unaware. All government documents, such as passports, visas, and money, are not accepted worldwide. When Viktor arrives at the airport with just these documents, he is denied entrance. Viktor cannot be sent back until Krakozhia's air service is restored. Frank, a Customs and Border Protection director, have a conversation on several points that formerly failed due to the language difference, but later succeeded because Viktor learned English as a shared language of communication in order to create an emergent ground.

According to the socio-cognitive approach, both the interlocutors in the communication process carry equal importance. Similarly, Frank and Viktor are two important characters who mutually try to co-construct the emergent common ground in interpersonal communication to comprehend each other's production, i.e., conversation and utterances.

Viktor initially meets Frank at the airport when he tells him about the civil war in his nation, which revoked his visa and passport. It is important to keep in mind that at this earlier stage, the interlocutors struggle to comprehend one another due to the difference in language. Therefore, Frank asks for an interpreter to co-construct the common ground first, as given below.

Frank: Do we have an interpreter?

But I understand that you speak a little English.

Viktor: Yes

Frank: Oh you do?

To his surprise, Viktor says yes, to which the idea of a translator is dismissed, but it would not work at a later stage as Viktor has less vocabulary of the desired language.

Frank: I've a bit of bad news.

Your country has suspended all traveling privileges...

There were few civilian casualties. I'm sure your family's fine. The Republic of Krakozhia is under new leadership.

Viktor: Krakozhia! Krakozhia!

As stated above, it can be seen that all Viktor could comprehend was his country's name, Krakozhia, despite Frank's tragic news. Furthermore, to help Viktor understand the current



situation, Frank opts for a literal demonstration. But Viktor's focus is more on his country's name than the information provided.

Frank: Right. I don't think he gets it. Er... Let me... OK. Look. Imagine that these potato chips are Krakozhia.

Viktor: Kra-kozhia.

Frank: Kra-kozhia.

Viktor: Yes.

Frank: Krakozhia.

Viktor is once again told that due to the dismissal of his visa and passport, he cannot enter the U.S. as his arrival is considered illegal because of a flaw in the system, or like a crack in the system, to which his comprehension accepts that he is a "crack" or "flawed".

Frank: You have fallen through a crack in the system.

Viktor: I am crack

The communication process in intercultural interaction is dynamic because it is based on the co-construction of current situation, comprehension and production. For instance, Frank meets Viktor once again. By this time, Viktor has learned English as a common language and a means of communication. In the lines that follow, you can see how a current sense is made while Viktor is also able to communicate well.

Frank: I have some very very good news for you

Viktor: what?

Frank: I think I have found a way out a way to get you out of this airport.

Viktor: How?

Frank: we have some laws for protecting aliens like you who have fear of returning to their countries. If we can establish this fear with you...bring you to immigration judge... plead your case for asylum.

Viktor: asylum? So, I go New York city?

Frank: it is only possible if we establish fear with you.

Viktor: fear? From what?

Frank: if you give me correct answer, I can get you out of this airport tonight.

Do you at this point have any fear of returning to your own country?

Viktor: no.

Frank: there is war in your country... guns...women and children thrown into jail. So, you are afraid of Krakozhia?

Viktor: no, Krakozhia is home.

Frank starts the conversation by co-constructing a common ground of good news for Viktor. And for the first time, Viktor comprehends Frank's words. To which he confidently replies, "what?" and "how"? asylum? Fear of what? Viktor's comprehension results in the production of successful emergent ground among the interlocutors. Although one is Krakozhian and the other is



American, they both share some common ground, which is the understanding of the word "fear" based on the fact that it has a negative connotation and cannot be denoted to home, and "asylum" on the other hand, refers to those who seek legal protection in another country with the intention of never returning to their home country. According to SCA, shared sense is as important as current sense and, in some cases, shared sense may differ among the interlocutors' perception. For this reason, whatever wayout Frank constructs for Viktor, as he knows what he needs at the current moment, does not work out due to the Viktors' understanding of the word "fear." Even if the civil war causes Frank anxiety, for Viktor, Krakozhia is still his home, and he has no qualms about returning there.

In their last intercultural communication, when finally, Viktor gets a pass visa to New York City, Frank comes in like a foot in the door.

Viktor: I got to New York now.

Frank: Do you really want to do this?

Look, part of my job is to get rid of undesirables, and there are quite a few.

Like this guy, Joe Mulroy. I think you know him... he might lose his job.

And then comes Enrique Cruz, I think you know him too...often cause a security breach.

Viktor: I will go home (Krakozhia).

Viktor's only aim was to step his foot on American soil. As long as Frank kept on describing his job it did not matter to Viktor at all till he mentioned getting rid of "undesirables," along the names "Joe" and "Enrique," who were among Viktor's friends. Because in the shared sense the words undesirable has a negative use for those who might have committed crimes in the past likewise, in the current sense the same "undesirable," "Joe," "Enrique," and "losing job" constructed by Frank came in together, they were comprehended by Viktor instantly. He got it that his entrance into New York would cause a snag for his friends. On the spur of the moment, he decides to go home. "I will go home," instead of to New York, for which he had waited for months.

Objective 2.

Grice (1975) believed that in order to be meaningful and achieve a successful communication one needs to be relevant, truthful, clear and informative also known as maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner.

With reference to 'the terminal' it is important to note that the selected characters both followed and avoided these maxims also as known as positioning of maxims during the intercultural communication.

The Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality refers to the utterances that you back up with evidence for instance

Frank: Your country has suspended all traveling privileges...

There were few civilian casualties. I'm sure your family's fine.

The Republic of Krakozhia is under new leadership

There is no need to provide any supporting evidence for the claim that New York is one of the most populated cities in the United States since this fact stands on its own. Second, by the time Viktor reaches the terminal, Krakozhia has been plunged into a civil war, which is also a reality that is well known across the world. As a result, when Frank tells Viktor the horrible news from his homeland, he does not need any documentation or witnesses since he is certain that he is delivering the truth without any shadow of a doubt. As a result, a maxim of quality is adhered to here.

Frank: At 12 o'clock today the guards at those doors are going to leave their posts.

As per official rule, the duty of all employees is to have shifts, which is a fact. Similarly, Frank mentions clearly that the duty guards at the door will leave at 12 p.m., and the next duty guards will take their place.

Frank: There is Gupta, he is a janitor. But it turns out that he is wanted for assaulting a police officer back in India in 1979...

There is Mulroy, who has been here for 20 years,

but, it turns out that he's been running an after hour poker game...

Frank cautions Viktor that if he dared to step out of the terminal, his friends will face the snag that has been doing illegal acts. For example, Mulroy runs an after-hours poker game, bringing in alcohol and marijuana, which could cause him to lose his job and pension. Gupta, a janitor, attacked a police officer in India several years ago in 1979. India is Gupta's home country. Claims made by Frank are entirely founded on verifiable facts and compelling pieces of proof with specific dates and actions.

Maxim of Quantity

It is essential to avoid bombarding the listener with an unnecessary amount of information that is not relevant. Instead, it deals only with supplying information that is relevant and keeps the process of communication continue for as long as it is necessary; failing to do so will result in the maxim being overlooked. Take, for instance,

Frank: See. You don't qualify for asylum, refugee status, temporary protective status, humanitarian parole, or non-immigration work travel or diplomatic visas. You don't qualify for any of these things. You are at this time simply – unacceptable... I'm talking about I'm talking about human rights. Viktor, please don't be afraid to tell me that you're afraid of Krakozhia.

Because Viktor does not technically have a nationality, Frank intends to persuade Viktor to support an application for asylum. All that he does to convince him is to overwhelm him with an excessive amount of information, such as explosives, asylum, refugee status, and temporary protected status. Instead of selecting terms with less weight but more consistency, he uses phrases like "human dignity," "humanitarian parole," "non-immigration work travel," and "diplomatic visas.

Frank: Viktor, airports are tricky places, you understand. I am about to tell you something that you are never to repeat to anyone. It is a secret. At 12 o'clock today the guards at those doors



are going to leave their posts and their replacements will be five minutes late. No one is going to be watching those doors and no one is going to be watching you, so, America is open for 5 mins.

When Frank runs into Viktor once again, he tries to explain to him that he will have barely five minutes to exit the terminal without being seen. When referring to airports, he uses phrases like "tricky places," "secret," "no one watching," and "America is open for five minutes." He also chooses to make lengthy statements instead of observing shorter ones.

It is seen that the maxim of quantity is not only flouted but also observed in 'the terminal'.

Viktor: America is not close.

Frank: No, America is open for five minutes only.

Viktor follows Frank and tells him that he is now free to go out of the terminal and that he is no longer unacceptable; however, Frank remains clear in stating the fact that he has only five minutes to move out of the airport.

Maxim of Manner

Grice (1975) says that in order for two people to communicate in a meaningful way, they must follow a rule of manner, which is to avoid using too many complicated words because they are from different cultures.

Frank: Krakozhia is like a twilight zone. Do you ever see that show?

Viktor: I go home

Frank: technically you don't have home, it seems you have fallen through a small crack in the system

Viktor: I am crack

Frank: welcome to the United States, almost.

Talking tina, Nightmare at 30000 feet, Zanti misfits'...Cats has closed too. Frank is fond of using running statements and complex words despite knowing that Viktor is unable to comprehend them easily. Referring to Krakozhia as "a twilight zone followed by several TV programmes such as" Zanti Misfit "and" Talking Tina, "Nightmare at 30000 feet followed by the closure of "Cats" out of thin air seems overly complex. He tells Viktor that he has entered the land of America through a 'crack in a system', which is not explained whether it is the system of America or Krakozhia. Also, when Viktor requests to return to his homeland, Frank informs him that he cannot do so because he does not 'technically' have a home still welcome to the United States 'almost' further leads to a violation of the maxim of manner.

Maxim of Relevance

Frank and Viktor are seen for the first time together at Frank's office, where Viktor comes there to brief Frank about the cancellation of his passport and visa.

Frank: I hope you don't mind if I eat while we talk.

This marks the beginning of their relationship. Frank's conversation should be relevant, but instead he wanders from topic to topic without ever getting to the core of the issue.

Frank: there is war in your country... guns...women and children thrown into jail.



Viktor: On Tuesday.

Frank: yes, Tuesday.

Viktor: I hate Tuesdays.

Later, Frank offers Viktor a way to escape the terminal; he informs him of his country's situation where there is bombing; women and children are thrown into jail, to which he replies, "on Tuesday?" I hate Tuesday', and Frank affirms ' Tuesday', which seems irrelevant in the communication here because it is only Viktor who knows why he hates Tuesdays because of the genitor he met earlier, and in the civil wars women and children were not thrown into jail on Tuesday only. Therefore, the maxim of relevance is flouted here.


Frank: I hope Uncle Sam will have sorted this all by tomorrow.

In order to be relevant in a conversation, it is important to be relevant in one's conversation and avoid obscurity. For instance, Frank guides Viktor to stay at the airport till his situation is cleared by the department, which he calls "Uncle Sam." Hicks (2006) states that in American culture, Uncle Sam is a popular symbol of the US government and patriotic emotion. Here, it has nothing to do with Viktor's clearance because it is the job of the government and not Uncle Sam's. Once again, the maxim of relevance is avoided.

Findings and Conclusion

The findings of the first objective indicate that in an intercultural interaction between Frank and Viktor, prior to beginning the discussion, Frank co-constructs a common ground because both of them come from different cultural backgrounds. He formulates the utterances in such a way that Viktor can comprehend the information with relative ease, hence facilitating easy communication between the two of them.

The findings of the second objective indicate that Gricean maxims, which include maxims of manner, maxims of quality, maxims of quantity, and maxims of relevance, are both followed and sometimes ignored during an intercultural interaction between Frank and Viktor, i.e., maxims are positioned in a specific context. It can be said that most of the time, Frank avoids following the maxim of quantity to convince Viktor and to make the situation feasible for Viktor to comprehend and act accordingly. Frank avoids following the maxim of quantity. Because the information he has to deliver to Viktor is sensitive and may create issues if it is not presented accurately. It has also been seen that Frank would intentionally include extraneous allusions into their conversation at times, fully aware that Viktor would not have the same background knowledge. For example, 'Uncle Sam' "Tuesdays," which, on the other hand, only Viktor knows. As far as the maxim of manner is concerned, Viktor needs to be kept out of any grey situation, yet Frank uses doubtful statements, for example, "welcome to the United States," almost avoiding the said maxim. In contrast, Viktor adheres to maxims more, for instance 'America is open', and 'Krakozhia is home'.

UNIVERSITY OF CHITRAL JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS AND LITERATURE
VOL. 6 | ISSUE I | JAN – JUNE | 2022  ISSN (E): 2663-1512, ISSN (P): 2617-3611
<https://doi.org/10.33195/jll.v6i1>

References

- Amaliyasari, M. R., & Widiyanah, I. (2019). flouting maxim and hedging maxim in multicultural students interaction. *Journey: Journal of English Language and Pedagogy*, 2(2), 105- 112.
- Ayasreh, A., & Razali, R. (2018). The flouting of Grice's conversational maxim: examples from bashar al-assad's interview during the arab spring. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 23(5), 43–47.
- Aziz, Z. A., Mustafa, F., & A'la, P. N. (2019). Flouting maxims as a sense of humor in Indonesian Speech Acts. *Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics*, 4(2), 169–180.
- Cohen, A. D. (2012). Research methods for describing variation in intercultural pragmatics for cultures in contact and conflict. *Pragmatic variation in first and second language contexts: Methodological issues*, 271-294.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.
- Cutting, J. (2008). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. New York: Routledge.
- Ekah, M. H., & Akpan, A. N. (2018). Discourse-Syntax interface: A study of Gricean Maxims in computer-mediated discourse. *Language in India*, 18(2), 187–203.
- García-Gómez, A. (2020). Intercultural and interpersonal communication failures: analyzing hostile interactions among British and Spanish university students on WhatsApp. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 17(1), 27-51. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2020-0002>
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cutting, J. (2008). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. New York: Routledge.
- Hicks, T, A. (2006). *Uncle Sam*. Marshall Cavendish. p. 9.
- Hlavac, J., Xu, Z., & Yong, D. X. (2015). Intercultural pragmatics at work:(Self-) perceptions of intercultural behavior of Chinese and English speakers and interpreters in healthcare interactions.
- Ibrahim, Z., Arifin, M. B., & Setyowati, R. (2018). The flouting of maxim in the se7en movie script. *Ilmu Budaya: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni dan Budaya*, 2(1), 81-94.
- Jacobs, L. R., & Shapiro, R. Y. (2000). *Politicians don't pander: Political manipulation and the loss of democratic responsiveness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kecskes, I., & Zhang, F. (2009). Activating, seeking, and creating common ground: A sociocognitive approach. *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 17(2), 331-355.
- Khosravizadeh, P., & Sadehvandi, N. (2012). Some instances of violation and flouting of the maxim of quantity by the main characters (barry & tim) in dinner for schmucks. *International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, 26, 122–127.
- Kurniati, M., & Hanidar, S. (2018). The Flouting of the Gricean Maxims in the Movies *Insidious and Insidious 2*. *Lexicon*, 5(1), 65-76.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.



- Lestari, N. G. (2019). An analysis of flouting maxims in conversation speaking of the main character in the movie of Home Alone 2 "Lost In New York" By John Hughes. *Journal of English Pedagogy, Linguistics, Literature, and Teaching*, 7(1), 1–11.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moeschler, J. (2004). Intercultural pragmatics: a cognitive approach. , 1(1), 49-70. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iprg.2004.007>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc
- Sembiring, E., & Ghozali, I. (2017). An analysis of maxims flouting in "the jungle book" movie script. *Journal of English Language and Language Teaching JELLT*, 1(2), 33– 39.
- Stenbacka, C. (2001). Qualitative research requires quality concepts of its own. *Management Decision*, 39(7), 551-555
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Tupan, A. H., & Natalia, H. (2008). The multiple violations of conventional maxims in lying done by the characters in some episodes of Desperate Housewives. *K@ta Journal*, 10(1), 3–78.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vergis, N. (2017). The interaction of the maxim of quality and face concerns: An experimental approach using the vignette technique. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 118, 38–50.
- Wahyuni, M., Arifin, M. B., & Lubis, I. S. (2019). An analysis of flouting of maxims done by main characters in La La Land Movie. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 3(3), 384– 392.



© 2022 by the author. Licensee University of Chitral, Journal of Linguistics & Literature, Pakistan. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).