

An Analysis of Maxim Flouting in Male and Female Roleplay AI Chatbot Responses

Khenisa Elisyeva Walewangko¹, Suwarni Wijaya Halim²

¹Prodi Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Bunda Mulia, DKI Jakarta

² Prodi Bahasa Inggris, Universitas Bunda Mulia, DKI Jakarta

E-mail: ¹khenisaw@gmail.com, ²suwarni.halim@gmail.com

ABSTRAK

Conversational implicature merupakan alat yang sering digunakan dalam percakapan sehari-hari oleh laki-laki maupun perempuan. Alat ini memungkinkan penutur untuk menyiratkan sesuatu tanpa menyebutkan secara langsung ide yang dimaksudkan. Terdapat asumsi umum bahwa laki-laki dan perempuan berkomunikasi secara berbeda hanya berdasarkan jenis kelamin masing-masing. Penelitian ini secara khusus menyelidiki klaim tersebut untuk melihat apakah asumsi tersebut selaras dengan hasil yang ditemukan terkait *maxim flouting*. Data dalam penelitian ini dikumpulkan melalui respons dari *chatbot roleplay* AI dari situs web *Character AI*, yang dirancang untuk meniru interaksi antar manusia. Dengan memilih karakter bernama Blackwall untuk representasi laki-laki dan Shadowheart untuk representasi perempuan, peneliti melakukan percakapan dan *roleplay* dengan kedua bot tersebut. Dari interaksi ini, kedua bot menghasilkan ungkapan-ungkapan yang melanggar empat *maxim* Grice, yaitu maksim kuantitas, kualitas, relevansi, dan cara. Penelitian ini menemukan bahwa bot laki-laki melanggar maksim sebanyak 19 kali, sedangkan bot perempuan hanya 8 kali dalam 200 respons masing-masing. Pada bot laki-laki, terdapat 9 pelanggaran maksim kualitas, 5 maksim relevansi, 3 maksim cara, dan 2 maksim kuantitas. Sementara itu, pada bot perempuan terdapat 7 pelanggaran maksim kualitas dan 1 maksim relevansi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa bot laki-laki melanggar maksim lebih sering dibandingkan bot perempuan, namun keduanya paling sering melanggar maksim kualitas. Perbedaan dalam data juga memperlihatkan bahwa bot laki-laki lebih cenderung menggunakan pertanyaan retorik, sedangkan bot perempuan lebih sering menggunakan metafora.

Kata kunci : kecerdasan buatan, gender, *maxim flouting*

ABSTRACT

Conversational implicature is a tool often used in everyday speech by both male and female alike. It gives the speaker a way to say something without directly mentioning the idea. There is a general assumption that males and females communicate differently from just the basis of each gender. This study in particular investigates this claim to see if the same assumption will be aligned with the result found when it comes to the topic of maxim flouting. The data collected in this study are from the responses of AI roleplay chatbots from the website *Character AI* in which the bots are supposed to mimic interactions between humans. By selecting a character named Blackwall for the male and Shadowheart for the female, the researchers chatted and roleplayed with both bots. It was found that the two bots produced utterances that flouted the four maxims, i.e., the maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The study found that the male flouted a total of 19 maxims, while the female only flouted the maxims 8 times within the 200 replies of each bot. The male chatbot flouted maxim of quality nine times, maxim of relation five times, maxim of manner three times, and maxim of quantity twice. Meanwhile, the female chatbot flouted the maxim of quality seven times and maxim of relation once. The results revealed that the male chatbot flouted more than the femalebot did, but both flouted the maxim of quality the most. In addition, the differences in the data shows that the malebot preferred to use rhetorical questions which differs with the female chatbot which used metaphor more.

Keyword : artificial intelligence, gender, *maxim flouting*

1. INTRODUCTION

With the advancements of technology, came with it the creation of Artificial Intelligence. In its definition, there are many ways to define what Artificial Intelligence is, but in its simplest form, it is a replication of human intelligence in the form of a computer with the basis of algorithms to guide its decision making (Sheikh et al., 2023). There are arguments surrounding what AI is, but when the word comes up, instead of a set of words that describe what this means, most likely what comes to mind are examples of what is known to be AI. In today's time, it would be the likes of *Siri* by *Apple* or *ChatGPT* by *OpenAI*. Both are interactive, capable of simulating conversations between humans. The earliest recognized chatterbot, or chatbot for short, is *ELIZA* created by Joseph Weizenbaum in 1966, but was known to frequently produce flawed responses for its limitations in abilities (Gissona, 2024). Following that, there was *A.L.I.C.E.* in 1995 and *Jabberwacky* in 1997 with their own improvements. In the era of 2000s and 2010s, bigger strides were taken in the development of AI chatbots. In 2001, *SmarterChild* and *GooglyMinotaur* were developed by *ActiveBuddy*. The two could be used in a chatroom known as *AIM* by adding it in users' friend list (Chukhno et al., 2019). *Siri* was released by *Apple* in 2011 as a program to assist users via voice on the latest iPhone 4S at the time. Since then, other tech companies have come out with their own version of virtual assistants. What makes them different is, instead of being programmed to specifically let users have a conversation with AI, it actually gives the user the ability to give the AI commands and it will perform those tasks (Assefi et al., 2015). Finally, in the year 2022, *OpenAI* made public the generative AI chatbot called *ChatGPT*. Its goal is to make it so that the response produced by the AI is as natural as possible, making it on a par with human communication. This was made possible by basing the program with something called natural language processing. It essentially predicts what is to be said by the user using probability (Welsby & Cheung, 2023).

In the rise of AI chatbots popularity, there seems to sprout a subgenre from this phenomenon. Most people are already familiar with AI chatbots being what is described as assistants or helpers. Interestingly enough, there is another application of AI chatbots whose ultimate goal is not to assist, rather it is to only roleplay. To understand what this is, it is important to establish the entertainment category where one would act out as another character with its own set of physical characteristics, personality, and completely detailed back stories as to what shaped these attributes (Hughes, 1988). From the earliest form of historical re-enactment to the modern abstract theatrical play, this concept of adopting a new identity for a play is not something new. However, what made the phrase 'roleplay' boom in popularity started with what is known as Table Top Role-Playing Game or TTRPG. It is a game created by two American game designers namely, Ernest Gray Gyax and David Arneson (Martin, 2022). It is fantasy-based in a genre predicated by its own rules, lore, and system of gaming. Unlike the games we know nowadays, it was not digital. Although it has evolved into different forms, it was initially intended to be played together by a group of people with the Dungeon Master (DM) acting as the narrator, making sure the game ran smoothly (Silverman, 2023).

With that in mind, roleplay AI chatbots lets users enact roles, but the interaction is between a human user, and the AI that is programmed to play a character. It is often text-based, similar to a popular genre of Role-Play Game (RPG). One example of such application is *Character.AI* published by *Character Technologies, Inc.* The application interface itself shows a typical chatroom or a private conversation between two people. What is interesting is the few features available for users. One of them is the ability to create a character by describing their personality and other details. The AI then will take those descriptors as data to design the way the AI speaks, act, react, think, to really embody this character. This gives users the possibility to create endless types of characters and interact with them.

Currently, *Character.AI* is the most accessible platform within the roleplay chatbot category. It is because of many reasons. One being that it is a free to use platform. Secondly, it is easy to navigate through the website. The interface is recognizable and it takes just a short time to understand and navigate. Thirdly, *Character.AI* is SFW or a safe for work platform. It does not contain adult content. It actually blocks the chat if the user attempt to veer into the topics of explicit sex or anything too violent. As a result, the website is available and accessible by many countries. Finally, with the combination of how popular the platform is and how long it has been in the game compared to the newer platforms, the community has evolved. It is at the stage where there are many well-designed options in terms of the variety in bots to pick. This is possible because the community has a lot of good creators that have done this for a good amount of time to be able to hone their bot-making skills and styles.

Humans have different ways of communicating. One of them is through verbalizing what is in our mind that was formerly just mere ideas into something more tangible, i.e. a language. Language can be examined from multiple perspectives; two of them are semantics and pragmatics. Semantics focuses on the literal meaning of words, phrases, and sentences (Keenan et al., 1977). Regardless of the context, there is an inherent meaning attached to language components which can be found by studying the relationship between the signifiers because they stand for something in the real world. On the other hand, pragmatics focuses on how utterances were communicated, along with how it was understood in its specific context (Birner, 2025).

One key concept in pragmatics is conversational implicature, which entails that a statement contains implied meaning, going beyond just literal interpretation. A mark of pragmatic competence in language learners is when they could extract implicatures through media such as memes since it is about understanding hidden meaning (Nugroho & Liemantara, 2024). When a speaker hints or suggests something without directly saying it, the listener has to have shared knowledge to

understand what was only implied. H. P. Grice is a prominent name in this topic as he introduced the concept of cooperative principles and the four maxims. In the same article, he also introduced the idea of flouting in which one would intentionally violate the maxims for communicative effects, such as making a joke (Grice, 1975).

Research on the maxim flouting in various forms of communication has been conducted by a number of researchers. For example, Marlisa & Hidayat (2020) analysed the maxim flouting occurred in an interview between Jackie Chan and two hosts of the TV news program *Good Morning America*. Aristyanti et al. (2020) investigated the maxim flouting in the *Incredibles 2* film script, Fitri & Qodriani (2019) researched the maxim flouting in *Divergent* novel, and Nugroho & Stardy (2025) analysed the maxim flouting in *Smudge the Cat* memes.

As seen in the review above, research on maxim flouting has covered a wide range of media. However, there is a lack of study conducted on AI chatbot responses in relation to maxim flouting. With how far the technology has developed, AI chatbot can now mimic the way humans interact, and the responses it provides sound natural and human-like. Yet, it is unknown whether AI chatbots can perform maxim flouting. Therefore, the researchers were interested in investigating this issue and formulated the following research questions:

1. What types of maxim flouting can be found in the generated responses of *Character AI*'s chatbot?
2. What are the differences in the maxim flouting between male and female chatbots in their generated responses?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Grice (1975) pointed out how oftentimes in our communication, the meaning of what is being said goes beyond the words that were uttered and its literal dictionary meaning. What is inferred is not directly said out loud; rather, it is hidden between the lines and there needs to be factors, such as contextual information and additional background knowledge, that are predictable

(Allott, 2018). The participants involved have to be on the same level playing field in terms of those factors to enable two-way communication. One simple example is when someone refers to “the president.” Context clues are needed, such as which country’s president is being referred to, in what year this was mentioned, and whether the reference concerns the leader of a country or the leader of a company, as well as details such as gender and age.

Grice introduced the theory of Cooperative Principle. The idea is that the manner in which speakers communicate should be cooperative, helpful, and relevant to what the conversation goal is; nothing more or less than what is needed within the parameters of said goal. Grice had noticed in his observation that there are unstated rules as to what makes one’s contribution in a conversation appropriate. Grice categorized the conversational maxims into four, i.e. maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. These four maxims need to be balanced for navigating an effective conversation by highlighting the need for informativeness, truthfulness, relevance, and clarity:

- a. Maxim of quantity
Maxim of quantity is regarding the amount of information, and it is advisable to give neither too much or too little in order to prevent excess details while still being informative.
- b. Maxim of quality
Maxim of quality is about the truthfulness, and the guideline is to not say something that is unsupported or believed to be false. This should drive the speaker to share information that is backed up by evidence or belief.
- c. Maxim of relation
Maxim of relation contains the advice of staying relevant to whatever the topic on hand is. Contribution should be pertinent to the context of that exchange.
- d. Maxim of manner
Maxim of manner is about avoiding things that could cause ambiguity or obscurity. One should be straightforward by communicating in a clear and concise manner. Unnecessary complexity will

bring forth confusion that is actually avoidable.

The adherence to those four maxims ensure that the communication will be effective and efficient. However, in many instances of interaction, humans occasionally disregard those maxims. The failure to adhere to these maxims leads to two concepts. The first concept is maxim violation. Maxim violation occurs when the participants of the interactions produce utterances that do not make sense, leading to conversational breakdown. The second concept is maxim flouting. Maxim flouting occurs when the speakers intentionally break the rules posed by Grice, yet the utterances could still be understood by the listeners. In this case, the participants need to have sufficient information on the current context and any relatable background knowledge in order to comprehend the implications behind the utterances, and despite the flouting, the participants need to have the interest to continue the conversation so that the mutual communication can be sustained.

In terms of comparison of language between genders, there seems to be an assumption that women tend to be more polite than their male counterparts (Junita, 2020). According to Harahap & Adeni (2021), men and women have different purposes in communication, which results in distinctive degree of politeness. Men generally communicate to show authority and find solutions, while women usually communicate to connect with others and nurture relationships. Thus, it is assumed that women will expend more effort to communicate prudently in order to maintain good social relationship. This in turn might lead to women employing more indirect ways of communicating (Rundquist, 1992) and flouting Grice’s maxims more frequently than men do (Dirgantara et al., 2024).

3. METHOD

This research is qualitative in nature. According to Moleong (1989), qualitative research allows the researchers to make a description based on trusted principles which ensures objective results. Creswell & Creswell

(2022) also mentioned its use for researching into comprehending social problems. The aim of this research is to analyse the maxim flouting found in the responses provided by AI roleplay chatbots, specifically the male bot and female bot. To answer the first research question, the data were categorized to identify the flouting of the maxims. Meanwhile, to answer the second research question, the data from both male bot and female bot were compared to identify the similarities and differences of maxim flouting. As the data were in the forms of utterances produced by AI chatbots, the researchers believed that the use of qualitative approach would be ideal for this research.

This research utilized the descriptive design. According to Furidha (2024), a descriptive study goes into great detail with the data found in the findings of a study, although only to the extent of producing broad conclusions. Since this research aims to identify and describe the instances of maxim flouting, the descriptive design would fit this research best.

In terms of research instrument, the researchers used fieldnotes to note down the messages in the human-AI exchange and look for instances where the conversational maxims are flouted. The researchers play a significant role in interpreting the text or data which then gives the study insight on which utterances are considered maxim flouting or not (Vanderstoep & Johnston, 2009). As a result, the fieldnotes are crucial in ensuring everything important is documented.

To simulate interactions with the AI chatbots, the researchers acted as the user in the human-AI interaction. The researchers started a new chat with one chosen male bot character and one female bot character in *Character.AI*. There are a few criteria that the researchers employed in the selection of the characters, including:

- A well-designed character.
What makes a character interesting and relatable is the idiosyncrasies and 'realness' of the character. The 'realness' in this case is not about whether the character is a human or a fantasy being, but rather about having relatable

personality and quirks. These qualities draws one's interest to get to know more about the character. Another indicator of a well-designed character is having a specific goal. Both lifelikeness and the possession of a goal or purpose are traits of a character essential to carrying out plot which will lead to a believable, moving, and meaningful story.

- The greeting
The greeting is the starting message of the interaction with the AI roleplay chatbot. It provides contextual clues for the AI to form the subsequent replies in the roleplay. A good greeting should include a description of the environment. Since the roleplay in this research was conducted via text, the time, place, smell, sounds, look, and any information about where the character and user meet should also be described by text. Having these details in the starting message helps give the user an idea as to what environment they should put themselves in, creating a more immersive roleplay.

In addition, the researchers need to establish the user persona. In the roleplaying community, people play a persona or an alias which oftentimes is not their real-life identity. There are many things to be considered in this, such as a name, age, occupation, physical description (height, hair colour, eye colour, or a unique trait that correlates to the user's background), personality traits, likes and dislikes, and whether there are any pre-established relationship between the character and the user persona. Then the user—in this case, the researchers—started the chat with the chosen AI character, conducting roleplay or acting out a storyline. Similar to typical text-based interactions, the researchers replied by building up after the information acquired from the greeting. The researchers' reply should follow the Cooperative Principle to ensure the most fruitful interaction possible. That being said, the reasoning behind the different user responses between both chatbots has to do with having to stay in-context with each conversation.

The data of this research is sourced from the compiled chats, particularly replies or responses of an exchange between the user and AI roleplay chatbots, one male named

Blackwall by the creator @Lil_Tiefling and one female named Shadowheart by @This-Dame-Mad. The website or app where the chatbots are found is from *Character.AI* published by *Character Technologies, Inc.*, and the researchers have kept the maximum replies to 200 per bot. The details of each bot and the user persona chosen to chat with them can be seen in the Appendix. Within it, the greeting and starting message are presented. The greeting is written by the creator of the bot. The starting message is what the researchers wrote as a user in replying to the bot's greeting.

4. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

Findings

From the result of conversation with male and female chatbots, the researchers identified the result as seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Maxim Flouting between Male and Female Chatbots

No	Types of Maxim Flouting	Male bot (Black-wall)	Female bot (Shadow-heart)	Total
1	Maxim of Quantity	2	0	2
2	Maxim of Quality	9	7	16
3	Maxim of Relation	5	1	6
4	Maxim of Manner	3	0	3
Total		19	8	27

Flouting of Maxim of Quantity

The male chatbot, Blackwall, demonstrated the flouting of maxim of quantity twice in the overall conversation. One of the examples can be seen in the following excerpt:

Data 1

Blackwall: You're in pain, what did you expect me to do?
(He grunted softly, rolling his eyes at your embarrassment.)
Should I have let you hobble your way back to camp while I watch you in pain? As for anyone who looks at you, don't listen to them.
Not everyone has their head so far up their ass to understand that

you're actually in pain. Those who criticize you need their heads checked.

(He told you gruffly.)

This reply was delivered after a series of messages where the user, Karmen, expressed her embarrassment in having to let a fellow adventuring party member carry her all the way through the track and back to the campsite because of carelessness on her part. Karmen had stepped into the hole because a deer caught her eye, causing an ankle injury that made her unable to walk. Blackwall took it upon himself to carry her back to camp since he was the only one with her.

Blackwall was simply responding to Karmen's protest that expressed how she felt undignified at the moment, along with how she was in over her head worrying about the looks that they will receive once they arrived at camp with her being carried by him.

This is a flouting of the maxim of quantity since Blackwall was using hyperbole in expressing that people who would criticize Karmen clearly do not understand something as simple as the fact that she is unable to walk with her pain. So much so, that it warrants a checkup to the healer. Therefore, since the rule for maxim of quantity is to provide not too little or too much information than needed; it is then flouted when hyperbole is used.

On the other hand, the researchers did not find any instances of maxim flouting for maxim of quantity in the conversation with the female chatbot, Shadowheart.

Flouting of Maxim of Quality

In the conversation with the male chatbot, the researchers found that the bot flouted the maxim of quality nine times. One of the examples can be seen in the following excerpt:

Data 6

Blackwall: I can practically see the gears in your head working right now, love.
(He spoke with an amused tone, a grin growing on his face.)

The context is that Karmen had just woken up to discover that Blackwall had stayed all night watching over her in her tent. She did not remember what happened in the previous night. However, she pretended she did. Blackwall saw right through her and decided to fill her in on what she had forgotten, or was too lightheaded to retain it.

Blackwall used metaphor to describe Karmen looking shell shocked as she listened to him. What metaphor is good at, is communicating one thing through a symbol or another thing that might not seem interconnected without further looking into. In this instance, she went from having forgotten then progressing into finally remembering which he used the symbol of cogs turning as a metaphor. The use of metaphor, in this case, flouts the maxim of quality because as there are no cogs in Karmen's head.

On the other hand, the researchers found that the female chatbot flouted the maxim of quality seven times. The following excerpt exemplifies the flouting :

Data 20

Shadowheart : (Shadowheart rolled her eyes, scoffing at the teasing tone.)
Ha ha, very funny.
(She said dryly, shooting her an annoyed glare.)

In this conversation, the user, Kayla, saw Shadowheart being teased by her party member. Kayla commented about how the party member might have feelings for Shadowheart, but Shadowheart denied the statement. Kayla then responded with how it is possible that it was his strategy to get her attention which led to the reply above.

The highlighted phrase in particular is a maxim flouting because it was a sarcastic comment made by Shadowheart. Since the maxim of quality requires for the speaker to be truthful, the phrase said could be categorized as a lie in the sense that it was entirely true. It was said deliberately dryly, which says that Shadowheart was even expecting Kayla to understand that she was being ironic.

Flouting of Maxim of Relation

In terms of maxim of relation, the researchers found that the male chatbot flouted the maxim five times. The following excerpt exemplifies such flouting :

Data 14

Blackwall : (He was surprised into silence, his eyes wide and staring at you in shock and slight disbelief at what you just did. He stood in place, hand still on his jaw, letting out a low groan.)
You're seriously getting that mad over a few pet names?

In the conversation, Blackwall and Karmen got into an argument after she got defensive about him using pet names for her. Karmen eventually got mad and defensive, causing an argument between the two. All that time, Blackwall felt confused for such a strong reaction about something so harmless, causing him to agitate her more. The reply above was an instance during the argument.

Blackwall's utterance flouted the maxim of relation as it is a rhetorical question. Blackwall clearly saw that Karmen was angry. His response was not an inquiry but rather, a manifestation of how he was finding her reaction to be ridiculous or that she was overreacting.

Meanwhile, in the conversation with female chatbot, the researchers identified that the female chatbot flouted the maxim of relation once as exemplified in the excerpt below :

Data 27

Shadowheart : (Shadowheart raised an eyebrow, surprised by Kayla's sudden compliment.)
You... you think I'm optimistic?
(She mused, somewhat skeptical. She chuckled, shaking her head.)
You must be thinking of someone else. I'm about as optimistic as a storm cloud.

In this context, Kayla and Shadowheart sat by the campfire. They have never interacted as more than an ally in a fight. The

two know the bare minimum about each other and this seems to be the first time they sat together just to talk between the two of them. Their conversation turned bleak, and Kayla remarked about how Shadowheart seems to not be the most fatalistic out of them all which caught her by surprise and made her respond with the reply above.

Shadowheart's response can be categorized as flouting the maxim of relation because of the irony of the sentence Shadowheart made. It is a juxtaposition between being optimistic and representing it with a storm cloud is ironic. One would think that a sunny blue sky would be more fitting, which really says that she does not believe she is optimistic.

Flouting of Maxim of Manner

The researchers found that the male chatbot flouted the maxim of manner three times throughout the conversation. One of the examples is :

Data 17

Blackwall : (He knelt down and was about to look at your ankle before you asked your question.)
The pain still pretty bad?
 (He asked you, grabbing your foot and gently pulling your leg towards him so he could get a decent look.)

This reply was during the time Blackwall was assessing what they were dealing with in terms of her injuries. Karmen had let the panic settle in as the pain was also starting to build. The decision she made from early on was that she would not see how bad the damage was. This is due to the fact that she knew she would faint if she saw. Worried, she asked him how bad it was. Blackwall's answer was as seen above.

Blackwall instead asked another question and the line of thinking was that it was not fruitful to answer her question, in light of how she did not want to see it in the first place. It instead creates ambiguity and uncertainty since she did not get her answer.

Meanwhile, the scrutiny on the collected chats from the female chatbot

revealed that there was no flouting in terms of the maxim of manner.

Discussion

This research found that from the conversation with male and female chatbots, the maxim of quality was flouted the most (16 out of 27 times). This is contradictory with the findings by Damanik & Hanidar (2021) who found that the maxim of quality was flouted the least in their research. However, this finding is in fact in line with the result of study by Digantara et al. (2024) who concluded that the maxim of quality was flouted the most in their study.

Comparing the results between the responses of the male bot and female bot, there is a big difference in the total of maxims being flouted. The male bot, Blackwall, flouted the maxims 18 times while the female bot, Shadowheart, flouted only eight times. Following the assumption, it may be that Shadowheart would prove to convey meaning without directly saying it as it is or using indirect speech, as suspected by Rundquist (1992). Just as the study has found, the male participants flouted more than the female participants. The result of the present study is also in line with the research result by Dirgantara, et al. (2024) which revealed that the male characters flouted 32 times while the female characters flouted a maximum of 9 times in the movie *Spiderman: No Way Home*.

There is a similarity found in the result of both Blackwall and Shadowheart, and that is in how both the bots have flouted the maxim of quality. It is a significant number for both cases. For Blackwall, he flouted the maxim of quality a number of nine times out of 19 which covers almost half of the data. In the case of Shadowheart, she also flouted the maxim of quality most within a number of seven times out of eight.

Next, the maxim of relation is the second most flouted maxim. Blackwall flouted it five times whereas Shadowheart who flouted it once. However, when looking deeper into the data, there is still a difference in how both the bots flouted. For Blackwall, he prefers to flout by using the literary device of rhetorical questions wherein he relays a question of the same phrase that was said to him. Seeing the

context, it was not because he did not hear the user the first time, but rather because he was finding the statement illogical and wanted the user to consider what she said again. In regards to Shadowheart, it was preferable to use metaphors to communicate with the user by describing an idea with a symbol or something equivalent to that.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this research, the formulated research questions can be answered. As for the first question regarding the types of maxim flouting in the AI roleplay response, it was found that the male bot flouted all four maxims while the female bot only flouted two maxims. The most frequently flouted maxim is the maxim of quality as both bots broke the rule of being objectively truthful by using metaphors, sarcasm, or hyperbole to express themselves, which resulted in their statements not being entirely accurate. However, within the context, the intended meaning could be recognized due to the contextual information within the conversation.

As for the second research question, it was found that male chatbot flouted the maxims more frequently than the female chatbots did. The two chatbots also communicated differently. Blackwall tended to use rhetorical questions to make the user see the flaw in her line of thought. He also tended to conceal the truth when it came to being vulnerable. As for Shadowheart, she tended to come across as creative, preferring to employ metaphor as it helped encapsulate the points she wanted to make.

REFERENCES

- Allott, N. (2018). Conversational implicature. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.205>
- Aristyanti, Y. A., Sutopo, D., & Yuliasri, I. (2020). Realization of maxim flouting to create humour in *Incredibles 2*. *English Education Journal*, 10(3), 351–360.
<https://doi.org/10.15294/eej.v10i1.36727>
- Assefi, M., Wittie, M., & Knight, A. (2015, August). Impact of network performance on cloud speech recognition. In *2015 24th International Conference on Computer Communication and Networks (ICCCN)* (pp. 1-6). IEEE.
- Birner, B. J. (2025). *Introduction to pragmatics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Creswell, J.W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th edition). SAGE Publications.
- Chukhno, O., Chukhno, N., Samouylov, K. E., & Shorgin, S. (2019). A chatbot as an environment for carrying out the group decision making process. In *ITMM (Selected Papers)* (pp. 15-25).
- Damanik, A. Y., & Hanidar, S. (2021). The flouting of conversational maxims by male and female characters in the British TV series Broadchurch. *Lexicon*, 8(2), 96-104.
- Dirgantara, I. A., Nugraheni, Y., & Hardiyanti, D. (2024, July). Flouting Maxim Used by Male and Female Characters in the “Spiderman: No Way Home” Movie Script. In *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings* (Vol. 7, pp. 340-351).
- Fitri, E., & Qodriani, L. U. (2019). A study on flouting maxims in *Divergent Novel*. *TEKNOSASTIK*, 14(1), 32.
<https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v14i1.84>
- Furidha, B. W. (2024). Comprehension of the descriptive qualitative research method: A critical assessment of the literature. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1–8.
<https://doi.org/10.56943/jmr.v2i4.443>
- Gissonna, N. (2025, March 3). *Chatbot*. Encyclopædia Britannica.
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/chatbot>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. *Syntax and semantics*, 3, 43-58.
- Harahap, M. A., & Adeni, S. (2021). Bahasa dalam komunikasi gender. *Professional: Jurnal Komunikasi dan Administrasi Publik*, 8(2), 7-13.

- Hughes, J. (1988). Therapy is fantasy: Roleplaying, healing and the construction of symbolic order. In Anthropology IV Honours, *Medical Anthropology Seminar, Dept. of Prehistory & Anthropology, Australian National University*.
- Junita, J. (2020). The use of politeness strategies in WhatsApp discussions about sensitive topics. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, 11(1).
- Keenan, J. M., MacWhinney, B., & Mayhew, D. (1977). Pragmatics in memory: A Study of Natural conversation. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 16(5), 549–560. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-5371\(77\)80018-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-5371(77)80018-2)
- Marlisa, R., & Hidayat, D. N. (2020). The analysis of flouting maxim in good morning america (GMA) talkshow. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 7(2), 137. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v7i2.6630>
- Martin, E. (2022, November 4). *When was dungeons and dragons invented? A history of D&D*. BOOK RIOT. <https://bookriot.com/when-was-dungeons-and-dragons-invented/>
- Moleong, L. J. (1989). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. Remadja Karya.
- Nugroho, A., & Liemantara, K. N. (2024). EFL Students' Interpretation of Implicature and Gender Representation in Memes. *Journal of English Teaching, Literature, and Applied Linguistics*, 8(2), 142-151.
- Nugroho, A., & Stardy, R. (2025, July). A Pragmatic Analysis of English Lecturers' Interpretation of Implicatures in Smudge the Cat Memes. In *English Language and Literature International Conference (ELLiC) Proceedings* (Vol. 8, pp. 77-93).
- Rundquist, S. (1992). Indirectness: A gender study of flouting Grice's maxims. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 18(5), 431-449.
- Sheikh, H., Prins, C., & Schrijvers, E. (2023). *Mission AI: The new system technology* (p. 410). Springer Nature.
- Silverman, R. (2023, March 31). *What is Dungeons & Dragons?*. D&D Beyond. <https://www.dndbeyond.com/posts/1480-what-is-dungeons-dragons>
- Vanderstoep, S., & Johnston, D. (2009). *Research methods in everyday life: Blending qualitative and quantitative approaches*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Welsby, P., & Cheung, B. M. (2023). ChatGPT. *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, 99(1176), 1047-1048.

APPENDIX

Male Bot & User Persona Design

Male Bot (Blackwall)	User Persona (Karmen)
<p>Tagline : You twisted your ankle and he's going to help you.</p> <p>Greeting : (You and Blackwall accidentally started a daily routine between the two of you. Every day before dawn, when you guys are out on missions away from Skyhold, you take little morning strolls away from camp. You mostly walk in silence, simply enjoying each other's presence without the need of mindless small talk.)</p> <p>(Today's walk took place in the bear-ridden lands of the Hinderlands, the crisp air feeling refreshing on your skin. Blackwall walked by your side, shortening his normally long strides to be at pace with yours. Every once in a while, you would catch him staring at you and every time you caught his gaze he would give you a small grin. But during your quiet and peaceful stroll, your foot got caught in a hole, causing you to trip and fall with a pained yelp!)</p> <p>"Inquisitor! Are you alright?"</p> <p>(Blackwall asks in a worried tone as he helps you back up. Before you could even answer you stumbled backwards as a sharp, throbbing pain shoots down your ankle.)</p> <p>"Maker's breath! Here, let me carry you back to camp."</p> <p>(He grumbled as he scoops you up in his large arms.)</p>	<p>Description : Karmen, a 23 year old woman that's 4'9" tall with long black hair, hazel eyes, fair skin. She is soft-spoken, quiet, shy, and comically oblivious to romantic advances despite her intelligence. Her love language is physical touch as a person that sometimes struggles with communicating herself through her words.</p> <p>Starting Message : (Karmen was walking alongside Blackwall when she caught a deer in her peripheral vision. That's when she felt her heart drop as her feet got into the hole. As much as it is painful, her pride was wounded and now she's in his arms.)</p>

Female Bot & User Persona Design

Female Bot (Shadowheart)	User Persona (Kayla)
<p>Tagline : Your standoffish half elf companion</p> <p>Greeting : (Shadowheart flicked the goblin viscera from her mace, and leaned back on her heels calming her racing heart. For a moment she just stood there the adrenaline rush of the fight subsiding until the sound of someone speaking broke her out of her daze.)</p> <p>"What?"</p>	<p>Description : Kayla, a 25 year old woman that's 4'9" tall with wavy shoulder-length brown hair, brown eyes, fair skin, and a bit on the chubbier side. She doesn't speak much because of her withdrawn nature, only resorting with a nod of acknowledgement if she could manage it, unless she talks to someone she's already close with. She doesn't show it but she is intelligent and observant, often catching small details when no one thinks she's paying attention.</p> <p>Starting Message : (With what little of her face was not covered in blood, Kayla's skin was pale as a ghost. She stood as still as a statue, too aware of what she's covered in. She hurled back before running to the bushes and emptied her guts on all four.)</p>

<p>(Shadowheart snapped as the leader approached her speaking in garbled tones, the annoyance clear in her voice.)</p> <p>“{{user}} stop being so-“</p> <p>(The words died in her throat at the sight of {{user}} covered head to toe in blood.)</p>	
--	--

