



The Flouting of Grice's Conversational Maxims in the Classroom Interactions of Tenth-Grade Students at SMA Swasta HKBP Sidorame

¹Elisabeth Hutabarat , ²Isli Iriani Indiah Pane 

*English Language and Literature Department,
Universitas Medan State, INDONESIA*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received

Accepted

Keywords:

Communication

Cooperative Principle

Maxims

Flouting Maxims

ABSTRACT

People need to interact with one another in order to build strong connections. Communication allows people or groups to express information, thoughts, ideas, and emotions. In the classroom as well as outside the classroom, effective communication is important for a successful learning process. To achieve this effective communication, Grice created a rule called the Cooperation Principle which is then categorized into 4 maxims, namely: Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relation, and Maxim of Manner. But a speaker in a talk exchange may fail to fulfill a maxim variously and this situation is called flouting maxim which is also categorized into 4 namely: Flouting Maxim of Quantity, Flouting Maxim of Quality, Flouting Maxim of Relation, and Flouting Maxim of Manner. This study aims to find out; (1) the types of conversational maxims are flouted by the teachers and the students during classroom interaction, (2) the reasons teachers and students flouted the maxims. The descriptive qualitative research design with research instruments in the form of observation, note-taking, video-recording transcription, and interview was employed in this research. The result of this study found that the flouting of conversational maxim did occur in the classroom interaction between the teachers and the students of the tenth-grade at SMA Swasta HKBP Sidorame. There are 36 utterances in total that were flouted by the teacher and the students during the learning process. The maxim that flouted the most is the maxim of relation (66,66%), followed by the maxim of quality (16,66%), followed by the maxim of quantity (13,88%), and the maxim of manner the least flouted (2,80%). There are 7 reasons for teachers and students flouted the maxims.

Conflict of interest:

None

Funding information:

Type here

Correspondence:

Elisabeth Hutabarat

Hutabaratelisabeth84@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

To continue living, every person needs relationships and interactions with other people. People need to communicate with others to develop excellent relationships. Information, thoughts, opinions, and emotions are exchanged between people or groups through communication. In the classroom as well as outside the classroom, effective communication is essential for a successful learning process. In a learning environment, in-class communication refers to the sharing of information between teachers and students.

Yule (2010, p. 127) stated that communication clearly depends on not only recognizing the meaning of words in an utterance but recognizing what speakers mean by their utterances. The study of what speakers mean, or “speaker meaning,” is called pragmatics. Senft (2014) states that pragmatic is the discipline within linguistics that deals with actual language use.

According to Grice (1989), there is a guideline that creates effective communication called the “Cooperative Principle”. Grice assumed such general principles are accepted, four categories can be distinguished among them and Grice called these categories as Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. All the categories follow specific maxims: The maxim of Quantity relates to the quantity of information to be provided, the maxim of Quality assures the speaker is being truthful or factual and is not presenting what is seen to be unreliable or fraudulent proof, the maxim of relation determines the speaker’s relevance to the topic under discussion, and the maxim of Manner determine the speaker such as being precise and organized, as well as guidelines for avoiding obscurity and ambiguity.

In reality, a participant in a talk exchange may fail to fulfill a maxim variously and this situation is called flouting maxim. The flouting maxim is a term used in pragmatics to describe a situation in which a speaker intentionally violates one of these maxims to convey a particular meaning. Flouting a maxim can be a deliberate rhetorical device, used to create humor or irony, or to convey a hidden meaning. It can also be a form of indirect communication, in which the speaker is trying to convey something without explicitly stating it. Grice (1989) stated on the assumption that the speaker is able to fulfill the maxim and to do so without violating another maxim, is not opting out, trying to mislead, the listener is faced with a minor problem. This situation is one that characteristically gives rise to a conversational implicature. When a conversational implicature is generated in this way, Grice said that a maxim is being exploited. The phenomenon of the flouting maxim that Grice mentions can be easily found in various fields. Predictably not only in movies, talk shows, and novels, flouting maxims are also shown in classroom communication.

This research aims to analyze the flouting maxims between the teachers and the

students in classroom interactions during the learning processes and to find out the reasons why did the flouting of conversational maxims occur among the teachers and the students. The researcher discovered that many people were still oblivious to the flouting they had engaged in with their interlocutors, which is why the flouting maxim was chosen as the study's focus.

METHOD

This research used descriptive qualitative research. Creswell (2007) said that qualitative research is research that studies the process of understanding social or human issues and includes building complexes, word-formed big pictures, and detailed views reported by informants, and people or based on the natural environment of the place. Creswell (2014) also added that the researcher of qualitative research will outline a research issue that can be better understood by digging into a concept or phenomenon.

The data of this research was obtained from utterances that were conducted in an English classroom interaction of SMA Swasta HKBP Sidorame. The participants of this research were two English teachers and 15 students in X class.

The researcher used three instruments to support this research. The first one is the notes that the researcher took while doing observation. The second instrument is a question outline that the researcher needed while interviewing the teachers and the students to get more data that was needed to complete this research. And the third one is the transcription of the video recording.

There are certain methods for collecting the data to accomplish this research :

- a. Observation
- b. Note-Taking
- c. Video-Recording
- d. Transcribing the utterances taken from note-taking, interview, and video-recording.
- e. Interview

The data analysis was conducted by using the analysis method proposed by Creswell (2014) as follows:

- a. Organize the Data
- b. Reading and Memoing
- c. Describing and Classifying into Code and Theme
- d. Data Interpretation
- e. Presenting and Visualizing the Data

FINDINGS

3.3 The Maxims Flouted by Teachers and Students

3.3.1 Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Context:

The conversation below took place when the teacher was about to start the teaching process when the teacher asked one of the students to read out the learning achievement of their learning material.

Data 1

Teacher : Supaya bukunya baik-baik aja. Ok, yok mari kita lihat dulu. Ini Kumer ya kita pembelajaran Kumer. Identifying the use of expression for discussion. Ya, kau baca dulu bang you. Apa lah maksudnya itu, dalam pembelajaran. Coba. Baca, you read it. I define the use of expression....

Nathanael : Cara penggunaan ekspresi dalam berdiskusi.

Teacher : Iya, baca lah dulu. Dalam pembelajaran... Learning achievement-nya. Target pencapaian yang mau kita penuhi nanti.... learning achievement-nya. Silahkan.

Based on the dialogue above, and Nathanael flouted the maxim of quantity it shows when the teacher tells Nathanael to read the learning achievement of their teaching material for that day but instead of reading the learning achievement Nathanael interprets the teacher's words with he translated the titles of their materials because he assumed that the teacher only told him to translate what the teacher said. This could happen because the teacher is uninformative by giving unclear instructions to him which is he read the learning achievement or he translated what the teacher said. To prevent this from happening, the teacher could instruct Nathanael to read the learning achievement in the first place instead of just reading the first sentence of the text.

3.3.2 Flouting Maxim of Quality

Context:

The conversation below occurred when one of the groups presented the results of their discussion and the teacher asked the other groups whether they agreed or not with the results of the discussion of the group that was presenting the results of their discussion.

Data 2

Teacher : The second expression of agreeing i prefer to consume blablabla. Do you agree with them?

Nathanael : We don't agree ma'am.

Teacher : Mereka ga setuju katanya, expression agreeingnya katanya bukan itu. How about you boys? You agree with them?

Jonathan's group : Setuju ma'am.

Teacher : Setuju ajalah aku yakan, biar cepat *laugh* hahahahaha

Students : *laugh* hahahahaha

The conversation above shows a violation of maxims of quality which can be seen from the teacher's statement saying "Setuju ajalah aku yakan, biar cepat *laugh*"

hahahahaha” where the statement is not proven to be true or unsupported by evidence whether it is true that students agree with their friends' statements because they want to hurry up or not. The teacher said this because Jonathan's group did not pay attention to the learning process and were only busy chatting with each other which could have caused them to not understand their learning material and ended up making them agree with the other group's opinion during the presentation.

3.3.3 Flouting Maxim of Relation

Context:

The below conversation occurred because the teacher moved the sitting position of some students. After all, they were noisy which made their other friends unable to focus on learning.

Data 3

Teacher : Ok, tunggu ya. Elkana kau pindah dulu duduk kesitu cepat.

Elkana : Kemana ma'am?

Teacher : Cepat.

Elkana : Kesitu kan ma'am?

Teacher : Kesini ke depan.

Jonathan : Ma'am aku kesitu lah ya ma'am.

Teacher : Cepat. Topi mu.

Elkana : Disini ajalah aku ma'am, Di belakang miss ini ma'am.

Teacher : Maju.

Elkana : Sini aja ma'am.

Tores : Ihh, pindah lah aku ke belakang ma'am.

The dialog above shows that teachers and students flouted the maxim of relation by changed the topic of conversation abruptly. The dialog above is still related to the previous dialog in which students were alternately paired to read the conversation in their books. Before continuing to other students after Arisman and Rina finished reading the conversation, the teacher suddenly moved the sitting position of several students because they were noisy and did not focus on the learning process which could have disturbed other students.

3.3.4 Flouting Maxim of Manner

Context:

The conversation below happened when Nathanael's group asked Febi's group why they disagreed with his group's opinion during the presentation.

Data 4

Nathanael : I want to ask you guys, why do you not agree with me? What's the reason?

Teacher : Kenapa you engga setuju dengan apa tadi, siapa tadi rupanya engga setuju? Yang disagree, you agree with them?

Febi's group : Setuju nya ma'am.

Teacher : Setuju? Setuju nya.

Nathanael : Tadi kau bilang engga setuju.

Febi's group : Setuju nya kami bilang

Nathanael : Tadi kau bilang engga, geleng-geleng kepalamu. Kau bilang tadi gitu.

Febi's group : Setuju nya tadi kami bilang, iya nya kami bilang.

The above conversation shows a violation of the maxim of manner because the febi group gave an unclear and ambiguous answer. This happened because the members of the febi group did not give the same answer when nathanael's group presented the results of their discussion. According to the febi group, they agreed with the results of Nathanael's group discussion but Nathanael said that he saw one of the febi group members shaking his head as a sign of disagreement which made Nathanael assume that the febi group did not agree with the results of his group discussion. To avoid this happening, the febi group should have discussed before they gave their answers during Nathanael's group presentation.

3.3.5 The Reasons for Flouting the Maxims

From the 4 reasons found by Jazeri (2008, p. 155-157), the researcher found 2 reasons why there can be a violation of maxim of quantity between the teachers and the students in this study are Conversational Implicature and Clarifying Information.

From the 4 reasons found by Jazeri (2008, p. 155-157), the researcher found 1 reason why there can be a violation of maxim of quality between the teachers and the students in this study is Want to Cause Joke.

From the 11 reasons found by Fajar (2009, p. 62), the researcher found 5 reasons why there can be a violation of maxim of relation between the teachers and the students in this study, namely causing jokes, explaining, sarcasm, commanding, and diverting the conversation.

From the 3 reasons found by Jazeri (2008, p. 155-157), the researcher found 1 reason why there can be a violation of maxim of manner between teachers and students in this study, namely Conversational Implicature.

DISCUSSION

After the data was analyzed, the result of the analysis are shown in the following below. The table describes the number of utterances that were flouted by the teacher and the students while interacting in an English classroom and the reasons why the teachers and the students flouted the maxims. The data was obtained by analyzing the utterances that were flouted in classroom interaction during two meetings.

Table 4. 1 The Data of Flouting Maxim

No.	Types of Flouting Maxims	Frequency		Percentage
		Teachers	Students	
1.	Flouting Maxim of Quantity	4	1	13.88%
2.	Flouting Maxim of Quality	2	4	16.66%
3.	Flouting Maxim of Relation	11	13	66.66%
4.	Flouting Maxim of Manner	0	1	2.80%
Total		36		100%

$$\text{Note : } P = \frac{f}{t} \times 100\%$$

The table above is the result of the analysis and it shows there are 36 utterances in total that were flouted by the teacher and the students during the learning process. The maxims that are flouted the most is the maxim of relation with a percentage of 66.66% or flouted 24 utterances, followed by the maxim of quality with a percentage of 16.66% or flouted 6 utterances, followed by the maxim of quantity with a percentage of 13.88% or flouted 5 utterances and the maxim of manner is the least that flouted with percentage 2.80% or flouted 1 utterance.

Based on the results of the study, the researcher found 2 reasons for the occurrence of violation maxim of quantity, which are: Conversational Implicature and Clarifying Information. For the violation of maxim of quality, the researcher found 1 reason for the occurrence of violation maxim of quality, which is: Wanting to cause jokes. For violation of maxim of relation, the researcher found 5 reasons for the occurrence of maxim of relation, which are: Explaining, Causing joke, Sarcasm, Commanding, and Diverting the Conversation. For the violation of maxim of manner, the researcher found 1 reason for the occurrence of violation maxim of manner, which is: Conversational Implicature. In total there were 7 reasons why teachers and students violated the maxim, namely: Conversational Implicature, Clarifying Information, Causing Joke, Explaining, Sarcasm, Commanding, Diverting the Conversation.

CONCLUSION

This research focuses on the types of maxims flouted by the teachers and the tenth-grade students of SMA Swasta HKBP Sidorame and the reasons for flouting the maxims. The data of this research was obtained from utterances conducted in an English classroom interaction of SMA Swasta HKBP Sidorame. The participants of this research were two English teachers and 15 students in class X. Data was obtained through observation, note-taking, transcripts video-recording, and interviews.

There are a total of 36 utterances that show violations of maxims that were flouted by the teachers and the students during the learning process. The maxim that was flouted the most is maxim of the maxim of relation with a percentage of 66.66% or flouted 24 utterances, followed by the maxim of quality with a percentage of 16.66% or flouted 6 utterances, followed by the maxim of quantity with a percentage of 13.88% or flouted 5 utterances and the maxim of manner is the least that flouted with percentage 2.80% or flouted 1 utterance.

The researcher analyzes the reasons why the teachers and the students flouted the maxim and found there were 7 reasons, there were; Conversational Implicature, Clarifying Information, Causing Joke, Explaining, Sarcasm, Commanding, and Diverting the Conversation.

REFERENCES

- Ary, D. et al. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education 8th Edition*. USA: WADSWORTH, CENGAGE Learning.
- Brown, G., Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design 2nd Edition*. California: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design : Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches Fourth Edition*. California: SAGE.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse : A resource book for students*. New York: Routledge.
- Fajar, M. (2009). *Ilmu Komunikasi: Teori dan Praktik*. Jakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Finegan, E. (2008). *Language : Its Structure and Use Fifth Edition*. USA: THOMSON WADSWORTH.
- Fitri, E. Qodriani, L. U. (2016). A Study on Flouting Maxims in Divergent Novel. *Teknosastik*, 32-40.
- Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in The Way of Words*. Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Jazeri, M. (2008). Realisasi Prinsip Kerjasama Dalam Sebuah Interaksi. *diksi*, 149-158.
- Johnson, David W. Johnson, Roger T. Johnson. (1999). Making Cooperative Learning Work. *THEORY INTO PRACTICE*, 67-73.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. United State of Amerika: Longman Inc.
- Levison, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Manurung, L. W. (2019). Flouting Maxims in Hitam Putih Talk Show. *SUAR BETANG*, 151-166.
- Marlisa, R. Hidayat, D. N. (2020). The Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Good Morning America (GMA) Talkshow. *Englisia : Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 132-142.
- Paltridge, B. (2012). *Discourse Analysis : An Introduction 2nd Edition*. London, New York, UK, USA: BLOOMSBURY.
- Puteri, Y. S. (2018). *The Flouting of Cooperative Principle Maxim in Inside Out Movie*. Medan: Faculty of Teacher's Training and Education University of Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara.
- Putri, A. E. (2022). *Flouting Conversational Maxim by English Department Students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya*. Surabaya: English Department Faculty of Arts and Humanities UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.
- Senft, G. (2014). *Understanding Pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.
- Wahyudi, A., Yusuf, S. & Lestari, Z.W. (2020). Maxim's Flouting : An Analysis of Classroom Interaction. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, 219-231.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language Fourth Edition*. United States of America: Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Yule, G. (2017). *The Study of Language Sixth Edition*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.