



**AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIMS USED BY STUDENTS DURING  
PROPOSAL SEMINAR**

**THESIS**

*Submitted to English Teaching Department  
Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty of UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar  
As a Requirement for Getting Bachelor Degree (S1)  
in English Teaching*

**FAUZIA REIHANIL JANNAH**  
**Reg. No.1830104019**

**ENGLISH TEACHING DEPARTMENT  
TARBIYAH AND TEACHER TRAINING FACULTY  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF MAHMUD YUNUS  
BATUSANGKAR  
2022**

## PERNYATAAN KEASLIAN SKRIPSI

Saya yang bertandatangan di bawah ini:

Nama : Fauzia Reihanil Jannah

Nim : 1830104019

Jurusan : Tadris (Pendidikan) Bahasa Inggris

Dengan ini menyatakan bahwa SKRIPSI yang berjudul : **“AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIMS USED BY STUDENTS DURING PROPOSAL SEMINAR”** adalah hasil karya sendiri, bukan plagiat, maka bersedia menerima sanksi sesuai dengan ketentuan yang berlaku.

Batusangkar, Juli 2022

Yang membuat pernyataan,



**Fauzia Reihanil Jannah**

**Reg. No. 18 301 04 019**

**THESIS ADVISOR' APPROVAL**

The thesis advisor of **FAUZIA REIHANIL JANNAH**, Reg. No: **18 3010 4019**, entitled "**AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIMS USED BY STUDENTS DURING PROPOSAL SEMINAR**", approves that be mentioned thesis fulfilled the requirements to proceed to thesis examination.

This aproval is granted and used appropriately.

Batusangkar, 12<sup>th</sup> July 2022

Advisor,






Yulnetri, SS., M.Pd.

NIP. 19731022 200312 2 003


### THESIS EXAMINERS' APPROVAL

This thesis was written by **FAUZIA REIHANIL JANNAH**, Reg. No: 18 3010 4019, entitled "AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIMS USED BY STUDENTS DURING PROPOSAL SEMINAR", has been examined by board of examiners of English Teaching Department of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty of Mahmud Yunus State Islamic University Batusangkar on Tuesday, August 2<sup>nd</sup> 2022 and approved to be accepted as requirement to obtain Bachelor Degree in Teaching English.

No	Names	Position	Signature	Date
1	<u>Dr.Rita Erlinda,M.Pd</u> NIP. 19730121 200003 2 001	Examiner		19/8-2022
2	<u>Yulnetri, SS., M.Pd.</u> NIP. 19731022 200312 2 003	Advisor		21/8-2022
3	<u>Rini Anita,M.Pd</u> NIP. 19840723 201101 2 012	Co-Examiner		19/8/22

Batusangkar, August 2022  
Approved by,  
Dean of Tarbiyah and  
Teacher Training Faculty



  
Dr. Adripen, M.Pd.  
NIP.19650504 199303 1 003

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT



*Alhamdulillah* rabbil 'alamin, first and foremost, the researcher would like to express her thankfulness to Allah SWT Who has blessed her in finishing this thesis entitled: **“AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIMS USED BY STUDENTS DURING PROPOSAL SEMINAR”**. Then, *Shalawat* and *Salam* are delivered to the prophet Muhammad S.A.W who left mankind two heritages, *Al-qur'an* and *Sunnah*, that they can learn from both of those to be a glorious servant in this world.

This thesis was written as one of the requirements to obtain bachelor degree (S1) of English Teaching Department of State Islamic University of Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar. First, she would like to express her special honor and gratitude to her advisor Yulnetri, SS., M.Pd as her advisor who has guided the researcher and support during the process of completing the thesis. Thanks for the advices, suggestions, and guidances. Next, she also wants to say deepest thanks to Dr. Rita Erlinda, M.Pd and Rini Anita, M.Pd as her examiners of this research who have given contribution to accomplish this thesis. Then, she also wants to say thanks to the English Teaching Department Students especially who follow proposal seminar have been documented as the sources of the data to help the researcher in collecting data.

Moreover, the deepest thanks also go to the Head of the English Teaching Department, Suyono, S.Pd., MA. (TESOL), Ph.D for facilitating in her research and permissions to conduct this research. She would like to thanks to all of lecturers of English Teaching Department of UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar for their helps during studying at this Department. Next, she wants to express her thanks to Dr. Sirajul Munir, M.Pd as her academic advisor who always gives advice to her during his study. Then, she also thanks to staff of English Teaching Department, Syahrur Ramli, S.Pd., M.Pd, who helped administratively during writing this thesis. Next, she also thanks to the Dean of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty, Dr. Adripen, M.Pd who helped her during academic year. Next, the researcher sincere gratitude is also expressed to the head of LPPM UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar Dr.H.Muhammad Fazis, M.Pd. who has given recommendation letter for her research. Then, her deepest gratitude is addressed to the Rector of UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar, Prof. Dr. Marjoni Imamora, M.Sc who has given chance for her study at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar until she got bachelor degree.

Next, she wishes to show her deepest love and gratitude to her beloved father Novrizal, S.H and beloved mother Dra. Wasni who has given guidances and

support in finishing her study. They always pray for for their daughter and support to reach her dream. Then, she really appreciates for her beloved Siblings Arfi Ramadhana Putra, S.Pd, Letda Caj Rahmat Akbar, S.Sn., Fauzana Lailaturrahmi, S.Si and Yaumil Fitri. Next, she really appreciates for her beloved sister in law Agnesd Jufra Meilina, S.Pd and Briptu Intan Widya Ningsih who has given supports in every process of her study. Next, she really appreciates for her beloved brother in law Yasfajri who has given supports in every process of her study. Last but not least, she really appreciates for her beloved nephew Adzkan Aladdin Arfan who has given supports, in every process of her study.

Futhermore, her acknowledgement also to her seniors, and her juniors of English Teaching Department of State Islamic University of Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar Mardiyah, Nailur Rahmi, Farhany Muhklis, Muthiah Rahmah Khairunnisa, Aisah who have given supports each other in completing this thesis. Then, for her beloved seniors Nelvi Zuliani, S.Pd, Winda Mulyana, S.Pd, Widya Restu Utami, S.Pd, Refi Maulana, S.Pd, Asril, S.Pd, Refky Rahmat, S.Pd. Next, for his beloved juniors Nurul Aulia Verona, Anita Kurniasih, Vika Astrinova, Yilda Riskanda, Fatma Sari, Tiara Khairunnisa, Indah Sri Rezeki, Hanifah who has accompanied during his study.

Finally, she thanks so much to anyone who has encouraged her in completing this thesis. *Syukron Katsiran*

Batusangkar, 12<sup>th</sup> July 2022  
The researcher,



**Fauzia Reihanil Jannah**  
**Reg. No. 18 301 04 019**

## ABSTRAK

**FAUZIA REIHANIL JANNAH, NIM. 1830104019.** Judul Skripsi: "**AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIMS USED BY STUDENTS DURING PROPOSAL SEMINAR**" Jurusan Tadris Bahasa Inggris, Fakultas Tarbiyah dan Ilmu Keguruan, Universitas Islam Negeri Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar.

*Flouting Maxim* bisa terjadi di berbagai situasi pendidikan. Salah satu situasinya yaitu di sebuah seminar proposal. Di dalam seminar proposal, adanya interaksi antara dosen dan siswa. Dalam melakukan interaksi, seorang dosen memberikan saran, kritikan, pertanyaan untuk meminta klarifikasi, konfirmasi, dan untuk mengetes pemahaman siswa terhadap apa yang telah dibuat. Dalam memberikan respon dosen, adanya kemungkinan seorang siswa melakukan *flouting maxim*. Hal ini dikarenakan adanya kemungkinan siswa dalam menanggapi pertanyaan dosen, mereka tidak paham dengan maksud pertanyaan dosen atau mungkin mereka merasa *nerveous* dan sebagainya. Jadi, Permasalahan dalam penelitian ini adalah belum terungkapnya jenis-jenis *flouting maxim* yang terjadi selama seminar proposal di Program Studi Bahasa Inggris. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mendeskripsikan jenis-jenis *flouting maxim* dan untuk menunjukkan *flouting maxim* yang sering digunakan oleh mahasiswa yang terjadi selama seminar proposal.

Penelitian ini adalah penelitian *qualitative* menggunakan desain *content analysis* yang menggambarkan jenis-jenis *flouting maxim* yang terjadi selama seminar proposal. Penelitian ini menggunakan dokumen tertulis dari hasil transkripsi rekaman video pada mahasiswa Program Studi Bahasa Inggris di Universitas Islam Negeri Mahmud Yunus di tahun ajaran 2021/2022. Data dari penelitian ini adalah semua *utterances that consist of flouting maxim* yang digunakan oleh mahasiswa Bahasa Inggris yang sedang melaksanakan proposal seminar. Data dari penelitian ini dikumpulkan dari bulan Maret-Juni. Sumber data dalam penelitian ini adalah 11 dokumen yang terdiri dari interaksi antara penguji, pembimbing dan siswa selama seminar proposal. Dalam menganalisis data, penulis menggunakan langkah-langkah menurut Venderstoep and Johnston, dimana hasilnya berupa "*Data Analysis*".

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan ada beberapa maxim yang di flouting siswa saat proposal seminar. Jumlah *flouting maxim* yang ditemukan adalah 91 *utterances* dengan rincian 33 (36%) *flouting maxim of quantity*, 17 (19%) *flouting maxim of quality* and 41 (45%) *utterances flouting maxim of relevance*. Dari data diatas, *Flouting maxim* yang paling sering diucapkan mahasiswa Bahasa Inggris adalah *flouting maxim of relevance*.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

<b>COVER</b> .....	
<b>SURAT PERNYATAAN KEASLIAN</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>THESIS ADVISOR’S APPROVAL</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>THESIS EXAMINERS’ APPROVAL</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>ABSTRAK</b> .....	<b>vi</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>x</b>
<b>CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
A. Background of the Problem .....	1
B. Research Focus.....	7
C. Research Questions .....	7
D. Definition of the Key Terms .....	8
E. Purpose of the Research .....	8
F. Significance of the Research.....	8
<b>CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	<b>10</b>
A. Review of Related Theories .....	10
1. Educational Interaction .....	10
a. Definition of Educational Interaction .....	10
b. Types of Educational Interaction .....	10
c. The Characteristics of Educational Interaction.....	11
2. Pragmatics .....	12
a. Definition of Pragmatics .....	12
b. The Importance of Learning Pragmatics .....	13
c. Pragmatic Competence .....	14
d. The Scope of Pragmatics .....	14



3. Cooperative Principle & Grice’s Conversational Maxims .....	16
a. Definition of Cooperative Principles .....	16
b. Definition of Maxim .....	17
c. Types of Conversational Maxims .....	17
1) Observance of maxims.....	17
2) Non-observance of maxims .....	20
4. Flouting Maxim .....	22
a. Definition of Flouting Maxim .....	22
b. Types of Flouting Maxim .....	23
B. Review of Relevant Studies .....	29
<b>CHAPTER III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>36</b>
A. Research Design.....	36
B. Data and Data Source of the Research.....	36
1. Data of the Research .....	36
2. Data Source of the Research .....	37
C. Technique of Data Collection .....	37
D. Checking the Data Trustworthiness .....	37
E. Technique of Data Analysis .....	38
<b>CHAPTER IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>41</b>
A. Research Findings .....	41
B. Discussion .....	51
<b>CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION .....</b>	<b>56</b>
A. Conclusion .....	56
B. Suggestion .....	56
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>63</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1. Types of Flouting Maxim and The Indicators .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Table 2. Total and Categorize of Flouting Maxim .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Table 3. Sample of Flouting Maxim of Quantity .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Table 4. Sample of Flouting Maxim of Quality .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Table 3. Sample of Flouting Maxim of Relevance.....</b>	<b>48</b>

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

<b>Appendix 1 : Transcription and Coding the utterances of Flouting Maxim..63</b>	
<b>Appendix 2 : Table Categorize of Flouting Maxim and the Analysis .....124</b>	<b>..</b>
<b>Appendix 3 : Recommendation Letter of the Research.....158</b>	

## CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

### A. Background of the Problem

Humans, as social beings, need other people in their lives. They always be contact with each other in various situations and forms of communication. Among the various types of situations, there is one particular type of situation namely the educational interaction which takes place in the purpose of education. As stated by Subakir (2017:381) educational interaction means a process of reciprocal relationship that is communicative, done intentionally, planned, and have certain goals. It means that, there are some people that do the reciprocal relationship in educational interaction. In educational interaction there are two main elements that must be present in a deliberate situation, that is teachers and students. Thus, the teacher-students interaction happens.

According to Eisenring & Margana (2019:51) teacher-students Interaction is established when a teacher talks to the whole students in the classroom. There is a active activity for teacher and students to exchange their ideas, feelings, opinions, views, perceptions, and etc. Teacher-student interaction might happen in any situation of educational interaction. One the situation is proposal seminar. In proposal seminar, the student and teacher not merely do the interaction in like in learning process, but a proposal seminar also has certain goal that are to convince and to answer the examiner's question. So, it means that proposal seminar is belong to educational interaction. When doing interactions, it is possible that the student will misunderstand the teacher's meaning. Thus, the students as a listener must comprehend the teacher's aim in order to avoid misunderstandings in interactions. The study of what the meaning a speaker said based on the context is called pragmatic.

Pragmatics is the study of the meaning that interpreted by the listener or reader to connect what is said to what is assumed based on the context. Yule (1996:3) proposed that Pragmatic is a branch of linguistic which concerns with the study of meaning of communications between two speakers and

hearer. Pragmatic studies what meant by the speakers when doing the interaction. Each person in an interaction is responsible for their actions if they use language to communicate. When they interact, they unconsciously expect that speaker and listener will be conversationally cooperative that we will cooperate together to achieve successful conversation.

To create successful conversation in the target language uses pragmatic competence. According to Kasper in Wyner (2015:521) Pragmatic competence can then be defined as knowledge of how to use language to achieve goals in language interaction, or rather, competence of language interaction in a sociocultural context. It means that it is not only by the knowledge of grammar and vocabularies but also knowledge about the culture of the target language. It means that pragmatics competence has benefits to students to understand the meaning behind the utterances. If the students do not learn about pragmatics competence, there will be pragmatic failure where the interlocutors cannot understand each other and failure in communication occurs.

Beside that, students will have a successful conversation when they follow a Cooperative Principle. Based on theory of Grice's Cooperative in Herawati (2013:44) there are four main sub-principles or maxims. Those maxims are: 1) The maxim of quantity (be brief). 2) The maxim of quality (be true). 3) The maxim of relation (relevant). 4) The maxim of manner (be clear). These maxims, in instance, describe listeners' assumptions of speakers' speaking style rather than describing how someone should speak. In order for the listener to comprehend what is being said and for the conversation to run smoothly, the speaker should consider these maxims. However, some person disobeys the cooperative principle or fails to live up to the maxims. The students do not always follow the rule of the maxim in their interactions. The speaker who does not follow the rule of the maxim it called as flouting maxim.

Flouting maxim happen when a speaker appears not to follow the Gricean maxim, he is expecting the hearers to infer the meaning implied (Cutting,

2002), (Thomas, 2013), (Helmie, 2019). In other words, in flouting a maxim, the speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim because the speaker wants the hearer to look for implied meaning. They expect the hearer to uncover the hidden meaning behind the utterance. When people disobey the maxims, they still attempt to cooperate together, but their words often have a hidden meaning in what is said. It means that flouting maxim is when a speaker do not disobey the rules, their utterance made the addressee to draw an inference.

In the same way as the four maxims, flouting maxim also divided into four categories as follows: quantity, quality, relevance and manner. Firstly, Flouting of Maxim Quantity means the speaker gives too much information or a lack of information. For example:

A: I forgot the result. Please, would you send it again.

B: Oh my god, you can scroll up.

(Arofah & Mubarak, 2021:253)

Based on the conversation above, the teacher didn't give the information which was needed by the student. Instead of sending the score to the group, the teacher said, "*Oh my god, you can scroll up,*" which implied that she didn't want to send it again, and asked the student to look for the score by scrolling up. Here, the teacher flouted the maxim of quantity because she didn't give the information what is required.

Secondly, Flouting of Maxim Quality means when a speaker flouts a maxim of quality, the speaker says something that does not represent what he or she thinks. For example:

A: So who are you going out with tonight?

B: Koosh and Laura

(Faridah, 2016:19)

Speaker B answer A's question with untrue information, because B actually does not going out with anyone tonight. It means that B has flouts maxim of quality when B answer A's question.

Thirdly, Flouting of Maxim Relation means that the speakers of a conversation fail to be relevant incommunicating. For example:

A: Where's my box of chocolates?

B: I've got a train to catch.

(Leech, 1983:94)

In the conversation above, B has flouted maxim of relevance, which is not causality. When A asks B about 'where', actually B should answer the question about the place. However, B, here, has changed the topic of conversation. A asks B about A's box of chocolates, but B answer A's question about his/her wanting to get a train. Therefore, B's utterance is unmatched.

Fourthly, Flouting of Maxim Manner means when a speaker is ambiguous, not transparent, not brief, perspicuous (ambiguous), and orderly in saying things. For example:

A: What are your plans for this afternoon?

B: Well, I was going to take the D-O-G for a W-A-L-K

(Maulinawati, 2018:19)

In this case, it can see that B answers the question's A by spelling the words 'dog' and 'walk', this means that B flouts the maxim of manner because he answers the question vaguely.

The study about flouting maxims has been conducted by many people in non academic setting and academic setting. Firstly, the study of flouting maxim was done by Sunggu & Afriana Binawan (2020), they analyzed in "Movie". Secondly, in Maryatul Kipya (2019), she analyzed the flouting maxim in "Talkshow". Thirdly, the study of flouting maxim was done by Asri Dwi E.S (2015), she analyzed in "classroom interaction". Next, the study was done by Ivan Achmad Nurcholis, Ria Angraini, Washlurachim Safitri, and Esa Putriami (2020), they analyzed flouting maxim in "proposal seminar".

From the previous studies, this research have the differences from others. In the previous studies, they researcher analyzed the flouting maxims in non academic setting like movie and talkshow. Then for academic setting are in classroom interaction and proposal seminar. In this research, the researcher

still focuses on academic setting which are maxim flouted by students during proposal seminar. But, this research focus on online proposal seminar.

Based on the previous studies, the researcher think that conduct a research about flouting maxim is very important, because it can help the students to understand and be more aware of being cooperative in a conversation so the conversation will run smoothly. They can also avoid misinterpretation in the use of maxim flouting in a conversation. As said by Faridah (2016) comprehending the flouting maxim is essential for effective communication. So, when people understand the deep meaning of what speaker say, misunderstanding will not appear in the end of conversation.

Flouting maxim is an interesting topic to be discussed because it can help students analyzing the meaning behind a conversation. Flouting maxim occur in academic setting. One of the academic setting is in research presentation as held by English Teaching Department. Proposal Seminar is one of series where the students present, convey and explain the concept of the research. There will be a question and answer session about topics that are being discussed that are presented which must be accounted by the students in front of their supervisors and examiners before conducting a research.

In proposal seminar, it is lead by the moderator to set whose turn to speak. The presence of the lecturer examiner is ask, to confirm, to test, to exam, to clarify, to suggest, to critisize, and etc. Therefore, the lecturer's utterances often happen during proposal seminar is questioning, critisizing, suggesting and evaluating. Based on the observation, the researcher found there are many of flouting maxim come out in this kind of utterances. One of the example can be seen in this conversation below:

- L.E : Is perspective same with perception?  
 S : Hmm, (*The student look around while thinking*) diff, (laughs) hehehe,,diff,different,,different ma'am?  
 L.E : I'm asking you..  
 S : Hehehe,, Opinion is the same with perspective,,is the same with opinion, ma'am.



The context of conversation above was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 12<sup>th</sup> July 2021 in question answer section. The examiner tested the student's knowledge about two things whether perspective is the same with opinion or not. The examiner needed Yes/No response from the student. But, The response from the student is unmatched. Even, she asked to her examiner. Naturally, the students should give a Yes/No response, as expected. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of relevance. So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she could not read and comprehend the theory. Eventually, the session was not run smoothly.

The another example can be seen in this conversation below:

L.E : Now for example, I asked you. Is there anyone in the world doesn't have self-regulated learning? Or everyone must have self-regulated learning.

S : Of course yes sir

L.E : What?

S : Yes, of course yes sir. But, possibility. Eh but aaa the level is different, sir.

The context of conversation above was between an examiner and an student happened during proposal seminar at 12<sup>th</sup> July 2021 in question answer section. The examiner asked the student whether anyone in the world has self regulated learning or not and everyone must have self regulated learning or not. First, The student answer of course yes with confidence, then when the student asked again she answer yes but its possibility. So, in this utterance the student could not give the true response. The fact is she use word possibility. Naturally, the students should explained the answer of course yes toward the questions given by the examiner with the good evidence. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quality. So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she does not read yet the theory. Eventually, the session was not run smoothly. Finally, the examiner failed to ensure the student' understanding about the question that he asked.

Then, the conversation has continued...

- L.E : So, it means that everyone has self-regulated learning?  
 S : Yes  
 L.E : In theory, what does theory say?  
 S : About self-regulated learning, ehm. So...

The context of conversation above was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 12<sup>th</sup> July 2021 in question answer section. The examiner confirmed the student that anyone in the world has self regulated learning. Then, the student answer by saying “*Yes*”. Then, the examiner asked what does theory say?. The student could not explained as informative as possible. On the other hand, The student only answer “*About self-regulated learning, ehm. So..*”.It means that the answer from the student is too short and not informative as it required. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quantity. So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she does not read yet the theory. Eventually, the session was not run smoothly. The examiner didn’t get the answer as she expected.

Based on the preliminary research, the researcher found an interesting phenomena and this often happens in proposal seminar. This happen when the student gave irrelevant response to the examiner’s question and it might happen because the student’s anxiety so they tend to not obey the rules of conversation. In fact, there are some misunderstandings happen that make the session was not run smoothly. Therefore, the researcher gets curiosity to find out the flouting maxim showed by student during proposal seminar.

## **B. Research Focus**

Based on the phenomena above, this research focuses on Flouting Maxims used by students during proposal seminar.

## **C. Research Questions**

Based on the research focus above, the research question can be formulated as:

1. What kind of flouting maxims used by students during proposal seminar?
2. What is the frequent flouting maxims used by students during proposal seminar?

#### **D. Definition of the Key Terms**

To avoid misunderstanding in this research, the key terms are defined as follows:

1. Flouting maxim is occur when the students do not have sufficient knowledge and did not undertand what examiners' question so they tend to disobey the maxim by giving the response that does not need by the examiner.
2. Proposal Seminar is an academic activity that conducted by the students to present their topic by using english language in front of the participant, advisor and examiners via online platform in question answer section.

#### **E. Purpose of the Research**

Based on the research question previously, the purposes of this research are:

1. To identify the kinds of maxims are flouted by students during proposal seminar.
2. To show the frequent flouting maxims used by students during proposal seminar.

#### **F. Significance of the Research**

By doing this research, the researcher expects that this research contributes both theoritically and practically:

1. Theoritically

Theoritically, the result of this research hopefully can enrich some knowledges about types of flouting maxim found on English Teaching Department Students during Proposal seminar at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar.

2. Practically

The researcher hopes this research is useful for the Lecturer, English Students and the researcher.

- a. Lecturer

For the Lecturer, hopefully this research can provide a description of the maxims that are flouted in Seminar and they can used as

references in teaching the flouting maxim. Beside that, it also hoped that the lecturer when as an examiner she/he can interact with their students well and avoid the possibility happens of flouting maxim in the proposal seminar, so the students do not feeling afraid, confused, ashamed and misunderstanding when doing proposal seminar.

b. English Students

For English Students, hopefully this research can give a description about flouting maxim during proposal seminar and also to arouse curiosity and interest to make further research in line with this study. In addition, it also hoped that the students able to understand about pragmatics competence and also know that in utterance not only grammar is our focus but also know how to understand the meaning behind the utterances. Thus, the students interact with his/her examiner effectively and can avoid flouting maxim in Proposal Seminar, so the students do not feeling stress, panic and the Proposal seminar will run smoothly.

c. Researcher

For the researcher herself, hopefully it also expect the researcher to enrich her knowledge related to pragmatic especially for flouting maxim and also enhance her skill in analyzing flouting especially enhance pragmatic competence the researcher itself and give meaningful experience for the researcher herself. Then, this research is one of the requirements to get an bachelor degree at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

#### **A. Review of Related Theories**

##### **1. Educational Interaction**

###### **1) Definition of Educational Interaction**

There are several definitions of educational interaction by some experts. According to Hamalik in Subakir (20017:387) Educational Interaction is a two-way active relationship that uses knowledge as its medium, so that interaction is a meaningful and creative relationship. All elements of educational interaction must proceed in line with the goals of education. Meanwhile, according to Sudirman in Subakir (20017:389) Educational Interaction in teaching is a deliberate interaction process, awareness of the purpose, i.e. to deliver students level maturity. In addition, educational interaction explains by Shuyadi and Abu Achmadi in Subakir (20017:389) as a relationship between educators (teachers) and students that take place in education bond.

It can be concluded that educational interaction is a relation activity of various educational elements with some knowledge that have certain goals.

###### **2) Types of Educational Interaction**

According to Dagarin in Eisenring & Margana (2019:51) argue that interaction as “a two-way process between the participants in the learning process”. In other words, the teacher influences the learners and vice versa. Talking about the interaction of teaching and learning, then we cannot separate the "teacher" and "educator". According to Rachel (2016:32-33) there are two types of classroom interaction based on the participants. They are:

### **1) Student-Teacher Interaction**

Theories behind student and teacher interaction state that this type of interaction is vital for student because it compares to the relationship with a boss or superior. Students must learn to interact respectfully, but must also learn how to be assertive without being rude, so that their points and opinions are heard without disruption.

### **2) Student-Student Interaction**

One-on-one student interaction is important because it allows students to understand what it means to work with a partner. Theories of this type of interaction say that it prepares students for one-on-one relationships they will have with work associates, friends and even their spouses. Students must learn be able to evaluate what their own strengths and weaknesses are as they try to complete a task.

Based on the theory above, there are two types of classroom interaction based on the participants. They are: student-teacher interaction and student-student interaction.

### **3) The Characteristics of Educational Interaction**

According to Djamarah in Rachel (2016:35-36) There are several characteristic of educational interaction:

- 1) The interaction of teaching and learning has a purpose.
- 2) There is procedures (the course of interaction) are planned, designed to achieve the objectives that have been implemented.
- 3) The interaction of teaching and learning is characterized by the cultivation of a special material. The material is designed so as to achieve goals and be prepared before the course of teaching and learning interaction.
- 4) Marked by the presence of student activity. Students as a center of learning, the student activity is a necessary condition for the continuity of teaching and learning interaction.

- 5) In the interaction of teaching and learning of teachers acting as mentors. The teacher provides the motivation for going process of interaction and as a mediator and the process of learning,
- 6) In the interaction of teaching and learning requires discipline.
- 7) There is a deadline, each goals was given a certain time, when the objective must be achieved.
- 8) Elements of the assessment, to determine whether the goals have been achieved through the interaction of teaching and learning.

Based on the theory above, it can be concluded that there eight characteristics of educational interaction.

### **3. Pragmatics**

#### **a. Definition of Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is the study of how people communicate through language, specifically the interactions between utterances and the contexts in which they are employed. It's a scientific study that looks into the connection between what the speaker is saying and the listener's understanding and meaning. According to O'keeffe (2011:1), the term of pragmatics is commonly use in linguistic research to refer to the study of meaning interpretation. According to Huang (2007:2) Pragmatic is the systematic study of meaning by virtue, on dependent on, the use of language.

Then, Yule (2010:127) states that the study of what the meaning a speaker said based on the context is called pragmatic. According to Cutting (2008:2) states that pragmatics and discourse analysis study the relationship between language language and contextual background elements such as context, text and function. In line with Yule, Rowe (2006:166) states pragmatics as the study how people use language to accomplish spesific goals. Then, the meaning of a speaker can be interpreted more accurately by understanding the context.

Based on the theories above, it can be summarized that Pragmatics is the study of the speaker meaning between language and context in relation to speech situation that interpreted by the listener or reader to connect what is said to what is assumed.

**b. The Importance of Learning Pragmatics**

According to Yule (1996:3) The reason for studying language through pragmatics is that people can convey each other's meaning. Then it will be easy for someone to interpret what individuals are saying when they are talking about something. This pragmatics is important because it is focused in how people make language sense of each other, but it can be a disappointing area of study because it requires us to make sense of others and what they are thinking.

As Locastro (2012:30) mentioned improving the learners' pragmatic knowledge is as important as developing one's IT and technology skills. Both are important for the world of today. The learners benefit from the explicit teaching of pragmatics by their teachers and ideally become autonomous learners, doing pragmatics to solve communication problems and pushing their competence level.

In conclusion, pragmatics is important for students to learn about pragmatic. Because Pragmatics will allow students to interact with others in a variety of ways. Through learning pragmatics, students will be able to maintain their cultural identities, participate more completely in target language communication, and gain more control and over force and outcome of their contributions. Involving students in pragmatics in their foreign language helps the students to develop their perception of target language and those who speak it. So, by learning pragmatic it can help and guide the learner in determining the appropriate meaning of language for the situations they encounter.



### **c. Pragmatic Competence**

According to Kasper in Wyner (2015:85) Pragmatic competence can then be defined as knowledge of how to use language to achieve goals in language interaction, or rather, competence of language interaction in a sociocultural context. Then, Bachman (1990) states that pragmatic competence is concerned with the relationship between utterances and the functions that speakers intend to perform through these utterances (illocutionary force) and the characteristics of the context of language use that determine the appropriateness of utterances. In addition, Celce-Murcia & Olshtain In Lestari (2017:46) explain that Pragmatic competence relates to ‘a set of internalized rules of how to use language in socio-culturally appropriate ways, taking into account the participants in a communicative interaction and features of the context within which the interaction takes place.

Based on the explanation above it can be concluded that pragmatic competence is the appropriate ways to use language in order to relate between languages and their users in language interaction based on the context. It means that, pragmatic competence is very important for EFL learners to understand speech and its meaning to avoid pragmatic failure in communication. Because in communication, not only focus on grammatical but also focus on how language is used in communication to avoid pragmatic failure.

### **d. The Scope of Pragmatics**

Mey ( 2001:5) states that Pragmatics is the study the use of language in human communication as determined by the situations of the society. It means pragmatic refers to a study of language that determines the situation of the people in the area.

In learning pragmatics, there are several scopes of pragmatics that should be mastered by the english learners. It will be discussed as follows.

### 1) Deixis

According to Huang (2007:132) deixis means a fundamental linguistic phenomenon. That is, all human languages contain deictic terms. A language without deictic cannot serve communication needs. For example, when the teacher check the students' attendance, The teacher says, "*How many students absent **today**?*". The word "today" refers to time deixis which focuses on the deictic adverbs of time, where today means the day at the time.

### 2) Presupposition

According to Huang (2007:65) explains that a presupposition is inference or proposition whose truth is taken for granted in the utterance of sentence. For example, when the students complain about the task to the teacher, the teacher says to other "*They **started** complaining.*" It means they were not complaining before. Then, when a student came late to the class, the other students say among them "*She is late **again**.*" It means she was late before.

### 3) Implicature

According to Mey (2001:45) states that the word *implicature* is derived from the verb *to imply*, as is its cognate *implication*. Etymologically, *to imply* means to fold something into something else; hence, that which is implied, is folded in, and has to be unfolded in order to be understood. The term of implication is distinguished from implicature.

### 4) Speech acts

According to According to Austin in Hidayat, A (2016:3) Speech acts are acts that refer to the action performed by produced utterances. It is commonly given more specific labels, such as apology, complaint, compliment, invitation, promise, or request. By speech, people can deliver an idea to the hearer in

order to make a good communication for them. Speech also produces meaningful linguistic expressions

#### 5) Politeness

According to Cruse (2006:131) politeness as linguistic behaviour is concerned, politeness is a matter of minimising the negative effects of what one says on the feelings of others and maximising the positive effects (known as 'negative politeness' and 'positive politeness' respectively).

#### 6) Cooperative principle

A basic underlying assumption we make when we speak to one another is that we are trying to cooperate with one another to construct meaningful conversations. This assumption is known as the Cooperative Principle. Furthermore, Yule (1996:37) states that cooperative principle suggests the speaker makes his/her conversational contribution as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which s/he engaged.

Hence, there are several topics in pragmatic. They are deixis, presupposition, implicature, speech act, politeness and , cooperative principle.

### 4. Cooperative Principle & Grice's Conversational Maxims

#### a. Definition of Cooperative Principles

Cooperative Principle is a predominant principle in pragmatics that was developed by an English philosopher, H.P. Grice. A cooperative principle describe how people interact with the another, the principle is intended as a description of how people normally behave in conversation. As said by American linguist Grice in Bilal & Naeem (2013:2) Cooperative Principle is an umbrella term of nine components that guide how we communicate. According to Grice as cited Levinson (1983:101) Cooperative principle is making the contribution such it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the

accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

Based on the theories above, it can be concluded that cooperative principle is the principle that guide people's communication and how the people use language.

#### **b. Definition of Maxim**

In doing a conversation, maxim is a statement that should be truthful. In short, maxim can be understood as the rule of conversation that should be obeyed during the conversations. It is necessary to make the successful communication in order to make the content of the communication itself makes sense in taking the inference, Maxim itself can lead the good conversation and avoid the misunderstanding. According to Brown and Yule (1983:32) A "maxim" is a form of rule of thumb.

To put the definition of maxim briefly, maxim can be defined as a principle or a rule for behavior. Maxim it self fleshed into four types in cooperative principle as follows; quality maxim, quantity maxim, manner maxim, and the last is relevance maxim.

#### **c. Types of Conversational Maxims**

According Erlinda (2019: 53) in general, there are two types of maxim obversable and non-obversable maxims. Observance maxims can be identified clearly because it is stated explicitly. It follows the rules of conversational maxims. Non-observance maxi is difficult to recognise because it is not explicitly stated.

##### **1) Observance of maxim**

Grice (1975:45-47) formulated guidelines to describe how the cooperative principle in a language works for efficient and effective conversation. The guideline is called the maxim of conversation. Grice called these four category as quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

### a) Maxim of Quantity

According to Cutting (2002:34) Maxim of quantity means the speaker should give information as is required and give neither too little nor too much information. Then, Huang in Erlinda (2019:54) stated there are two terms of quantity maxims:

- 1) Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)
- 2) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

In other words, the speakers should give enough information as which is needed by the listeners. The participant also should not give information more than it is required. In other words the speaker do not talk less informative or more informative in a conversation. the speaker who gives less information risk the hearer for not being able to identify the meaning because its explicit enough. For example:

A : How did Harry fare in court the other day?

B : Oh he got a fine.

(Levinson, 1983:105)

In the example, Harry got a life sentence too, and then B would certainly be guilty of misleading A, for he has failed to provide all the information that might reasonably be required. Therefore, speaker B has already given the informative situation.

### b) Maxim of Quality

According to Huang in Erlinda (2019:54) quality maxims as an effort to make your contribution one is true. Furthermore, Grice in Yule (1996:37) said that to observe this maxim, the participants should not say what they

believe to be false and which they lack adequate evidence.

They are two terms of quality maxims:

- 1) Do not say what you believe to be false.
- 2) Do not say something you lack adequate evidence.

The point of the maxim quality is that the speaker must say what they believe to be true and has evidence. For example:

A : Does your farm contain 400 acres?

B : I do not know that it does, and I want to know if it does.

(Levinson, 1983:105)

Here, the sentence shows that it simply extends the scope of quality by reviewing truth as a special sub-case of sincerity applied to assertions. A answers B about the B's farm. Yet actually, B does not deny that B has farm, and B can prove it when B said that he/she would want to measure his/her farm. This case can be proved that B can give contribution to what addressor believes to be true.

### c) **Maxim of Relation**

According to Cruse in Erlinda (2019:55) maxim of relation means "be relevant" in contributing to a conversation. The terms of maxim relevance:

- 1) Say things that are relevant to the topic under discussion.

It means that, each person in a conversation should give relevant contribution to the topic. The communication message must relate to what has gone before. For example:

A : Where's my box of chocolates?

B : It's in your room

(Leech, 1983:94)

The example is interpreted as relevant to the present action. A is asking about 'where' and B answer about the place that is 'your room'. So, B's answer matches with A's question.

#### **d) Maxim of manner**

Huang in Erlinda (2019:55) states that maxim of manner should be perspicuous. There are some terms of manner maxim:

- 1) Avoid obscurity of expression.
- 2) Avoid ambiguity.
- 3) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
- 4) Be orderly.

The point of the maxim of manner is that the speakers must be clear and of course obey the sub-maxim mentioned above. For example:

A : Where was Alfred yesterday?

B : Alfred went to the store and bought some whisky.

(Levinson, 1983:108)

The example above has already obeyed the maxim of manner. B can give explanation orderly since he/she gives a clear explanation where Alfred was.

## **2) Types of Non-Observance Maxim**

The participants of the conversation sometimes seem do not adhere to the four sub-principles. It means that the participants fail to observe the maxims. The failure of observing maxims is done by breaking the rules of them whether deliberately or accidentally and it is called non-observance maxims. The types of non observance maxim can be classified into five, those are:

### **1) Violating maxim**

According to Thomas (1995:73) a speaker can be said to violate a maxim when they know that the hearer will not

know the truth and will only understand the surface meaning of the words. They intentionally generate a misleading implicature. For example:

Husband : How much did that new dress cost, darling?

Wife : less than the last one.

(Cutting, 2002:40)

The wife, when asked “How much did that new dress cost darling?” could have violated maxim of quality by not being sincere, and giving him the wrong information: “Thirty-five pounds”. Here, the wife covers up the price of the dress by not saying how much less than her last dress.

## 2) Hedging maxim

According to Grundy (2000:79-80) hedging maxim is avoiding to make bold statement. Maxims are hedged when the information is not totally accurate but seem informative, well found and relevant. The information is taken by quoting from other person opinion.

By using hedges, the speaker shows the hearer that she does not have complete information about the topic being discussed about as in the example below.

I may be mistaken, but I thought I saw a wedding ring on her finger.

(Yule, 1996:38)

By using hedge in his/her utterance, the speaker's utterance will be understood as maxim hedging of quality. This utterance shows that the speaker is not sure whether the information about the girl they are talking about is married or not. But he/she wants to assure the hearer that at some points, he/she has seen her wearing a wedding ring on her finger.



### 3) **Opting out maxim**

According to Cutting (2002:41) a speaker who opts out the maxims shows the unwillingness to cooperate. He/she wants to be looked uncooperative. Sometimes he/she cannot reply in the way expected because of legal or ethical reasons. The example of opting out the maxims is when a police officer refuses to release the name of an accident victim until the relatives have been informed by saying 'I am afraid I can't give you that information' or by using expression like 'no comment'.

### 4) **Infringing maxim**

According to Thomas in Cutting (2002:41) a speaker who infringes the maxims fails to observe the maxims because he/she has imperfect linguistics performance. It can happen if the speaker has an imperfect command of the language such as a child or a foreign learner when their performance is impaired such as nervous, drunkenness, or excitement, if they have a cognitive impairment, or if they are simply incapable of speaking clearly.

### 5) **Suspending maxim**

According to Thomas (1995: 76) suspending a maxim is a case in which the speaker needs not opt out of observing the maxim because there is no expectation for the maxim to be observed. Suspending a maxim occurs when there are culture-specific or particular events that force the speaker not to say something directly, for instance, taboo word.

## 5. **Flouting Maxim**

### a. **Definition of Flouting Maxim**

According to Levinson (1983:104) A flout happens when a speaker blatantly fails to disobey a maxim, not to deceive or mislead the

listener, but because the speaker wants the hearer to look for the meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning. It occurs when people deliberately cease to apply the maxims to persuade their listeners to infer the hidden meaning behind the utterances; that is, the speakers employ “implicature”.

Grundy (2000 : 78) states in his book that flouting is a particularly silent way of getting an addressee to draw an inference and hence recover an “implicature”. It is also said by Cutting (2002:37) that flouting the maxims is when speakers appear not to follow the maxims but expect listeners to understand the intended meaning. Then, According to Thomas (2013:65) when flouting a maxim, the speaker does not intend to mislead the hearer but wants the hearer to look for the conversational implicature, that is, the meaning of the utterance not directly stated in the words uttered.

So, it can be concluded that flouting maxim is when a speaker do not disobey the rules, but their utterance hopes the hearer to find the intended meaning.

#### **b. Types of Flouting Maxim**

There are four types of flouting maxims, such as:

##### **1) Flouting Maxim of Quantity**

Flouting maxim of quantity occur when a speaker blatantly give more or less information. Cutting (2002:37) states that “the speaker who flouts the maxim quantity sees to give too little or too much information. It means that the speaker may give information not as it requires. Here, Cutting gives his example:

Peter: Well, how do I look?

Mary: Your shoes are nice....

(Cutting,2002:36)

In this case Mary has flouted the maxim of quantity by giving information less than required. Peter asks her about his whole appearance, but Mary only refers to his shoes. She does

not say directly that the shirt or his jeans look nice, which means that she is not impressed with the rest of what he is wearing. To avoid offending Peter, Mary decides not to obey the maxim of quantity. Thus Peter is forced to infer the hidden meaning of Mary's utterance.

## 2) Flouting Maxim of Quality

According to Thomas (1995:67). The interlocutors can be mentioned flouts the maxim of quality when she/he implies the information which it is not suitable with the fact. Flouts which exploit the maxim of quality occur when the speaker says something which blatantly untrue or for which she/he lacks adequate evidence. When we communicate there is a tacit assumption that each communicant says or writes will be truthful. For instance, when speaker A below asks B who is going to spend the evening. In this moment A expects B to give a truthful answer.

A: Teheran's in Turkey isn't it, teacher?

B: And London's in Armenia I suppose.

(Levinson,1983:110)

From the dialogue it can be seen that B has flouted the maxim of Quality. By giving statement that London is in America, B fail to fulfill the maxim of quality because he tells something false that actually London is in England. The reason of B's response to A is because A also says something false that Teheran is in Turkey, where actually it is in Iran.

Cutting (2002: 37-38) reduces Grice's idea about flouting maxim of quality into five familiar ways. The five ways of flouting maxim of quality are excessively used by a speaker to convey an implied meaning. They are Hyperbole, Metaphor, Irony, Banter, and Sarcasm.

**a) Hyperbole**

Hyperbole is an extravagant statement or the use of exaggerated terms for the purpose of emphasis/heightened effect. According to Cutting (2002: 37-38), hyperbole is something that should not be seen at the face value because it usually represents something in a greater manner than it actually is. A quality of something at the face value has been overstated to some purposes such as giving an emphasis.

“He asks me a hundred times.” It exaggerates the amount of the question because the speaker wants to criticize the interlocutor who insists on asking the same question. The speaker says what he believes to be false because the interlocutor asks many times the same question but the frequency of the question is not until a hundred times. The number of question perhaps only ten times, yet the speaker exaggerates the quantity of the question into a hundred.

**b) Metaphor**

A speaker implicates something through metaphor and a hearer draws the implicature through two objects being compared in the metaphor. Jay (2003: 315) states that metaphor is a comparison between two objects. The example of maxim flouting using metaphor by Cutting (2002:37) can be seen in the utterance “My house is a refrigerator in January”. The hearer will know that by using metaphor “a refrigerator”, the speaker is trying to tell the hearer that his/her house is very cold when it comes to January.

**c) Irony**

Levinson (1983: 109) states that irony arises when a speaker says something rather different from what he has actually said, namely the opposite or negation of what the speaker has uttered. Then, Cutting (2001: 38) defines that

“irony is an apparently friendly way of being offensive (mock-politeness) that expresses a positive sentiment and implies a negative one”. The example of irony in maxim flouting by Cutting (2002:37) can be seen in the utterance “If only you knew how much I love being woken up at 4 am by a fire alarm”. This utterance is said by a student to his/her friends when they are getting their breakfast downstairs. This utterance shows how the student is annoyed by the bell of the alarm in 4 am to wake them up and having breakfast early in the morning. This also implies that the student is expecting to have more sleep and eat breakfast not at 4 am.

**d) Banter**

Banter is a reverse of irony. Cutting (2002: 38) denotes that “banter is an offensive way of being friendly (mock-impoliteness) that expresses a negative sentiment and implies a positive one”. The speaker implies a positive sentiment which is showing closeness or social intimacy/solidarity among best friends/partners through a negative utterance (abusive or offensive language).

Alharthi (2006: 26) provides an example of banter that is a moment when a speaker and an interlocutor tease each other in long exchange of remarks in a teasing/humorous way. Taboo words as the negative sentiment (bad girl and dork) are used to show social intimacy/solidarity between the speaker (A) and the interlocutor (B).

A: You're a bad girl, aren't you?

B: You're a dork!

A: You don't get out much, do you?

B: You're cute, like my little sister.

The conversation between A and B is banter. They tease one another in a long humorous way. B does not get

offensive for being called as a bad girl and A does not feel annoyed for being mentioned as a dork. Here, the both parties, the speaker (A) and the interlocutor (B), can infer the implied meanings behind “bad girl” and “dork” which are to show a closeness between them, hence, they belong to the same group (intimate friends), thus it does not backfire between the two.

**e) Sarcasm**

According to Cutting (2002: 38) sarcasm is a kind of irony that implies a more ironic and negative meaning towards the hearer . It is often used to openly hurt the hearer as in “Why don’t you leave *all* your dirty clothes on the lounge floor, love, and then you only need wash them when someone breaks a leg trying to get to sofa?” (Cutting, 2002: 38). This utterance is said by a wife to her husband. In this utterance, the wife is trying to tell the husband to help her a little bit in doing the housework. She is tired of doing that alone while her husband is not helping her; instead, he is making her more tired by leaving the entire dirty clothes all around the house.

**3) Flouting Maxim of Relevance**

According to Thomas (1995:70) The maxim of relevance (be relevant) is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand. So the speaker flouts the maxim of relation when she/she does not given a response within the topic which is being discussed.

A: Smith doesn’t seem to have a girlfriend these days

B: he has been paying a lot of visits to New York lately

(Grice, 1975:51)

The dialogue shows that the conversation between A and B is unmatched. The response of B is not relevance with A's statement. By saying so, B has implicates that Smith might has a girlfriend in New York because he spends more time to go there. In this case, B flouts the maxim of relation because B tries to shorten the utterances by merely saying that.

#### 4) Flouting Maxim of Manner

According to Cutting (2002 :39), those who flout the maxim of manner may appear to be obscure, are often trying to exclude a third party, as in this sort of exchange between husband and wife:

A: Where are you off to?

B: I was thinking of going out to get some of that funny white stuff for somebody.

A: Ok, but don't be log-dinner's nearly ready

(Cutting, 2002:39)

Therefore, Cutting analyzes that B speaks in an ambiguous way, saying "that funny white stuff" and "somebody" because he is avoiding saying 'ice-cream' and 'Michelle' so that his little daughter does not become excited and ask for the ice cream before her meal.

To make all of the types of flouting maxim above easy to understand, here the researcher make such a table that content of definition and the indicators of flouting maxim itself.

**Table 1. Types of flouting maxim and the indicators**

<b>Expert</b>	<b>Types of flouting</b>	<b>Definitions</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
Cutting (2002)	Quantity	The speaker who flouts the maxim quantity sees	Give more or less

		to give too little or too much information	information
	Quality	They may quite simply say something that obviously does not represent what they think.	a. Untrue b. Lack of evidence
	Relation	When the response of the hearer irrelevant with what the speaker needs	a. Irrelevant b. Out of topic
	Manner	The speaker may appear to be obscure, are often trying to exclude a third party	a. Obscure b. Ambiguous way

## B. Review of Relevant Studies

There are many researcher in the previous studies conducted about flouting maxim in academic setting and non academic setting. For academic setting, the researcher conducted about flouting maxim in classroom interaction, debate, teacher students interaction, in proposal seminar. Meanwhile for non academic setting, the researcher conducted about flouting maxim in movie and talkshow.

Firstly, Febrian Cubra (2015) under his research title “*An Analysis of Flouting Maxims Found in English Classroom Interaction (A Study of The Tenth Grade of Islamic Senior High School 2 Bukittinggi 2014/2015 Academic Year)*”. The purpose of this research is to find out the kind of flouting maxim that found in English Classroom interaction at the tenth grade of MAN 2 Bukittinggi. The design of this study was descriptive qualitative research by using content analysis. This research found that there were many maxims which were flouted by the teacher and the students in the classroom. From the data, the researcher found 85 flouting maxim in classroom interaction. Those



are 29 flouting maxim of quantity, 27 flouting maxim of quality, 17 flouting maxim of relevant and 12 flouting maxim of manner. This research has similarities and differences with the researcher's research. The similarity with the researcher is about both of the research discuss about flouting maxim and use descriptive qualitative research by using content analysis as the research design. The differences are the source of data in Febrian's research is classroom interaction, but this research focus on English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar. Then, Febrian's research took place at Islamic Senior High School 2 Bukittnggi, but this research will conduct at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar.

Secondly, the research done by Chandra Yuliasman (2015) under the title "*AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIM IN THE ENGLISH DEBATE (A Study of the Grand Final Round of the Sixth English Debating Championship of SMA of West Sumatera 2014)*". The purpose of this research is to analyze and describe the flouting maxim in the grand final round of Sixth English Debating Championship of SMA of West Sumatra 2014. The design of this study was descriptive qualitative research by using content analysis. This research found four types of flouting maxim found in the English debate especially in the grand final round of the sixth English debating championship of SMA of west Sumatera 2014. From the data, the researcher found 51 flouting maxim in the english debate. Those are 17 flouting maxim of quantity, 1 flouting maxim of quality, 11 flouting maxim of relevant and 22 flouting maxim of manner. This research has similarities and differences with the researcher's research. The similarity with the researcher is about both of the research discuss about flouting maxim use descriptive qualitative research by using content analysis as the research design. The differences are the source of data in Chandra's research is English Debate, but this research focus on English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar. Then, Chandra's research took place at SMA of West Sumatra, but this research conducted at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar.

Thirdly, the next research by Siti Arofah dan Husni Mubarak (2021) under the title “*An Analysis of Violation and Flouting Maxim on Teacher Students Interaction in English Teaching and Learning Process*”. The purposes of the research are to investigate the violation and flouting maxims, another purpose was to find the most dominant type of violation and flouting and what most produced between the violation and flouting of the maxim that happen in classroom interaction during the English teaching and learning process. This research was descriptive qualitative research. The result of the research showed that there are four types of maxims that are violated by the teacher and students. These are the maxim of quantity 11 (50%), the maxim of quality 5 (22.73%), the maxim of relation 1 (4.54%), and the maxim of manner 5 (22.73%). The dominant violation was the maxim of quantity with 11 occurrences. Based on the findings, there are three types of flouting maxims in which the most of flouting maxim that is occurred was the maxim of relation. This research has similarities and differences with the researcher’s research. The similarity with the researcher is about both of the research discuss about flouting maxim. The differences are their research discuss about violation and flouting maxim, but in this research the researcher focus only on the flouting maxim. Then, the source of data in their research is Teaching and Learning Process, but this research focus on English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar. Next, their research took place at Hasyim Asy’ari Bangsri, but this research conducted at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar.

Fourthly, the next research by Ivan Achmad Nurcholis, Ria Angraini, Washlurachim Safitri, and Esa Putriami (2020) under the title “*THE FLOUTING MAXIMS ON ENGLISH STUDENTS’ PROPOSAL SEMINAR IN ENGLISH EDUCATION*”. The purposes of the research is to identify the types of maxim (Grice’s theory) and the most dominant maxim which was flouted by English students on English proposal seminar in English Education Study Program of Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu. This research was descriptive method. The result of the research first, there were four types of maxims flouted by the students. They were 1) maxim of quantity (21

utterances that flouted by the students; 2) maxim of quality (4 utterances flouted by students); 3) maxim of manner (11 utterances that flouted by students), and 4) maxim of relevance (13 utterances that flouted by the students). Second, the most dominant maxim which flouted by students on English students' proposal seminar in English Education Study Program of Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu was maxim of quantity with percentage 42.85% and identified for 21 times. This research has similarities and differences with the researcher's research. The similarity with the researcher is about both of the research discuss about flouting maxim on proposal seminar. The differences are the research is done through offline and the most dominant which flouted by students was flouting maxim of quantity, but this research is done through online and the most dominant of flouting maxim used by students was flouting maxim of relevance.

Fifthly, the research done by Asri Dwi E.S (2015) under the title "*AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIM IN EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION*" This research aimed at investigating how the conversational implicatures especially flouting maxim are being formed in teacher and students dialog during EFL teaching and learning process. The present study used qualitative approach. The result of this research all of the speakers (teacher and students) are able to observe 4 maxims proposed by Grice. The observance maxim is far more dominating rather than non-observance maxim, the proportion is about 98%. This finding also indicates that in general, all of the speakers did not generate any conversational implicature or the proportion of conversational implicature is small. Moreover, the table above shown that the proportion of non-observance of maxim is only 2%. The table above indicates that majority of the speakers flout maxim of quality and quantity. It also indicates that the speakers fail to provide adequate truthful information or evidence during the conversation. This research has similarities and differences with the researcher's research. The similarity with the researcher is about both of the research discuss about types of flouting maxim. The differences are the source

of data in this research is Classroom interaction, but this research focus on English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar.

Sixthly, the research done by Wahyudi, Yusuf & Lestari (2020) under the title “*Maxim's Flouting: An Analysis of Classroom Interaction*”. The research aimed to find out the types of flouting maxim produced by teachers and students. Furthermore, this study also investigates the effects of maxims flouting to classroom activity. This study implements descriptive qualitative as the method of the study. The result of the study showed that there were four types of maxims flouting produced by the teacher and students during classroom interaction. Moreover, the researchers found four adverse effects of flouting maxim in a classroom activity. This research has similarities and differences with the researcher’s research. The similarity with the researcher is about both of the research discuss about types of flouting maxim. The differences are the source of data in this research is Classroom interaction, but this research focus on English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar. Then, this research also investigates the effects of maxim flouting but this research only focus to find kind of maxim flouting.

Seventhly, the research done by Sunggu & Afriana (2020) under the title “*FLOUTING MAXIMS IN “WONDER WOMAN“ MOVIE*”. The researcher made the research that analyze the flouting maxims in Wonder Woman movie and find the reason why the characters flouted the maxims by using the theory of Grice. This research was qualitative descriptive. This research found The results of the research showed that there were 12 data which were flouting maxims namely 1 data flouting maxim of quality, 2 data flouting maxim quantity, 2 data flouting maxim manner and 7 data were flouting maxim relations. As for some reasons why the casts do flouting maxim aims to entertain the audience even though it is done not a few of the audience knows what is meant in conversation. This research has similarities and differences with the researcher’s research. The similarity with the researcher is about both of the research discuss about types of flouting maxim. The differences are the

source of data in Sunggu & Afriana research is Movie, but this research focus on English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar.

Eighth, the research done by Maryatul Kipya (2019) under the title "*FLOUTING THE MAXIM IN CONVERSATION AT ELLEN DEGENERES SHOW AND THE TONIGHT SHOW STARRING JIMMY FALLON*". The aims of this research are: To find out, to know the strategies and to know politeness principle at Ellen DeGeneres Show and The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon. This research uses qualitative research and descriptive method. This research found the results of the research are found 1) types of flouting maxim used in Ellen DeGeneres Show and The Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon, 2) the strategies to flout the maxim in these talk shows used in this research are Rhetorical strategies which are tautology, overstatement, understatement, metaphor, irony, and rhetorical question, 3) there are seven politeness principles: tact maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, sympathy maxim, consideration maxim, generosity maxim, and praise maxim. This research has similarities and differences with the researcher's research. The similarity with the researcher is about both of the research discuss about types of flouting maxim. The differences are the source of data in Maryatul research is Sho, but this research focus on English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar. Then Maryatul research focus on types, strategies and politeness principles. Meanwhile this research focus on types of flouting maxim on English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar.

Ninth, the research done by Susan Hutapea (2017) under the title "*AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIM IN OPRAH WINFREY SHOW*". The goals of the study are formulated as the following: To find out the maxims that are flouted in Oprah Winfrey Show and To find out the strategies that are used to flout the maxims in Oprah Winfrey Show. This research is conducted by using descriptive qualitative method. This research found The results of the research showed that 1) They are 10 maxims quality, 33 maxims quantity, 10 maxims relation, and 9 maxims manner. Maxim of quantity is

the most dominant maxim that flouted by Winfrey and J.K Rowling. 2) Winfrey and J.K Rowling used the strategies to flout the maxims by giving too much information (10 times), giving too little information (22 times), giving an ambiguous statement (9 times), tautology (1), irony (8 times), changing the topic (8 times) and rhetorical question (4 times). Meanwhile, metaphor, hyperbole, overstatement, understatement, and banter strategy are not used to flout the maxims in Oprah Winfrey Show. This research has similarities and differences with the researcher's research. The similarity with the researcher is about both of the research discuss about types of flouting maxim. The differences are the source of data in Susan research is Show, but this research focus on English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar.

Tenth, the research done by Faridah (2016) under the title "*FLOUTING CONVERSATIONAL MAXIM USED BY MAIN CHARACTERS IN LIE TO ME MOVIE*". There two problems of this study, (1) What types of maxims are flouted by main characters in Lie to Me movie?. (2) What are the reasons of flouting maxims showed by main characters in Lie to Me movie?. This research is conducted by using descriptive qualitative research . This research found The results of the research are: thirty types of flouting maxims which are presented in twelve data. In *Lie to Me*, flouting maxims come with the certain reason. There are some reasons of the main characters uttered flouting maxims. They are to be clear, to save the time, to change the topic, and others. This research have similarities and differences with the researcher's research. The similarity with the researcher is about both of the research discuss about types of flouting maxim. The differences are the source of data in Faridah research is Movie, but this research focus on English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar. Then, in Faridah, she also find the reason of flouting maxim but this research only find types of flouting maxim.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **A. Research Design**

This research was descriptive qualitative research by using content analysis. According to Gay (2009:9) Qualitative research focused on the collection and analysis of non numerical data such as observation, interview, and other more discursive types of data. Then, Gerring (2007) states that descriptive qualitative research uses a natural context as the direct source of data with the researcher acting as the primary instrument. Next, According to Ary (2006:29) content analysis focuses on analyzing and interpreting recorded material within its own context such as public records and textbooks.

Dealing with the theories above, the researcher used descriptive qualitative research by using content analysis to find out the flouting maxims were appeared in English Teaching Department Students during Proposal seminar at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar. Because the researcher analyzed the data in the form of utterances in the English Teaching Department Students during Proposal seminar and also used descriptive study to describe the data.

#### **B. Data and Data Source of the Research**

##### **1. Data of the Research**

The data of the research are the students' utterances that consist of flouting maxim in English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar. The utterances classified into four categories of flouting maxim. Those are: Flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of quality, flouting maxim of relevance and also flouting maxim of manner. In doing interaction, the students, advisor and examiner used three languages, namely English and Indonesia and Minangkabau language.

## **2. Data Source of the Research**

The source of data in this research was 11 documents that consist of some interactions between students, advisor and examiner during Proposal Seminar that conducted by using online platform. The researcher used document that have been taken during English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar. The reason why the research took 11 documents because there are two reasons. First, it can help the researcher easily to analyze the data, because it is take a long time the for analyzing the data. Secondly, only 11 documents were done a proposal seminar in online.

### **C. Technique of Data Collection**

In this research, the main instrument of this research is the researcher herself. As explained by Sugiyono (2018:222) in qualitative research the main instrument is the researcher herself. In this case, the researcher entered the setting to get the data, copied and studied the data, and interpreted the data by herself. Here, the researched collected data start from 22<sup>nd</sup> 13<sup>rd</sup> March-June. In this research, the researcher used supported instruments to analyze kind of flouting maxim that appear in English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar. The supported instruments were video, audio and table theory that containing table categories of student, advisor, student and examiner that related with flouting maxim. It used by the researcher to make the researcher easy to categorize types of flouting maxim that appear in English Teaching Department Students during Proposal seminar.

### **D. Checking the Data Trustworthiness**

Checking the data trustworthiness is very important to do in order to enhance the accuracy of the data. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985:290), the aim of trustworthiness in the qualitative approach is to support the argument that the research findings are able to be trusted. In this research, the researcher chose triangulation in order to check validity of the data. Moleong (2009:330) defines “Triangulation is technique of checking the validity of the data by employing the other data”.



There are three kinds of triangulation as states by Sugiyono (2007:127). First is source triangulation, which is used to test the data trustworthiness by checking data with some sources. Second is technique triangulation, which is used to test the data trustworthiness by checked data with some techniques. The last is time triangulation, which is used to test the data trustworthiness by checked data with some techniques in different times, such as: in the morning, in the afternoon or in the evening. Then, Denzim as cited by Moloeng (2009 : 330) distinguish the four type of triangulation as a technique to check the validity of the data that utilizes the use of sources, methods, investigator, and theory.

In this research, the researcher used time and theory triangulation to check the trustworthiness of the data. The researcher played the recording again in different time. Here, the researcher play the recording first and do transcription, then the researcher play the recording again to make sure the utterances are belong to flouting maxim or not. Next, to interpret the data, the researcher used Grice's cooperative principle theory as the basic theory that supported by Levinson, Leech, Cutting to answer the research questions.

#### **E. Technique of Data Analysis**

This research analyzed the flouting maxim that appears on the English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar based on the video recording and result the transcription. According to Venderstoep and Johnston in Hidayati (2015: 38), the results of qualitative studies are presented in "Data Analysis". Data analysis means working the data that include organizing, classifying, synthesizing, comprehending, and choosing the data that presented to answer the research question. Data analysis is working with data which includes organizing, classifying, synthesizing, understanding the data, and determining the data that presented. In accordance with the definition, the procedures of data analysis in this research were as follows.

1. The researcher identified the raw data to categorize them into the types of maxim flouting.

In this step, the researcher coded the utterances from the video of the English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar. Here the researcher coded the utterance that belong to humor which are : Flouting maxim of Quantity (FQ), Flouting maxim of Quality (FL), Flouting maxim of Relevance (FR), and Flouting maxim of Manner (FM). In addition, there are eleven transcripts of the data from eleven students. So here the researcher also coded each of transcription of the data which “S.1” as the Student 1, “S.2” as the Student 2, “S.3” as the Student 3, “S.4” as the Student 4, “S.5” as the Student 5, “S.6” as the Student 6, “S.7” as the Student 7, “S.8” as the Student 8, “S.9” as the Student 9, “S.10” as the Student 10, and “S.11” as the Student 11. Then, “LE” as the lecturer examiner, “LA” as the lecturer advisor and “M” as the moderator.

Then, the researcher code the utterances of each student that containing of flouting maxim with “FQ/ 1” as flouting quantity 1, “FL/ 1” as flouting quality 1, “FR/ 1” as flouting relevance. Here, the researcher code the utterances start from the student until the end (see appendix 1, page 63).

2. The researcher analyzed the pursued data in order to answer the problem formulation.

In this step, the researcher analyzed the flouting maxim that appears in the English Teaching Department Students during Proposal Seminar at UIN Mahmud Yunus Batusangkar. Here, the researcher make the table categorize and analysis of the utterances after coding each students' utterances. Then, the researcher made conclusion of the result from the data that have been reduced in table. The researcher display the data with tables give the description that given the interpretation from the data that found (see appendix 2, page 124).

3. The researcher checked the accuracy of the analyzed data by checking the data trustworthiness.

In this step, the researcher checked the data of trustworthiness by using time and theory triangulation.

4. The researcher made the conclusion based on the findings.

Finally, after the researcher got the result of the data. The researcher make the conclusion.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

#### A. Research Findings

This chapter discusses about the finding of the research about an analysis of flouting maxim used by students during proposal seminar. They were collected in the form of transcription during proposal seminar happened. The data consisted of three languages, namely English, Indonesia and Minangkabau language.

Based on the data analysis that the researcher found in the utterances of the students during Proposal Seminar. There were three types of flouting maxims. They were flouting of quantity maxim, flouting of quality maxim, flouting of relevance maxim. To be brief, the research finding is shown in the table below:

**Table 2. Total and Categories of Flouting Maxim**

No	Flouting Maxim Categorize	Total Frequency	Percentage
1	Flouting Maxim of Quantity	33	36%
2	Flouting Maxim of Quality	17	19%
3	Flouting Maxim of Relevance	41	45%
4	Flouting Maxim of Manner	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>91</b>	<b>100</b>

Furthermore, to make it clear, those findings are described one by one elaborately, as follows:

#### 1. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Flouting maxim of quantity occur when a speaker blatantly give more or less information. Cutting (2002 :37) states that “the speaker who flouts the maxim quantity sees to give too little or too much information. It means that the speaker may give information not as it requires.

In the video transcription that the researcher analyzed, she found 33 excerpts of utterance that flout the quantity maxim.(See Appendix 2 ,

page 124). Here some flouting of maxim quantity that appears in the video transcription:

**Table 3. Sample of Flouting Maxim of Quantity**

Student	Actor	Utterances
1	L.E	Well,, regarding the teacher who teaches,,of course we also give an information. The teacher who teaches this,, is teacher A says the teacher symbolized by A or B, either X or Y, I don't know what,, teaches in this class,, he teaches in this class. The school is here as a research setting right, okay, who is the research informant?
	S.1	<u>The student sir</u>
	L.E	Which student?
	S.1	The student grade see,, ten IPK and MIA sir
	L.E	How many students all?
	S.1	34 sir

The context of excerpt student 1 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 21<sup>th</sup> April 2022 in question answer section in minute 32.20. The examiner asked the student about who is the research informant. The student answer “*The student*”. Then, the examiner asked again “*Which student?*”. And then he asked again “*how many students all?*”. Here, the student gave less information. Naturally, the student should response about who is the informant with good enough information. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quantity .So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she didn’t understand about the examiner’s question. Eventually, the session was not run smoothly because the student didn’t make her explanation just now in her proposal, Thus the examiner still asked questions to the student.

2	L.E	If in journal, it should make who is the expert,, because here micro teaching is a training technique, we know that micro teaching is one of the programs right? Actually you already explain it in paragraph one,,why do you repeat again,,the teach aa the skill in teaching suggest opening skills, what does opening mean here? opening? Opening skill
	S.2	<u>Yes miss, in micro there are some skills miss.</u>

The context of excerpt student 2 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 30<sup>th</sup> Maret 2022 in question answer section in minute 20.51. The examiner confirmed the student whether it is opening skill or not. The student gave more information by saying “*Yes miss, in micro there are some skills miss.*” Naturally, the student should answer yes or no, as she expected. But, the student gave more information about in micro there are some skill that the examiner didn’t need it. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quantity .So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she want to make her examiner know that she know about skill in micro.

3	L.E	No, right,, that's why the strategy must allow extroverts to get a portion, you have to mention it here, that's why there are introverts and extroverts who mix here, for example, what do you offer, what are the strategies here that you see this is the extrovert...
	S.3	<u>There are many things in some of those articles sir</u>

The context of excerpt student 3 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 26<sup>th</sup> Maret 2022 in question answer section in minute 18.30. The examiner asked the student about the strategy that the student will see in extrovert. The student gave less information by saying “*There are many things in some of those articles*”. Naturally, the student should give the explanation what’s the strategy. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quantity . So it drew the implied meaning that he flouted the maxim because he didn’t remember what’s the strategy in the article. Eventually, the examiner not satisfied with the answer so he try to discuss it with the student.

5	L.E	What is the test like?
	S.5	<u>The test oo is about the material of punctuation miss</u>
	L.E	No! What is the test like? Because you didn't provide the information clearly in chapter 3, what is

		the test like? To find out what students ability will you do? There is no information how to collect the data in chapter three,,ya so I don't know oo how you collect aa the data about this. No informations so I am asking you now, please tell me aa how will you get the data about the students ability ?
--	--	--

The context of excerpt student 5 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 23<sup>th</sup> Maret 2022 in question answer section in minute 16.17. The examiner clarify that if the student want to conduct about student abiliy, it means that it will use a test. Then, the student answered yes. After that, the examiner asked what the test is like. The student asnwered “*The test oo is about the material of punctuation miss.*”. Then, the examiner asked again. “*No, What is the test like?..* Here, the student gave less information, she didn’t tell what kind of the test in detail. Naturally, the student should explain the test is like. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quantity . So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she didn’t know the test that she will use in her research. Finally, the session was not run smoothly because the student could not give the response as needed by the examiner.

<b>6</b>	L.E	Aaa once you talk about qualitative, you must be able to dict and elaborate the current phenomena yaa. No matter, whether you have aa tallk about aa the previous a research, anyway the real phenomena should be explain deeply. Jadi belum ada disini. Pertanyannya semester berapa orang tu PL misalnya?
	S.6	<u>Ooo yang kemaren pak. Setahun yang lalu pak</u>
	L.E	Berapa?
	S.6	Setahun yang lalu pak, oo tepatnya
	L.E	Semester berapa mereka PL tu?
	S.6	Oo semester 7 pak.

The context of excerpt student 6 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 28<sup>th</sup> Maret 2022 in question answer section in minute 13.44. The examiner asked the student about what semester the students did PL? The student answered “ *Ooo yesterday*

*sir, a year ago sir*". Then, the examiner asked "How?". The student answered "A year ago exactly". Here, the student gave less information. He didn't mention a year ago means is semester 7. Naturally, the student should directly answer what semester as needed by the examiner. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quantity .So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because he didn't understand the question from the examiner. Eventually, the session was not run smoothly because the student didn't give the information that needed by the examiner as well.

## 2. Flouting Maxim of Quality

According to Thomas (1995: 67). The interlocutors can be mentioned flouts the maxim of quality when she/he implies the information which it is not suitable with the fact. Flouts which exploit the maxim of quality occur when the speaker says something which blatantly untrue or for which she/he lacks adequate evidence.

In the video transcription that the researcher analyzed, she found 17 excerpts of utterance that flout the quantity maxim. (See Appendix 2 , page 135). Here some flouting of maxim quantity that appears in the video transcription

**Table 4. Sample of Flouting Maxim of Quality**

Student	Actor	Utterances
1	L.E	Random? How many aa how many sampling strategies can be used in qualitative research?
	S.1	<u>Random sampling,, purposive sampling</u>

The context of excerpt student 1 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 21<sup>th</sup> April 2022 in question answer section in minute 33.18. The examiner asked the student about how many sampling strategy in qualitative research. The student answered "Random sampling, purposive sampling." The student gave untrue response that Random sampling is not part of sampling strategy in qualitative research. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quality .So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the



maxim because she didn't know well about sampling strategy in qualitative research.. Eventually, the examiner could not get the response as he expected.

<b>2</b>	L.E	The last,, is bibliography, try to refer or you read the previous research, if it journal what should be italicized, if unpublishes thesis should be italicized, if book what should be italicized. some are correct but others, so inconsistent. So I'm not sure if it was RI that made it or what, did you take it from other people's research,so that part of what you mean is the biliography, yeah, it's partly right, the way you made the bibliography is partly wrong. So if the bibliography is from journals what should be italicized?
	S.2	<u>The title Miss</u>

The context of excerpt student 2 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 30<sup>th</sup> April 2022 in question answer section in minute 37.15. The examiner asked the student if the bibliography is from journal. What should be italicized. The student answered “*The title miss*”.Here, The student gave blantly untrue response that if the bibliography is from journal it is not the title should be italicized, but the name of journal exactly. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quality .So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she didn't understand well about how to make bibliography from journal and others. Eventually, the examiner remind the student to read it again.

<b>3</b>	L.E	People or students it can be start yaa,, students are being sociable is the correct one yaa,, lovely in passive seeking novelty, I ask you what does it mean by seeking novelty here?
	S.3	<u>Aaa seeking novelty here means like seeking attention sir</u>

The context of excerpt student 3 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 26<sup>th</sup> Maret 2022 in question answer section in minute 22.48. The examiner checked the student's comprehension about what does it mean by seeking novelty here. The

student answered “*Aaa seeking novelty here means like seeking attention sir*”. Here, The student gave blantly untrue response that seeking novelty in bahasa means “*mencari kebararuan*”not mencari perhatian. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quality .So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she didn’t know what seeking novelty it is. Eventually, the examiner give more explanation about seeking novelty to the student.

<b>4</b>	L.E	How long the informant that you will interview did research presentation in online?
	S.4	<u>Daah oh maybe aaa one year sir.</u>

The context of excerpt student 4 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 22<sup>th</sup> Maret 2022 in question answer section in minute 08.06. The examiner asked to the student about how long the informant that she will interview did research presentation in online. The student answered “*Daah oh maybe aa one year sir*”. Here, The student gave unsure response, so she lack of evidence Naturally, the student should answer it confidently without using word maybe. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quality .So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she couldn’t make sure how long the student present their research in online. Eventually, the examiner confused about the answer from the student.

<b>11</b>	L.E	Why these seminars? Why is there an s in the seminar, T? What does it mean?
	S.11	<u>Oo because it is more than one people ma’am</u>

The context of excerpt student 11 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 10<sup>th</sup> June 2022 in question answer section in minute 07.32. The examiner clarified to the student that why there is a in seminars. The student answered “*Ooo because it is more than one people ma’am*”. Here, The student gave the untrue response. Actually adding s in this seminar it is not relation with more than one people. Naturally, the student said it is adding s because it is related with

more than one situation seminar such as proposal seminar and seminar in general. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of quality. So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she didn't comprehend well the adding of s after seminar here. Eventually, the examiner could not sure about the answer from the students and the examiner give some clues to help the student in answering the true answer.

### 3. Flouting Maxim of Relevance

According to Thomas (1995:70). The maxim of relevance (be relevant) is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand. So the speaker flouts the maxim of relation when she/she does not given a response within the topic which is being discussed.

In the video transcription that the researcher analyzed, she found 41 excerpts of utterance that flout the quantity maxim.(See Appendix 2, page 141). Here some flouting of maxim quantity that appears in the video transcription.

**Table 5. Sample of Flouting Maxim of Relevance**

Student	Actor	Utterances
1	L.E	How many kinds of qualitative research do you know?
	S.1	<u>What sir?</u>

The context of excerpt student 1 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 21<sup>th</sup> April 2022 in question answer section in minute 29.15. The examiner asked to the student about how many kinds of qualitative research do you know. The student answered "*What sir?*". Here, The student gave unmatched response by asked again to her examiner. Naturally, she should give response like as I know there 6 kinds of qualitative research. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of relevance. So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she could not know exactly how many

kinds of qualitative research. Eventually, the examiner could not get what he needed.

<b>2</b>	L.E	If the quantity it must be like that, right, used a questionnaire, why is it because I want to know the perception or perspective. Is perception is a perspective?
	S.2	<u>The result of thinking from someone miss</u>

The context of excerpt student 2 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 30<sup>th</sup> Maret 2022 in question answer section in minute 13.11. The examiner tested the student comprehension about the meaning of perception. The examiner said Is perception is perspective or not. The student answered “*The result of thinking from someone miss*”. Here, The student gave irrelevant response. Actually, the examiner needed the response Yes/No as she expected. Naturally, she should Yes/No response. She shouldn’t response the another answer. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of relevance. So it drew the implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she didn’t know the differences between perception and perspective so she only want to deliver what she think about perception. Eventually, the examiner could not get the information as she needed.

<b>4</b>	L.E	Yes, the reason is indeed research, why should be a case study, how about it is not a case study?
	S.4	<u>No</u>

The context of excerpt student 4 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 22<sup>th</sup> Maret 2022 in question answer section in minute 03.40. The examiner asked to the student how about that research not case study. The student answered “*No*” Here, The student gave irrelevant response. The examiner needed the reason why this study should be case study, how about not case study. Naturally, she should give response if this study don’t use case study this research will blablabla. The student can answer based on her observation. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of relevance. So it drew the

implied meaning that she flouted the maxim because she could not know well why she use case study. Eventually, the examiner didn't get the reason why she use a case study.

<b>6</b>	L.E	The theories aa explaining about the problem is not enough. See page sixteen, how many theories that you cite about the problem from the expert.
	S.6	<u>Problem in online learning sir?</u>

The context of excerpt student 6 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 28<sup>th</sup> Maret 2022 in question answer section in minute 12.40. The examiner asked to the student about how many theories that he cite about the problem from the expert. The student answered "*Problem in Online Learning Sir?*" Here, The student gave irrelevant response by asking back to the examiner. The examiner needed the response about how many theories. . Naturally, the student should mention it directly in a number Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of relevance. So it drew the implied meaning that he flouted the maxim because he didn't know the answer and still want to cooperate by asking them back.

<b>9</b>	L.E	This is a new term in research, including for myself. So that's why I asked you. The researcher used, this is use past tense right, it should will be. Focus group interview, what does it mean by focus group interview?
	S.9	<u>Oo from, based on the theory above sir, there are several kinds of research design sir, so there are a structure, open ended, individual on or focus group interview sir. so in my research sir, use focus group interview sir</u>
	L.E	Why focus group interview, what is it like?

The context of excerpt student 9 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 13<sup>th</sup> June 2022 in question answer section in minute 05.51. The examiner clarified the student about what does it mean by focus group interview. The student answered "*Based on the theory above sir, there are several kinds of research design sir, so there are a structure, open ended, individual on or focus group*

*interview sir. so in my research sir, use focus group interview”* Here, The student gave irrelevant response by giving long response that not explain about what is focus group interview. The examiner needed the student to give the explanation about what does it mean by focus group interview. Naturally, the student should answer focus group interview is. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of relevance. So it drew the implied meaning that he flouted the maxim because she didn’t know well about focus group interview. Eventually, the examiner couldn’t get the information what he needed.

<b>10</b>	L.E	Yes what is the difference. What is the difference with the oo offline?
	S.10	<i>(The student silent) Different sir</i>

The context of excerpt student 10 was between an examiner and a student happened during proposal seminar at 13<sup>th</sup> June 2022 in question answer section in minute 21.53. The examiner asked to the student “*Yes, what is the difference with offline?*”. The student answered “*Different sir*” Here, The student gave irrelevant response by repeat the word different as the response. The examiner needed the student to explain what is the difference with offline. Naturally, the student should answer the different aree blabla. Therefore, In this utterance the student was flouting maxim of relevance. So it drew the implied meaning that he flouted the maxim because he could not understand what examiner’s question. Eventually, the examiner could not get the explanation as he needed from the student.

## **B. Discussion**

The research finding shows that there are three types of flouting maxim found during proposal seminar. They are: flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of quality, and flouting maxim of relevance. From the analysis, the researcher found that there are 91 utterances that flouted by students. Those are 33 flouting maxim of quantity (36%), 17 flouting maxim of quality (19%) and 41 flouting maxim of relevance (45%).

The most frequent is flouting maxim of relevance. Its frequency is 41(45%). This result almost reached 50% of utterances of flouting maxim. As states by Thomas (1995:70) The maxim of relevance is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic in hand. This happened when the students during proposal seminar gave unmatched and irrelevant response to the examiner's question. Here, the students unfulfill a maxim, but they still cooperate in that conversation. The students must answer the examiner's question because in seminar proposal they should give some informations, clarifications, and confirmations to their examiner. Thus, when they didn't comprehend the question or they didn't know how to answer the examiner's question, the students tend to flout the maxim of relevance. As the result, the students gave some irrelevant response to change the subject of the conversation. They thought it could minimize their failure in answering the questions.

Furthermore, this research has similarity from research that analyzed by Siti Arofah (2021) in *English Teaching and Learning Process* that the dominant maxim flouted is also flouting maxim of relevance. This maxim appears the most because the student did not answer with relevant answers according to the topic. In that reseach, some reasons of changing topic are avoiding answering questions or topics and failing to maintain the topic of conversation. Based on the previous research, it is line with this research that flouting maxim of relevance frequent happened when the student want to change the topic in a conversation to avoid answering the questions.

Then, for the second position is flouting maxim of quantity. Its frequency is 33(36%). As stated by Cutting (2002: 37) Flouting maxim of quantity occur when a speaker blatantly give too little or too much information. This maxim happened when the students during proposal seminar didn't give the required information as needed by the examiner whether they give less or more information. The students here as a participants of seminar proposal, they must have enough knowledge to be shared. Giving too much information is a way to show they comprehension about their proposal and convince the

examiner they can do the research well. On the other hand, giving too little information is done because they have lack of knowledge about their proposal so that they couldn't answer the examiner's question as informative as possible. Thus, they want to cooperate in examiner's question by giving the information that they just know a little about the answer of the questions. This is one way the students done to maintain their proposal during proposal seminar.

Furthermore, this research also has similarity from research that analyzed by Wahyudi, Yusuf & Lestari (2020) in *Classroom Interaction* that the dominant maxim flouted is also flouting maxim of quantity. This maxim appears frequent because the student does not contribute as required, giving too little information, giving too much information. Based on the previous research, it is line with this research that flouting maxim of quantity frequent happened when the student gave too little information and much information.

Well, the third position, there is flouting maxim of quality that frequency is 17(19%). According to Thomas (1995: 67) The interlocutors can be mentioned flouts the maxim of quality when she/he implies the information which it is not suitable with the fact. Flouts which exploit the maxim of quality occur when the speaker says something which blatantly untrue or for which she/he lacks adequate evidence. This maxim is the lowest rank than the previous maxim of flouting. This maxim happened when the students during proposal seminar gave untrue response because the students lack of evidence in answering the examiner's question. When the examiner want tested and checked the student's comprehension about some points in their proposal, the students try cooperate, they try to give the answer but they didn't know the answer was wrong. The context is in english proposal seminar where all of the students are expected to give an true answer, but when the students who as participant in proposal seminar flouting the maxim of quality, it was obvious which at that time, they are still want to cooperate and convince the examiner.

Furthermore, this research also has similarity from research that analyzed by Wahyudi, Yusuf & Lestari (2020) in *Classroom Interaction* that the less



maxim flouted is flouting maxim of quality. This maxim appears less frequent because the speaker he didn't tell the truth and not supported by evidence, then student saying something that is not true. Based on the previous research, it is line with this research that flouting maxim of quality happened because the student gave the blantly untrue response with lack of evidence.

Here, there is no maxim of manner was flouted. According to Cutting (2002 :39), those who flout the maxim of manner may appear to be obscure. This maxim was not flout by the english students because during a proposal seminar, the student fulfill maxim of manner. It means that in proposal seminar the student didn't use ambiguous language which make the examiner confused about the questions that he/she asked. The context of proposal seminar is in english proposal seminar where all of the students are expected to give a clear answer. So the student try to answer the examiner's question by not using ambiguous language in order to avoid misunderstanding in the proposal seminar.

Furthermore, this research also has similarity from research that analyzed by Siti Arofah (2021) in *English Teaching and Learning Process* that None of the floutings of the maxim of manner was found. The previous research line with this research that there is no flouting maxim happened. This might happened because the context is in academic setting so the context is formal. As a result, it possible to the student didn't try to exclude a third party and use ambiguous word.

It is different with the previous study from Gustary (2018) that found the dominant maxim flouted was flouting maxim of manner. That research is in Mata Najwa Talkshow "Gengsi Merebut Kursi". Meanwhile flouting maxim of relevance was less frequent flouted.

It can be concluded that there are three types of flouting maxim used by students during proposal seminar and the frequently maxim flouted was maxim of relevance. The conclusion is the dominant maxim that can be flouted in communication is depend on what situation or the places that the speaker faced at that time. So, it is very important to know what is flouting

maxim because it is very useful for examiner and also students to avoid misunderstanding when asking, answering or giving the information during proposal seminar.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

#### A. Conclusion

Based on the data description and data analysis, it can be concluded that among the four types of flouting maxim, there are three types of the flouting maxims happened during the proposal seminar in academic year 2021/2022. They are flouting maxim of quantity, flouting maxim of quality, and flouting maxim of relevance. There were 91 utterances of flouting maxim.

Furthermore, it was found that there were 91 utterances indicating as flouting maxims. The most frequent flouting maxim is flouting maxim of relevance with 41 (45%) utterances. Then, for second position is flouting maxim of quantity with 33 (36%) utterances. Next, it follows by the flouting maxim of quality with 17 (19%) utterances.

#### B. Suggestion

Based on the result of the research, the researcher give some suggestions as follows:

##### 1. Lecturer

From the result of the research, it found that flouting maxim of relevance is the most frequent happened. This happen when the student didn't know the answer and didn't understand what examiner's question. So, the researcher suggest to the lecturer especially when she/he as a examiner in online proposal seminar to give the question more clear and brief. Beside that, it also hoped that the lecturer can interact with their students well and avoid the possibility to happens flouting maxim in the proposal seminar.

##### 2. English Student

Based on the result of the research, the maxim relevance is the most flouted by te students. This happen when the student didn't know the answer, didn't understand what examiner's question and felt nerveous. So, the researcher suggest to the students to prepare more before doing

proposal. Then, it hope to the student to keep focus when listened the examiner's question. Beside that, the student need to increase the pragmatic competence so they can follow the rule in interaction and understand the meaning behind the utterances well.

### 3. Next Researcher

For the next researcher, the researcher suggest to conduct a research about the students' strategies to flout maxim during proposal seminar.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alharthi, Adel Awadh A. (2016). *Challenges and Strategies of Subtitling Humour: A Case Study of the American Sitcom Seinfeld, with Particular Reference to English and Arabic*. Doctoral Thesis. Manchester: University of Salford.
- <https://search.proquest.com/openview/e47745ca83939fb3a6b7b7175fd9e71d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2026366&diss=y>
- Arofah, S., & Mubarak, H. (2021). An Analysis of Violation and Flouting Maxim on Teacher-Students Interaction in English Teaching and Learning Process. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 15 (2), 249–256. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lc.v15i2.28148>
- Bilal, H. A., & Naeem, S. (2013). Probing into the Dialogue of the President of Pakistan: Application of Grice's Maxims. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 5(4), 1.
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, G & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by Principles : An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (Second). New York: Longman.
- Byrne. (1984). *Teaching Oral English*. New Jersey: Longman Group Ltd.
- 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.
- Chubra, F. (2015). *An Analysis of Flouting Maxims Found in English Classroom Interaction*. Batusangkar: State Islamic College.
- Cruse, A. (2006). *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269107473\\_What\\_is\\_governance/li](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269107473_What_is_governance/li)

- nk/548173090cf22525dcb61443/download%0Ahttp://www.econ.upf.edu/~reynal/Civilwars\_12December2010.pdf%0Ahttps://thinkasia.org/handle/11540/8282%0Ahttps://www.jstor.org/stable/41857625
- Dagarin, M. (2004). Classroom interaction and communication strategies in learning English as a foreign language. *English Language and Literature Teaching*, 1 (2), 127-139.
- Englehart, J. M. (2009). Teacher-Student Interaction. *International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching*, 711–722.
- Erlinda, R. (2019). Introduction to English Pragmatics: Applying Research-Based Learning Model. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group
- E.S, A. D. (2015). An Analysis of Flouting Maxim in EFL Classroom Interaction. *Journal Vision*, 4(2), 243–259. <https://doi.org/10.21580/vjv4i21592>
- Eisenring, M. A. M. (2019). The Importance of Teacher – Students Interaction in Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). *Prasasti: Journal of Linguistics*, 4(1), 46–54. <https://doi.org/10.20961/prasasti.v4i1.17052>
- Faridah. (2016). *FLOUTING CONVERSATIONAL MAXIM USED BY MAIN CHARACTERS IN LIE TO ME MOVIE* [UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim]. <https://www.infodesign.org.br/infodesign/article/view/355%0Ahttp://www.abergo.org.br/revista/index.php/ae/article/view/731%0Ahttp://www.abergo.org.br/revista/index.php/ae/article/view/269%0Ahttp://www.abergo.org.br/revista/index.php/ae/article/view/106>
- Gay, L.R. (2000). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (Sixth)*. New Jersey: Merrill Publishing Company
- Gay, L. R. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications (9th)*. New Jersey: Merrill Pearson Education
- Gerring, J. (2007). *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics*, vol 3: Speech Act. New York: Academic Press: <https://doi.org/10.2307/324613>
- Grundy, P. (2013). *Doing Pragmatics (third)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203784310>

- Gustary, D. T., & Dikramdhanie, M. (2018). The Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Mata Najwa's Talkshow Gengsi Merebut Kursi. *Biomatika Jurnal Ilmiah FKIP Universitas Subang*, 4(1), 1–8.
- Helmie, J., & Lestary, 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. *Jurnal JOEPALLT (Journal of English Pedagogy, Linguistics, Literature, and Teaching)*, 7(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.35194/jj.v7i1.537>
- Herawati, A. (2013). The Cooperative Principle Is Grice's Theory Suitable To Indonesian Language Culture. *Jurnal Lingua Cultural*. 43-48
- Hidayat, A. (2016). Speech Acts: Force Behind Words. *Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 1-12.
- Hidayati, L. H. W. (2015). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting Done By The Main Characters in the Devil Wears Prada*. Yogyakarta State University.
- Huang, Y. (2007). *Pragmatics* (Series (ed.)). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783095001-007>
- Hutapea, S. (2017). *an Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Oprah Winfrey Show*. Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Jay, Timothy B. (2003). *The Psychology of Language*. New Jersey: Pearson Education,
- Kipya, M. (2019). *Flouting the Maxim in Conversation At Ellen Degeneres Show and the Tonight Show Starring Jimmy Fallon* [UIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin]. <https://doi.org/10.30631/nazharat.v25i2.18>
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman Inc. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-74564-5\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-74564-5_12)
- Lestari, D. E. (2017). Teaching Pragmatics to Indonesian Learners of English Disa. *METATHESIS*, 1(2), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Lincoln, S. Y. and Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage

## Publications.

- LoCastro, V. (2012). *Pragmatics for Language Educators: A Sociolinguistic Perspective*. New York: Routledge <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203850947>
- Maulinawati, R. (2018). *Flouting Maxims In Central Intelligence Movie Script*. Jakarta: State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah.
- Mey, J.L. (2001). *Pragmatics : An introduction (Second)*. Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429451072-1>
- Moleong. (2009). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosda Karya
- Nurcholis, I. A., Angraini, R., Safitri, W., & Putriami, E. (2020). the Flouting Maxims on English Students ' Proposal Seminar in English Education. *Voice of English Learners, 1(2)*, 121–135.
- O'Keeffe, A., Clancy, B., & Adolphs, S. (2011). *Introducing Pragmatics in Use*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203830949>
- Op.Sunggu, E. J., & Afriana. (2020). Flouting Maxims in “Wonder Woman“ Movie. *Linguistic, English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal, 4(1)*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v4i1.1394>
- Rachel, R. (2016). TEACHER-STUDENTS'INTERACTION PATTERNS IN ENGLISH CLASS FOR THE TENTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMA NEGERI 1 MENGKENDEK. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language Overseas Journal, 4(1)*, 29-47. <http://ukitoraja.ac.id/journals/index.php/ojtefl/article/download/250/212>
- Rowe, B. M. & D. P. Levine. (2006). *A Concise Introduction to Linguistics*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Subakir, A. (2017). Concept of Educational Interaction in Education: in Sociological Perspective. *Didaktika Religia, 5(2)*, 381–400. <https://doi.org/10.30762/didaktika.v5i2.867>
- Sugiyono. (2018). *Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2007). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.



- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: Introduction to Pragmatics*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Thomas, J. (2013). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London and New York: Routledge  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269107473\\_What\\_is\\_governance/link/548173090cf22525dcb61443/download%0Ahttp://www.econ.upf.edu/~reynal/Civilwars\\_12December2010.pdf%0Ahttps://thinkasia.org/handle/11540/8282%0Ahttps://www.jstor.org/stable/41857625](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/269107473_What_is_governance/link/548173090cf22525dcb61443/download%0Ahttp://www.econ.upf.edu/~reynal/Civilwars_12December2010.pdf%0Ahttps://thinkasia.org/handle/11540/8282%0Ahttps://www.jstor.org/stable/41857625)
- Venderstoep, S.W. and Johnston, D. D. (2009). *Research Methods for Everyday Life: Blending Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wahyudi, A., Yusuf, S., & Lestari, Z. W. (2020). Maxim's Flouting: An Analysis of Classroom Interaction. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, 4(2), 219–231.  
<https://pesquisa.bvsalud.org/portal/resource/en/mdl20203177951%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0887-9%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41562-0200884z%0Ahttps://doi.org/10.1080/13669877.2020.1758193%0Ahttp://serisc.org/journals/index.php/IJAST/article>
- Wyner, L., & Cohen, A. D. (2015). Second language pragmatic ability: Individual differences according to environment. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(4), 519–556. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssl.2015.5.4.2>
- Yuliasman, C. (2015). *An Analysis of Flouting Maxim In The English Debate*. Batusangkar: State Islamic Collage.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language Fourth Edition*. Amerika: Cambridge University Press
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press