Maxim's Flouting: An Analysis of Classroom Interaction

Abdi Wahyudi
Universitas Islam Nusantara
Abdiwahyudi1995@gmail.com
Suhendra Yusuf
suhendrayusuf@gmail.com
Zubaedah Wiji Lestari
zubaedah.wijilestari@gmail.com
Correspondence email: zubaedah.wijilestari@gmail.com

Abstract

This study focused on analyzing the maxim flouting between the teacher and students of XI IPS in SMA PGRI 2 Bandung during classroom interaction. The objective of this study was 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. There are five instruments used in this study; those are observation checklist, field note, the script of recorded video, questionnaire, and interview. 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.

Keywords: flouting maxim, classroom interaction, cooperative principle

Introduction

Communication, specifically language, is used for many purposes. It uses for socializing, expressing a feeling, sharing knowledge and ideas, maintaining good relationships with others, and others related to human interaction in life. Brown (2001) said that to get experience in English communication, they need to interact regularly using the target language since the interaction is the heart of communication. In a language classroom, interaction plays a significant role in that it is both the medium through which learning realized and an object of pedagogical attention (Hall & Walsh: 2002). Through the interactions among the class member, students create mutual understanding and relationships. Sometimes the interaction between teacher and students does not run smoothly because not all students' responses answer the

teacher's questions. Moreover, it makes the students trapped in a misunderstanding situation.

Grice (1975) in Yule (2010) states that in conversation, sometimes the participants are not always cooperative with each other, and sometimes they are flouting the rules or maxims for specific reasons. Behind the utterances in which maxim flouting occurs, there are some hidden meanings and specific purposes that tries to be conveyed by the speaker. The maxims are a maxim of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. In this sense, there is a violation between students and teachers in gaining interaction.

A Cooperative principle is a fundamental principle in pragmatics in which people demanded to make their conversation as cooperative as possible, in line with the purpose of the conversation (Yule, 2010). This principle resulted from the common assumption about communication as a cooperative effort. In this principle, there are four sub-principles called maxims, which provide more detailed principles of conversational cooperation (Grice: 1989 in Meyer: 2009; Grundy, 2000). The maxims are a maxim of quantity, a maxim of quality, a maxim of relation, and a maxim of manner (Grice: 1989).

The maxim of quantity, according to Grice (1989) (as cited in Meyer, 2009): First, make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange) and Second, do not make your contribution more informative than is required. The maxim of quality, according to Grice (1989) (as cited in Meyer, 2009): First, do not say what you believe to be false, and second, do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. According to Grice (1975) (as cited in Yule, 2010): the maxim of relation should be relevant. The maxim of manner, according to Grice (1989) (as cited in Meyer, 2009): first, should be perspicuous second, avoid obscurity of expression third, avoid ambiguity fourth, be brief and fifth, be orderly. The point of this maxim is that be orderly and clear.

Grice (1975) in Yule (2010) states that in conversation, sometimes the participants are not always cooperative with each other, and sometimes they are flouting the rules or maxims for specific reasons. Those flouting maxims are as follows. (1) Flouting of Maxim Quantity. This violating means the speaker gives too much information or a lack of information (Rost, 2011; Syafryadin, et al, 2020). Example of violating this maxim: (2) Flouting of Maxim Quality. When a speaker flouts a maxim of quality, the speaker says

something that does not represent what he or she thinks (Rost, 2011). According to (Rost, 2011) this is the example of violation/flouting maxim of quality: The teacher believes the son will not be accepted based on evidence of his performance but says the contrary. (3) Flouting of Maxim Relation According to (Rost, 2011) relevance maxim flouting means that the speakers of a conversation fail to be relevant in communicating. (4) Flouting of Maxim Manner. When a speaker is ambiguous, not transparent, not brief, perspicuous (ambiguous), and orderly in saying things (Rost, 2011). However, on some occasions, ambiguity indeed happens whether the speaker intends to make it or not. Then, the maxim of manner has not fulfilled a result. An example of the manner maxim flouting presented in the following dialog:

The existence of these maxims flouting investigated in the English teaching process during classroom interaction between the teacher and students. Interaction occurs every day in the classroom between the teacher and students in language learning, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) as cited in Hall (2003) described what they found to be the basic unit of classroom interaction that is three-part sequential IRE (information, response, evaluation) exchange. Interaction in the classroom also categorized as the pedagogic interaction, which means the interaction in the teaching and learning process (Sarody et al. 2006). According to Dagarin (2014), classroom interaction is "a two ways process between the participants and the teacher in the language process, and it influences the learners ."

Based on the background above, this study tries to answer the following questions; what type of maxims that flouted by the teacher and students during classroom interaction?. Moreover, this study investigated the effects of maxim flouting used to classroom interaction.

Research Methodology

This study used descriptive qualitative as the method of the study, where the study tends to describe and explain a phenomenon found by the writer during the study. In this study, the writer tries to find out the types of maxim flouting produced by the teacher and students during classroom interaction of the English teaching-learning process and also to find the effects of its violating toward the classroom. The subjects of the study are the teacher and students of XI IPS in SMA PGRI 2 Bandung. In collecting

the data, the writer used observation, field notes, recording, questionnaires, and interviews. In analyzing the data, the writer conducted some steps to answer both of the research questions, transcribing the video recording into a script, analyzing the maxim flouting through the script, and video recording, classifying the maxim flouting into its types. Besides, the writer also analyzed the data of observation, field notes, and questionnaires by interpreting it into a paragraph and transcribe it in the form of conversation and interpreting it into a paragraph.

Findings and Discussions

In this part, the writers would like to present and explain the result of the study.
After collecting the data of the study and analyzing them systematically, the writer found that the teacher and students flouted all four maxims during English classroom interaction. The table below shows the classification of maxims flouting which produced by the teacher and students during classroom interaction.

Table 1. Types of Maxim Flouted by Teacher and Students

No	The Types of Flouting Maxim	Data		Total Frequency	Percentage
		First Meeting	Second Meeting		
1	Quantity	19 utterances	12 utterances	31	53%
2	Quality	6 utterances	5 utterances	11	19%
3	Relevant	10 utterances	3 utterances	13	22%
4	Manner	2 utterances	1 utterances	3	6%
Total				58	100%

Note: $\frac{Total\ frequency}{Total} \times 100$

Table 1 shows the types of maxim flouting by the teacher and student in percentage. The total number of maxims that flouted by the teacher and students is 58 times. Based on the data, 31 utterances flouted the maxim of quantity or around 53%, flouting of maxim quality with 11 utterances or around 19%, flouting of maxim relevant with 13 utterances or around 22%, then flouting of maxim manner with three utterances or

around 6%. Based on the data above, the most dominant maxim that flouted by the teacher and students is the maxim of quantity with the total number is 31 utterances or around 53%. Besides, to give additional data, the researcher put some examples of flouting maxims that exist on the utterances between the teacher and students during classroom interaction in Table 2.

Table 2 The Example of Maxim Flouted by The Teacher and Students

No	Types of Flouting Maxims	Times	Data
1	*Quantity*	00.00.01 00.00.03	T: WL what did you study last week WL? S.WL: *(silence)*
		00.06.59 00.07.02	T: The example is? S: *Rangga...**uncompleted answer
		00.07.11 00.07.15 00.07.26	S: Why Agil is being sick (guiding by the teacher) T: Yes. Why agil is being sick. Then, it's become? S: *I don't know*
2	*Quality*	00.03.11 00.03.15	T: We are go straight to example. I have give the formula, right? S: *Have not...have..have..have not..*
		00.09.38 00.10.05 00.10.06 00.10.07 00.10.08	T: Ok. she will study english tomorrow, it is ok. T: Here, "will" become? S.IN: *She will* S: She would S.IN: *Eh..she would*
		00.08.33 00.08.34	T: Do you understand? S: *Yessss...no...yess*
3	*Relevant*	00.03.54 00.03.56	T: when will you..., then? S: *Marry me..**made a joke
		00.06.47 00.06.54 00.06.56 00.06.57	T: So, do you remember the last example? Insan...what should be put first? S: Agil... T: Agil, then? S: *Handsome...* *made a joke
		00.20.58 00.20.59 00.21.01 00.21.04	T: So, the tobe is? S: (did not answer the question) T: Come on, what is it? S.RG: *(sang a pinneapple pen song)*
4	*Manner*	00.01.11 00.01.17	T: Past tense will become? S: *Past ten...se*
		00.11.51 00.11.58	T: What is to be? S.RG: *To be itu t..u..b..e*
		00.20.52 00.20.57	S: *So, the formula is simple persen. right, miss?* T: Simple present not simple persen

Based on Flowerdew (2013), Hadi (2013) and Xin (2015), in line with Rost (2011), there are four types of maxim flouting used by speakers. Those types classified into; flouting of maxim quantity, flouting the maxim of quality, flouting of maxim relevant, flouting of maxim manner. By following Flowerdew and Rost, the writer found that the participants in this study flouted all types of maxim. The description is as follows.

1. Flouting of Maxim Quantity

Based on the script of the recorded video, the writer found the maxim of quantity is flouted 31 times (53%) by the teacher and students during classroom interaction. Here, the teacher and students fail to fulfill the maxim quantity, which requires the speaker to give enough information to the hearer and to be as informative as it required. In some exchanges, the teacher and students have not enough information to flout the maxim quantity. In line with Fatmawati (2014), speakers become less informative or more informative when they flout maxim quantity.

One example, which student WL flouts the maxim of the quantity taken from the following dialog. It is when the teacher asked her a question.

(00.00.01) Teacher: WL, what did You study last week?
(00.00.03) Student WL: .....(did not answer the question)

From the dialog above, the teacher asked the student WL about the study last week to stimulated her students. However, student WL did not give any answer to fulfill her contribution as a participant of conversation. Student WL should respond to her teacher's question by at least saying, "I am sorry Mrs, I did not come to this class last week" or "we are discussing .... last week" or something else. However, in this exchange, student WL did not do that.

In terms of maxim flouting, her utterances flout maxim quantity since it does not contribute as required. In this case, being less informative is the one that makes student WL failed in fulfilling the maxim of quantity.

2. Flouting of Maxim Quality

In line with Rost (2011), when a speaker flouts a maxim of quality, the speaker says something that does not represent what he or she thinks. Fatmawati (2014) also mentions that maxim flouting of quality happens when the speaker is saying something that is believed to be false. This type of maxim found around 11 utterances (19%) during classroom interaction between the teacher and students. Maxim requires speakers to make appropriate contributions. It states what is right according to them and provides adequate evidence. In its occurrences, the maxim of quality violates in various ways by speakers.

One example of this maxim flouting is in the following dialog. It occurred when the teacher asked students about the formula, and then students answered the question with something that is not true.

(00.03.11) Teacher: We are going straight to example. Am I already have given the formula,

right?
(00.03.15) Students: not yet, have yet, have yet, not yet

From the conversation above, we can observe that students stated false statements. They did not sure about the question then answered something that is not true about the condition. In this exchange, the statement from students is not reliable with the real situation. However, in this case, students have flouted the maxim of quality by saying something that is not true.

3. Flouting of Maxim of Relevant

In line with Rost (2011) and Alduais (2012), relevance maxim flouting means that the speakers of a conversation fail to be relevant in communicating. In this maxim flouting, the teacher and students fail to fulfill the maxim of relevance because their answer is irrelevant. This type of maxim flouting happened 13 times or around (22%) of the total 58 maxims flouting.

One example is taken from the conversation between the teacher and students when students being irrelevant in answering the teachers' questions. The dialog as follows.

(00.03.54) Teacher: When will you... then?
*(00.03.56) Students: Marry me..*made a joke*

In this situation, when the teacher asked students about the next word as an example of exercise, students did not give an appropriate response. They intentionally gave an irrelevant answer, which the answer is only a joke. Therefore, students failed to fulfill the maxim of relevance, which requires them to be relevant in the conversation.

4. Flouting of Maxim of Manner

This type of maxim has flouted only three times or around (6%) during classroom interaction between the teacher and students in SMA PGRI 2 Bandung. This maxim is slightly under relevant maxim flouting in its occurrences. In this situation, the maxim of

manner flouted by students. They fail to fulfill the maxim of manner that requires them to be clear, brief, and orderly in stating their utterances.

One of the examples taken is from the conversation between the teacher and students. In the following dialog, students have flouted the maxim of manner.

(00.01.11) Teacher: Past tense will become?
(00.01.17) Students: Past ten...se

In the dialog above, the teacher asked the meaning of "past tense," but students only responded to the question by repeating the word in "past tense." In this situation, the answer from students contains an ambiguity. It means the students flout the manner maxim.

The effects of maxim flouting toward classroom

Based on the analyzing of data questionnaire and interview also supported by observing during the study, the writer found that the effects of flouting maxims which produced by the teacher and students during classroom interaction show negatives. Those adverse effects are; the students become flurry toward the information given by the teacher, the students become not understand the lesson, the class becomes rowdy and noisy, and the teacher becomes ignored. Each negative effect presented and discussed as follows:

1. Flurry Toward the Teacher's Information

The first effect of flouting maxims toward the classroom is that the students become flurry or confusion toward the information given by the teacher. This negative effect has occurred when the teacher gives either not enough information or more information toward students' requests (question) as means of flouting the maxims. For example, when one student asked her about the change of the verb in a sentence, the student asked in her language, "Miss, it turned into verb 3 or verb what?". The teacher seemed to confuse in responding to this question. He asked back to the student, and she answered in her language, "that is…euuhh.., simple present or simple past tense?". Then the student answered "sim…past...past perfect," then the teacher informed her that when the question tag 'why' followed by the word 'do', it is mean a simple present. Then, the students just said 'em...' with confuse expressing. In this case, the teacher's answer is unclear. It showed when the teacher asked the student back by giving a choice, whether "simple present" or "simple past". The student did not answer by

choosing the teacher's option. Instead, the student answer "past perfect" where the answer does not exist in the teacher's option and is also the wrong answer. It means the student was confused when the teacher asked back, but then answered teachers' questions cooperatively. Finally, students were confused and did not satisfy the answer to their questions. Even though the teacher wanted to propose them to develop their skills, the teacher was flurry when responding to students' questions and unfortunately provided ambiguous information.

2. Students Misunderstand the Lesson

The other effect of maxims flouting toward the classroom is that the students become misunderstand the lesson given. This negative effect occurs when the teacher gives sufficient information or too much information toward students' questions. Especially the question that is asking material given that particular day.

For example:

When a student asked her about the change of the verb in a sentence, the student asked in her language "Miss, it turned into verb three or verb what?"

The teacher seemed to confuse and asked back to the student, she answered in her language "that is…euuhh.., simple present or simple past tense?" the student answered "sim…past..past perfect" then the teacher informed to her when the question tag 'why' followed by the word 'do', it is mean a simple present. Then, the students just said 'em..' with confuse expressing. In this case, the teacher's answer is ambiguous or unclear. It is showed when the teacher asked student back by giving a choice whether simple present or simple past, the student did not answer from two option which is given by the teacher, instead of the student answered by past perfect where the answer does not exist in the teacher's option, and it also was the wrong answer. It means the student was confused when the teacher asked back then answered her question cooperatively. Finally, the students could not catch what the teacher means or what the teacher explains to the students. Therefore, students still did not understand the material, and it will influence the goal of the learning process because they cannot answer the task.

3. Rowdy and noisy class situation

The third effect of flouting maxims toward the classroom is that the class becomes rowdy and noisy. This negative effect occurs when the flouting maxims

produced by the students. When the students' flouting toward the teacher's question, it could influence classroom circumstances. In this case, one student answered the teacher's question in the learning process by joking such as when the teacher asked the students "what is the verb after the words 'when you'?" one student answer it by "marry me," the answer should be "will," so that the student had flouted the maxim. As a result, other students laughing and commented on one another. In the end, the class was not conducive because this situation happened many times.

4. Ignore to the Teacher

The fourth effect of flouting maxims toward the classroom is that the teacher becomes ignored. This negative effect occurs when flouting maxims produced by the teacher. In this case, the teacher either gives more information or gives an ambiguous answer to the student's question. When the teacher explained the material, the teacher gave some information to the students. Sometimes, giving more information by moving from one information to other information make students confuse because not all students can receive many materials or lessons. For example, when the teacher explained about direct and indirect sentences on one occasion. Even though the material is related to each other, but many questions and explanations in one topic can make students unfocus. The student needs time to digest an explanation so that when the teacher gives more information by moving from one information to other information. When the teacher gives much information, some students did not listen to the teacher and became ignorant. Students pretend to nod and understand in order for the teacher to stop her talks.

Conclusion

Dealing with the types of maxim flouting, the teacher and students perform four types of maxim flouting during classroom interaction. The types of maxims flouting are maxim flouting of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. The data shows that the most dominant maxim flouted by the teacher and students is the maxim of quantity. The data shows 31 utterances flouted the maxim of quantity. Furthermore, the study reveals four adverse effects found in the class during classroom interaction between the teacher and student. The adverse effects are: students become flurry toward the

information given by the teacher, students become not understand toward the lesson, the class becomes rowdy and noisy, and the teacher becomes ignored.

References

Alduais, A.M.S. (2012). Conversational Implicature (Flouting the Maxims): Applying Conversational Maxims on Examples Taken from Non-Standard Arabic Language. Yemeni Dialect and Idiolect Spoken at IBB City. *Journal of Sociological Research*. 3(2), 376-387.

Brown, H. D. (2010). Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices, Second edition. USA: Pearson Education.

Dewi, Risti Utami. (2014). A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting and Rhetorical Device to Create Humor in Modern Family Season 1. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta. Unpublished Research Paper.

Fatmawati, Siti Nur Khasanah. (2015). A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting Performed by Solomon Northup in 12 Years A Slave Movie. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University. Unpublished Research Paper.

Flowerdew, J. (2009). Discourse in English Language Education. New York: Routledge.

Hadi, A. (2013). "Critical Appraisal of Grice's Cooperative Principle". *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*. 3(1). 69-72.

Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press Inc. New York.

Hall, J. K., and Walsh, M. (2002). Teacher-Student Interaction and Language Learning. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 22, 186-203. USA: Cambridge University Press.

Linawati, D. (2013). *A Gricean Maxim Analysis of an English Teacher's Talks in SMPN 1 KALASAN*. UNY. Unpublished Research Paper.

Meyer, F. Charles. 2009. *Introducing English Linguistics*. USA: Cambridge University Press.

Yule, George. (2010). *The study of Language fourth edition*. USA: Cambridge University Press.

Syafryadin, Wardhana, D.E.C., Apriani, E., Noermanzah. (2020). Maxim Variation, Conventional and Particularized Implicature on Students' Conversation. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 9(2). http://www.ijstr.org/paper-references.php?ref=IJSTR-0120-30135.

Xin, W. (2015). Cooperative Principle in English Euphemism. *English Language Teaching*. 3(1). 11-14.