



# Plagiarism Checker X Originality Report

**Similarity Found: 4%**

Date: Rabu, Desember 30, 2020

Statistics: 143 words Plagiarized / 3996 Total words

Remarks: Low Plagiarism Detected - Your Document needs Optional Improvement.

---

An Analysis of Violation and Flouting Maxim on Teacher-Students Interaction in English Teaching and Learning Process

Siti Arofah, Husni Mubarak\* Universitas Islam Nahdlatul Ulama Jepara, Indonesia  
husni@unisnu.ac.id Abstract The objectives of this research is to analyze the type of violation and flouting maxim of teacher-students interaction in English teaching and learning process in MA Hasyim Asy'ari Bangsri and also find the most frequently produced between violation and flouting of maxim. This research used descriptive qualitative method.

The data was obtained from the conversation between the teacher and students during teaching and learning process and analyzed by categorizing utterances based on the violation and flouting maxim theory of Cooperative Principle. The data were collected through the observation then analyzed by using the technique which is suggested by Miles and Huberman that consists of data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusion or data verification. The result of the research showed that there are four types of maxims that are violated by the teacher and students. These are: maxim of quantity 11 (50%), maxim of quality 5 (22.73%), maxim of relation 1 (4.54%), and maxim of manner 5 (22.73%).

The dominant violation was maxim of quantity with 11 of occurrences. Based on the findings, there are 3 types of flouting maxims in which the most of flouting maxim that are occurred was maxim of relation. They are divided into: 1 (14.29%) maxim of quantity, 2 (28.57%) maxim of quality, and 4 (57.14%) maxim of relation. In conclusion, the most produced between the violation and flouting was the violation of maxim with 22 (75.86%) of total occurrences. Meanwhile, the proportion of flouting maxim was 7 (24.14%). Keywords: Maxims, descriptive qualitative, cooperative principle, teacher-students interaction

INTRODUCTION Language is a device of communication for people.

It is important role in human development and history as a main tool of interaction. Through the presence of language, people can share any information, facts, or ideas among others. Moreover people can also express their feelings through language. In conversations, sometimes, the interlocutor wants the hearer to find the hidden meaning or implicit meaning of the utterances. Yule (1996: 35) said that speakers actually communicate more than the words they utter, in this case, they communicate the additional meaning to the hearer. This study is called implicature.

Sihai (2008: 10) defines implicature as a special case of situations in which the perceived meaning extends beyond the literal meaning. The use of language for expression are expected to obey the maxim of cooperative principle proposed by Grice (1975), this is required for the communication to be run well and effective. Pragmatic provides Cooperative Principle theory which encourages people to be cooperative in communicating toward each other.

Grice (2004: 45) also states Cooperative Principle is make your conversational contribution what is required; at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. The cooperative principle of conversation is elaborated in four sub-principles, called maxims. The four maxims are quantity, quality, relation and manner. Maxim of quantity means the speaker should be as informative as required, they should give neither too little information nor too much.

When they provide inadequate information, the interlocutor will not be able to identify what they are talking about because they do not give more information. On the other hand, those who give excessive information tend to imply something. Moreover, Grice (2004) stated that over informative is not transgression of cooperative principle but merely either a waste of time or make confusion. The maxim of quality concerns in the truthfulness in an utterance. The interlocutor should not give information that he/she does not have evidence. Rahmi & Wahyuni (2018: 177) argued that maxim of quality refers to the truth contribution which given by the speaker in the conversation.

This means that in following the maxim of quality, people should give information truthfully and provide the evidence of it. Maxim of relation means be relevant. The interlocutor should say what is relevant to the conversation. In fulfilling the maxim of relation, people should adhere to the topic of the conversation. In addition, Dwi (2015: 246) explained that the maxim of relation must be relevant to the topic being conversed. The speaker and hearer must always ensure of what they say is the information which relates to the topic of conversation. Meanwhile, in fulfilling the maxim of manner, the

interlocutor should give information as clearly and orderly as possible.

Shofwan (2018: 75) explains that maxim of manner is to mean participants in a discourse should not make their contributions obscure, ambiguous or difficult to understand. Moreover, Zebua (2017: 104) defines maxim of manner as the speaker should be brief and orderly. Sometimes people do not always follow the rule of maxim in their interaction so that the communication is not efficient. The uncooperative communication also found in teaching and learning process. The speakers who do not obey the rule of maxim are known as the violation and flouting maxim.

Cutting (2002: 40) states 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. According to Elizabeth Black (2006) as cited in (Rahman & Abbas, 2013: 54), flouting occurs when the speaker makes it clear to the hearer that he/she is aware of the cooperative principle and the maxims, that it makes the audience is led to consider why the principle or the maxim was broken. In flouting maxim, the speakers employ the implicature. They expect the hearer to uncover the hidden meaning behind the utterance.

This present research investigated the violation and flouting maxims in teacher and student interaction during English teaching and learning process at MA Hasyim Asy'ari Bangsri. The purposes of the research are to investigate the violation and flouting maxims happen in classroom interaction during English teaching and learning process. Another purpose was to find the most dominant type of violation and flouting and what most produced between violation and flouting maxim. METHODOLOGY This research was descriptive qualitative research.

Qualitative method is a method in which the researcher collects and analyses the data then draw the conclusion. Gerring (2007) states that descriptive qualitative research is a natural setting as the direct source of data with the researcher taking a role of being the key instrument. In conducting this research, the researcher did the observation in teaching and learning process to obtain the data. In the observation, the researcher joined the group class in online course.

This research was conducted on 8 – 23 October 2020 in three meetings. The subjects of the research were a teacher and students of MA Hasyim Asy'ari Bangsri. The primary subjects were a teacher (a female teacher) and 26 students (2 males and 24 females). The students were 12th grade of Immersion students of MA Hasyim Asy'ari Bangsri in the academic year of 2020/2021. The data in this research were collected through virtual observation during teaching and learning process. The data were in form of visual e.g.

text message conversation and audio e.g. voice recording.

In collecting the data, the researcher did some procedures as follows: The researcher listened to the utterances that were produced by the teacher and students, the researcher also read the utterances in the conversation during teaching and learning process. Then the researcher tried to understand the utterances which were uttered by the teacher and students during teaching and learning process. The researcher transcribed the audio recording of the utterances into writing form and also rewrote the utterances. The data which were transcribed were in form of dialogue between teacher and students. The researcher listened to the recording in several times to make sure that the data are accurate.

The researcher classified the data into each type of violation and flouting maxim based on Grice's cooperative principle. Then gave a code. The researcher specified the types of violation and flouting of maxim and its number of occurrences. The data was analyzed by using the technique which is suggested by Miles and Huberman. According to Miles & Huberman (1994: 10), there are three activities in analysing the data, namely data reduction, data display and drawing conclusion or verification. In data reduction, the researcher reduced the data through selection. The researcher selected some part of utterances which maxims that were violated and flouted based on the Cooperative Principles theory.

After that, the researcher analyzed the type of violating and flouting maxims that occurred in the dialogue between teacher and students. After reducing the data, in data display, the researcher displayed the data taken from the observation by presenting in form of table and descriptions. Then, the researcher calculated the percentage of violation and flouting maxim and decided what most produced between violation and flouting maxim that found on teacher and students interaction in the classroom of their utterances.

The formula which was used to know the frequency of violation and flouting maxim as follow: 
$$P = \frac{N}{T} \times 100\%$$
 Explanation: P: Percentage of particular type of maxim (violation or flouting) N: frequency of particular type of maxim (violation or flouting) T: Number of type of maxim (violation or flouting To conclude the result, the data which were inserted as in data display were confirmed to reach the trustworthiness of the data. Denzim (1970) in Cohen et al. (2000) states that there are several types of triangulation, they are time triangulation (to include diachronic reability, stability over time and synchronic reability, similarity of data gathered at the same time), space triangulation, combined levels of triangulation (e.g.

individual, group, organization, societal), theoretical triangulation (drawing on alternative theories), investigator triangulation (more than one observer), and methodological triangulation (using the same method on different occasions) or the researcher's techniques in collecting the data to obtain validation. In this research, the researcher used methodological triangulation to reach the validation of data. Verification enhanced by conducting through consultation with the expert. In addition, in getting the data trustworthiness, the researcher applied investigator triangulation. The researcher checked the data that were obtained from the observation to the expert.

The researcher first classified the data of cooperative principle of maxims that are obtained from the observation. Then the researcher consulted it to the expert of pragmatics study. **RESULT AND DISCUSSION The Violation of Maxims That are Produced by The Teacher and Students** in English Teaching and Learning Process Violation of Maxim Quantity Speaker violates the maxims of quantity when the information they give to the hearer is not enough to know what is being talked. Here, the speaker does not want the hearer know about the whole information.

The example of violation maxim of quantity as follows: Data 5 T : \_Download the pdf then see the question for compulsory English no 1 to 10. Any question? \_S : \_Ditulis di buku atau gimana? \_S : \_Ndak gitu mbak \_S : \_Trus gimana fer? \_S : \_Kamu buka pdf itu trus liat soal nah kalo ada yang ndak paham kamu tanyakan ke miss Risa. \_S : \_Oh iya. Ga faham tadi. \_S : \_Itu kan hari ini kita bahas soal yang mid kemarin. Kan miss Risa mau ngadain remidi. Nah sebelum kalian remidi kita bahas dulu soal-soalnya. Nah, pdf yang miss Risa kirimkan itu diliat, dari nomer yang miss Risa kasih tau mana nanti miss Risa terangkan.

\_ \_From the conversation above, there were 2 violations of maxim. The utterance, "Ndak gitu mbak," was not enough information. It can be seen from the utterance of, "Trus gimana fer?" which it showed that the student did not fully understand about the explanation. It indicates the violation maxim of quantity because the student gave too little information. Another violation of maxim quantity, it could be seen in the utterance of, "Itu kan hari ini kita bahas soal yang mid kemarin. Kan miss Risa mau ngadain remidi. Nah sebelum kalian remidi kita bahas dulu soal-soalnya..."

The teacher gave too much information than is required. It is enough for the teacher to answer by, "Nah, pdf yang miss Risa kirimkan itu diliat, dari nomer yang miss Risa kasih tau mana nanti miss Risa terangkan." Violation of Maxim Quality Noertjahjo et al. (2017:178) explains that violating towards maxim of quality is a situation where a speaker is not sincere and gives wrong information to a hearer, which can be said as lie. Data 7 T : \_There are more or less still 8 students who haven't joined the class. Where

are your friends? \_S : \_I don't know miss. Mungkin makan atau mandi. \_S : \_They are still walking in their sweet dreams.

\_S : \_Maybe still sleep or do something or help their mother. Idk. \_In this conversation, the students' responses were seemingly untrue which were classified as the violation of maxim quality. The students violated the maxim of quality because she said something that she does not believe to be true. They did the violation of maxim quality twice. They gave the information with lack of evidence, as in the utterances of "I don't know miss. Mungkin makan atau mandi," and "Maybe still sleep or do something or help their mother. Idk."

Violation of Maxim Relation Cutting (2002: 40) states that violating in maxim of relation happens when speakers try to distract and change the topic to another one. As the example below: Data 5 T : \_Download the pdf then see the question for compulsory English no 1 to 10. Any question? \_S : \_Ditulis di buku atau gimana? \_From the conversation above, there was violation of maxim relation. The teacher asked to students if they have questions but then the student replied, "Ditulis di buku atau gimana?" from the utterance it doesn't relate to the question of "Download the pdf then see the question for compulsory English no 1 to 10."

Any question?" The questions could be replayed by using the word, "yes" or "no" such as, "Yes, I have question." Violation of Maxim Manner Cutting (2002) defines that violating towards maxim of manner happens when someone gives obscure reference, and vague reference, in order to avoid a brief and orderly answer in a conversation. Data 3 T : \_Compulsory English (the teacher was giving the score of Compulsory English) Optional English (the teacher was giving the score of Compulsory English) \_S : \_MTDDS \_T : \_What's that? \_The word of MTDDS indicates as the violation of maxim manner. The student used the ambiguous word of MTDDS which it only could be understood by their friends who are in boarding school. It means only few people know about the word.

The following dialogue explains that the word of MTDDS is an abbreviation of the phrase Mak Tratap Dek-dek Ser. It is included as slang words. Slang words are specific words used by a particular group of people. MTDDS has similar meaning with the word of nervous. The student was nervous to know their score he was actually afraid whether the score was bad. Instead of saying he was nervous or was not ready to know their score, the student failed to follow the maxim of manner by saying ambiguous word.

Based on the observation during teaching and learning process, the researcher found there are 22 violations of maxim that are produced by the teacher and students on their

interaction during teaching and learning process. There are divided into: violation of maxim quantity 11 (50%), violations maxim of quality 5 (22.73%), violation of maxim relation 1 (4.54%) and violations of maxim manner 5 (22.73%). There were 6 violations of maxim done by the teacher, while the students violated the maxims in 16 times. It can be claimed that the students mostly did the violations of maxim rather than the teacher.

The conclusion is the violation maxim of quantity was more dominantly violated. It occurred 11 times. This means the speakers tend to give too much information either less than what is required. The Flouting Maxims That are **Produced by The Teacher and Students** in English Teaching and Learning Process Aisya & Fitrawati (2019: 43) argue that when speakers flout the maxim, it means that they are also being indirect in communication. In this research, there are 3 types of flouting maxim which were **produced by the teacher and student** in teaching and learning process. The result consists of 1 (14.29%) flouting maxim quantity, 2 (28.57%) flouting maxims of quality, and 4 (57.14%) flouting maxims of relation. None of flouting maxim of manner was found.

The data analysis can be seen as follows: Flouting Maxim of Quantity The speaker who breaks the maxim of quantity seems to give **too little or too much information** in which the speakers employ implicature. Data 16 S : \_I forgot the result. Please, would you send it again. \_T : \_Oh my god, you can scroll up. \_Based on the conversation above, the teacher didn't give the information which was needed by the student. Instead of sending the score to 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 than what is required. Flouting Maxim of Quality Cutting (2002) stated that the flouting the maxim of quality would imply a metaphorical use of language, an exaggerated expression of feelings (hyperbole), metaphor, irony, or banter. Irony and banter together form a pair. The example below: Data 19 S : \_Miss bahasa inggrisnya ambyar nopo kak? \_S : \_Im pyar.

\_Based on the conversation above, the flouting maxim of quality occurred because the student said that was blatantly untrue in which he lacked of evidence about the English word of "ambyar". The word "Im pyar" was untrue. It implied that she didn't know the how to say "ambyar" in English and tried to make a joke. Flouting Maxim of Relation According to Rahman & Abbas (2013: 54), maxim of relation is flouted when the speaker does not make the connection between his words and the context clear in a verbal manner.



The speaker expects the hearer to understand what the utterance did not say through 'implicature'. Data 18 T : \_Have you done reading the material? \_S : \_Masih loading miss. \_The teacher gave the material on site by online learning. She asked the students to read the material first and asked them to give some questions that are related to the material. According to the conversation above, the student flouted the maxim of relation by saying, "Masih loading miss." This has no relation towards the question. The teacher's question could be answered by "No, I haven't done" or "Yes, I have done." The utterance of, "Masih loading miss" implied that the student hasn't started to read the material.

The Violation and Flouting Maxim Happened during Teaching and Learning Process The total utterances of the violation maxims which were produced by the teacher and students were 22 data that were obtained from teacher and students interaction. There are 11 (50%) utterances considered as the violation maxims of quantity. In this case, the teacher did the violation of maxim quantity more than the students. The teacher tended to give more information than it is required. The teacher broke the rule of maxim of quantity in order to make the student more understand about the material by giving additional information. There were 5 (22.73%) of violation maxims of quality.

According to Cutting (2002), people who violate the maxim of quality indicates not being sincere and give wrong information. Based on the data analysis, the students violated the maxim of quality by giving wrong information in which it did not have an evidence of it. Moreover, the students did more the violation of maxim of quality than the teacher. There was 1 (4.54%) of violation maxims of relation and the least, there were 5 (22.73%) of the violations of maxim manner which are found during the teaching and learning process.

In conclusion, the most violated maxim of cooperative principle that done by the teacher and student was the maxim of quantity. The flouting maxims also occurred during teaching and learning process. There were 7 occurrences of the flouting maxim in teacher and students' interaction. The researcher found three kinds of maxim that were flouted by the teacher and students; they were the maxim of quantity (14.29%), the maxim of quality (28.57%), and the maxim of relation (57.14%). The most flouted maxim was the maxim of relation that done by the students. They flouted the maxim of relation by giving the information that did not have relation toward the question.

The students flouted the cooperative principle because want the hearer to uncover the hidden meaning behind the utterances. Table 1. The Violation and Flouting Maxim No. \_Non-observance Maxim \_Frequency \_Percentage \_1. \_The violation of Maxims \_22 \_75.86% \_2. \_The flouting of Maxims \_7 \_24.14% \_ \_Total \_29 \_100% \_ \_ Answering the

problem question, according to the data table above, there were 22 (75.86%) occurrences of the violation of maxim and 7 (24.14%) occurrences of the flouting of maxim. Therefore, violation of maxims was the most frequently produced by teacher and students in their interaction during teaching and learning process.

**CONCLUSION** This research was aimed to find the types of violation and flouting maxim of Cooperative principle and find the most frequently produced between violation and flouting of maxim in teacher and students interaction during teaching and learning process in MA Hasyim Asy'ari Bangsri. Based the data finding and discussion, it can be concluded that this research tried to employ the theory proposed by Grice (1974). The focus of the research was to analyze the violation of maxims and the flouting maxim based on the Grice's cooperative principle maxims that were produced by the teacher and student in teaching and learning process.

According to the data analysis, there were 22 data (75.86%) found considered as violation of maxims and 7 data (24.14%) found included as the flouting maxims. It can be concluded that the violation of maxims is more dominating rather than the flouting maxims. REFERENCES Aisya, N., & Fitrawati (2019). An Analysis of Flouting Of Maxim Performed By Politician Guests In Mata Najwa Talk Show In The Episode Of Adu Lantang Jelang Penentuan And Babak. E-Journal of English Language and Literature. 8(4). Cohen, L., Manion, L., Morrison, & Keith. (2000).

Research Methods in Education (5th ed.). Cutting, J. (2002). Pragmatics and Discourse. Routledge. Dwi, A. E. (2015). An Analysis Of Flouting Maxim In EFL Classroom Interaction. Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning. 4(2). 243–259. Gerring, J. (2007). Case Study Research: Principles and Practices. New York: Cambridge University Press. Grice, H. P. (2004). Logic and Conversation. Berkeley: University of California. Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis (2nd ed). Sage Publications. Noertjahjo, E., Arifin, M. B., & Ariani, S. (2017). Analysis of Flouting And Violating Towards Maxim Of Quality in My Sister ' S Keeper Novel. Jurnal Ilmu Budaya, 1(3), 193–206. Rahman, R.,

& Abbas, S. (2013). Antic Disposition?: Hamlet in the Light of Cooperative Principle. Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences 21 (1), p51–61. Rahmi, S. S., Refnaldi, & Wahyuni, D. (2018). The Violation of Conversational Maxims Found In Political Conversation at Rosi Talkshow. E-Journal of English Language and Literature. 7(1). Shofwan, M. I. (2018). The Violation Of Maxim Rules In Ketoprak Humor. Journal of English Studies, 1(1), 72–81. Sihai, W. (2008). Study on Teaching The Interpretations of Conversational Implicature in Listening Comprehension. CELEA Journal. 31 (3). 66 - 77. Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Zebua, E. Rukmini, Dwi. &

Saleh, Mursid. (2017).

The Violation and Flouting of Cooperative Principles in the Ellen Degeneres Talk Show. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 12(1), 103–113.

#### INTERNET SOURCES:

-----  
<1% - <https://journal.ikipsiliwangi.ac.id/index.php/project/article/view/1479>  
<1% -  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259763444\\_Conversational\\_Implicature\\_Flouting\\_the\\_Maxims\\_Applying\\_Conversational\\_Maxims\\_on\\_Examples\\_Taken\\_from\\_Non-Standard\\_Arabic\\_Language\\_Yemeni\\_Dialect\\_an\\_Idiolect\\_Spoken\\_at\\_IBB\\_City](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259763444_Conversational_Implicature_Flouting_the_Maxims_Applying_Conversational_Maxims_on_Examples_Taken_from_Non-Standard_Arabic_Language_Yemeni_Dialect_an_Idiolect_Spoken_at_IBB_City)  
<1% -  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320773888\\_Project-based\\_Learning\\_Activities\\_and\\_EFL\\_Students'\\_Productive\\_Skills\\_in\\_English](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320773888_Project-based_Learning_Activities_and_EFL_Students'_Productive_Skills_in_English)  
1% - <https://www.sfu.ca/~jeffpell/Cogs300/GriceLogicConvers75.pdf>  
<1% - <https://publikasi.dinus.ac.id/index.php/lite/article/download/1094/807>  
<1% - <https://www.slideshare.net/shalabymostafa/pragmatics-46611119>  
1% - [https://dyahsihpratiwi.blogspot.com/2013/07/journal-of-pragmatics\\_5251.html](https://dyahsihpratiwi.blogspot.com/2013/07/journal-of-pragmatics_5251.html)  
<1% -  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230866316\\_Some\\_Instances\\_of\\_Violation\\_and\\_Flouting\\_of\\_the\\_Maxim\\_of\\_Quantity\\_by\\_the\\_Main\\_Characters\\_Barry\\_Tim\\_in\\_Dinner\\_for\\_Schmucks](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230866316_Some_Instances_of_Violation_and_Flouting_of_the_Maxim_of_Quantity_by_the_Main_Characters_Barry_Tim_in_Dinner_for_Schmucks)  
<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X1300119X>  
<1% -  
<https://123dok.com/document/y6ewe8gz-pragmatic-analysis-humor-using-medical-terms-anatomy-season.html>  
<1% -  
[https://www.academia.edu/33205020/A\\_Study\\_on\\_Flouting\\_Maxims\\_in\\_Divergent\\_Novel](https://www.academia.edu/33205020/A_Study_on_Flouting_Maxims_in_Divergent_Novel)  
<1% -  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274116019\\_A\\_Critical\\_Appraisal\\_of\\_Grice's\\_Cooperative\\_Principle](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274116019_A_Critical_Appraisal_of_Grice's_Cooperative_Principle)  
1% - <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/322377945.pdf>