

**FLOUTING CONVERSATIONAL MAXIM BY ENGLISH
DEPARTMENT STUDENTS AT UIN SUNAN AMPEL
SURABAYA**

THESIS



**BY:
ARFIANI EKA PUTRI
REG. NUMBER: A03217006**

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES
UIN SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA**

2022

DECLARATION

I am the undersigned below:

Name : Arfiani Eka Putri
NIM : A03217006
Department : English
Faculty : Arts and Humanities
University : UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

Truly state that the thesis I wrote is really original work, and not a plagiarism/fabrication in part or in whole.

If in the future it is proven that this thesis result from plagiarism/fabrication, either in part or in full, then I am willing to accept sanctions for such actions in accordance with the applicable provisions.

Surabaya, January 7th 2022



Arfiani Eka Putri

APPROVAL SHEET

FLOUTING CONVERSATIONAL MAXIM BY ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
STUDENTS AT UIN SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA

by
Arfiani Eka Putri
Reg. Number: A03217006

Approved to be examined by the Board of Examiners, English Department,
Faculty of Arts and Humanities, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

Surabaya, January 7th, 2022

Thesis Advisor



Suhandoko, M.Pd.
NIP. 198905282018011002

Acknowledged by:
The Head of the English Department



Dr. Wahyu Kusumajanti, M.Hum.
NIP. 197002051999032002

EXAMINER SHEET

This thesis of Arfiani Eka Putri (Reg. Number: A03217046) has been approved and accepted by the Board of Examiners, English Department, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya on February 3, 2022.

The Board of Examiners are:

Examiner 1



Suhandoko, M.Pd.
NIP. 198905282018011002

Examiner 2



Endratno Pili Swasono, M.Pd.
NIP. 197106072003121001

Examiner 3



Raudlotul Jannah, M. App. Ling.
NIP. 197810062005012004

Examiner 4



Novia Adibatus Shofah, S.S., M.Hum.
NUP. 202111012

Acknowledged by:
The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Humanities
UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya



Dr. H. Agus Aditoni, M.Ag.
NIP. 10021992031001



KEMENTERIAN AGAMA
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA
PERPUSTAKAAN

Jl. Jend. A. Yani 117 Surabaya 60237 Telp. 031-8431972 Fax.031-8413300
E-Mail: perpus@uinsby.ac.id

LEMBAR PERNYATAAN PERSETUJUAN PUBLIKASI
KARYA ILMIAH UNTUK KEPENTINGAN AKADEMIS

Sebagai sivitas akademika UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini, saya:

Nama : Arfiani Eka Putri
NIM : A03217006
Fakultas/Jurusan : Adab dan Humaniora / Sastra Inggris
E-mail address : arfianiekap30@gmail.com

Demi pengembangan ilmu pengetahuan, menyetujui untuk memberikan kepada Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif atas karya ilmiah :

Sekripsi Tesis Desertasi Lain-lain (.....)
yang berjudul :

FLOUTING CONVERSATIONAL MAXIM USED BY ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

STUDENTS AT UIN SUNAN AMPEL SURABAYA

beserta perangkat yang diperlukan (bila ada). Dengan Hak Bebas Royalti Non-Eksklusif ini Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya berhak menyimpan, mengalih-media/format-kan, mengelolanya dalam bentuk pangkalan data (database), mendistribusikannya, dan menampilkan/mempublikasikannya di Internet atau media lain secara *fulltext* untuk kepentingan akademis tanpa perlu meminta ijin dari saya selama tetap mencantumkan nama saya sebagai penulis/pencipta dan atau penerbit yang bersangkutan.

Saya bersedia untuk menanggung secara pribadi, tanpa melibatkan pihak Perpustakaan UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, segala bentuk tuntutan hukum yang timbul atas pelanggaran Hak Cipta dalam karya ilmiah saya ini.

Demikian pernyataan ini yang saya buat dengan sebenarnya.

Surabaya, 17 Maret 2022

Penulis



(Arfiani Eka Putri)

ABSTRACT

Putri, A. E. (2021). *Flouting Conversational Maxim by English Department Students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya*. English Department, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Advisor: Suhandoko, M.Pd.

Keywords: cooperative principle, flouting maxims, English department students.

This research focuses on analyzing the flouting maxims by the students of the English Department at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. In this research, the researcher employed Gricean cooperative principle (1989). There are two research questions: (1) What are the maxims flouted by the English department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, and (2) What are the reasons for flouting maxim by the English Department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya?

The researcher used a descriptive qualitative approach in analyzing data. The data of this research were the student's utterances in speaking class. The subjects of this research were 112 English Department students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya in the 2020-2021 academic year. A total of 112 subjects who comes from different cities and backgrounds is participating in the research. Two instruments were used in this research. The first instrument was the observation, and the second instrument was the focused-group discussion using a teleconference application. The researcher collected the data by recording the online learning activity using a laptop. After getting the data, the researcher transcribed the conversation between students and the lecturer during the online learning process. Then, the researcher carried out the data analysis process. At the end of the analysis, the researcher concluded based on the maxim's flouting types and the reason for students' flouting the maxim.

The result of this research showed 28 data containing all types of flouting maxims. Flouting the maxim of quantity is the most frequently used by students, with a percentage of 71% or 20 utterances. Then, the second is flouting the maxim of relation with 14% or 4 utterances, and the third is flouting the maxim of quality with 11% or 3 utterances. The most infrequently used is flouting the maxim of manner with a percentage of 4% or only 1 utterance. Focus group discussion is used to explore the reasons for the students' flouting the maxims in-depth. Based on the focused-group discussion result, the researcher found 7 reasons used by English department students. Those reasons are; giving the floor to others, giving detailed information, lack of interest in the conversation, lack of adequate knowledge, lack of understanding of instruction, avoidance, and being fun. The researcher concluded that lack of interest in the conversation, lack of adequate knowledge, and avoidance are the main reasons students flouting maxims.

ABSTRAK

Putri, A. E. (2021). *Pelanggaran Maksim dalam Percakapan Mahasiswa Sastra Inggris di UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya*. Program Studi Sastra Inggris, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Pembimbing: Suhandoko, M.Pd.

Kata Kunci: prinsip kerjasama, pelanggaran maksim, mahasiswa Sastra Inggris.

Penelitian ini berfokus untuk menganalisis pelanggaran maksim antara mahasiswa dan dosen jurusan Sastra Inggris di UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Dalam penelitian ini, peneliti menggunakan teori prinsip kerja sama dari Grice (1989). Terdapat dua masalah penelitian dalam penelitian ini: (1) Apa maksim yang dilanggar oleh mahasiswa program studi Sastra Inggris UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, dan (2) Apa alasan dari pelanggaran maksim dalam percakapan yang dilakukan oleh mahasiswa program studi Sastra Inggris UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

Peneliti menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif deskriptif dalam menganalisis data. Data penelitian ini berupa ucapan mahasiswa di kelas berbicara. Subyek penelitian ini adalah 112 mahasiswa program studi Sastra Inggris UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya tahun akademik 2020-2021. Sebanyak 112 subjek yang berasal dari berbagai kota dan latar belakang yang berbeda berpartisipasi dalam penelitian ini. Terdapat dua instrumen yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Instrumen pertama adalah observasi, dan instrumen kedua adalah diskusi kelompok terfokus dengan menggunakan aplikasi telekonferensi. Peneliti mengumpulkan data dengan merekam aktivitas pembelajaran daring menggunakan laptop. Setelah mendapatkan data, peneliti mentranskripsi percakapan antara mahasiswa dan dosen selama proses pembelajaran. Kemudian, peneliti melakukan proses analisis data. Di akhir analisis, peneliti menyimpulkan berdasarkan jenis pelanggaran maksim dan alasan mahasiswa program studi sastra Inggris melanggar maksim.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan 28 data yang berisi semua jenis pelanggaran maksim. Pelanggaran maksim kuantitas adalah yang paling sering digunakan oleh mahasiswa, dengan persentase sebanyak 71% atau 20 ucapan. Kemudian, yang kedua adalah pelanggaran maksim hubungan dengan persentase sebanyak 14% atau 4 ucapan, dan yang ketiga adalah pelanggaran maksim kualitas dengan persentase 11% atau 3 ucapan. Yang paling jarang digunakan adalah pelanggaran maksim cara dengan persentase sebanyak 4% atau hanya 1 ucapan. Diskusi kelompok terfokus digunakan untuk menggali alasan mahasiswa melanggar maksim secara mendalam. Berdasarkan hasil dari diskusi kelompok, peneliti menemukan 7 alasan yang digunakan oleh mahasiswa program studi Sastra Inggris. Alasan tersebut adalah; memberi kesempatan kepada orang lain untuk berbicara, memberikan informasi yang rinci, kurangnya minat dalam percakapan, kurangnya pengetahuan yang memadai tentang topik pembicaraan, kurangnya pemahaman instruksi dosen, penghindaran, dan bercanda. Peneliti menyimpulkan bahwa kurangnya minat dalam percakapan, kurangnya pengetahuan yang memadai, dan penghindaran adalah alasan utama mahasiswa melanggar maksim.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Cover Page	
Inside Cover Page	i
Approval Sheet.....	ii
Examiner Sheet	iii
Declaration	iv
Publication Agreement Sheet.....	v
Acknowledgement.....	vi
Abstract	vii
Abstrak	viii
Table of Contents	ix
List of Tables.....	x
List of Appendices	xi
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Problems of the Study	8
1.3 Significance of the Study	8
1.4 Scope and Limitation of the Study.....	8
1.5 Definition of the Key Terms	9
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
2.1 Pragmatics	10
2.2 Context.....	11
2.3 Cooperative Principle.....	12
2.4 Maxim	13
2.4.1 Maxim of Quantity.....	13
2.4.2 Maxim of Quality.....	14
2.4.3 Maxim of Relation	15
2.4.4 Maxim of Manner	15
2.5 Flouting Maxims	17
2.5.1 Flouting of Maxim Quantity	18
2.5.2 Flouting of Maxim Quality	19
2.5.3 Flouting of Maxim Relation.....	20

2.5.4 Flouting of Maxim Manner.....	21
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODS	22
3.1 Research Design.....	22
3.2 Data Collection.....	23
3.2.1 Research Data.....	23
3.2.2 Data Source and Subject of the Study.....	23
3.2.3 Instrument	24
3.2.4 Data Collection Techniques	25
3.3 Data Analysis	26
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	28
4.1 Findings.....	28
4.1.1 The Maxims Flouted by the English Department Students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya	28
4.1.2 The Reasons of the Flouting Maxim by the English Department Students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.....	47
4.2 Discussion	59
CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION	66
5.1 Conclusion	66
5.2 Suggestion.....	67
REFERENCES.....	68
APPENDICES	70

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Pages
3.1 Raw Data of Flouting Maxims	26
4.1 A Total Frequency and Percentage of Types of Flouting Maxims	29



UIN SUNAN AMPEL
S U R A B A Y A

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendices	Pages
Focus group discussion in A-class	70
Focus group discussion in B-class	81
Focus group discussion in C-class	88
Focus group discussion in D-class	94



UIN SUNAN AMPEL
S U R A B A Y A

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the reasons the researcher was interested in conducting this research. This chapter deals with the background of the study, the research problems, the significance of the study, the scope and limitation, and the definition of key terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

Every individual should have relations and interactions with others to continue their lives. They have to build a good relationship by communicating with others. Communication means connecting people with a clear understanding of how the participants provide and receive information from each other. A conversation is one common form of communication. Parvaneh and Nikan (2011, p. 122) defined that "the conversation, itself, as a reciprocal act, retains specific rules and regulations." It means that the participants should respond to whatever the interlocutor has said. When participants do a good reciprocal act, it can make them understand each other's statements, and the result would be a smooth conversation.

There are two essential roles involved in the conversation; speakers and hearers. Yule (1996, p. 36) says that there have to be speakers and hearers involved in the conversation, and generally, they cooperate to make their conversation succeed. Due to the speaker's speech in the conversation, misunderstanding may occur between speakers and hearers in catching the

meaning. To avoid misunderstanding in conversation, people need to know about the intended purpose of a speaker. Yule (1996, p. 3) says that pragmatics is the study concerned with the speaker's meaning.

Grice (1989) proposes a general principle, called the "Cooperative Principle," to give what participants are expected to obey. This principle consists of four principles referred to as maxims. Those are maxim of quantity, a maxim of quality, a maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. Maxim of quantity rules the speaker to contribute as informative as required. Maxim of quality ensures the speaker tells the truth or fact and does not say something believed to be inadequate or false evidence. Maxim of relation rules the speaker to be relevant to the topic discussed. Maxim of manner rules the speaker to be brief and orderly also rules the speaker to avoid obscurity and ambiguity.

When having a conversation, the speakers do not always fulfill and eventually break the maxim. Breaking the maxim is also called a non-observances. There are five non-observances of the maxim: flouting, violating, infringing, opting out, and suspending. The most often non-observances found in daily life are flouting and violation. A flouting means when the speakers say implicitly in their utterances. They let the listener seek a hidden meaning that the speakers utter, yet the listener still believes in a cooperative principle. It means that the speaker is intentionally trying to give a special meaning different from the literal meaning, as long as the speaker or the context provides enough indicators for the hearer to realize it.

Meanwhile, maxim violation means that the speaker intends to mislead the listener. The speaker speaks the truth but shows what is wrong (Thomas, 1995, p. 72). This can be inferred that when someone violates the maxim, they plan to tell a lie or to pretend that what they say is the truth.

The participants in the flouting of the maxim often provide implicit information that is not relevant to the conversation context. They try to imply what they mean by flouting a maxim when conveying the utterances. From time to time, people flout the maxims for various reasons. Thus, it does not mean they fail to communicate in their conversations. However, on the contrary, they break the roles of maxims to produce negative pragmatic effects such as sarcasm and irony, prevent unpleasant things and emphasize messages (Cook, 1989, p. 31).

The phenomenon of the flouting maxim can be easily found in the movie. This phenomenon can be found in the characters' utterances in the movie dialogues. This is applied in a movie to make a dialogue alive and to make the audience guess the speaker's purpose, as it was conducted by Faridah (2016), Detrianto (2018), and Adawiyah (2016), who had conducted research on flouting maxim in conversations in movies. Faridah (2016) focused on a scientific movie and found that flouting the maxim of quantity and relevance dominantly occurred in the conversation between characters. She further explained that the main characters often flouted those maxims because they find conveying what they mean to their interlocutors.

In contrast to Faridah (2016), who conducted research using scientific movies, Detrianto (2018) and Adawiyah (2016) conducted research about the

flouting of the maxims in comedy movies. Detrianto (2018) found that maxims of relation were dominantly flouted. The flouting of maxims made by characters in the *Bajaj Bajuri* movie causes a humorous effect and makes the conversation lively and friendly. Whereas, Adawiyah (2016) found that maxims of quantity were dominantly flouted and explained that the conversation between characters in *Focus* movie can still run well without miscommunication.

Several previous researchers have studied the flouting maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principle in the talk show, for instance, Zebua, Rukmini, and Saleh (2017), Hutapea (2017), and Manurung (2019). Zebua et al. (2017) investigated the flouting maxims in Ellen Degeneres's talk show, and Hutapea (2017) researched Oprah Winfrey Show. In both pieces of research, it was found that among the four flouting maxims of Gricean's Cooperative Principle, the most frequently flouted maxim was the maxim of quantity. Another research by Manurung (2019) investigated the flouting maxims in the *Hitam Putih* talk show and found that the flouting of maxims was used to make jokes.

Not only in movie and talk shows, but it is also possible to find flouting maxim in a daily conversation around us, as conducted in previous research by Dwi (2015), Wahyudi, Yusuf, and Lestari (2020), and Khayati, Mujiyanto, and Warsono (2019). Those studies analyzed the flouting maxims between the teacher and students during the classroom learning process. The results of the three studies were different. Dwi (2015) attained research in EFL classrooms and revealed that the students often flouted the maxim of quality. She also found that students flouted the maxim of quantity because they did not have sufficient

linguistic competence to respond appropriately to teacher utterances. On the other hand, Wahyudi et al. (2020) found that flouting maxims produced by the teacher and students during classroom interaction show adverse effects. This research revealed four adverse effects: the students became flurry toward the teacher's information, the students did not understand the lesson, the class became rowdy and noisy, and the teacher became ignored.

Different from Dwi (2015) and Wahyudi et al. (2020), Khayati, Mujiyanto, and Warsono (2019) examined teacher's interaction with male and female students at Bilingual Boarding School. The male students flouted all Gricean's maxims, but the female students only flouted the maxim of relevance. They also found that male students tend to use the flouting maxim of relevance to change the subject of the topic of the discussion. Meanwhile, the female students flouted the maxim of relevance to avoid a particular topic.

Furthermore, Sari and Musyahda (2016), Fitri and Qodriani (2019), and Ulia (2020) had investigated research about flouting maxims in written texts. Sari and Musyahda (2016) examined the utterances of text on *Cak Cuk* Surabaya T-shirts and found that flouting the maxim of quality was considered the most flouted one. Also, they found that the use of flouting maxims was intended to create humor. Contrary to Sari and Musyahda (2016), who found that the maxims of the quality were dominantly flouted, Fitri and Qodriani (2019) and Ulia (2020) revealed that most of the flouting maxims found were flouting the maxim of quantity. The four types of flouting maxim found in Ulia (2020) was to maintain the conversation between the speaker and hearer. While Fitri and Qodriani (2019) found that

characters flout the maxims because they wanted to explain more about the topic so that the hearer has a clear understanding. However, they did not find the data that shows flouting the maxim of manner.

Studies about the flouting of the maxim have been widely used by several studies above. The differences between this study and the research conducted by Faridah (2016), Detrianto (2018), and Adawiyah (2016) are in terms of the use of data sources. The dialogues in movies are intendedly scripted, making them considered unnatural. In the context of talk shows, not all talk shows contain many flouting maxims. For instance, a study conducted by Zebua et al. (2017) used comedy talk shows as their data sources and found many flouting maxims.

Meanwhile, Hutapea (2017) and Manurung (2019) got fewer data containing the maxims' flouting since their data source was not a comedy talk show. So it can be concluded that comedy talk shows contain more flouting maxims than talk shows in general. Different from movies and talk shows whose data is in the form of utterances, research conducted by Sari and Musyahda (2016), Fitri and Qodriani (2019), and Ulia (2020) researched the flouting maxim in the text. The flouting maxim in the text is in the form of writing that is not spontaneous orally and primarily prepared in advance, so it is considered an unnatural data source.

Hence, this research was conducted in an almost similar way to Dwi (2015), Wahyudi et al. (2020), and Khayati et al. (2019) that the data were obtained from observation but different in the way that a focused-group discussion (FGD) was also used to investigate the reasons students flouting maxims. The researcher

employed FGD because it is very effective for analyzing people's knowledge and experiences and can examine what people think and how and why they think that way. The advantage of using this method for examining flouting maxim is that group processes can help participants explore and clarify their views in ways that would be more difficult to access in a one-on-one interview. When the discussion works well, the participants work alongside the researcher, bringing the research in new and sometimes unexpected ways.

This research aims to analyze the flouting maxims and the implied meaning between lecturer and students during the teaching and learning process. The researcher was interested in examining the flouting maxim as the topic of the study because the researcher found that many people were still unaware of the flouting they had committed with their interlocutors. The researcher was also inspired by the conversations between English Department students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya that do not comply entirely with Gricean's cooperative principles. Furthermore, to broaden the area of the study, particularly with the cooperative principle, this study anticipated that it could represent the real examples of flouting maxim and produce different research findings from prior research since there have been many studies in flouting maxims that used movies as the subject rather than observation, let alone using focus group discussion. In this research, focus group discussion means conducting online small group interviews that focus on communication between research participants to generate data through participants' opinions.

1.2 Problems of the Study

- 1.2.1 What are the maxims flouted by the English department students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya?
- 1.2.2 What are the reasons for the flouting maxim by the English department students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya?

1.3 Significance of the Study

The present research is expected to provide significance theoretically and practically. Theoretically, the results of this study are expected to enrich knowledge and a deeper understanding of pragmatics, especially about the flouting maxims. Also, this study is expected to be a guideline to make people have a successful conversation. For practically, it is expected to make people more aware of being cooperative in a conversation to make the conversation work effectively. Also, it is expected to make people apply four maxims of conversation to avoid misinterpretation and pay more attention to their utterance in the use of maxim flouting in a conversation.

1.4 Scope and Limitation of the Study

The study would analyze the types and reasons of the flouting maxim in utterances used by English Department students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. The researcher used Gricean's cooperative principle (1989). The researcher limited the analysis of the flouting maxim by only focusing on sentences and phrases.

1.5 Definition of Key Terms

1.5.1 Cooperative principle is a guideline or principle that people should apply to make the conversation required as they expect.

1.5.2 Flouting maxim means when the speakers say implicitly in their utterances, they let the listener seek for a hidden meaning that the speakers utter.



UIN SUNAN AMPEL
S U R A B A Y A

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There are several related theories presented in this chapter. This chapter is important because it elaborates the theory of cooperative principles, the four conversational maxims, and the flouting of the maxims, which is the basic analysis of this research.

2.1 Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that studies the contribution of context in meaning. Yule (1996, p. 3) argues that the study concerned with the speaker's meaning is pragmatics. Therefore, it has more to do with an analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words do with an analysis of what people mean by their utterances that what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves. Pragmatics is the study of what individuals intend in a particular situation and how that context influences what they say. This requires focusing on how speakers arrange what they want to say according to what is stated. This requires considering how speakers arrange what they intend to say according to whom they are speaking to, where they are speaking, when they are speaking, and under what conditions. Thus, pragmatics can be defined as the study of meaning conveyed by speakers through context.

To understand the context, speakers and listeners share some principles about how language works. One of those principles is the cooperative principle which declares that a cooperative speaker will cooperate with the listener by following some communication rules. This principle uses several utterances that follow more specific principles or maxims to convey the meaning of these utterances clearly and easily understood. The researcher uses this theory of pragmatics to know how to communicate.

2.2 Context

Context is the situation in which something happens. In this research, the researcher uses the theory from Hymes (1974) in the ethnography of communication. He found the concept of communication, known as S.P.E.A.K.I.N.G. This concept has 8 main components which aim to provide an overview of how to understand a speech event's context. The following is an explanation of the S.P.E.A.K.I.N.G. concept where each letter represents the following meaning:

- S for setting and scene. Setting refers to the time and place where the speech takes place, while the scene refers to the situation of place and time.
- P for participants. Participants are parties involved in the conversation. Participants included speakers and listeners, or addresser and addressee.
- E for ends. Ends refer to the intent and purpose of the utterance.
- A for acts sequence. Act sequence refers to the form of speech and the content of the speech. This form of speech relates to the words used, how they are used, and the relationship between what is said and the topic of conversation.

- K for a key. Key refers to the tone, manner and spirit in which a message is conveyed. For example, cheerfully, seriously, curtly, arrogantly, mockingly etc. Gestures can also show this.
- I for instrumentalities. Instrumentalities refer to the language used, such as spoken, written, etc.
- N for norms. Norms refer to the rule of communication.
- G for the genre. Genre refers to the type of speech event, such as proverbs, apologies, prayers, poetry, narrative, etc.

2.3 Cooperative Principle

The Cooperative Principle is a theory formulated by Herbert Paul Grice in his article *Logic and Conversation*. It was first published in 1989 by Harvard University Press. Grice (1989, p. 26) defines cooperative principle as to “make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.”

Grice proposed that the cooperative principle directs the speaker to contribute as required based on the context of the conversation. It refers to how people are trying to get their conversation to work. Meanwhile, the speaker and the hearer have to work together to get a productive conversation.

Grice formulated guidelines for communicating effectively and efficiently in conversation to make the cooperative principles acceptable. These guidelines are known as conversational maxims. Grice divided the conversational cooperative

principle concept into four categories. Those are maxims of quantity, maxims of quality, maxims of relation, and maxims of manner.

2.4 Maxim

Maxim as part of the cooperative principle is a pragmatic field. Maxim is a concept that leads to the speaker's contribution to the conversation. The concept of maxims is based on Grice's (1989) pragmatic note on communication. Yule (1996, p.37) mentioned that the assumption of cooperation is pervasive that it can be stated as the cooperative principle of conversation and described in four sub-principles, called maxims. Maxim is a rule that must be observed to build a cooperative principle of conversation between listeners and speakers. The cooperative principle has four maxims to help speakers and listeners understand the meaning of utterances, and those are; the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manners.

2.4.1 Maxim of Quantity

Grice (1989, p. 26) defines that maxim of quantity relates to the quantity of information to be provided, and under it fall the following 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."

This means that the speaker should give information as informative as required and not provide too little or too much information. In other words, the

speakers should give the listeners enough information as needed. Participants who provide too little information will not explain what they are talking about because they are unclear. For instance:

A : “Do you have any pets?
 B : I have two cats.”
 (Finegan, 2008, p. 287)

In the conversation above, the information delivered by B is informative. It makes the maxim of quantity fulfilled since she gives enough contribution towards A’s question about whether she has any pets or not.

2.4.2 Maxim of Quality

Grice (1989, p. 27) defines maxim of quality as:

1. “Do not say what you believe to be false
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence”.

Maxim of quality means that the speaker should be honest to communicate cooperatively. Cutting (2002, p. 35) defines that the speakers should be sincere in fulfilling the maxim and say what they believe matches reality. In line with Cutting, Finegan (2008, p. 289) defines that the maxim of quality proposes that the interlocutors tell the facts and provide evidence of their utterances. For instance:

A : “I’ll ring you tomorrow afternoon then.
 B : Erm, I shall be there **as far as I know**, and in the meantime have a word with Mum and Dad if they're free. Right, bye-bye then sweetheart.
 A : Bye-bye, bye.”

B's response in the discussion above fulfils the maxim of quality because B says, “as far as I know,” which means that she can not be completely sure that she

will be there if A rings up and discovers out B is not there. Within that case, B is covered from charges of lying because she made it clear that she was unsure.

2.4.3 Maxim of Relation

Grice (1989, p.27) defines maxim of relation as:

1. Be relevant

Maxim of relation means that the speaker should be relevant to the context of a conversation. Cutting (2002, p. 35) argues that in order “to fulfil the maxim of relation, the speaker is expected to say something relevant to what has been said before.” Meanwhile, Finegan (2008, p. 288) adds that “the maxim of relation directs speakers to organize their utterances in such a way that they are relevant to the ongoing context.” Grice's maxim of relevance stipulates that contributions should be relevant to the intended current objectives of the interlocutors (Griffiths 2006, p. 132). Conversation participants will find it hard to comprehend the topic without relevance because the statements will seem to be very unconnected. For instance:

A : “There's somebody at the door

B : I'm in the bath.”

(Cutting, 2002, p. 35)

In the example above, it is clear enough between A's statement and B's response that they fulfil the maxim of relevance since their conversation is relevant to each other. In this case, B wants A to realize that the current position of B is relevant to A's statement that there is someone at the door, and A can not go and see who that person is because he is in the bathroom.

2.4.4 Maxim of Manner

Grice (1989, p.27) defines maxim of manner as:

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

Maxim of manner expects the speaker to be clear. This means that the speaker should be brief and orderly and avoid obscurity and ambiguity. For instance:

"Thank you, Chairman. Jus – just to clarify one point. There is a meeting of the Police Committee on Monday, and there is an item on their budget for the provision of their camera." (Cutting, 2002, p. 35)

The speaker's statements fulfil the maxim of manner since he tries to be cooperative by saying "just to clarify one point," which aims to make the listener understand what point the speaker wants to emphasize.

Grice (1989, p. 30) defines that "A participant in a talk exchange may fail to fulfil a maxim in various ways which include the following:

1. He may quietly and unostentatiously violate a maxim; if so, he will be liable to mislead in some cases.
2. He may opt-out from the operation both of the maxim and cooperative principle; he may say indicate or allow it to become plain that he is unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires.
3. He may face a clash: he may be unable, for example, to fulfil the first maxim of quantity without violating the second maxim of quality.

4. He may flout a maxim; that is, he may blatantly fail to fulfil it.”

2.5 Flouting Maxims

Occasionally people are flouting the maxims of the conversation of their utterances for various reasons. Flouting of maxim has always happened of conversational implicature, which permits the speaker to convey meaning beyond what is expressed. Cutting (2002, p. 37) defines flouting maxim is when speakers appear not to follow the maxim but assume hearers to realize the implied meaning. Besides, Black (2006, p. 25) defines that “a speaker who flouts maxims is aware of the cooperative principles and the maxims. In other words, it is not only about the maxims being broken down but that the speaker prefers an indirect way of achieving cooperation.”

The implication often occurs in a conversation when the speaker does not feel assured that he can say it explicitly. Brown and Yule (1983, p. 32) define that “maxim flouting was the result when the speaker conveyed an utterance additionally to the literal meaning which is the implicature of the conversation.” Within that case, as a receiver, the hearer should understand the hidden meaning of the speaker's statement and conclude the further meaning of that statement. Also, Levinson (1983, p. 104) defines that “flouting happens when a speaker deliberately fails to follow a maxim, not with any intention of deceiving or misleading, but he/she allows the hearer to look for the meaning that is different from, or, instead, to take the meaning conveyed.” This occurs when

people intentionally fail to apply the maxim to allow their hearers to conclude the hidden message behind the utterances; that is, the speaker uses implicature. There are four kinds of flouting of the Grice (1989) maxim. Those are the maxim of quantity flouting, a maxim of quality flouting, a maxim of relation flouting, and a maxim of manner flouting. The four types of maxim flouting are explained in the following points.

2.5.1 Flouting of Maxim Quantity

Flouting maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker seems to provide too little or too much information than is required. The information can be insufficient and uninformative contributions (Cutting, 2002, p. 37). For instance:

A : “Well, how do I look?
B : Your shoes are nice.”

From the example above, B's response is flouting the maxim of quantity since B only gives an opinion about part of A's shoes while A asks B's opinion on his whole appearance. Within that case, B provides less information than is required. B does not tell that the sweatshirt and jeans do not look nice. B's answer leads A to infer that his appearance is not good enough unless for his shoes.

The example above clearly shows that the conversation is flouting the maxim of quantity since too little information is required. Another example given by Grice (1989, p. 33) defines that “utterances of patent tautologies like: provide flouting of the maxim of quantity

“Women are women.”
“War is war.”

Grice's opinion on those kinds of examples is completely non-informative, and therefore, at that level, it can not but infringe the maxim of quantity in any conversational context. Infringement of the first maxim of quantity, "Do not give more information than is required," on the assumption that the existence of such a maxim should be admitted.

2.5.2 Flouting of Maxim Quality

Based on Cutting (2002, p. 37), "the speaker who flouts the maxim of quality may do it in several ways." First, they might say something that does not represent what they think. In this case, in his utterance, the speaker does not provide true facts by stating what is known to be false and saying what is lacking insufficient evidence. Second, speakers can flout the maxim using hyperbole, metaphor, irony, and banter. The speaker seems to be flouting the maxim of quality when they overstate their point utterance such as "I could eat a horse." Within that example, the speaker expects the listener to infer that they are really hungry and can even eat a horse. For instance:

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

B : "And London's in Armenia, I suppose."

(Levinson, 1983, p. 110)

From the conversation above, both A and B's answers flout the maxim of quality since they are false that London is in Armenia and Teheran is in Turkey. In this case, B provides an incorrect statement to infer an implication that A's statement is not correct so that A can introspect that his answer is false. Another example:

"My house is a refrigerator in January."

The example above is categorized as flouting the maxim of quality since it gives a metaphor statement. This does not mean that the house will turn into a refrigerator in January. It means that the house was very cold as a refrigerator.

2.5.3 Flouting of Maxim Relation

According to Thomas (1995, p.70), “the flouting maxim of the relation is exploited by making a response or observation which is very obviously irrelevant to the topic.” Thus, the speakers flout the maxim of relation when they do not answer within the topic discussed. Also, Cutting (2002, p. 39) defines that “the speaker who flouts the maxim of relation expects the hearers to be able to imagine what the utterance did not say and make the connection between his/her utterance and the preceding one.” For instance:

A : “I do think Mrs. Jenkins is an old windbag, don’t you?
 B : Huh, lovely weather for March, isn’t it?”
 (Levinson, 1983, p. 111)

B's answer flouts the maxim of relation from the dialogue above since B provides an irrelevant statement to A's topic. In this case, B offers an irrelevant statement for inferring an implication to A that they should stop talking about Mrs. Jenkins and realize that Mrs. Jenkins's nephew is standing right behind them.

Another example:

A : “So what do you think of Mark?
 B : His flatmate's a wonderful cook.”

B's answer is flouting the maxim of relation since she makes the conversation unmatched from the dialogue above. Within that case, B does not

say that she was not impressed by Mark, but she implied that by not mentioning him in her answer and saying something irrelevant.

2.5.4 Flouting of Maxim Manner

Cutting (2002, p. 39) stated that “those who flout the maxim of manner are being obscure and often trying to exclude the third party.” It means that flouting the maxim of manner occurs when the speaker makes ambiguous responses and cannot be clear and orderly in conversation. For instance:

- 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 long –dinner’s nearly ready”.

From the conversation above, B's answer is flouting the maxim of relation because they say, “that funny white stuff” to replace ice cream and mentioning “somebody” to replace “his/her daughter.” In this case, B makes their daughter not become excited and asks for ice cream before a meal.

UIN SUNAN AMPEL
 S U R A B A Y A

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter presents the research method used in this research. It consists of research design, data collection, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

This research used a descriptive qualitative approach. Qualitative research is conducted in a natural environment where the researcher is the main instrument of data collection that collects words or images, analyzes them inductively, focuses on the meaning of the participants, and explains a method that is descriptive and convincing (Creswell, 1998, p. 14). Meanwhile, Bogdan and Biklen (1998, p. 29) explain that qualitative data collection took the form of words or images rather than numbers. The written results of the research contained quotations from the data to support and illustrate the presentation.

In this case, the researcher collected data related to students' utterances with their lecturer in the English department at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya based on the conversational implicature concept developed by H.P. Grice. The research data were the utterances in the dialogue of English department students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya with one of the lecturers in the classroom. The data were limited only to the utterances that flout the maxim of conversation since the

flouting maxim could generate conversational implicature. The research participants were English department students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya and a lecturer of a speaking class in the 2020-2021 cohort.

3.2 Data Collection

This part presented research data, data sources, instruments, and data collection techniques.

3.2.1 Research Data

The data of this research were in the form of utterances by students in their interaction with the lecturer in the speaking class, which indicated the flouting of the maxim during the learning process. The form of the data was a dialogue, including phrases and sentences.

3.2.2 Data Source and Subject of the Study

This research took two kinds of data. The first data source was a video transcript of the utterances during the learning process in the speaking class. The second data was an audio transcript of FGD about why the participants committed flouting maxims. This research took place in April 2021 - June 2021, where even semester students started studying after odd semester breaks.

This research participants were English department students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya in the academic year of 2020. A total of 112 students participated in the study: 28 students from A-class, 28 students from B-class, 28 students from C-class, 28 students from D-class. All come from different cities and backgrounds (18–22). The choice of subjects for the participants was a

speaking class taught by a teacher pseudonymized as Mrs. Samantha. The reason for choosing the speaking class was that students in the 2nd semester have not learned about pragmatics which means they have no idea what a flouting maxim is. Therefore, a more natural conversation and valid data can be obtained.

3.2.3 Instrument

The researcher used two instruments to support this research. The first instrument was an observation by the researcher herself. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the researcher recorded the teaching and learning process using a laptop. The second instrument was focused-group discussion using the Zoom meeting conference application. According to Kitzinger (1995, p. 299), a focused group discussion was a group interview that focused on communication between research participants to generate data through participants' opinions.

A focused group discussion was conducted to determine why the students flout the maxims during the online learning activity in class. Four focused-group discussions were conducted: 1 group from A-class, 1 group from B-class, 1 group from C-class, and 1 group from D-class. The first FGD consisted of students who flouted maxims in the A-class, then the next discussion continued in the B until finally to C and D classes.

In the discussion process, the researcher presented a video of the participants doing the flouting maxim during online learning activities in the class. The researcher then started with open-ended questions and asked participants their reasons for the flouting maxims. The researcher used teleconferences applications, such as Google Meet, Zoom, and Whatsapp, then took notes to clarify why they

have committed the flouting of maxim after the learning process. The discussions were elicited by asking participants to respond to why they flouted the maxims. Each discussion lasted for approximately 15-30 minutes.

3.2.4 Data Collection Techniques

There were several techniques for collecting the data to complete this research:

1. Before the class began, the researcher prepared a laptop, stationery, and a notebook. Then, the researcher tried to do some tests with the laptop to prevent undesirable events. After that, the researcher asked permission from the speaking class lecturer to allow her to sit in the class, playing the role of a student, so the researcher was unknown by the participants.
2. The observation was conducted using teleconference applications. This observation in every class meeting took around 100 minutes and was carried out 16 times according to the A-D speaking class schedules. The researcher recorded all interactions using a laptop to get original data from the natural situation in observation during the learning process. The researcher also took notes on important moments when an event flows quickly.
3. After every class meeting, the researcher conducted a focused-group discussion to ask why they were flouting the maxim. The researcher used teleconferences applications and recorded them in the focused-group discussion process. Each discussion lasted for approximately 15-30 minutes and took around 5 minutes for each participant.

4. The researcher collected the data by transcribing students' utterances flouting the maxim in videos and focused-group discussions. Then, the researcher marked and circled the selected data, which contained the types of flouting the maxim.

3.3 Data Analysis

Data analysis is described as follows:

1. Data reduction

Data reduction was the first step used to select the relevant data so that the researcher could easily focus on the primary concerns. The researcher then reviewed the data that has been transcribed by underlining the sentences and trying to match the participants' utterances and their reasons. If it was found that the data did not match the criteria, then the data was separated from the core data. This was a process for the reduction and transformation of raw data.

2. Data identification

The researcher began to identify this research by categorizing the selected raw data into the maxim's flouting types. The reasons for participants in the previous discussion were not included in the table, but it was written below. The table below shows the researcher's classifying raw data for analysis.

Table 3.1. Raw Data of Flouting Maxims

Class	Date	Types of Maxim	Conversation

--	--	--	--

The coding systems will be as below:

- Class : The origin class of the student
- Date : The date of the data taken
- Types of Maxim : The type of maxim that the students flout
- Conversation : The research data

3. Data interpretation

The researcher began to analyze the research data by compiling the participant's utterances above and writing down the analysis below. Afterwards, the researcher systematically arranged it to avoid the unclear reasons of the participants in the focused-group discussion. The researcher made a little interpretation in arranging the reasons of participants based on Gricean's (1989) cooperative principles so that the reason was more structured without changing the contents in it.

4. Conclusion

At the end of the analysis, the researcher concluded on the maxim's flouting types and why English literature students flouted the maxim.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents findings and a discussion of research findings. In findings, there are several types of flouting the maxims committed by UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya students. Then, in the discussion part, explain some of the reasons behind them committing this flouting maxim in depth.

4.1 Findings

This part presented the results of the data analysis. It aimed to find several types of flouting the maxims used by English department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya during the learning activity in speaking class and their reasons for flouting maxims. The finding section is divided into two parts following the research questions. First, the researcher presents the maxims flouted by the students. Second, the reasons for flouting maxims will be explained.

4.1.1 The Maxims Flouted by the English Department Students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

Gricean cooperative principles are used to identify the types of flouting the maxims. Those types are flouting the maxim of quantity, flouting the maxim of quality, flouting the maxim of relation, and flouting the maxim of manner. The

following table will describe the number of flouting maxims used by UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya students during three months of online learning.

Table 4.1. A Total Frequency and Percentage of Types of Flouting Maxims

No.	Types of Flouting Maxims	Frequency	%
1.	Flouting Maxim of Quantity	20	71%
2.	Flouting Maxim of Quality	3	11%
3.	Flouting Maxim of Relation	4	14%
4.	Flouting Maxim of Manner	1	4%
Total		28	100%

The table above is the result of the researcher's analysis. It shows that most of the students are flouting maxims of quantity. The flouting maxim of quantity is more dominant than the others, with a percentage of 71% or 20 times. Then, the second is flouting maxims of relation with a percentage of 14% or four times, and the third is flouting maxims of quality with a percentage of 11% or three times. The most infrequently used is flouting the maxim of manner with a percentage of 4% or only once.

4.1.1.1 Flouting Maxims of Quantity

Flouting the maxim of quantity is when the speaker deliberately gives more or less information than required. 20 data are flouting the maxim of quantity used by the English department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. The researcher finds that students often give too little information rather than give too much information. The way students flout the maxim of quantity is explained below.

Data 1 (11/6/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : Olivia Kumara? Olivia?
 Olivia Kumara : [no answer while she's on the screen]
 Mrs. Samantha : Olivia Kumara hasn't joined yet.

The topic material on that day was teaching practice. Mrs. Samantha called the names of the second group members to make a presentation immediately, including Olivia Kumara. Olivia then turned on the camera without answering Mrs. Samantha's questions. Knowing that her question was not answered, Mrs. Samantha concluded that Olivia Kumara had not joined yet. Instead of responding to Mrs. Samantha's question by saying, "Yes ma'am, I am present. I have joined the meeting," she was only silent. Her uninformative contribution to Mrs. Samantha categorized it as flouting the maxim of quantity.

Data 2 (11/6/2021)

Tony : The number 4, *mbak* Nahtasya, maybe wants to answer this?
 Nahtasya : Eh.. The answer is A. Was.
 Tony : Why you choose was? Why not were?
 Nahtasya : [no answer]

Tony was assigned to play a role as a speaker from the second group and delivered the material about simple past tense. After finishing the presentation, he continued to the question session. He called Nahtasya to answer question number 4, and she answered it by saying, "*Eh.. The answer is A. Was.*" Tony then asked again why she chose the answer, but she was only silent. She did not answer Tony's question, which led her to flout the maxim of quantity. Nahtasya should have answered Tony's questions quickly since Tony had explained before asking questions. By giving a short statement, Nahtasya is categorized as the one who did not fulfill the maxim of quantity.

Data 3 (11/6/2021)

Richie : First is I blablabla my new class yesterday. Anyone want to answer?
Anyone, please? Or I choose you one by one?

Aliana : I wanna try to answer the question.

Richie : Yes, please

Aliana : My name is Aliana and the question I blablabla my new class yesterday.
My answer is was started. Is it true?

Richie : Eh--- I am sorry, that's wrong, but that's okay. Thank you. The answer is started. Why we use started because is, we can see at A answer was started is I think is wrong. Eh—wrong form. If eh-- to be or like was, were need verb is the verb is eh-- have to eh-- it have verb ing form. So like was starting like on C answer. But the right answer is B. Started. Was starting is right form but in we use that in simp— eh-- past continuous, now we talk about simple past tense, so we use started. Thank you, mbak Alya, and we move to the second question.

Richie was assigned to play a role as a speaker of the third group. After finishing his presentation, he continued to the quiz session. One of his friends, named Aliana, volunteered to answer the first question. She answered Richie's question by saying, "*My name is Aliana and the question I blablabla my new class yesterday. My answer is was started. Is it true?*" Then, Richie answered with too much information than Aliana was required. He gave a lengthy explanation when he could easily answer Aliana's question with a yes or no. Therefore, Richie is categorized as an example of giving too much information by flouting the maxim of quantity.

Data 4 (18/6/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : Hallo, hallo, the first group? Loh? *Ini sudah buat atau saya panggil satu-satu--- langsung panggil aja?*

Sunny : *Sudah buat, mam.*

Mrs. Samantha : *Ya sudah buat ya ayo, who is the first group?* [laugh]

Sunny : Sorry, ma'am, for the late. *Ada Tamara---*

Mrs. Samantha : Turn on your camera, please, so I can see your name.

Sunny : Wait, ma'am. Wait.

Mrs. Samantha : Ya *mbak* Sunny and then who else?

Sunny : [no answer]

Mrs. Samantha : Okay *mbak* Sunny, and then who are the friends, *mbak?*

Sunny : [no answer]

Mrs. Samantha started the class by asking the students about the first group presenting. One of the students, Sunny, the members of the first group, responded to Mrs. Samantha's question. While responding to Mrs. Samantha, Sunny did not turn on the camera, so Mrs. Samantha told her to turn on the camera to know who was talking. After turning on the camera, Sunny did not respond to Mrs. Samantha's question. Even though Mrs. Samantha had called her several times, there was only silence from her, making her fail to fulfill the maxim of quantity. She should have easily responded to Mrs. Samantha's question by mentioning her friends' names, but she did not. Therefore, she was categorized as the one who flouted the maxim of quantity because giving less information than required.

Data 5 (11/6/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : Okay, everyone, before ending the class, any questions?
Or is it clear enough?

[no one answer]

Mrs. Samantha : Hello, is it clear enough, everyone?

[no one answer]

Mrs. Samantha was about to end the class that day. At the end of the lesson, she always asked the students whether they had understood the material or not. After waiting for a while, none of the students answered Mrs. Samantha's question. The absence of answers from these students made them flout the maxim of quantity. It should be easy for them to say "Yes, ma'am, I understand," or "I still don't understand, ma'am." However, they failed to do so. Since they gave too little information that made Mrs. Samantha unsatisfied, they were categorized as flouting the maxim of quantity.

Data 6 (23/4/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : Who will answer the second question? *Mbak* Chelsea or *Mas* Damian?

[both of them did not answer the question]

Mrs. Samantha : Who will answer the second question? *Mas* Damian, will you answer it?

Damian : [no answer]

Mrs. Samantha : *Mas* Damian or *Mbak* Chelsea? Hello? Time is up. Come on, hurry up, everyone

[both of them did not answer the question]

The dialogue above showed a conversation between a speaker and students.

The students were assigned to deliver material about wildlife protection at seminars. Rosie was the moderator in the second group, while Chelsea and Damian were the speakers. After delivering their material, Rosie held a question-and-answer session. They got two questions from their friends. When it was time to answer the question, Chelsea and Damian did not respond, failing to fulfill the maxim of quantity. They should have easily responded, "Yes, mam. We are still working on it," but they did not. Since they failed to be cooperative in the conversation, they identified as flouting the maxim of quantity by saying less information than the lecturer needed.

Data 7 (25/6/2021)

Chelsea : There's a question, everyone?

Mrs. Samantha : you didn't make the scenario? Hehe

Chelsea : [no answer]

The learning material was about roleplaying on talk shows. Chelsea played the role of a host, and three other friends played famous characters. After her three friends finished playing their roles, Chelsea opened a question-and-answer session. Knowing that there was no question from students, Mrs. Samantha asked Chelsea if she did not make a talk show scenario to perform that day. Chelsea only showed a confused expression on her face without giving any answers to

Mrs. Samantha. In this case, ignoring the teacher's question was the cause that made Chelsea flout the maxim of quantity.

Data 8 (25/6/2021)

Marco : What is your baby's name?

Emma : Is Ka— is Khai.

Marco : Eh.. what? Spell its name. Spell.

Emma : What? Can you repeat it?

Marco : Spell this name, spell.

Emma : Just Khai.

The conversation above was between Marco and Emma, playing roles on a talk show. Emma played the role of a famous character named Gigi Hadid, while Marco became the audience asking questions. Marco asked a question about the name of Gigi Hadi's child, and Emma immediately answered the question, saying that her daughter's name was Khai. Marco then asked Emma to spell Khai's name, but Emma did not. Considering that she did not give the information Marco needed, Emma was the one flouting the maxim of quantity. In these terms, being less informative than the hearer required was the cause that made Emma fail to fulfil the maxim of quantity.

Data 9 (25/6/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : Now we move to the third group, group third... group three? The third group, are you ready?

[Damian, Hannah, Sylvi, Alexis, Samuel, Ginny, Abby, Emily did not answer]

Mrs. Samantha : Group three?

[Damian, Hannah, Sylvi, Alexis, Samuel, Ginny, Abby, Emily did not answer]

Mrs. Samantha : Group three???

[Damian, Hannah, Sylvi, Alexis, Samuel, Ginny, Abby, Emily did not answer]

Mrs. Samantha : Okay, come on, group three, are you ready, group three?

[Damian, Hannah, Sylvi, Alexis, Samuel, Ginny, Abby, Emily did not answer]

Before performing on talk shows, Mrs. Samantha called each group member by name to ensure they were present and ready to play a role. After the previous group performed, it was the turn of the third group to perform. Mrs. Samantha

called the third group to start the talk show immediately. Although Mrs. Samantha has called them several times, none have responded. It should be easy for them to answer "Yes, mam. We are ready," or "We are still getting ready, mam. Would you give us some time to prepare?" However, none of them responded to any single words. As shown above, all of them were considered the ones who flouted the maxim of quantity because they ignored Mrs. Samantha's question.

Data 10 (25/6/2021)

- Mrs. Samantha : So *mas* Damian, eh.. who is your group? Who are the members of your group?
- Damian meeting] : [did not answer the question, but he still joined the meeting]
- Mrs. Samantha : *Mas* Damian?
- Damian meeting] : [did not answer the question, but he still joined the meeting]
- Mrs. Samantha : Hello?

Mrs. Samantha previously explained the final exam to the students in the conversation above. Damian was one of the students who stated that he could not take the exam because he had the same schedule as the exam time. Mrs. Samantha responded to Damian's statement by asking which group he belonged to. Even though Mrs. Samantha called his name three times, there was still no response from him. Seeing that he deliberately gave too little information than Mrs. Samantha required, he identified as flouting the maxim of quantity.

Data 11 (25/6/2021)

- Mrs. Samantha : Yes, okay, *mbak* Astrid. What is your impression after joining this class?
- Astrid : Very fun, mam.
- Mrs. Samantha : What makes you fun?
- Astrid : ehm---
- Mrs. Samantha : Ehm, what? Keep silent.

The last day of the speaking class was closed by giving an impression during one semester of learning. Mrs. Samantha started by asking the male students about their impressions of learning in speaking class. After seeing the response of the male students who were full of enthusiasm, Mrs. Samantha then asked the female students. After waiting for a while, Mrs. Samantha did not respond to the female students. Mrs. Samantha finally appointed Astrid to give her impression during her speaking class. At first, Astrid answered Mrs. Samantha's question appropriately by saying, "*Very fun, mam.*" However, when Mrs. Samantha asked why Astrid responded to that question, she only said "*hmmm,*" which made Mrs. Samantha unsatisfied with the answer and replied to her by saying, "*Ehmm what? keep silent.*" Thus, as explained above, Astrid was categorized as the one who flouted the maxim of quantity since she deliberately gave an answer that was less than Mrs. Samantha required.

Data 12 (18/6/2021)

Marco : Do you want to sing for me?

Lily : [no answer, just laughing]

Louis : Okay, do you wanna sing for us, maybe miss Lily?

Lily : [no answer, just laughing]

The conversation above involved three students who were playing a role. Louis played the role of the host, Lily played the role of Taylor Swift, and Marco played the role of the audience asking questions. After Lily finished her talk show, Louis opened a question-and-answer session. Marco asked Lily to sing a song, Louis as the host, also asked Lily to accept Marco's request. Lily looked surprised. She did not answer anything and only responded to the questions of her two friends with laughter. Lily deliberately flouted the maxim of quantity twice when

Marco asked, and Louis repeated Marco's request. Questions from Marco and Louis should have been answered easily by saying yes or no, but instead, she only laughed without answering any questions. The way she replied to the questions from Marco and Louis indicated that she flouted the maxim of quantity by giving less information than required.

Data 13 (11/6/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : Still trouble, *mbak*?
Emily : [no answer]

The dialogue above was showed a conversation between Mrs. Samantha and Emily. Emily was the speaker of seminars. She delivered the presentation while her friend handed out the PowerPoint screen. Unfortunately, in the middle of the presentation, her friend experienced a network disturbance which caused her presentation to stop. It took a little while until finally, Mrs. Samantha asked Emily if she was still facing the problem or not. Emily seemed to be listening to Mrs. Samantha's question, but she did not respond. In this case, the one who experienced network disturbance was Emily's friend, not her. Considering that she deliberately did not answer Mrs. Samantha's question when she could easily answer it by saying yes or no, she was identified as flouting the maxim of quantity by giving answers that were less than what was required.

Data 14 (25/6/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : Now we move to the third group. The third group are you ready?
[Stella, Sheryn, Ruby, Dara, Sofia, Milly, Raisya, Julian did not answer]
Mrs. Samantha : The third group?
[Stella, Sheryn, Ruby, Dara, Sofia, Milly, Raisya, Julian did not answer]

After the first and second groups finished performing the talk show, Mrs. Samantha called the third group to perform the talk show. She called the third

group to start immediately. All members appeared on google meet, turning on their cameras, but none answered Mrs. Samantha's call. All third group members showed that they flouted the maxim of quantity because they deliberately ignored Mrs. Samantha. It should have been easy for them to answer, "Yes, mam" or "Sorry, ma'am, our members are still incomplete. Would you like to wait a moment?" There were eight members of group three, and they did not have time to answer. As explained above, it can be concluded that the third group members gave very little information, which made them fail to be cooperative in the conversation.

Data 15 (25/6/2021)

Alicia : Caleb, what game do you often play?

Caleb : I prefer to play games that are I mean (...) and seems relaxed. But for the world of e-sport itself we have to be forced to be the best of, the best of many people. Like it or not I play more often (...) that are competitive ehm time I mean competitive genre.

The dialogue above was showed a conversation between students named Alicia and Caleb. They played the role on talk shows. Alicia was the host, and Caleb was the speaker. Alicia started the talk show by asking Caleb a few questions, then Caleb answered each of the questions. There was a question from Alicia to Caleb about what game he played the most. Caleb directly answered Alicia's question by giving too much information. All he needed to say was only mention the game's name, but instead, he explained in detail. In terms of flouting maxims, his utterances made him the one who flouted the maxim of quantity.

Data 16 (28/5/2021)

Irene : Is that clear to you, Cindy?

Cindy : [no answer]

Irene : *Mbak* Cindy, is that clear?

Cindy : [no answer]

The dialogue above was a conversation between students named Irene and Cindy. Irene was the seminar moderator, and Cindy was the audience asked a question. Cindy asked Satria, one of the speakers in Irene's group. After Satria answered the question, Irene asked Cindy whether the answer given was clear or not. Cindy appeared at google meetings, listened to Irene's voice, but she did not respond to Irene's calling. Irene's question should have been answered by simply saying, "Yes, it is clear enough" or "No, I still do not understand," but she failed to do it. In this case, Cindy deliberately did not answer Irene's question, which caused her to flout the maxim of quantity.

Data 17 (28/5/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : Did you watch the video... *Menteri Luar Negeri*?

[No one answer]

Mrs. Samantha : Hello everyone, did you watch it?

[No one answer, so Mrs. Samantha answers her question]

Mrs. Samantha : No? Hehe.

At the end of the lesson, Mrs. Samantha gave feedback to her students. She gave feedback on the student's expression, pronunciation, and grammar. In the middle of her explanation, she asked the students about the video she had sent before. None of them answered the question. Mrs. Samantha even asked them for the second time, but no one responded. In this case, those who failed to fulfil the maxim of quantity were Mrs. Samantha's students. They failed to fulfil their contribution as participants in the conversation because they deliberately did not respond when they could easily answer the question with a yes or no. In terms of flouting, giving less information was the one that made Mrs. Samantha's students did not fulfil the maxim of quantity.

Data 18 (4/6/2021)

- Mrs. Samantha : The international famous dancer Maria Tallchief demonstrates that. Are you sure, A? Why is it A? What is the answer? Why?
- Eric : [no answer]
- Mrs. Samantha : Why should be A?
- Eric : [no answer]
- Mrs. Samantha : Are you sure, A?
- Eric : [no answer]

The dialogue above was between Mrs. Samantha and Eric. At that time, Mrs. Samantha was about to give feedback to her students about the presentation. Before giving feedback, she asked the students about the TOEIC and TOEFL tests. She took one example then she asked her students what the answer was. One of Mrs. Samantha's students, Eric, volunteered to answer the question. After knowing that Eric said A as the answer, Mrs. Samantha asked why Eric chose A. He did not answer any of Mrs. Samantha's questions, even though Mrs. Samantha had been called him many times. Eric gave too little information, which led him flout the maxim of quantity. Not only once did he flout the maxim of quantity, but three times. In this case, flouting the maxim of the quantity he did was silent without answering.

Data 19 (4/6/2021)

- Mrs. Samantha : What do you think about this sentence? What tense in this sentence? Simple present tense, present continuous, present future, or the other?
- Joanna : Simple present tense.
- Mrs. Samantha : Simple present tense. How do you know this is simple present tense?
- Joanna : [no answer]

The dialogue above was still related to the previous dialogue. The conversation was between Mrs. Samantha and students named Joanna. In the last dialogue, the question was answered by Eric. Mrs. Samantha then asked the

students what tenses were in the sentence. Joanna responded it by saying, "*simple present tense*." Mrs. Samantha then asked her why she answered simple present tense, but she only kept silent, making her less informative than required.

Considering that the learning material that day was about the simple present tense, she should have answered Mrs. Samantha's question easily. As shown above, Joanna was categorized as flouting the maxim of quantity by giving too little information.

Data 20 (7/5/2021)

- Mrs. Samantha : Ya okay, before I forgot this is to announce you this is to inform you that next week you are going to have holiday ya. Eh—because eh-- we have Eid al-Fitr , your holiday will be started from 12 until 14 if I'm not mistaken. That's the official announcement from our campus, but it depends on the lecturer ya. But the official holiday is eh—12 until 14 May. So, eh—14 May is Friday so next Friday you still have holiday, and then we are going to meet again in two weeks ya, we meet again in two weeks eh—in 21 May ya. So happy holiday! [laugh] happy holiday!
- Valen : Wow that's long, mam.
- Mrs. Samantha : Hah?
- Valen : It's long, mam.
- Mrs. Samantha : Long? [laugh] why is it long?
- Valen : [no answer]

The dialogue above showed a conversation between Mrs. Samantha and a student named Valen. Before starting the lesson, Mrs. Samantha explained the Eid al-Fitr holiday to the students. After giving information about the Eid holiday, Valen responded to Mrs. Samantha by saying, "*Wow, that's long, mam.*" Then, Mrs. Samantha replied to Valen's statement by asking why she said so. Valen did not answer Mrs. Samantha's question, but she still appeared on google meet. Knowing that Valen had no response, Mrs. Samantha continued to start learning.

In this case, the way Valen responded that was less than required made her become the one who failed to fulfil the maxim of quantity.

4.1.1.2 Flouting Maxim of Quality

Flouting the maxim of quality is when the speaker deliberately says something untrue. There are 3 data of flouting the maxim of quality used by the English department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. The way students flout the maxim of quality is explained below.

Data 21 (7/5/2021)

- Mrs. Samantha : Build, teaches, and develop. These are incorrect, this is incorrect, and what is the correct one? Can you make it correct? What should be? What should be in b? Teaches this is incorrect. What should it be, everyone? You understand what I mean?
- Hagia : Construct maybe, mam?
- Mrs. Samantha : Ah, no. This actually should be 'teach' only ya. This is a parallel structure.

The dialogue above was between Mrs. Samantha and a student named Hagia. At the end of the lesson, Mrs. Samantha gave feedback on the student presentation. She explained the simple present tense and then asked the students. In the question, she gave three options, one of which was the wrong answer. Hagia did not answer from the three options that Mrs. Samantha gave. Instead, Hagia responded by saying, "*construct maybe, mam?*" where the answer did not exist in Mrs. Samantha's option, and it also was the wrong answer. Mrs. Samantha replied that his answer was wrong, then gave the correct answer. Hagia's utterances stated false statements that indicated he flouted the maxim of quality. Since he deliberately gave a wrong answer, he failed to fulfil the maxim of quality.

Data 22 (4/6/2021)

Dilan : So now I am going to ask a few questions. The first question is for Swift, can you give me a simple present tense for habits example? (00.32.57)

Swift : She's only eats fish.

Dilan : Okay, that's a correct question because 'eats fish' is a habit.

The dialogue above was a conversation between students named Dilan and Swift. The topic material was a seminar, and they played roles as a speaker and students. Before the presentation started, Dilan and Swift had already made a scenario that would be carried out. Dilan was the lecturer who delivered a presentation about the simple present tense, while Swift was a student answering questions. In the middle of his explanation, he asked Swift to give an example of simple present tense for habits. Swift answered by saying, "*She's only eats fish,*" and Dilan replied by saying, "*Okay, that's a correct question because "eats fish" is a habit.*" Both failed to cooperate to fulfil the maxim of quantity since Swift's answer was incorrect, and Dilan believed Swift's answer was correct. The correct answer should be, "she only eats fish," by removing the s in "*she's*." In terms of flouting maxims, their utterances made them become the ones who flouted the maxim of quality by deliberately saying something false that was believed to be true.

Data 23 (4/6/2021)

Dilan : The next question is for Thena. Can you give me an example for simple present tense for general truth?

Thena : Yes, a water freezer at zero danger.

Dilan : Okay, that's a correct answer.

The dialogue above was still related to the previous dialogue. The conversation was between students named Dilan and Thena. Dilan, Swift, and Thena were in the same group. Same as Swift, Thena has also made a scenario

with Dilan. After Dilan finished asking Swift a question, Dilan asked Thena to give an example of the simple present tense for general truth. Thena answered by saying, "*yes, a water freezer at zero danger,*" and Dilan replied by saying, "*okay, that's a correct answer.*" Both considered to flout the maxim of quality since Thena's answer was wrong, and Dilan believed that Thena's answer was right. Thena's correct answer should be "water freezes at zero degrees." In this case, deliberately saying something false that was believed to be true made them categorize as the ones who did not fulfil the maxim of quality.

4.1.1.3 Flouting Maxim of Relation

Flouting the maxim of relation is when the speaker deliberately gives an irrelevant response to the topic being discussed to the interlocutor. 4 data are categorized as the flouting the maxim of relation by the English department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. The way students flout the maxim of relation is explained below.

Data 24 (23/4/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : Okay, will it be directly answer or two questions first, *mbak* Emma?
 Emma : Yes, Marco, the floor is yours.

The dialogue above showed a conversation between Mrs. Samantha and Emma. The learning material was about seminars. Emma was the moderator, while her other two friends were the speakers. After the speakers finished delivering their material, Emma asked her friends to give questions to the speakers. There was a question from Astrid, but when she finished her question, Emma did not respond for a while until finally, Mrs. Samantha asked her a

question by saying, "Okay, will it be directly answer or two questions first, *mbak Emma?*" Emma then replied to Mrs. Samantha's question by saying, "Yes, Marco, *the floor is yours.*" From Emma's utterances, it can be seen that she did not give an appropriate response related to the question given. She should have answered Mrs. Samantha's question by saying, "Yes ma'am, the question will be directly answered" or "Yes ma'am, the question will be noted first," but she failed to give a relevant answer. Therefore, Emma failed to fulfil the maxim of relation, which required them to be relevant in the conversation by deliberately responding unrelated to the topic being discussed.

Data 25 (25/6/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : What's going on, *mbak?* Hello?
Eva : Satria, mam.

The dialogue above was a conversation between Mrs. Samantha and Eva. The lesson material was about seminars. Eva and Arga were in the same group. Eva was the moderator, while Arga was assigned to give questions to the speakers. In the middle of the presentation, Arga, who was assigned to give questions to the speaker, did not appear. All group members were silent for a little while until Mrs. Samantha asked Eva what was going on. Eva replied to Mrs. Samantha's question by saying, "*Satria, mam,*" which indicated that her answer was irrelevant to the topic. Instead of answering what happened that day, Eva mentioned her friend's name, Satria. Regarding flouting maxims, she considered failing to fulfil the maxim of relation by giving an irrelevant answer to Mrs. Samantha.

Data 26 (11/6/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : Wait, can you repeat number two, *mbak?*

Ruby : Number two is *mbak* Stella.
 Mrs. Samantha : Yeah, I mean, can you show me the question?
 Ruby : Yes, mam.

The dialogue above was a conversation between Mrs. Samantha and Ruby. The lesson material was seminars, and Ruby played the role of the speaker who delivered material about simple past tense. After delivering the explanation about simple past tense, she continued to give a quiz to her friends. In the middle of giving the quiz, Mrs. Samantha asked her to repeat question number two. Ruby then answered Mrs. Samantha's question by saying, "*Number two is mbak Stella.*" which showed that she was giving an unrelated answer by mentioning her friends' name, Stella. In this case, being irrelevant was the one that made Ruby flout the maxim of relation.

Data 27 (7/5/2021)

Mrs. Samantha : Good afternoon, everyone!
 Hailey, Tamara, etc : Good afternoon, ma'am!
 Mrs. Samantha : How are you today?
 Lisa, Stormi, etc : I am fine. Thank you, how about you, ma'am?
 Mrs. Samantha : I am fine too, thank you. Nice to meet you.
 Peter : Happy holiday.

The dialogue above was a conversation between Mrs. Samantha and the students. At the beginning of the lesson, Mrs. Samantha greeted her students by saying good afternoon and asking how they were doing. Most of them answered Mrs. Samantha's greeting and asked how she was. However, one student, Peter, answered Mrs. Samantha's greeting with another word. However, instead of answering Mrs. Samantha's question by saying, "Good afternoon, mam. I am fine, thank you. How about you, ma'am?" or "Nice to meet you too, ma'am," he responded to Mrs. Samantha's greeting by saying "happy holiday," which was

utterly irrelevant to the topic discussed. In this situation, not giving an appropriate answer was the one that made Peter fail to fulfil the maxim of relation.

4.1.1.4 Flouting Maxim of Manner

Flouting the maxim of manner is when the speaker deliberately says something unclear. There is only one data of flouting the maxim of manner used by the English department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. The researcher finds that the student uses an obscure word to flout the maxim of manner. The way students flout the maxim of manner is explained below.

Data 28 (11/6/2021)

Nahtasya : Eh.. The answer is A. Was
 Tony : Why you choose was? Why not were?
 Nahtasya : [no answer]
 Tony : Hello? *Mbak* Nahtasya?
 Nahtasya : Eh.. because I.. I thought is- I you and I. Oh ya sorry. I am sorry.
 Tony : Yes that's true. I use was as their (...) in simple past tense.

The dialogue above was a conversation between students named Tony and Nahtasya. The learning material was about the seminar. Tony played the role of the speaker who delivered material about the simple past tense, while Nahtasya played the role of the student answering question. After finishing the presentation, Tony asked Nahtasya to answer question number four and reasons. Nahtasya answered by saying, "*Eh.. because I.. I thought is-- I you and I. Oh ya sorry. I am sorry,*" which indicated that she used obscure words to answer Tony's question. In this case, Nahtasya failed to fulfill the maxim of manner that requires her to be clear, brief, and orderly in stating her utterances.

4.1.2 The Reasons of the Flouting Maxim by the English Department Students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya

Based on the analysis of focused-group discussion also supported by observing during the study, the researcher found seven reasons for students' flouting maxims during the learning activity. Those reasons are; giving the floor to others, giving detailed information, lack of interest in the conversation, lack of adequate knowledge, lack of understanding of instruction, avoidance, and being fun. Each reason is presented as follows:

4.1.2.1 Giving the Floor to Others

The first reason for flouting maxims in the classroom is that the students want to give the floor to others to answer the interlocutor's question. In this case, giving the floor to others means giving other people the opportunity to answer questions. This situation happened when Mrs. Samantha asked the students whether the explanation given was clear enough or not. In responding to Mrs. Samantha's question, Hagia and Richie chose not to answer Mrs. Samantha's question. In the following excerpt, the discussion focus on examining the reasons for students' silences when the lecturer asked them questions. Since they were only silent when the lecturer asked them a question, they were categorized as flouting the maxim of quantity. The researcher found that they were silent when the lecturer asked because they had understood the material presented by the lecturer. The following was an excerpt that showed the reasons why students were silent when the lecturer asked a question.

Richie : “If I do not answer Mrs. Samantha's question, **it was because the material presented was clear.**”

Hagia : “Because **I already understand.**”

The excerpt above describes why students did not answer the question from the lecturer in data 6 who asked, "*Hello, is it clear enough everyone?*" Since they had understood the lecturer's material, they chose to remain silent instead of answering the question. However, their silence was not without reason. If they answered with "Yes," the lecturer would continue explaining the next topic and negate other students who did not understand the lecturer's explanation. To give the floor to others who did not understand the lecturer's explanation, they did not respond to the question, as shown in the following dialogue excerpt.

Richie : "If I respond directly to Mrs. Samantha's question by saying, "No questions, ma'am. That is clear," then Mrs. Samantha will immediately end the class. **So, I did not respond to Mrs. Samantha's question because I thought maybe other class members felt that the material was not clear. Therefore they could ask questions.**"

Hagia : "Because I already understand... **I allow the other members of the class to answer Mrs. Samantha's question.**"

The excerpt above showed that students flouted the maxim of quantity because they wanted to give the floor to others. They wanted to give other friends an opportunity who did not understand the explanation to answer Mrs. Samantha's question. They had clearly understood the explanation, but they did not give adequate answers because they thought maybe others felt that the material was not clear enough and they could directly ask Mrs. Samantha.

4.1.2.2 Giving detailed information

The second reason for flouting maxims in the classroom is that the student wants to give detailed information replying to the interlocutor's answer. In this case, giving detailed information means giving them all the information about something in deep. This situation happened when Richie was assigned to play the

role of a lecturer. One of his friends, Aliana, volunteered to answer the question given. Richie then replied to Aliana's answer by giving too much information. In the following excerpt, the discussion focus on examining the reasons for Richie's lengthy explanation when he replied to Aliana's answer. He gave too much information than Aliana required, which made him flout the maxim of quantity. The researcher found that Richie flouted the maxim of quantity to give detailed information to Aliana. The following excerpt showed why Richie gave detailed information to Aliana.

Richie : “If Aliana's answer is correct, I will move on to the next question. However, if Aliana's answer is wrong, I will explain in as much detail as possible. **So, I want to make sure that the material presented is well-received. Therefore, I give a long explanation.**”

The excerpt above was why Richie gave too much information replying to Aliana's answer in data 4, "*Eh--- I am sorry, that's wrong but that's okay. Thank you. The answer is started...*" Aliana gave a wrong answer, and Richie corrected it by giving a lengthy explanation. However, his lengthy explanation had a reason to give a detailed explanation so that the material presented could be understood well.

4.1.2.3 Lack of Interest in the Conversation

The following reason for flouting maxims in the classroom is that the students lack interest in the conversation. In this case, lack of interest in the conversation means having or feeling disinterested in talking to someone. This situation happened when Mrs. Samantha asked the students whether the explanation given was clear enough or not. In responding to Mrs. Samantha's

question, Sunny, Nahtasya, and Swift chose to be silent. Since they were only silent when Mrs. Samantha asked them a question, they were identified as flouting the maxim of quantity. In the following excerpt, the discussion focus on examining the reasons for students' silences when Mrs. Samantha asked them questions. The researcher found that Sunny and Nahtasya were silent when Mrs. Samantha asked because they already understood the material. The following excerpt showed the reasons Sunny and Nahtasya were silent when Mrs. Samantha asked them a question.

- Sunny : **“I already understood the material,** but what made it different from the previous meeting was the change in the rules.”
- Nahtasya : “Well, actually, the reason is the same as Sunny... **I already understood the material.**”

An excerpt above was why Sunny and Nahtasya did not answer the question from Mrs. Samantha in data 6, "*Okay, everyone. Before ending the class, any questions? Or is it clear enough?*" At that time, Sunny and Nahtasya had understood the learning material Mrs. Samantha had delivered, but they chose to keep silent. They were silent because Mrs. Samantha would explain the material again if they answered no. Since they were lack of interest in the topic of conversation and wanted to end the conversation, they chose not to respond to the question, as shown in the following dialogue excerpt.

- Sunny : “Well, actually, maybe **it was because of the habit of letting the class finish quickly.** So, when Mrs. Samantha asked the rest of the class, it was uncommon to find them to answer yes or no.”
- Nahtasya : “Well, actually, the reason is the same as Sunny... **want the class to finish quickly.**”
- Swift : “Because in Mrs. Samantha's class, the lesson hours were very tight with other subjects, **so if I answer, "I don't understand, ma'am," then Mrs. Samantha would repeat explaining the**

material and requires a lot of time. At the same time, there were other courses after Mrs. Samantha's class.”

The excerpt above showed that Sunny, Nahtasya, and Swift flouted the maxim of quantity because they lacked interest in the conversation. They gave no response to Mrs. Samantha's question because they wanted to end the conversation. So, if Mrs. Samantha asked them with a question, "*Is it clear enough?*" and no one answered it, then the class would be ended. Since they wanted the class to end quickly, they chose to flout the maxim of quantity by remaining silent.

Another situation happened when Mrs. Samantha called groups to make a presentation. None of them answered Mrs. Samantha's question even though Mrs. Samantha had been calling them two times. Since there was no response from all group members, they were categorized as flouting the maxim of quantity. The researcher found that they were silent when Mrs. Samantha called them because they lacked interest in the conversation. The following was an excerpt that showed the reasons why students were silent when Mrs. Samantha called them.

Sheryn : “When I was called, **I was getting ready.** That was why I did not have time to answer Mrs. Samantha's call.”

Julian : “When my group was called, **I was texting my friends on the WhatsApp groups** because I was preparing to make a presentation. It was hard to switch apps from WhatsApp to Google Meet because I accessed two applications using a cellphone at the same time.”

Emily : “At that time, **I was watching the previous group's presentation while lying down.** Then when my group was called, I immediately got ready to prepare the position of my laptop, and I was getting ready to wear my veil.”

An excerpt above was why students did not respond to Mrs. Samantha's call in data 10, "*Now we move to the third group, group third? Group three? The third*

group, are you ready?" and data 15, *"Now we move to the third group. The third group, are you ready?"* They did not respond to Mrs. Samantha's call because they lacked interest in the conversation. Since they were not interested in the topic discussed, they were busy doing something, making Mrs. Samantha neglected.

4.1.2.4 Lack of the Knowledge of the Discussion Topic

The following reason for flouting maxims in the classroom is that the students' lack of knowledge of the interlocutor's question. In this case, lack of adequate knowledge means someone's ignorance about information or something. This situation happened when Mrs. Samantha responded to Joanna's answer about the material on that day. In responding to Joanna's answer, Mrs. Samantha asked her why she chose simple present tense as the answer. She was only silent without answering Mrs. Samantha, which led her to flout the maxim of quantity. The researcher found that she did not answer Mrs. Samantha because she lacked adequate knowledge about the material that day. In the following excerpt, the discussion focus on examining the reasons for Joanna's silence when Mrs. Samantha responded to her answer.

Joanna : **"At that time, I was not sure about my answer. Also, I did not know how to describe the answer."**

The excerpt above showed why Joanna did not answer Mrs. Samantha's question in data 20, *"Simple present tense. How do you know this is the simple present tense?"* Joanna could not give a proper answer to Mrs. Samantha's question because she did not have adequate knowledge about the questions that

Mrs. Samantha asked. She was also having difficulties in describing the answer. Thus, she chose to keep silent.

Another situation happened when Mrs. Samantha explained the Eid al-Fitr holiday to students. Valen responded to the information given, and Mrs. Samantha asked a question. She did not answer Mrs. Samantha's question, and she was only silent for a while, which made her flout the maxim of quantity. The researcher found that she flouted the maxim of quantity because she lacked adequate knowledge to answer in English. In the following excerpt, the discussion focus on examining the reasons for Valen's silence when Mrs. Samantha asked her.

Valen : "Because **I do not know how to answer it in English.**"

The excerpt above was why Valen did not answer Mrs. Samantha's question in replying to her response in data 21, "*Long? why is it long?*" However, her silence had a reason. She was silent when Mrs. Samantha asked because she lacked adequate knowledge to answer in English. She had difficulty describing the answer in English, so she remained silent instead of answering Mrs. Samantha's question.

Another situation happened when Mrs. Samantha asked Eva what was going on because the presentation had stopped for a while. Eva replied to Mrs. Samantha's question with an irrelevant answer to what was being asked, making her flout the maxim of relation. The researcher found that she flouted the maxim of relation because she lacked adequate knowledge about the meaning of what was going on. In the following excerpt, the discussion focuses on examining why Eva gave an irrelevant answer when Mrs. Samantha asked her.

Eva : “**I do not understand what she means by “What is going on?”**. I thought Mrs. Samantha was asking who would appear next.”

The excerpt above was why Eva gave an irrelevant answer to Mrs.

Samantha’s question in data 27, “**What is going on, mbak? Hello?**” She gave an irrelevant answer because she did not know the meaning of what was going on.

She thought Mrs. Samantha asked her who would appear next in the presentation.

Another situation happened when Mrs. Samantha asked Astrid about her impression of joining the speaking class. At first, she gave an appropriate answer, but when she answered the second question from Mrs. Samantha, she was silent for a long time until Mrs. Samantha finally answered her question. Since Astrid could not answer what Mrs Samantha needed, she was then categorized as flouting the maxim of quantity. The researcher found that she did not answer Mrs. Samantha’s question because she lacked adequate knowledge to convey answers. In the following excerpt, the discussion focus on examining the reasons for Astrid's silence when Mrs. Samantha asked her a question.

Astrid : “**Yes, I was confused at that time.** I mean, Mrs. Samantha has a pleasant personality. She was also a lighthearted person..”

The excerpt above was why Astrid was silent in answering Mrs. Samantha's question in data 12, “*What makes you fun?*” However, she was silent for a reason.

She was silent because she was confused in giving the appropriate answer to Mrs.

Samantha. She wanted to say that Mrs. Samantha was a friendly and fun person.

However, at that time, she was confused and did not know how to convey it, so she chose to keep silent.

4.1.2.5 Lack of Understanding of Instruction

The next reason for flouting maxims in the classroom is that students' lack of understanding instruction made them fail to answer the interlocutor's question appropriately. In this case, a lack of understanding of the instruction means that someone does not understand the instructions given by the interlocutor. This situation happened when Mrs. Samantha asked Ruby to repeat question number two. In responding to Mrs. Samantha's question, Ruby gave an irrelevant answer by mentioning her friends' name, Stella. Since Ruby gave an inappropriate answer to the topic discussed, she identified as the one who flouted the maxim of relation. The researcher found that she did not give an appropriate answer because she lacked understanding of the instructions from Mrs. Samantha. In the following excerpt, the discussion focus on examining the reasons for Ruby's unrelated answer when Mrs. Samantha asked her to repeat the question.

Ruby : **“Because I thought Mrs. Samantha asked me about who read question number 4. Therefore, I answered Mrs. Samantha's question by mentioning my friend’s name, Stella.”**

The excerpt above explains why Ruby gave an unrelated answer to Mrs. Samantha's question in data 28, "*Wait, can you repeat number two, mbak?*" She answered Mrs. Samantha's question by mentioning her friend, Stella, unrelated to what was being asked. Mrs. Samantha instructed her to repeat question number 4, but Ruby lacked understanding of Mrs. Samantha's instructions by saying that the one who answered question number 4 was Stella. She thought that Mrs. Samantha was asking who read question number 4. Thus, she mentioned Stella because Stella read question number 4.

4.1.2.6 Avoidance

The sixth reason for flouting maxims in the classroom is that the students want to avoid questions given by the interlocutor. In this case, avoidance means the act of staying away or avoiding something. This situation happened when Mrs. Samantha asked students from C Class whether they had watched the Minister of Foreign Affairs video or not. None of them answered Mrs. Samantha's question, which made them flout the maxim of quantity. In the following excerpt, the discussion focus on examining the reasons for students' silences when Mrs. Samantha asked them questions. The researcher found that they were silent when Mrs. Samantha asked because they wanted to avoid talking about the video. The following excerpt showed why students were silent when Mrs. Samantha asked them questions.

Eva : "Because **I had not watched the video at that time, so I did not answer Mrs. Samantha's question.**"

Stella : "I **haven't watched the video.**"

Sheryn : "I **haven't watched the video either.**"

Joanna : "At that time, **I also haven't watched the video.**"

An excerpt above was why students did not answer the question from Mrs. Samantha in data 18, who asked, "*Did you watch the video... Menteri Luar Negeri?*" They chose to be silent because most had not watched the video. Instead of telling Mrs. Samantha that they had not watched the video, they kept silent to avoid the topic discussed. They avoided discussing the Minister of Foreign Affairs video because they were afraid they would be asked further questions, as shown in the following dialogue excerpt.

Julian : "I have watched the video, **but I am afraid of being asked to explain the contents of the video.**"

Stella : "**Yes, I am afraid.**"

Eva : "**Yes. I am afraid that I will be asked further questions if I say no.**"

Sheryn : “**Yes I'm afraid to be asked why I have not watched the video.**”

The excerpt above showed that students flouted the maxim of quantity because they avoided discussing the Minister of Foreign Affairs video. Since most of them had not watched the video, they were afraid that Mrs. Samantha would ask them about the reason they had not watched it. Julian, one of the students who had already watched the video, said that he was also afraid that Mrs. Samantha would ask him to explain the content of the video. Based on the students' statements, it can be concluded that they flouted the maxim of quantity to avoid further questions that Mrs. Samantha will ask.

4.1.2.7 Being Fun

The last reason for flouting maxims in the classroom is that the students want to be fun with the interlocutors. Being fun means to say something in fun or teasing rather than in earnest. This situation happened when Mrs. Samantha greeted her students by saying good afternoon and asking how they were doing. However, one of Mrs. Samantha's students, Peter, answered the greeting with another word unrelated to the previous sentence. Peter's irrelevant answer made him flout the maxim of relation. The researcher found that Peter flouted the maxim of relation to make fun. In the following excerpt, the discussion focus on examining the reasons for Peter's irrelevant answer when he responded to Mrs. Samantha's greeting.

Peter : “Maybe at that time, **I just wanted to say something other than I was fine, thank you...** In my opinion, saying "happy holiday" was not mean about long holidays, but it was only holidays. That day was Friday, while tomorrow was Saturday. So it means holidays too, just like that.”

The excerpt above was why Peter gave an irrelevant answer to Mrs. Samantha's greeting in data 29, "*Good afternoon everyone. How are you today?*" However, he responded to Mrs. Samantha's greeting by saying "happy holiday," which was utterly irrelevant to the previous sentence. His irrelevant answer was meant for being fun. He wanted to give a different answer to make the class atmosphere lively.

4.2 Discussion

This part focuses on a deeper explanation of the findings from the data obtained. In this research, the researcher focused on discussing the results of the data analysis related to types of flouting maxims and reasons for committing the flouting maxims by English department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya using Gricean cooperative principles (1989).

The researcher has answered the first question about the types of flouting maxims used by the English department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. Those types used by the English department students are; flouting the maxim of quantity, flouting the maxim of relation, flouting the maxim of quality, and flouting the maxim of manner. The frequency of flouting the maxim of quantity 20 times, flouting the maxim of relation 4 times, flouting the maxim of quality 3 times, and flouting the maxim of manner 1 time. Within this result, the researcher found that flouting the maxim of quantity was the most frequently used by the students. The most frequently flouted maxim used by the English department student was the maxim of quantity. According to Cutting (2002), flouting the maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker seems to provide too little or too much

information than required. The researcher found that flouting the maxim of quantity had the highest percentage with a value of 71% or 20 data of utterances.

The students' second most frequently flouted maxim was the maxim of relation. Thomas (1995) stated that flouting the maxim of the relation is exploited by giving a response or observation that is unrelated to the topic. The researcher found that flouting the maxim of relation had the second-highest percentage with a value of 14% or 4 data of utterances.

The frequent occurrence of flouting the maxim of relation was flouting the maxim of quality. According to Cutting (2002), flouting the maxim of quality occurs when the speaker does not give facts by saying what is known to be false and lacks adequate evidence. The researcher found that flouting the maxim of quality had a lower percentage with a value of 11% or 3 data of utterances.

The most infrequently flouted maxim used by the English department student was the maxim of manner. Cutting (2002) mentioned that flouting the maxim of manner occurs when the speaker makes ambiguous responses and they unable to be clear and orderly in conversation. The researcher found that flouting the maxim of quantity had the lowest percentage with a value of 4% or 1 data of utterances.

The present research results seem to echo what has been previously found by Wahyudi et al. (2020), who analyzed flouting maxims in the classroom interaction and found that the most dominant maxim flouted by the teacher and students is the maxim of quantity with 31 occurrences. Their research also found the maxim of relation was the second most frequently flouted while maxims the

quality and manners got the least frequently flouted by students. Similarly, the researcher also found that flouting the maxim of quantity was the most frequently used by the students, with a total data of 20. The present research revealed that the students mostly flouted the maxim of quantity to give less information than required, which made the interlocutor unsatisfied with the answer. However, the present research's findings and Wahyudi et al. contradict Dwi's (2015), in which flouting maxims of quality is the most dominant used by students when speaking to their teachers. She analyzed flouting maxims in the EFL classroom, and her result showed that the most dominant maxim flouted by the students is the maxim of quality with 3 utterances. Unlike Dwi (2015), she only obtained 6 data in her research since she only conducted observation for one day. Therefore, the appearance of the flouting maxim did not appear as much as the researcher did. Meanwhile, the present research and Wahyudi et al. (2020) conducted observations and interviews more than once to obtain more data. By conducting this observation, the researcher could obtain sufficient data to get the best result in analyzing the reasons for applying flouting maxim in communication.

With regards to the second question about the reasons for flouting maxims used by the English department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, the focused-group discussion involving 15 students found that giving the floor to others, giving detailed information, lack of interest in the conversation, lack of knowledge related to the subject, lack of understanding of instruction, avoidance, and being fun are among the reasons for flouting the maxims.

One of the main reasons students flout the maxim is a lack of interest in the ongoing discussion. Students claimed that the topic was not interesting enough to arouse their enthusiasm to engage in the conversation actively. Therefore, they want the conversation to end soon. Ulia (2020) claims that not being interested in the topic influenced people to flout the maxim of quantity. They tend to end the conversation when realizing that the topic being discussed was not interesting.

Lack of knowledge about the topic of conversation was the second top reason for the students to commit flouting maxims. Some of the students stated they flouted maxims because it was difficult for them to tell what they wanted to convey, and some of them also stated that they had no idea to give an answer related to the question given due to the absence of knowledge and experience with the topic. Dwi (2015) argues that students flouted the maxim of quantity because they did not have sufficient linguistic competence to give proper responses toward teacher utterance based on speaker or teacher's utterance. Similarly, in this present research, most students could not answer the interlocutor properly because they lacked adequate knowledge to answer the question given.

Avoidance is another reason for students flouting maxims in their conversations with lecturers. Students admit that their ignorance of a topic prevents them from commenting or actively engaging in conversation in class. Therefore, they tend to keep quiet to avoid being asked further about the topic and express their desire to change it. Adawiyah (2016) stated that the speakers flouted the maxims because they wanted to change the topic to avoid talking about something embarrassing or just to end the conversation. Similarly, in the present

research, some students stated that they flouted maxims because they avoided being asked about certain topics. The researcher concluded that they flouted maxim because they wanted to change the topic of conversation that was being discussed.

Grice (1989) refers to this situation as "implicature," when the listener attempts to understand the speaker, he must assume the meaning in such a context. In other words, the hearer did not only assume the meaning based on the conversational meaning but also the non-conversational meaning. Conversational implicature is a subtype of non-conversational implicature proposed by Grice. In conversational implicature, the speaker must work with the listener to recognize each other. This is designed to start a successful conversation from the beginning. Grice (1989) proposed the "Cooperative Principle" as a general principle to describe what participants are expected to observe, "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." This principle is contained four maxims. Those are maxim of quantity, a maxim of quality, a maxim of relation, and maxim of manner. When having a conversation, the speakers do not always fulfil and eventually break the maxim. Breaking the maxim is also called a non-observance. There are five non-observances of the maxim: flouting, violating, infringing, opting out, and suspending. The most often non-observances found in daily life are flouting and violation. Flouting means when the speakers say implicitly in their utterances, they let the listener seek a

hidden meaning that the speakers utter, and yet the listener still believes that they are in a cooperative principle.

Wahyudi et al. (2020) mentioned that sometimes, the interaction between teachers and students did not run smoothly because not all student responses answered the teacher's questions. They revealed four adverse effects of flouting maxim occurred in a classroom activity. The effects are; flurry toward the teacher's information, students misunderstanding the lesson, rowdy and noisy class situations, and ignoring the teacher. This present research also found similar findings related to the adverse effect of flouting maxims. The researcher revealed that the students' flouted maxims made the teacher feel ignored since not all students responded appropriately to answer the lecturer's question.

In conclusion, this research found that flouting the maxim of quantity was the most frequently used by the English department students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. It was also found that there were seven (7) reasons students flouted the maxims, and the most contributing reason was lack of interest in the conversation. Flouting the maxim of quantity and lack of interest in the conversation were used by students to end the conversation. Thus, the researcher concluded that students did not want to discuss specific topics and chose to flout the maxim of quantity.

This study focused on the flouting maxims used by the English department students at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. The second-semester students are pretty appropriate for this study because they have not taken pragmatic courses. Thus, this research contributes to the development of flouting maxims in natural speech, especially in online classes. Other than that, the researchers hope that this research

can improve students' awareness of the importance of the contribution between speaker and hearer in a conversation. The researcher would suggest for the future researcher interested in flouting maxims in the classroom interaction that focused-group discussion is the best option to gain the natural result of knowing the reasons for each flouting maxim. The use of focused-group discussions can also help researchers get a lot of data considering that they can add, support, or disagree with the opinions in the discussion. The researcher hopes this research will help further researchers employ flouting maxims in the real example of natural teacher-student interactions.



UIN SUNAN AMPEL
S U R A B A Y A

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter presents conclusions of the research and suggestion for further researcher who wants to conduct related research using flouting maxims.

5.1 Conclusion

This research focuses on the types and the reasons for flouting maxims used by English Department students of UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. The data is collected from a speaking class in the year 2021. A total of 28 data containing 4 types of flouting of maxims are found. The flouting maxims are flouting the maxim of quantity, flouting the maxim of relation, flouting the maxim of quality, and flouting the maxim of manner.

Based on the research findings, the flouting maxim of quantity is the most frequently used by students with a percentage of 71% or 20 utterances. Then, the second is flouting maxims of relation with 14% or 4 utterances, and the third is flouting maxims of quality with 11% or 3 utterances. The most infrequently used is flouting the maxim of manner with a percentage of 4% or only 1 utterance.

After analyzing the types of flouting maxims, the researcher analyzes why students flouted maxims. The focused-group discussion involved 15 students. Focused-group discussion is used to find the reasons why students flouted the

maxim in more detail. As a result, the researcher found the three main reasons students flout the maxim were lack of interest in the ongoing discussion, lack of knowledge about the topic of conversation, and avoidance.

5.2 Suggestion

The researcher hopes that this research can explain the types and the reasons for further researchers interested in analyzing flouting maxims. Understanding the flouting maxims is important to understand the theory first. It is expected that the reader can better understand before analyzing the flouting maxims. The researcher suggests that those who conduct similar research topics use different research methods to produce new results. This research still does not cover all the reasons students commit, but the researcher wants that future researcher can develop and make the complete one. The researcher also hopes that this research can help further researchers as a reference in the scope of pragmatics. In the end, the researcher expects that this research can be applied in daily life so that there are no misunderstandings in conversation.

UIN SUNAN AMPEL
S U R A B A Y A

REFERENCES

- Adawiyah, R. (2016). *Flouting maxim used by the main character in 'Focus' movie*. English Language and Letters Department Faculty of Humanities, The State Islamic University Maulana Malik Ibrahim of Malang
- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic stylistics: Edinburgh textbooks in applied linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Bogdan, R., Biklen, S. K., & Jha, A. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theories and methods*. Uttar Pradesh: Pearson India Education Services.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry et research design: choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles; London; New Delhi; Singapore; Washington DC: SAGE.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: a resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Detrianto, B. (2018). Humorous Effects on Flouting Conversational Maxims Found in Indonesian Drama Comedy: A Study of Humor in Language. *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 1262-1276.
- Dwi E.S., A. (2015). An analysis of flouting maxim in efl classroom interaction. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 4(2), 243. doi:10.21580/vjv4i21592
- Esterani F, Dwi Rukmini, Mursid Saleh. (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.
- Faridah. (2016). *Flouting conversational maxim used by the main character in Lie to Me movie*. English Language and Letters Department Faculty of Humanities, The State Islamic University Maulana Malik Ibrahim of Malang
- Fitri, E., & Qodriani, L. U. (2019). A study on flouting maxims in Divergent novel. *TEKNOSASTIK*, 14(1), 32. doi:10.33365/ts.v14i1.84
- Finegan, E. (2008). *Language: its structure and use*. Boston, MA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Griffiths, P. (2006). *An introduction to English semantics and pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hutapea, S. (2017). *An analysis of flouting maxim in Oprah Winfrey Show*. Department of English Faculty of Cultural Studies, University of Sumatera Utara, Medan

- Khayati, I., Mujiyanto, J., & Warsono (2019). The Realization of Grice's maxims in english teacher's interaction with male and female students. *Unnes English Education Journal, EEJ* 9 (3) 2019 391 - 398
- Khosravizadeh, P., & Sadehvandi, N. (2011). *International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics IPEDR. Vol 26*. IACSIT Press. Singapore.
- Kitzinger, J. (1995). Qualitative research; introducing focus groups. *British Medical Journal* 311, 299–302.
- Kreidler, C. W. (2002). *Introducing English semantics*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Levinson, S. C. (2008). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manurung, L. (2019). Flouting maxims in Hitam Putih talk show. *Suar Betang*, 14(2). doi:10.26499/surbet.v14i2.126
- Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: an introduction*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell.
- Paul, G. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.
- Wahyudi, A., Yusuf, S., & Lestari, Z. W. (2020). Maxim's flouting: An analysis of classroom interaction. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 4(2), 219-231. doi:10.33369/jeeet.4.2.219-231
- Yule, G. (1996). *The study of language*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

UIN SUNAN AMPEL
S U R A B A Y A