

AN ANALYSIS OF FLOUTING MAXIM IN EFL CLASSROOM INTERACTION

Asri Dwi E.S.

Graduate Program of PPS UNNES

ABSTRACT

The present study concerns with the flouting maxim occurred in EFL classroom interaction. It was aimed at investigating how the conversational implicatures especially flouting maxim are being formed in teacher and students dialog during EFL teaching and learning process. The present study used qualitative approach. The data taken from teacher and students interaction in EFL classroom are being transcribed and analyzed by categorizing utterances based on the flouting of maxim theory proposed by H.P. Grice. Based on the data analysis, it has been discovered that during the conversation, all speakers happen to be successful in observing maxims. The proportion of non-observance maxim is only 2%. Sorts of maxim that is flouted by speaker are maxim of quantity, quality and manner. The flout of maxim is done by students because of their lack of linguistic and actional competence.

Keywords: flouting maxim, conversational implicature, classroom interaction

INTRODUCTION

In our daily communication, we exchange our idea realized by feeling or information in form of written or spoken form with our interlocutor. In spoken communication, utterances that we exchange should be meaningful so that the communication can be successful

and run smoothly. Each utterance created by particular speaker can contain utterance or speaker meaning and sentence meaning. Utterance meaning is what speaker means or what speaker implies when he or she uses a string of language. On the other hand, sentence meaning is what a sentence itself means. It deals with literal or lexical meaning. Utterance meaning will be the starting point when we want to talk about implicature. (hurford,et.al, 2007)

Concerning on the statement above, the speaker's utterance needs to be interpret by people. It is so called as conversational implicature in pragmatics area. Grice implies that conversational implicature can be defined as "A different pragmatic meaning of an utterance with respect to the literal meaning expressed by utterance" (Jacob L. Mey, 1998: 371). Furthermore, it can be seen that in conversational implicature the hearer remarkably constructs the assumption that one of the conversational maxims, relevance, informativeness, or clarity is not violated by the speaker.

Contextual factor needs to be taken into account when we want to understand about Conversational implicature. Grice, (1975) as cited in Bouton (1994), propose that in order to deduce conversational implicatures precisely, the speaker and the hearer must share knowledge which include the utterance from which the implicature is to be interpreted; the roles and expectations of the participants in a conversation; the context of the conversation; and the world around them connected to their interaction. According to Jung (2002), the process involving inferring is based on a set of rational and the Cooperative Principle, which all participants in the conversation are expected to observe for successful communication. Lee (2002) states that presuming that a speaker in a conversation is being cooperative, an inferential process is then completed based on shared cultural knowledge and presuppositions to enter at an interpretation of the speaker's proposed meaning. In order to understand of more than what is said, apart from knowledge of grammar and lexical meaning or semantics, Taguchi (2005) points out that other contextual knowledge such as schemata, cultural background, or knowledge of the world must be supplied, as well. There has been an abundance of research on conversational implicatures on various

filed or subject. The present study tried to broaden the area of the study particularly conversation principle on EFL area especially in Indonesia EFL context. Conversational implicatures have different types and some types may be particularly difficult or easy for EFL students to understand (Boersma, 1994). This paper focuses on the identifying different types of conversational implicatures especially flouting maxim found in EFL classroom interaction.

BACKGROUND LITERATURE

Cooperative Principle

The success of conversation depends on the various speakers approach to the interaction. The way in which people try to make conversations work is called Cooperative Principle. The Cooperative principle is an indispensable assumption made by speaker and hearer when they speak to one another. In that particular conversation, we are attempting to collaborate with one another to assemble evocative and meaningful exchanges. Grice (1975) offers the Cooperative Principle which states “make your conversational contribution such is required, as the stage at which it occurs by the accepted purpose or the direction of the talk exchange which you are engaged”. It can be said that the speakers need to supply meaningful, fruitful utterance to extend and maintain the conversation. Furthermore, listener needs to assume that his or her conversational partner is doing the equivalent principle. Dealing with his Cooperative Principle, Grice has divided Cooperative principle into four basic conversational maxims.

Maxim

Maxim of quantity as one of the cooperative principle is chiefly concerned with providing information as it is needed and that not giving the contribution more informative than it required. Therefore, each participant’s contribution to conversation should be just as informative as it requires, it should not be less informative or more informative. And say as much as helpful but not more informative or less informative. Finnegan (2004, p.93) defines that in normal circumstance, speakers say just enough, that they supply

no less information and no more than is necessary for the purpose of the communication, for example:

A: Could you tell me how to get to the market?

B: next to that police office.

It can be seen that B information is informative and give enough contribution toward A's question about the exact location of market.

1.2 Maxim of Quality

The Maxim of Quality suggests that the speaker need to inform the fact in a conversation in order to create cooperative communication. Grice (1975, p.44) states that when we are held on conversation, the Maxim of Quality requires that we

1. Do not say what we consider to be fake.
2. Do not say something without having adequate and sufficient evidence.

For example

A : Who is the current president of Indonesia?

B : Mr. Joko Widodo

Here, A gives the correct answer which proves about the proper and true fact

1.3 Maxim of Relation

Maxims of relation recommend that the utterance must be relevant to the topic being conversed. Finegan (2004) states that this maxim expects speaker to deliver their utterance in such a way that is applicable and relevant to particular context being discussed: Be relevant at the time of the utterance. The maxim of relevance is fulfilled when the speaker gives contribution that is relevant to the topic of preceding utterance. Therefore, Grundy (2000, p.74) says that each participant's need to contribute relevant utterance related to the subject of conversation, for example:

A. How about your holiday?

B. Great and wonderful

Here, B's utterance fulfilled the maxim of relevance, because B's answer is relevant with the question.

1.4 Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner requires speaker's utterance to be understandable or comprehensible or not to be ambiguous, obscure, or disorderly and unnecessary prolixity. Thus, each participant's contribution needs to be plausibly direct, that is, it should not be blurred, ambiguous or excessively wordy. For example:

A. What's your opinion about the movie?

B. Well the movie is amazing. The actors show their best performance.

The B's answer is following maxim of manner, B can answer the question from his partner about the movie clearly.

Flouting Maxim

Once one of the maxims is violated by utterance generated by particular speaker, we need to assume that the speaker violated maxim is cooperative in communication. It can be said that violation is a indication that something being said indirectly. This is called flouting maxim. Grundy (2000, p.78) suggests that flouting maxims is a prominent way of getting an addressee to draw an inference, for example:

A : Can I borrow your laptop?

B : Well, uh, I have so many assignment that need to be done.

From the example above, B's answer violated the maxim of Quantity, B does not supply as much information as A desired (whether he can borrow the laptop or not).

According to Brown and Yule (1989. p.32), flouting of maxim made by speaker expresses an additional meaning (contextual meaning) to his or her utterance. This occurrence is called conversational implicature. A speaker who does not follow the conversational maxims can be categorized to be flouting the maxims and consequently, conversational implicature is produced by the speaker. The addressee or hearer actually understands that the speaker has flouted the

maxims so the addressee tries to infer further meaning from this violation of convention

2.1 Flouting Maxim of Quality

A: What is your name?

B: I'm the queen of Sheba

Implicature: B doesn't want to tell his or her name

B's statement is flouting the maxim of quality because speaker B gives information which is not match with the actual fact but B still seems to be cooperative. B gives the untrue statement to B in order to make A to introspect that his statement is not correct. B's utterance suggests that A's is absurdly incorrect.

2.2 Flouting Maxim of Quantity

A flout of maxim of quantity takes place when a speaker deliberately provides insufficient information within the situation requires. (Thomas, 1995)

A : How are we getting there?

B : we are getting there in Budi's car.

The statement above flouts the maxim of quantity since the information does not give clear contribution and it is not informative as required. The statement above suggests that B doesn't want to have a travel with A.

2.3 Flouting Maxim of Relation

The maxim of relation is flouted by making response which is very obvious irrelevant to the topic being discussed. (Thomas, 1995)

A: Where will you go?

B: Out

Implicature: B giving inappropriate response

B's utterance implicates that B doesn't want to answer A's question. B doesn't want to tell where exactly he or she want to go.

2.4 Flouting Maxim of Manner

A: I think the government needs to make a policy for expatri-

ate. Do you agree with me?

B: Well, I won't try to turn you away from your opinion

From the example above, it can be observed that the speaker B has been unsuccessful to monitor the maxim of manner by giving extremely long response for yes-no question posed by A. Actually, B just need to reply "yes" or "no".

Implicature

The notion of implicature was first introduced by Herbert Paul Grice (1967). He explains that implicature deals with something beyond what is said by particular speaker. Thomas (1995) adds that Grices's theory is attempting at describing how a hearer obtains from what is said to what is meant. How a hearer tries to understand particular utterance form the level of expressed meaning to the level of implied meaning. Gazdar (1979) defines Implicature is anything that is inferred from an utterance but that is not a condition for the truth of utterance.

Levinson (1981, p.98) adds the notion of implicature assures to convey the breach between what is literally said and what is essentially said. Furthermore, Levinson (1981) states that Implicatures are surmised based on the assumption that the speaker observes or flouts some principle of cooperation.

Grice divides implicature into conventional implicature and nonconventional implicature (conversational implicature). Thomas (1995) suggests that both of them have an additional of meaning away from the semantic meaning had by particular utterance. Furthermore, he adds that conversational and conventional implicature are different in the case of context. In conversational implicature, what is implied is varied based on the context of utterance. On the other hand, what is implied in conventional implicature is just the same apart from the context.

METHODS

The present study concerned with the flouting maxim occurred in EFL classroom interaction. It was aimed to investigate

how the conversational implicatures especially flouting maxim are being formed in teacher and students dialog during EFL teaching and learning process, the present study employs the theory of implicature offered by Grice (1975) to identify the structuring process of conversational implicature and to determine the type of conversational implicature.

The present study used qualitative approach. One can undertake qualitative in a natural phenomena where the writer works as the primary instrument of data collection that compiles words, analyzes then inductively, concerns with the meaning of participants, and describes an expressive language processes (Creswell, 1998). In this case, the writer collected the whole data related to utterances in dialogue of a teacher and her students during EFL teaching and learning process. The research design was content analysis dealing with someone's utterances. According to Ary et al (2002) content analysis deals with analyzing and inferring recorded material within its own context such as public records and textbooks. This study is purely qualitative where the collected data has been examined based on the conversational implicature concept developed by H.P. Grice.

The data of the present study were the utterances in dialogue of a teacher and her students during EFL teaching and learning process which are indicated flout the maxim of conversation. The data were limited only the utterances that flout the maxim of conversation since flouting maxim can generate conversational implicature. The data were obtained from observation conducted in an EFL classroom of SMK Palapa Semarang. The participant of the present study was an English teacher and her students in XI-TKJ class in the academic year of 2012/2013. The present study was conducted on 15th May 2013. The data were collected by video recording. The writer was in line with Ary et al (2002) who explicate that the qualitative approach data deals with data that are in the form of words rather than numerical or statistical data.

The primary instrument of collecting the data was the writer himself and the data was collected using document analysis. Thus, there were some ways of collecting the data in order to complete this study:

1. Observation, by observing teaching-learning process, the researcher can get the data from natural situation. In the observation process, the researcher plays role of observer as participant in which the role of the researcher is known by the participants. According to Creswell, the advantage of observer as participant is that the information or the data can be recorded as it happen or take place.
2. Video-recording, as the classroom interaction flows quickly, video-recording is needed to help capturing teacher and students' interaction. Richard and Lockhart state that the advantages of audio or video recording are that the data recorded can be repeated, analyzed several times and can portray many lesson details that cannot be captured by another instruments. In this case, the verbal communication among the teacher and students and another phenomena taken-place in the classroom are recorded by means of audio-recording.
3. Transcribing the utterances taken from video recording
4. Sorting utterances which flout the conversational maxim.
5. Enlisting these utterances based on the type conversational maxim that being flouted.
6. Arranging the obtainable data systematically.

The data analysis can be elaborated as follows:

1. Data Reduction

In this step, the writer chose some relevant utterances in the dialogue of a teacher and her students during EFL teaching and learning process. The writer only focused on the utterance which flouts the maxim of conversation. Therefore, the writer reduced the data or utterances which do not flout the conversational maxims since the data would give no contribution and result to implicature analysis.

2. Data Display

The writer then classified these utterances based on the type of conversational maxim that being flouted, the type of conversational implicature and the function of implicature. In data display, some devices such as table and particular codes (al-

phabetical letters) were used.

3. Data Analysis

After performing the utterances based on flouted maxim of communication the writer then described the process of forming implicature of each utterances and determined the type of implicature based on the theory of conversational implicature which proposed by Grice (1975).

4. Conclusion Drawing

Finally, the writer drew a conclusion in relation to process of forming implicature, the types of conversational implicature and the function of implicature.

FINDINGS

From the two teaching and learning session, it had been analyzed by transcribing and categorizing the utterances based on Grice's theory of conversational implicature. The following table will describe the distribution of observance and non-observance maxim.

Table 1

No.	Grice's Cooperative Principle	Frequency	%
1	Observance of Maxim	351	98%
2	Non-Observance of Maxim	6	2%
Total		357	100%

Based on the table above, it can be seen that generally, all of the speakers (teacher and students) are able to observe 4 maxims proposed by Grice. The observance maxim is far more dominating rather than non-observance maxim, the proportion is about 98%. This finding also indicates that in general, all of the speakers did not generate any conversational implicature or the proportion of conversational implicature is small. Moreover, the table above shown that the proportion of non-observance of maxim is only 2 %.

Table 2

No.	Flouting maxim	Frequency	%
1	Flouting maxim of quantity	2	33
2	Flouting maxim of quality	3	50
3	Flouting maxim of relation	1	17
4	Flouting maxim of manner	0	
Total		6	100%

The table above indicates that majority of the speakers flout maxim of quality and quantity. It also indicates that the speakers fail to provide adequate truthful information or evidence during the conversation.

Generally speaking, based on Grice's theory of Conversational Implicature mainly on non-observance of the maxim case, an implicature is generated simply in the case of flouting the maxim. In essence, a maxim happens to be flouted when a speaker is unsuccessful to observe the maxim deliberately and with no intention to delude or defraud the hearer. As what has been mentioned before, Grice has proposed four sorts of flouting a maxim: quality, quantity, relation and manner.

Example 1

T 35 Ok, Heru, what are you watching?[10]
S1 36 No Miss

The above example (1) is an example of flouting maxim of quantity that had been discovered from the transcript. Basically, flout of maxim of quantity is happened when a speaker presents either more or less information than it is needed. In other word, this occurs intentionally and an implicature is produced. Nonetheless, it can be noticed that the speaker (T) has asked the speaker (S1) a particular question asking for an exacting strand of information. That is, Teacher who is the speaker (T) has asked Heru who is the speaker (S1) about what he was watching at that time, and the answer must be specific like (video, TV, etc). Even though the teacher asked by using wh question, Hari answered the teacher's question by saying 'no' which is more appropriate for answering yes-no question. In

this case it can be discovered that Heru had flouted the maxim of quantity since he gave less information than is required. Heru's utterance implies that he didn't want his teacher to know what he did at that time because he worried that his mobile phone would be seized. Actually, during the teaching and learning process he holds his mobile phone and sometimes, he looks at his mobile phone to watch something.

Example 2

T 45 Deny where is your book?[13]

S 46 This is Panji's book Miss,

It has been discussed before that Grice has proposed four principles or sorts of flouting the maxim. In the examples 1, we have discussed and exemplified how a maxim of quantity is flouted and an implicature has been engendered. In this example, a new type of flouting the maxims happens to be brought in and illustrated. It is the maxim of quality. Chiefly, a maxim of quality is flouted when a speaker supplies either fake information or information which has lacks sufficient proof. Again, this happens deliberately by the speaker in order to entail or imply an extra meaning and of course with no intention to deceive the other speaker. Conversely, it can be seen here that the speaker (T) has asked for a particular kind of information where Deny's book is. Alternatively, the speaker (S2) provides information which explains that the book he was bringing is Panji's book. Hitherto, it cannot be argued that he is attempting to deceive his Teacher or grant her with incorrect information. In its place, we can take for granted that he is being cooperative and he has produced an effort to supply his Teacher with information that he brought the book but the book he brought was actually not his own book. He provided additional information which is not appropriate with Teacher's questions.

Example 3

T 47 Panji's book? So, where is your book?[14]

S 48 Ketinggalan Miss

In the previous paragraph, there had been introduced two types of flouting the maxim: quality and quantity. In this paragraph, it will

be discussed the third short (principle) of flouting maxim, flouting the maxim of Manner. Basically, a maxim of manner is flouted when a speaker is being unruly, vague, unclear, hazy, or wordy in his or her respond to the other speaker during conversation or speech act. Again, this occurrence takes place persistently and the consequence is a spawned implicature or an extra meaning rather than the literal or textual meaning. Example (3), demonstrates how the speaker (S) has flouted the maxim of manner. Principally, the teacher was asking about the where student (S) book is and his answer need to be as systematic and apparent as possible. The student is also need to be brief in order to assist the receiver (teacher) obtaining the accurate strand of information she has solicited before. In the other hand, the speaker (Student) is not being adequately systematic; he is supplying inadequate place which is inappropriate for the context of discussion. Regardless of this occurrence, it cannot be assumed that student was trying to deceive or even trick his Teacher. As an alternative, it can be claimed that he is being cooperative and trying to imply something else or extra meaning. This extra meaning could be that he does not know how to say “ketinggalan” in English. The word “ketinggalan” can be translated into left.

Example 4

Ss 69	Six
T 70	Ok Fersa, please write the first!
71	(Student was writing on the white board)
72	Don't forget to write the ? [21]
S 73	Titik

One more example about flouting the maxim of manner is example number (4). It has been revealed above that the maxim of manner is flouted when a speaker decides intentionally to be unclear, ambiguous, unruly or not brief in his or her respond to the other speaker. Based on the example above, the speaker (T) asked speaker (S) to complete her utterance by providing blank filling. The teacher (T) expected that the student (S) would give the answer by saying word punctuation or full stop. In this case, the student filed to observe teacher's implicature. Instead of saying 'punctuation' or 'full stop'.

DISCUSSION

After obtaining the data, the writer needs to discuss the findings in order to clarify the answer of research problems. The problem which is proposed in this research is what the conversational implicature (flouting maxim) occur in the dialogue of a teacher and her students during EFL teaching and learning process. Based on the implicature point of view proposed by Grice, there are two shorts of implicature those are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. In the present study, the flouting maxim is the vocal point. It is because the utterances in dialogue of a teacher and her students during EFL teaching and learning process are analyzed by maxims of conversation which means they depend on the recognizing the cooperative principle especially flouting maxim. It was discovered that there are 6 conversational implicature (flouting maxim) in the dialogue of a teacher and her students during EFL teaching and learning process. It can be claimed that the way to produce conversational implicature in the dialogue is violating or flouting maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner. Flouting maxim of quantity happens when speaker intentionally provide more or less information than the situation requires. Flouting maxim of quality occurs when speaker contribute is untrue or fake information. Flouting maxim of relevance happens when the speaker's input is not relevant for the context being discussed. Flouting maxim of manner occurs when speaker's input is not translucent and it may be incomprehensible, ambiguous and not reasonable direct. In present study, It can be found that the Student (S) often flout the maxim of quantity, quality, and manner. The reason why speaker (S) flouts the maxim of quantity is that the speaker doesn't have sufficient linguistic competence on order to give proper response toward teacher utterance based on Speaker (T) or teacher's utterance.

CONCLUSION

To sum up, the present study tried to employ one of the outstanding theories in the field of Semantics and Pragmatics namely Grice's theory Conversational Implicature. The focal point of the

present study was to analyze the applicability of Grice's non-observance which are flouting maxim of quality, quantity, relation and manner on EFL classroom interaction context. Based on the implicature point of view proposed by Grice, there are two sorts of implicature those are conventional implicature and conversational implicature. The present study the flouting maxim is the focal point. It is because the utterances in dialogue of a teacher and her students during EFL teaching and learning process are analyzed by maxims of conversation which means they depend on the recognizing the cooperative principle especially flouting maxim. It was discovered that there are 6 conversational implicature (flouting maxim) in the dialogue of a teacher and her students during EFL teaching and learning process. It can be claimed that the way to produce conversational implicature in the dialogue is violating or flouting maxim of quality, maxim of quantity, maxim of relevance and maxim of manner. Flouting maxim of quantity happens when speaker intentionally provide more or less information than the situation requires. Flouting maxim of quality occurs when speaker contribute is untrue or fake information. Flouting maxim of relevance happens when the speaker's input is not relevant for the context being discussed. Flouting maxim of manner occurs when speaker's input is not translucent and it may be incomprehensible, ambiguous and not reasonable direct. In present study, It can be found that the Student (S) often flout the maxim of quantity, quality, and manner. The reason why speaker (S) flouts the maxim of quantity is that the speaker doesn't have sufficient linguistic competence on order to give proper response toward teacher utterance based on Speaker (T) or teacher's utterance.

REFERENCES

- Creswell, John W., (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 3rd edition, California: SAGE.
- Hurford, James R. 1983. *Semantics of Coursebook*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Huda, Miftahul, 2013, *Conversational Implicature Found in Dialogue of Euro Trip Movie*. Kediri: Universitas Brawijaya, 2013, Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis.
- Levinson, S. C. (1995). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Taguchi, N., 2005. "Comprehending implied meaning in English as a foreign language". *The Modern Language Journal*, 89, pp.543-562.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. Longman, London and New York : Longman Group Limited.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, S. J., 2002. "Interpreting conversational implicatures: A study of Korean learners of English". *The Korean TESOL Journal*, 5 Fall/Winter, pp.1-26.

Mohammed Ahmed S.A., 2012. "Conversational Implicature (Flouting the Maxims): Applying Conversational Maxims on Examples Taken from Non-Standard Arabic Language", *Yemeni Journal of Sociological Research*, Vol. 3, No. 2.