

## THE FLOUTING MAXIMS ON ENGLISH STUDENTS' PROPOSAL SEMINAR IN ENGLISH EDUCATION

<sup>1</sup>Ivan Achmad Nurcholis, <sup>2</sup>Ria Angraini, <sup>3</sup>Washlurachim Safitri, <sup>4</sup>Esa Putriami  
ivanachmad350@gmail.com, ria.angraini16ags@gmail.com,  
washlurachimsafitri@umb.ac.id

<sup>1234</sup>Universitas Muhammadiyah Bengkulu

**Abstract:** This research aimed to identify the types of maxim (Grice's theory) and the most dominant maxim which was flouted by English students on English proposal seminar in English Education Study Program of Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu. The design of this research was descriptive method. The subjects of this research were 20 students as participants in question and answer on English Proposal Seminar, and the data were collected from the utterances of English students in answering the Examiners' questions in English Proposal Seminar in English Education Study Program of Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu. The instrument of this research was observation notes and checklist. The result of the research could be concluded that first, there were four types of maxims flouted by the students. They were 1) maxim of quantity (21 utterances that flouted by the students; 2) maxim of quality (4 utterances flouted by students); 3) maxim of manner (11 utterances that flouted by students), and 4) maxim of relevance (13 utterances that flouted by the students). Second, the most dominant maxim which flouted by students on English students' proposal seminar in English Education Study Program of Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu was maxim of quantity with percentage 42.85% and identified for 21 times. In line with information above, it was suggested that the participants should aware and cooperate in doing communication particularly in answering the examiners' questions by knowing the types of flouting maxims and seeing the context corectly because it can make the seminar runs well and avoid miscommunication that affected to the result of their seminars.

**Keywords:** *pragmatics, cooperative principle, flouting maxims, and english proposal seminar*

### INTRODUCTION

Conversation is one way to communicate and convey what is in mind through the words. The conversation itself will happen if there are two or more people who take a part in it. Like stated by Clark and Bly (1995:394) it is not a conversation if just there is one person, at least two people must be in the same conversation at the same time. Here, the speaker is the one who communicates the ideas, and listener is the one who interprets the meaning. One way of interpreting the meaning is through the context of communication take place, and it is called pragmatics.

In line with the statement above can be concluded that Pragmatics is important in communication process. Paltridge (2000:39) says that the relationship between meaning, context, and communication is explored in Pragmatics. In communication, if communicators do not concern with the context, it can cause misunderstanding and miscommunication, because context is one of the important elements that must be known by speaker and hearer. When speaker says something to deliver the word, the speaker's utterances maybe clear but sometimes the content is not clear. So the listener will be difficult to make inferences or inferred the meaning of utterances which made by speaker.

Successful conversation is not only seen from speaker who communicate and listener who reply, it needs more than that. There are some rules that people should aware to accomplish a successful conversation. If people can fulfilled the cooperative principle, they will have a successful conversation. Grice (1989:26) said that Cooperative principle means that people just need to give their contribution such as is required with the accepted of the direction and purpose in exchange the talk. According to Yule (1996:37) Cooperative principle is based of four sub- principles, or known as conversational maxims.

Maxim is a principle in conversation. Grice (1989:26) inferred that there are four submaxims in accordance with the cooperative principle; 1) The maxim of quantity (be brief),. 2) The maxim of quality (be true),. 3) The maxim of relation (relavant),. 4) The maxim of manner (be clear). Specifically, These maxims explain the listeners' assumptions about the way speakers do talk, not prescribe how someone should talk. These maxims should be consider by speaker so the listener can interpret the meaning clearly and make the conversation running smoothly. However, there is a participant who disobey the cooperative principle or unfulfilling the maxims.

The participants usually violating or flouting the maxim. Grice (1989:30) claimed that there are various ways why the participant may fail to fulfill a maxim, that is he may violate the maxim, he may opt out both of cooperative principle and maxim, he may be faced by clash, or he may flout a maxim. These cases may happen in the conversation that participants engaged, so they should be aware of these cases.

As one of unfulfilling the maxims which usually done by partipants' engaged, Flouting maxim is one interesting topic. Different with other cases of

unfulfilling the maxims, in flouting the maxim, the participants seem does not like comply the cooperative principle where actually they obey it, what they just do is unfulfilling the maxim. Sometimes people seems like disobey the maxims but the rest of the utterance show they follow cooperative principle. When people flouted the maxims, they still try to cooperate, but there will be another meaning in what is said. In other words, there is conversation implicature in it. Paltridge (2000:43) explained that conversational implicature is the inference of the hearer which interpret the speaker's intended meaning from literal meaning that appear in what is said. However, there are so many participants of conversation that flouting the maxims. It is not easy to assume or understand the meaning of conversational implicature or a hidden meaning in the conversation, so the listener often could not follow and can not get the point of the conversation. Flouting the maxim can occur in many situations of conversation.

One of the situations is in proposal seminar presentation. English Education Study Program of Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu also held the proposal seminar. Seminar of proposal is one of series where the students convey and explain the concept of their research, and there will be question and answer session about concepts that are presented which must be accounted by the students in front of their supervisors and examiners. Peccei (1999:30) give an example of flouting maxim of quantity between teacher and student, the teacher asks "What time is it? [towards the end of a lecture]", and student answer "It's 10:44 and 35.6 seconds". This is a flouting of the quantity maxim. The student is providing much more information than is normally draw the implicature that 'The student was bored and "counting the minutes" until the end of the lecture, but the flouting maxim of quantity also occurred when the speaker give too little information. As the researcher saw in presentation of proposal seminar, there are presenters who answered the question of the examiners by flouting the maxim and it rather difficult to continue questioning. For example, in question and answer on proposal seminar, there is an examiner who asks "How many master (theory) do you have?", and the student counted her fingers and answer "I bring one". This is a flouting maxim of Quantity. The student's answer is lack of information that is required in the conversation. The situation is the examiner asks how many master that she has, cause master is the key in the research and the examiner said to the student that when she does not have master, she cannot

measure, but from the student answer, it draws the implicature that “Either she has more than one master, or she just have one master as the key in her research. However, the speaker should give the information sufficiently for the current purpose of the conversation, do not reduce the information or make your contribution in the conversation more informative than is necessary, and make your contribution as is required without giving any other implications.

Some of prior researches in journals about maxims especially flouting maxims have been conducted by some researchers such as from Fadhly, F.Z. (2012), Dwi, A. (2015), Sari P.P. et al (2016), Affifatusholihah (2016), Hanna, E. et al (2017), Nurrahman, Arif. (2017), Kurniata, M. et al (2018), Pradika B.G et al (2018), Hassani, N. (2019), Hamani T. et al (2019), Lestary, N.G. (2019). Those researches discussed on flouting maxims in interview, EFL classroom, t-shirts, humour, TV Series, movie scripts, movies, and twitter influencers’ tweets. There is no research concerned in flouting maxims particularly in proposal seminar. Therefore, based on the phenomena, the researchers were interested to conduct the research about the flouting maxims in question and answer on proposal seminar of English Education Study Program of Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu. This is what distinguished this research from former researches.

## **METHOD**

This research was conducted by employing descriptive qualitative method since the research deals with words, and the purpose was to describe the types of flouting maxims which made by the students in their English proposal seminar. There are 20 English students who as participant in proposal seminar be the subjects of this research, and the data were collected from the utterances of English students in answering the Examiner’s question in English proposal seminar. Instrument of the research was observation notes, that contained of number of the student, the time when the proposal seminar began and the time that the flouting maxim occurred, the utterances of question and answer which done by examiners and students who flouted the maxim, Types of maxims that flouted which categorized into Maxim of quantity (QN), quality (QL), relevance (RL), manner (MN). Also the explanation of what types of maxims that had been flouted by English Student as participants in proposal seminar in Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu. The data was collected

through attending the students' proposal seminar and recording their presentations. At last for data analysis, some actions were taken such as: watching the recorded presentations video, coding the video into the same date, each rooms, and the students' order in presenting the proposal, making the transcription from all of the question and answer in the proposal seminar from the video recording, identifying the flouting maxims that were made by English students who as participant in English proposal seminar, determining what types of maxims were flouted, in accordance with the theory of Grice maxims (1989), and checked by the co-researcher, inputing the data in the table on observation list, re-checking the utterances in the transcription, analyzing each flouting maxim that was found in the question and answer on seminar proposal that done by English students, making the percentage of flouted maxims that has been found, finding out the most dominant maxim which flouted by English student in question and answer on english proposal seminar, and drawing a conclusion.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The speaker failed to fulfill the maxim of quality by flouting it, that is one of maxims in Grice theory which was concluded by Grice (1989:26) as make a true contribution on the part of participants in a discourse. They should not say or give information which they believe is false or which they do not have adequate evidence or are not sure of. In other words, they should try to make their contributions truthful. The tables of data and its discussion about the flouting maxim of quality (data 1-4) are presented as follow:

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|---------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7       | 12.22/<br>08.41 | Q: <i>sama type dengan jenis sama, ini tidak tipe tidak jenis, tahap kalo gini ni, ya kan? Kalo saya gak salah ya, coba lihat establish clearly &gt;bla-bla-bla&lt; establish () obtain &gt;bla-bla-bla&lt; obtain result () fleksible.. tip malah ini isinya tip ini, ini tip ini, tip saran ya bukan jenis. Kalo jenis misalnya, dia memberikan explanation sambil salto, satu. ya kan? Sambil duduk satu, itu jeniskan? Nah, ini tidak jenis ini.</i><br>A : <i>Kemaren tu.. kan tips.. tapi lupa kemaren tu mungkin jadi way</i><br>Q : <i>hah?</i> |

From data 1, the situation was in the previous question, the examiner asked about the types of planning and objection, but the student's answer was the both of them was

“jenis” or kind and the examiner said it was not, and the student said it was the type. The examiner said it was the same and it should be tips not types, but the student flouted the maxim of quality by saying it was tips but might be change to way. This was obviously untrue, because there was no discussion about the types. It drew the implied meaning that she understood, or knew she was wrong.

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                       |
|---------|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 8       | 12.49/<br>09.14 | Q: <i>hah halaman berapa?</i><br>A: <i>ee..{open her proposal} halaman tiga.</i> |

From data 2, the student flouted the maxim of quality because when the examiner asked the student about what page was holiday theory, the student answered it was on page three when it was a background which the examiner know it was obvious that she was lie and it lacked of edequete evidence.

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|---------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 12      | 10.57/ 15.13    | Q : <i>terus kamu analisis pakai apa?</i><br>A : <i>teori itu..</i><br>Q : <i>teori yang ini kan? nah mana? itulah teori yang mau dilihat itu ((hehe)).</i><br>A : <i>{searching} &lt; lupo bawa caknyo sir&gt;.</i><br><i>{Audience laughs}</i> |

From data 3, the situation was the examiner asked about what she wanted to use to analyze the data and asked the student to showe it, but the student said that she might not bring it, this was obviously untrue, the student had flouting the maxim of quality, because the context was this was proposal seminar, and she should be prepared and brought everything that related to her research, if not that mean the student was not ready yet, it drew the implied meaning that she did not have the theory, but the student could only be cooperative if the interpretation was she did have the theory.

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|---------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 17      | 11.27/<br>34.15 | Q : <i>mengenai berapa kali kamu mau ngambil data, bapak rasa nggak masalah ya dosen pasti akan membantu ini. mungkin kalo dulu dosen nggak ada effort, mereka jadi ada effort karna kamu ((laughs)), ngambil dua atau tiga kali bapak rasa nggak masalah, okay yang lain.. references?... references kok Cuma sebuah?{Look at another examiners}</i><br>A : <i>idak teprint berarti sir.</i> |

From data 4, It was obvious that this was proposal seminar, and the student answered that said the rest of the references was not printed was lack of adequate evidence, it drew the implied meaning that the student had another references but he did not write it down in references page so not printed out.

When the speaker flouting the maxim of quantity, the speaker failed to fulfill the maxim of quantity which stated by Grice (1989:27) that the maxim means every speaker should be informative in a discourse by saying the right amount of what is required. A speaker should not say more or less than what is necessary for the moment. The tables of data and its discussion about the flouting maxim of quality (data 5-8) are presented as follow:

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                                                                                                    |
|---------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6       | 11.52/<br>06.10 | Q : <i>bukan lewat pengamatan, hhm atau nggak?</i><br>A : <i>kalo dari pengamatan, saya lihat secara umum laki-laki dan perempuan itu berbeda. ((LAUGHS))</i> |

In Data 5 above, the student has flouted the maxim of quantity, because the student's answer was apparently both too informative, cause we knew male and female was different and informative enough since the student had not been directly answered the examiner's question.

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                                  |
|---------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7       | 12.22/<br>12.43 | Q : <i>ya, &lt;can you do?&gt; to get the all of data?</i><br>A : <i>Nggak seluruh sir.</i> |

In data 6 above. the situation was the student doubt too take a risk because it was hard to get the data like what had explained by the examiner. So the student was flouted the maxim of quantity by saying if not all of the data. It drew the implied meaning if she could do it but it was too hard for her to get all of the data and had to make it easier.

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|---------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10      | 09.55/<br>17.33 | Q : <i>kamu lihat di jurnal yang penelitian di Iran itu?</i><br>A : <i>nah yang itulah mam yang ilang tu mam ((hehe)).</i><br>Q : <i>huh?yang ilang mana?</i><br>A : <i>yang jurnal yang dikasih, yang di acc judul kemaren tu, kan dimasuki ke laptop, laptopnya rusak, jadi nak cari lagi tu dak ketemu jurnal tu mam.</i> |

In data 7 above, the student has flouted the maxim of quantity. The examiner asked about which journal that had been lost, and the student gave too much unnecessary information that needed by examiner, the implied meaning that he could not find the journal in laptop but he had no will to find the data in the internet and did not bring it in the proposal seminar.

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                              |
|---------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| 16      | 10.48/<br>07.26 | Q : <i>bisa?</i><br>A : <i>insyaa Allah diusahakan.</i> |

From data 8 above, the student had been flouting the maxim of quantity because he did not answered the examiner's question directly, "yes or no", it drew the implied meaning that he was not certain yet that he could do it.

The maxim of relevance means that in every conversational situation the speaker/hearer should adhere to the topic of their conversation, Grice (1989:27) said that there is should be relation. They must always ensure that they give only information that is related to the conversation at hand and in their interaction with each other. The tables of data and its discussion about the flouting maxim of quality (data 9-12) are presented as follow:

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|---------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 7       | 12.22/<br>12.09 | Q : <i>Nggak. Anda tau nggak cara bikin itu?</i><br>A : <i>[tau sir]</i><br>Q : <i>Kenapa anda bisa nilai orang itu bagus?... Jangan-jangan n-nanti banyak yang mereject anda ketika masuk klas," gak usah.. gak usah gitu.."</i> Belum lagi kalo anda ikuti seluruh item ini yang namanya construction tu mulai dari, ada planningnya, ada cohesionnya, okay? Nah, the question is <can you do?> itu aja.<br>A : <i>Nantikan minta izin dulu sir.</i> |

In data 9 above, the student had flouted the maxim of relevance because it was not relevant with the conversation at hand which the examiner asked her if she could do it even with so many risk or not, but the student's answer was not relavant, she said she would get the permission later. It drew the implied meaning that she could if there was a permission, and she could not do it if there was no permission.

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances |
|---------|-----------------|------------|
|---------|-----------------|------------|



|    |                 |                                                                                                     |
|----|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11 | 10.33/<br>08.35 | Q : Is it from our campus or?<br>A : <b>score-score- score..</b><br>Q : [ya]<br>A : <b>student.</b> |
|----|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

In data 10 above, the student had deliberately flouted the maxim of relevance, because she still concerned in answered the previous question and gave irrelevant answer for the discussion at hand, the implied meaning that there in student's utterance was she got the data from our campus and focus on the score.

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                |
|---------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 15      | 11.44/<br>07.57 | Q : kamu karang-karang itu?<br>A : <b>yang good learning environment?</b> |

In data 11 above, the situation was the examiner thought that she just made up her words, and when the examiner asked her about it for the second time, she gave irrelevant answer by asking back to the examiner. it drew the implied meaning that she did made up her answer or she did not understand the examiner's question about the good learning environment. The answer of the student could only be still cooperate, if yes she made up because she did not know the answer and still wanted to cooperate by asking them back.

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|---------|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 19      | 12.04/<br>02.05 | Q : kamu belajar dari mana itu?<br>A : <b>((hehe)) countable itu benda yang dapat dihitung, sedangkan uncountable noun yang idak dapat dihitung, contohnya ee kalo uncountable noun itu seperti segelas, secangkir kopi</b> |

In data 12, the student's answer was not relevant with what the examiner ask. The examiner asked where the student learned but she explained about the difference between the countable and uncountable noun instead. To still cooperated that wherever she was learn it did not matter, but she gave the wrong example, it drew the implied meaning for the examiner that she was not comprehend the theory yet and learned from the wrong sources.

When the speaker flouting the maxim of manner, the speaker failed to fulfill the maxim of manner which stated by Grice (1989:27) that means the participants in

a discourse should not make their contributions obscure, ambiguous or difficult to understand. It is a call for parties in any communication discourse to be perspicuous (clear). Besides, they should be very brief and organized. The tables of data and its discussion about the flouting maxim of quality (data 13-16) are presented as follow:

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|---------|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3       | 10.26/<br>17.48 | <p>A :<i>salah satunya pake eugene's theory.. eugene's theory tadi, jika ada menyangkut ketiga buah thematic progression ini {show a paper}.. bisa.. good.</i></p> <p>Q : <i>aa.. kalo tiga-tiganya</i></p> <p>A : <i>[tidak mesti, salah satu aja]</i></p> <p>Q : <i>oh kalo salah satunya? Ada?</i></p> <p>A : <i>[mhm]</i></p> <p>A : <i>mhm</i></p> <p>Q : <i>good, terus kalo tiga-tiganya ada ?</i></p> <p>A : <i>ngga {glance to audience} {look at her proposal} ()((laughs)) {shake her head}</i></p> |

In data 13, the situation was the student said that if there were three of the thematic progression it could be good but when the student asked by the examiner if there were three so it good or not, the student's answer was "no" with so many movements. The maxim of manner had been flouted because student's answer was ambiguous, so it drew the implied meaning that the student did not understand the question or the student could not comprehend the theory.

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                                                           |
|---------|-----------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 13      | 11.23/<br>10.33 | <p>Q : <i>ya, itu kan aspek.</i></p> <p>A : <i>°tiga,&gt; ada tiga jenis kan sir, yang pertama itu °&lt;, ()</i></p> |

In data 14 above, the situation was the student answered the examiner's question in slow volume so another examiner could not hear it, it kind of rude to just speak to one of the examiner, it was flouting the maxim of manner because it drew the implied meaning, that there was something that she hid.

| Student | Time/ Minute | Utterances                                                                                                                            |
|---------|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 16      | 10.48/ 10.53 | <p>Q : <i>umum ke khusus maksudnya gimana?</i></p> <p>A : <i>dari misalnya: ... {silent} {thinking} dari: ahh () ((laughing))</i></p> |

From data 15 above, the student's answer was not clear and his behaviour in answer was not right a little scream and laugh to himself, it drew the implied meaning that he sure not understood the theory or he forgot or did not know how to explain it.

| Student | Time/<br>Minute | Utterances                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|---------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 19      | 12.04/<br>03.12 | Q : <i>okay jelaskan dulu ya, yang mana yang bisa dihitung dengan yang tidak bisa dihitung, coba benda-benda yang bisa dihitung tu seperti apa paryati</i><br>A : <i>iya sir okay, kalo ya:ng for example, misal there are.. there is ee..ada beberapa mahasiswa yang datang kekelas, yang datang kekampus, sedangkan uncountable noun ada, eh salah ngga?ee ..for example ee countable noun and uncountable noun the first eh..</i> |

In data 16 above, the student has flouted the maxim of manner because the way the student answered the examiner's question was difficult to understand which the uncountable and countable noun was not clear from her explanation. It drew the implied meaning that she did not understand the theory or she understood but could not explain it in English. She should gave the example in english if she learned it in English.

Next, the dominant maxim that flouted by 20 english students who as participants in question and answer on english proposal seminar is explained in the Table 1 below. Table 1 is a table frequency of flouting the maxims in question and answer on english proposal seminar.

Table 1. Frequency Flouting Maxims in Question and Answer on English Proposal Seminar.

| Type of Flouting Maxims     | Number | Percentage |
|-----------------------------|--------|------------|
| Flouting maxim of quantity  | 21     | 42.85%     |
| Flouting maxim of relevance | 13     | 26.53%     |
| Flouting maxim of manner    | 11     | 22.45%     |
| Flouting maxim of quality   | 4      | 8.16%      |
| Total                       | 49     | 100%       |

As shown in the table above, the types of maxim flouting all occur in english students' answers. It means that english students who as participants in question and answer on english proposal seminar have every chance to flout the maxims. The total number of maxim flouting performed by 20 english students who as patcipants in english proposal seminar is 49 times. Here, the most dominant maxim flouting uttered by english students in answering examiner's questions in english proposal

seminar, that is flouting maxim of quantity. Its frequency is 21 (42.85%). This is almost a half of the occurrences of maxim flouting. This means that English student who as participants in English proposal seminar usually do not give the required information for the purpose of the exchange, whether they give too much or too little information. This maxim flouting frequently happens due to the fact that they are the presenters in the proposal seminar. As participants, they have enough knowledge to be shared. Giving too much information is a way to show they are mastering their proposal, and convince the examiner they can do the research. On the other hand, giving too little information is done because they still want to cooperate in examiner's question by giving the information that they just know a little about the answer of the questions. It is a way to survive in order to pass the proposal seminar.

Well under maxim flouting of quantity, there is flouting maxim of relevance that occurs 13 times (26.53%). This type of maxim happens when English student in answering the examiner's questions not be relevant in doing an exchange in conversation at hand. They unfulfill the maxim but still cooperate in conversation, because the situation is proposal seminar, it makes them need to answer the examiner's questions, and when they feel difficult to give the answer they flouting the maxim of relevance. Becomes irrelevant to change the subject of a conversation so that they can minimize their difficulty in giving response.

The third rank in the occurrences of maxim flouting is flouting maxim of manner. The frequency is slightly less than the relevance maxim flouting, 11 times (22.45%). Here, the English student who as participant in proposal seminar fails to be perspicuous, avoid obscurity, avoid ambiguity, and be orderly. In English proposal seminar, the participants should use English in answering the examiners' questions as the student that study in English department, but some of them, still difficult to understand or to speak English. That's why many of them difficult to answer the examiners' questions whether they know what the question is or what the answer of the question, they still want to cooperate by flouting the maxim of manner by being ambiguous and obscure. Therefore, they are failed to be clear in answering the examiners' questions.

Then, the last maxim flouting which has the lowest rank in the occurrence is flouting maxim of quality that occurs 4 times (8.16%). This type of flouting maxim happens when English students who as participant in English proposal seminar fail to

fulfill the maxim which require them to make a reliable contribution, say things that are believed to be true, and that have adequate evidence. This maxim is the lowest rank indicates that this flouting maxim of quality is rarely used. Because the context is in english proposal seminar where all of the participants are expected to give an honest answer, but when the english student who as participant in proposal seminar flouting the maxim of quality, it was obvious which at that time, they are still want to cooperate and convince the examiner and give overstatement.

Furthermore, the dominant of maxim that has been flouted in Solomon Northup in 12 years a Slave Movie that analyzed by Fatmawati (2015) found that the main character is a freeman so she said that he had enough knowledge to be shared, that is why because in proposal seminar the english student who as presenter should have much knowledge to be shared. For the second is the flouting maxim of quality, which is different with the result of this research where the flouting maxim is in the lowest frequency that flouted by the student who as participants in english proposal seminar. In solomon movie the main character uses this maxim flouting to save his face as a slave so that he can survive, but in proposal seminar is vice versa which for you survive, you cannot said something that lack of adequate evidence in answer the examiner's question to pass the seminar.

The third frequency is the flouting maxim of manner then next the flouting maxim of relevance in the last place but the frequency is a little different in solomon movie, and in English proposal seminar the frequency of the flouting maxim of relevance is more than the maxim of manner but the frequency of both of them is just slightly different. The conclusion is the dominant maxim that can be flouted in communication is depend on what circumstances or the places that the speaker faced at that time.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

In conclusion, the finding of this research revealed that the four maxims which based on Grice's theory are obtained, namely: 1) The flouting maxim of quantity, 2) The flouting maxim of quality, 3) The maxim of relevance, and 4) The maxim of manner. All of the maxims are flouted by the english students who as participants in proposal seminar. In addition, The finding also revealed that the most dominant maxim that flouted by English Student in question and answer on English

Proposal Seminar was the flouting maxim of quantity with the percentage 42,85% and happened for 21 times.

Further, the suggestions are addressed not only to the students but also to the examiners of the proposal seminar. Students who were as the participants should be cooperated in answer the examiner's question by knowing the types of flouting maxims because it can make the seminar runs well. The participants also should be careful when flouting the maxim because it can lead to miscommunication and affect to the result of seminar. Lastly, the examiners should aware that the flouting maxims might be used by the participants, and they have to see the context and get the implied meaning corectly.

## REFERENCES

- Dwi E.S, A. (2015). An Analysis of Flouting Maxim in EFL Classroom Interaction. *Journal of Vision, Volume 4 Number 2, October, 243-259.*
- Clark, H. H., & Bly, Bridget. (1995). *Speech, Language, and Communication*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fadhly, Fahrus Zaman. (2012). Flouts of The Cooperative Principle Maxims in SBY's Presidential Interviews. *Journal of English Education Vol. 1, Issue 1, December 2012* <http://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE>.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* (7th ed.). New York :Mc-Graw Hill Companies.
- Fatmawati, S. N. K. (2015). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Maxim Flouting Performed by Solomon Northup in 12 Years a Slave Movie*. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University.
- Grice, Paul. (1989). *Studies in The Way of Words*. London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Hamani, Triza., et al (2019). Pragmatics Analysis of Maxim Flouting Done by The Main Characters in Kungfu Panda Movie by Jonathan Aibel & Glenn Berger. *Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris Volume 08. No. 1 Juni 2019, 16-26.*
- Hanna BR., Ester et al (2017). An Analysis of Maxims Flouting in "The Jungle Book" Movie Script, *Journal of English Language and Language Teaching (JELLT)* | Vol.1, No.2, 33-39.

- Hassani, N. (2019). The Flouting Maxim on Twitter Influencers' Tweets, *Journal of Pragmatics Research Vol. 01, No.02*, 139-155
- Kurniati, Melinda et al. (2018). The Flouting of the Gricean Maxims in the Movies *Insidious* and *Insidious 2*. *Journal of LEXICON, Volume 5, Number 1, April 2018*, 65-76.
- Nurrahman, Arif. (2017). *Analysis of Flouting Maxims Related to Humor in The American Sitcom "Friends" Season 1 (A Pragmatics Approach*. Surakarta: Sebelas Maret University.
- Paltridge, Brian. (2000). *Making Sense of Discourse Analysis*. Australia: Gerd Stabler.
- Peccei, S. J. (1999). *Pragmatics*. London and New York: ROUTLEDGE, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Pradika, Bayu Garna et al. (2018). An Analysis of Flouting Maxims In "Coco" Movie, *Journal of PROJECT Volume 1, No. 5, September 2018*, 657-663.
- Sari, Pravita Puspita, et al. (2016). The Study of Flouting Maxim of Grice's Cooperative Principle on Cak Cuk Surabaya T-Shirts. *Journal of Anglicist Volume 05 No 02 (August 2016)* 109-116.
- Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.