

MAXIM VIOLATION IN EFL CLASSROOM

Sulviana
sulviana.dty@uim-makassar.ac.id
Universitas Islam Makassar

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to reveal the maxim violation in EFL Classroom of English Education of FKIP of Universitas Islam Makassar. In this research, the researcher used qualitative descriptive method to find out maxim violation in EFL classroom. In choosing subject, the researcher applied purposeful sampling. In purposeful sampling, (Creswell, 2012:206) states that researchers intentionally select individuals and sites to learn or understand the central phenomenon. In this study, sample consists of 20 students. To consider that the data is authentic, it was taken directly in the classroom by recording the conversation and some of those data were taken while the students are talking. After the data has been collected, they are transcribed into written form and then it was reduced, next analyzed by identified the violation of maxim. After that those violations were classified into table form. The study shows that the students of English Education of FKIP of Universitas Islam Makassar violated the maxim quantity, quality, relation and manner.

Key Words: *Maxim Violation, EFL Classroom*

Introduction

In communicating with others in a particular context, the most important thing we make the foundation is cooperation to realize meaningful communication, (Grice, 1975). In other words, in doing a conversation, people have to contribute a meaningful and productive utterance. The same thing that we hope to communicate that our talking partner will do the same thing that cooperate in establishing meaningful communication. (Girik Allo, 2018), In the observation he conducted in the learning context in the classroom, it was found that the students he taught thought that the hardest in communicating with overseas students was the use of the non-verbal language they used. There are some similar items, but they are mostly different. Further, they said that there were some phrases that they find difficult to understand in their use in certain contexts. In communication, Grice suggests that there are four maxim as the guides, they are the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation and the maxim of manner. Once the speaker violates one of those maxim, it is called maxim violation. Under normal circumstances people always want to remain cooperative during conversation. Speakers can actually signals

when they want to violate a maxims. They do so by using certain phrases which show non-committal or that makes things ‘fuzzy’.

In the context of communication, a speaker detected as violating the maxim when she/he understand that he hearer does not know the truth and only know the surface meaning, but the speaker tend to do the misleading one, (Thomas 1995:73). Such that violation, furthermore, it classified into types of maxims. First, quantity maxim, it defines as in which the speaker provide insufficient information, the speaker may be give more or less. Second, the violation of quality maxim when the speaker told to hearer and she/he give the different content in term of truth, sometimes they tell the lie. Third, violation of maxim of relevance occurs when the speaker tell something to hearer that irrelevant with the topic told. Fourth, the violation of maxim of manner related to information given by the speaker that is far from clearness, and information is not in sequences, telling ambiguous ones.

In relation of this research, there are several researchers who had conducted the study under the topic of violation of maxim. Below, the researcher had chosen two of them, they are: Agung (2016) “the violation of cooperative principles on students’ responses toward teacher questions in TEFL class”. He investigated that the students had violated the four maxims that are quality, quantity, relation, and manner of maxim. From the four ones, the quantity of maxim was the mostly violated by the students. Another one is Kartikasari (2014) conducted a research entitled “The Violation of Conversational Maxims by Sales Persons of “Revlon” Cosmetic in Two Department Stores in Malang”. She finds that the violation of maxim can be occurred in everyday life of people including in conversation between the salespersons of *Revlon* cosmetic with the customers while dealing with the products between them. Then, she suggests that further researcher could more deeply do the study in their field to make communication more meaningful.

Based on the preliminary observation at, there was maxim violation identify in EFL Classroom of English education of FKIP/ Universitas Islam Makassar. In classroom activity when lecturer and students are talking the particular topic, students gave misleading or confusing answer. As result, the other students did not understand on it, even the lecturer were requesting the students to explain that utterance specifically. For achieving the effective communication, the speaker and the hearer need to cooperate, it is because the cooperation is the key to get the productive interaction. Based on the background above, the writer is interested to analyze the

maxim violation in EFL Classroom of English Education of FKIP of Universitas Islam Makassar.

Review of Literature

1. Cooperative Principle

Cooperative Principle defined as a general Rule In order to guide interlocutors in Conversation, Grice (2004). The principle says “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, 2004: 45). Commenting on this paradigm, Saeed (2003: 204) states that cooperative principle is related to the agreement without telling in advance between each other about their cooperation in communication, therefore, effective communication can be obtained. The principle in interactions includes the four maxim they are quality of maxim, quantity of maxim, relevance of maxim, and manner of maxim. They are called Grice’s maxims, (Grice, 2004: 48).

Maxim of Quantity is related to the amount of information that provided in the interaction (Dornerus, 2005: 5). This means that when providing ideas, speakers should provide their sufficient and specific supporting details. Grice (2004) coins two sub-maxims falling under the category of quantity: “Make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purposes of the exchange)” and “Do not make your contribution more informative than required” (p.45). in this term, speakers should provide information that is as much helpful to them as it is for their addressees. Thus, the information should be neither too little nor too much.

The Maxim of Quality deals with the matter of giving the right information (Dornerus, 2005: 5). This maxim requires speakers to genuinely and sincerely provide information. The information should be as truthful and as convincing as required. Grice (2004) postulates two sub-maxims falling under the category of quality: “Do not say what you believe to be false,” and “Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence” (p. 47). This means that when giving information, the speaker should be honest. By the same token, the speaker should provide enough proof supporting his/her information or argumentation.

Relevance Maxim is related to the relevance of information provided by speakers in interaction. In a conversation, addresser and addressee should make their exchanges dovetailed

mutually. In this category, Grice (2004) only places a single sub-maxim, namely “be relevant” (p. 46).

Dornerus (2005: 5) underlines that Maxim of Manner come across with the information that is unclear and not in sequences when doing communication. ”This maxim comprises four sub-maxims, namely “Avoid obscurity of expression,” “Avoid ambiguity,” “Be brief,” and “Be orderly” (p. 46). This paradigm clearly discloses that speakers are supposed to provide information that is clear, concise, univocal, and orderly. In other words, speakers should not make wordy utterances with multiple ways of interpretation.

2. Violation of maxims

In the context of communication, a speaker detected as violating the maxim when she/he understand that he hearer does not know the truth and only know the surface meaning, but the speaker tend to do the misleading one, (Thomas 1995:73). Such that violation, furthermore, it classified into types of maxims. First, quantity maxim, it defines as in which the speaker provide insufficient information, the speaker may be give more or less. Second, the violation of quality maxim when the speaker told to hearer and she/he give the different content in term of truth, sometimes they tell the lie. Third, violation of maxim of relevance occurs when the speaker tell something to hearer that irrelevant with the topic told. Fourth, the violation of maxim of manner related to information given by the speaker that is far from clearness, and information is not in sequences, telling ambiguous ones.

The previous study by Arezou Sobhani and Ali Saghebi (2014) entitled *The Violating of Cooperative Principles and Four Maxims in Iranian Psychological Consultation*. They emphasized that it is necessary to correlate between implicature in conversation and violation in communication. They are related in term of meaning. This study also compared with the study done by Muslah entitled *Violating and Flouting the Cooperative Principle in Some Selected Short Stories*. Muslah (2015) She overviews that the dialogue in the short story was easy to understand because the use of cooperative principle.

Method

In this study, the researcher applied the qualitative descriptive method to find out maxim violation in EFL classroom. Qualitative method as (Mackey and Gass, 2005 cited in (Girik Allo, 2015) shortly explained that qualitative method refers to descriptive data and does not apply the

statistical data. In choosing subject, the researcher applied purposeful sampling. In term of purposeful sampling, (Creswell, 2012:206) states that the researcher chooses the sample of research intentionally in order to investigate the person or site as the subject of research. In this study, sample consists of 20 students. To consider that the data is authentic, it was taken directly in the classroom by recording the conversation and some of those data were taken while the students are talking. After the data has been collected, they are analyzed with the qualitative data, in this research, the researcher used cyclical data analysis as (Mackey, Alison, and Gass, M., 2005 cited in (Girik Allo, Taula'bi', & Sudarsih, 2019)) claims that the technique of analyzing data begin with collecting data, then, data analysis, a hypothesis-formation, reducing data, displaying data, and the last is verifying conclusion. That so called cyclical model of analyzing data.

Result and Discussion

1. Result

In finding, the writer presents the data analysis based on recording to analyze maxim violation in EFL Classroom as follows:

a. Maxim of Quantity:

1) Setting : Another student from another group as a teacher and explain material.

Teacher : *past it's means that from the beginning until the end of this story is form in past. Jadi, dari awal sampai akhir cerita itu dibentuk dalam past.*

(20) (past it's means that from the beginning until the (21) end of this story is form in past. So, the typed from (22) the beginning until the end of this story is past)

(23) Student 1 : past

Teacher : *past atau simple past. Nah, kedua ada namanya narrative present. Jadi narrative present itu adalah kebalikan dari narrative past, jadi kalau tadi dibentuk dalam past nah sekarang adalah seluruh cerita dibentuk dalam?*

(24) (past or simple past. Well, the second there is

(25) Narrative present. So narrative present is opposite

(26) with narrative past, so previously is typed in past,

(27) now all of the story is typed by?)

(28) Student 13 : present

In line 20-28 student as a teacher take turn to teach. The teacher teach

about narrative text. But in teaching learning process there is violation when teacher have just explain material, student repeated certain word that had been said by teacher.

Maxim violated: Maxim of quantity because student 1 repeat the word that had been said by teacher (past).

2) Setting : Lecturer ask to students about drawing.

(48)Lecturer :*Apa itu menggambar?.....*
(What is drawing?).....

(49)Student 10: *menggambar*
(Drawing)

In line 48-49 lecturer asked student what is drawing, but student 10 did not answer the question and just repeat word. Teacher need explanation from student 10 about drawing not repeat the word. **Maxim violated:** Maxim of quantity because student 10 repeat the word that had been said by lecturer (*menggambar*).

3) Setting : Teacher review the material last week

(97)Teacher : ok, I think all of you are here.

(98)Student 8 : yes mom

(99)Teacher : so, before we have a new topic for today, who still remember our topic in the last meeting.

(100)Student 9: Asking permission

In line 99 when teacher remained to student about material last week and asked student who still remember our topic in the last meeting student 9 answer it but it is not answer the question from teacher. **Maxim violated:** maxim of quantity. The response given is uninformative.

b. Maxim of Quality

1) Setting : Teacher is teaching and explaining about narrattive text.

(10)Teacher : well, who still remember that what we have studied last meeting?

(11)Student 6 : yes of course

(12)Student 9 : narrative text.

(13)Teacher : narrative text.

: narrative text,ok. I need one student, what is narrative text? *Satu orang come on, dari belakang ada yang bisa? Anybody here wants? Coba dari belakang, baju merah, the girls in red. what is narrative text?*

(14) Narrative text, ok. I need one student, what is

- (15) narrative text? Someone come on, please, is there
(16) anyone at the back? Anybody here wants?
(17) the girl who wears red shirts, can you try? What is
(18) narrative text?
Student 6 : *narrative text menceritakan ulang*
(19) (Narrative text is retell)

In line 10 teachers want to review material last week. When teacher asked student by saying well, who still remember that what we have studied last meeting? Suddenly there is one student answered it but the answer it false. In fact, teacher need a correct answer namely “ Narrative text “ but student 6 answered it by saying “ yes of course” and the answer from student 6 is considering as a violation of maxim because she does not give the truth contribution. **Maxim violated:** Maxim of quality because the answer of student 6 is false.

2) **Setting : Two of students in front of class to practice about preference material.**

- (76)Student 5 : hey Mei
(77)Student 11: hey Robert
(78)Student 5 : which one do you like banana or orange
(79)Student 11 : eeeee
(80)Student 22: banana
(81)Student 23: banana, banana
(82)Student 11: I prefer orange than banana
(83)Student 5 : I think you like banana
(84)Student 11: no I really don't like banana. Banana is makes us
(85) like a monkey maybe.

In line 76-85, two of students talk about preference. Student 5 (line78) asked to student 11 which one do you like banana or orange. However, according to the conversation above, instead giving clear anwer like “banana” or “orange”. Student 11 gave obscure idea when she uttered an expression “ eee..” to answer it. In addition, the questuion of student 5 is answered by student 22 and 23 (in line 81-82) by saying banana, but the answer is different with student 11. In fact, the correct answer is orange not banana. **Maxim violated:** Maxim of manner because the answer which student 11 gave student's 5 question is considering as a violation of maxim of manner because she disobeyed as she used obscurity expression and ambiguity and also violated maxim of quality because the anwer from student 22 and 23 is false. In fact, student 11 like orange than banana.

c. Maxim of relation

1) Setting : Teachers ask student about their material of the day after having warming-up before the classes is started.

(60)Teacher : *ada yang tahu apa materi kita hari ini?*
(who knows what is our topic today?)

(61)Student 14: *sudah ditanya tadi mom*
(Has been asked before Mom)

(62)Teacher : *sudah?*
(finished)

(63)Student 15: *memilih-milih*
(Preference)

In line 60, teacher asked student about their material of the day, but the response that given by student 14 in line 61 by saying *sudah ditanya tadi mom* (has been asked before Mom) did not answer the question from teacher. Student 14 should answered it by saying “*saya*” (me), so it can answer the question of teacher.

Maxim violated: Relation because the question from teacher and the answer from student 14 irrelevant.

2) Setting : Lecturer asked student (student as a teacher) about her name.

(86)Lecturer : your name please?

(87)Student (as a teacher) : Rice

(88)Lecturer : *apa?*
(What)

(89) student (as a teacher) : Rice

(90) lecturer : Tice, ok Tice

(91)Student 1 : Rice

In line 86, lecturer asked student (student as a teacher) about her name, because the voice of student (student as a teacher) is not loud,(it can see in line 88 and 90) when lecturer ask her, then lecturer asked again by saying *apa?* (what) and student (student as a teacher) answer again but still with low voice, so lecturer say a wrong name again, but it is corrected by student 1 by saying Rice.

Maxim violated : Maxim of manner because student (student as a teacher) not speak loudly so lecturer answered by said *apa?* because he did not hear.

d. Maxim of Manner

1) Setting: lecturer asks to student that they are ready to presentation or not.

(5)Lecturer : *sudah bisa bernapas yang tadi?*
(Can you already breathe?)

(6)Student 5 : *bisa*
(We can)

(7)Lecturer : *belum?*

- (8) Student 5 (Not yet?)
: *sudah pak*
(Ready sir)
- (9) Lecturer : *ow, sudah bisa bernapas, silahkan.*
(ow, you can already breathe, please)

In line 5 lecturer asked to student that what are they ready to presentation by saying *sudah bisa bernapas yang tadi* (can you already breathe) and one of student answered it by saying *bisa* (we can) because student 5 not speak loudly so lecturer did not hear and answered it by saying *belum* (not yet). Student should speak louder in order to answer that is given, so teacher can heard so well and it can avoid violation of maxim.

Maxim violated: Maxim of manner because student's 5 voice is not loud so lecturer misunderstanding.

2) Setting : teacher student about preference

- Teacher : *I prefer studying to sleeping. Any pasangan yang mana kamu suka menonton atau membaca buku?*
- (64) (I prefer studying to sleep. Any pasangan, which one do you prefer watch or read book?)
- (66) Student 3 : *menonton bu'*
(Watching Mom)
- (67) Teacher : *hmmm, apa?*
Hmmm, what?
- (68) Student 3 : *menonton*
(Watching)

Teacher asked one of student that which one do you prefer watch or read book and the question is answered by student 3, but teacher didn't hear what student 3 said and then teacher asked again by saying *hmmm, apa ?* (hmm what?) to know what student 3 said.

Maxim violated: Manner because student's 3 voice is not loud so teacher did not hear what student 3 said.

2. Discussion

In the case of conversation context, the speaker and the hearer require cooperation in order to achieve the meaningful conversation. (Grice, 1975 In other words, in doing a conversation, people have to contribute a meaningful and productive utterance. The same thing that we hope to communicate that our talking partner will do the same thing that cooperate in establishing meaningful communication. Therefore, Grice suggests that the members of conversation have to follow the principle of cooperation that consists of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner of maxim. When members of conversation violate the maxim, it is called violation. In the context of communication, a speaker detected as violating the maxim when

she/he understand that he hearer does not know the truth and only know the surface meaning, but the speaker tend to do the misleading one, (Thomas 1995:73). Such that violation, furthermore, it classified into types of maxims. First, quantity maxim, it defines as in which the speaker provide insufficient information, the speaker may be give more or less. Second, the violation of quality maxim when the speaker told to hearer and she/he give the different content in term of truth, sometimes they tell the lie. Third, violation of maxim of relevance occurs when the speaker tell something to hearer that irrelevant with the topic told. Fourth, the violation of maxim of manner related to information given by the speaker that is far from clearness, and information is not in sequences, telling ambiguous ones. This study shows that the types of maxim that are violated by the students in doing the conversations are analyzed as follows:

a. Maxim of Quantity:

- Lecturer said *from the beginning until the end of this story in past* and student 1 repeat certain word namely *past*.
- Lecturer asked about what is drawing? And student 10 not given answer but student 10 repeat words by saying *menggambar (drawing)* while teacher need student 10 explanation about drawing.
- Lecturer asked student by say who still remember our topic in the last meeting. The question is answered student 9 by saying, *“asking permission.”* It was an uninformative sentence since it does not answer the question from teacher.

b. Maxim of Quality

- Lecturer asked about who still remember that what we have studied last meeting, the students 7 answered it by saying, *“ yes of course ”* The answer that is given by that student 7 is false.
- A student another student by saying, *which one do you like orange than banana?”* And student 22 and 23 gave the wrong answer, because student 22 and 23 said, *“banana”* but in fact, student 11 prefer orange than banana.

c. Maxim of relation

- a. After teacher asked students about who knows our topic today and one of the student answer it. The question is answered by the student 14 by saying *sudah ditanya tadi mom (has been asked before)* but the answer that given by student 14 did not answer the question of teacher.
- b. when the lecturer asked student (student as a teacher) your name please?, and student (student as a teacher) answer it by saying Rice, because student (student as a teacher) did not speak loudly so lecturer did not hear so lecturer asked again by saying *apa (what)*.

d. Maxim of Manner

- a. Lecturer asked a student by saying *“sudah bisa bernapas yang tadi?”* And student 5 answered by saying *“bisa (we can)”*, because student’s 5 voice is not loud so the lecturer misunderstanding and say *“belum ? (Not yet)*.

- b. Lecturer asked about which one do you prefer watch or read book?, and student 3 answer the question from teacher by stated *menonton bu (watching mom)*, because student's 3 voice is not loud enough, so teacher asked again by saying *hmm apa?(hmm, what)*.

Revealing the result shows of this study that there are there were four types of maxim that were violated by the students of English Education of FKIP of Universitas Islam Makassar, likewise on study done by Agung (2016) in the article entitled “the violation of cooperative principles on students’ responses toward teacher questions in TEFL class” shows that there were four types of maxim that were violated on students maxim of quantity, maxim of quality and maxim of manner. Then considering on the study did by Kartikasari (2014) conducted a research entitled “The Violation of Conversational Maxims by Sales Persons of “Revlon” Cosmetic in Two Department Stores in Malang”. She finds that the violation of maxim can be occurred in everyday life of people including in conversation between the salespersons of *Revlon* cosmetic with the customers while dealing with the products between them. Then, she suggests that further researcher could more deeply do the study in their field to make communication more meaningful.. Therefore, it is to say that violation can be occurred in every context of conversation like in the conversation among the lecturer and students in EFL Classrooms proven by the result of the present study’s result.

Conclusion

Based on the result and discussion above, the researcher concludes that the students of English Education of FKIP of Universitas Islam Makassar violated the maxim quantity, quality, relation and manner.

References

- Agung, Sri, Kurnianingtyas, Winantu. (2016). The Violation of Cooperative Principles on Students' Responses toward Teacher Questions in TEFL Class. *Kodifikasia*, Vol. 10, No. 1: 2016.
- Alham Fadhl Muslahl, *Violating and Flouting the Cooperative Principle in Some Selected Stories*. 2015. College of Physical Education. Diyala University. retrieved from www.uobjournal.com/papers/oubj_paper_2015_72335510.pdf
- Arezou Sobhani and Ali Saghebi. The Violation Of Cooperative Principles and Four Maxims in Iranian Phychological Consultation. *Open Jurnal of Modern Linguistics* (2014), 4,91-99 retrieved from <http://www.script.org/journal/ojml>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Dornerus, E. (2005). Breaking maxims in conversation a comparative study of how scriptwriters break maxims. In *Desperate housewives and that 70's show*. Retrieved on October 10th, 2019, from <http://www.kau.divaportal.orgsmash-getdiva.pdf>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Girik Allo, M. D. (2015). Figurative Languages by the Lecturers in Teaching English at English Study Program of FKIP UKI Toraja. *TEFL Overseas Journal CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY OF INDONESIA TORAJA*, 1(1), 76–89. Retrieved from <http://journals.ukitoraja.ac.id/index.php/telfoj/article/view/214>
- Girik Allo, M. D. (2018). Intercultural Communication in EFL Classrooms. *Journal of Language Teaching and Literature*, 5(2), 159–170.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30605/ethicallingua.v5i2.1036>
- Girik Allo, M. D., Taula'bi', N., & Trika Sudarsih, E. (2019). The learners' needs on local cultural contents of reading professional context textbook at English program study. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)*, 2(2), 31–35.
<https://doi.org/10.33750/ijhi.v2i2.39>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (Eds.). *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol 3: Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press, 1975, PP. 41-58.
- Grice, H. P. (2004). *Logic and conversation*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Kartikasari, Wulan, Niken. (2014). "The Violation of Conversational Maxims by Sales Persons of "Revlon" Cosmetic in Two Department Stores in Malang". Thesis. Malang: Study Program of English Department Of Languages and Literatures Faculty of Cultural Studies Universitas Brawijaya.
- Malmkjaer, Kirsten. (2002). Second edition: *The Linguistics Encyclopedia*. London.
- Saeed, J. I. (2003). *Semantics* (Second ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in interaction. In an introduction to Pragmatic. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Yule, G. (1996). *The study of language* (4thed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.