

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter will explain the research findings and discussions dealing with the data that have been collected during the research. The data would take from the 3 classes of teaching-learning interaction in Cross Cultural Understanding Course in the 3th semester of 2021 Academic Year at English Education Department of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. In findings, the researcher examined the flouting of the principles according to Grice (1975, p. 45) and Leech (1983, p. 132).

A. Findings

In this part, the researcher presents the data related to the research questions; (1) What are the types of flouting cooperative principle and flouting politeness principle in teaching learning interaction of Cross Cultural Understanding course? (2) What are the purposes of those flouting principles in teaching learning interaction of Cross Cultural Understanding course? The data would be analysed from the flouting utterances of the speakers in the teaching-learning interaction.

1. Data Collection

In collecting data, the researcher used data cards and interview as the instrument of research. In this research, there are three steps to get the research result. First, using data card to notes the data which are the flouting communication principles utterances from the speaker. Second, analyse the

data to explain the context of the flouting. Third, arrange interview with the speaker who has delivered the flouting communication principles.

In order to collect data, the researcher read and understand the documentation interaction from WhatsApp chat group of the lecturer and students in four meetings of three classes. By using data cards instrument, the researcher took note the flouting utterances, there are 61 data found from the teaching learning interaction. The data found are follow.

Table 1. Datum Classification of Flouting Communication Principles

No. Data	Speaker	Utterances	Flouting Cooperative principle				Flouting Politeness Principles						Context
			Qn	Ql	R	M	TM	GM	AM	MM	AGM	SM	
1.	Student	Belum Miss, ulun lupa	√										The student forgot to upload material in Google Classroom
2.	Student	Inggih sudah Miss, cuma kelupaan meupload di gcnya.	√										The student forgot to upload material in Google Classroom
3.	Student	I want to ask about sport to group 10		√									The student want to ask question to the group persentation, but he asked the wrong group
4.	Student	Correct, mungkin maksudnya American football ya yang									√		They talking about whether rugby or

No. Data	Speaker	Utterances	Flouting Cooperative principle				Flouting Politeness Principles						Context
			Qn	Ql	R	M	TM	GM	AM	MM	AGM	SM	
		lebih brutal, maka dari itu perlu pakaian pelindung.											american football more brutal
5.	Student	Ee bukannya American football ya yang lebih brutal soalnya pakai pelindung segala dan saya melihat di TV ehhhh tabrakannya itu loh geprakkk kenceng bunyinya									√		They talking about whether rugby or american football more brutal
6.	Student	Rugby dikenal lebih brutal dikarenakan tidak memakai pelindung, selain itu aturan yang dipakai untuk melindungi pemain di American football tidak ada di rugby. Seperti di aturan digambar itu permainan tidak dihentikan kecuali ada yang memang punya luka jangka panjang.									√		They talking about whether rugby or american football more brutal
7.	Student	Sama Miss, ulun kada bisa sama sekali kalo disuruh menawar barang.	√										They are talking about bidding

No. Data	Speaker	Utterances	Flouting Cooperative principle				Flouting Politeness Principles						Context
			Qn	Ql	R	M	TM	GM	AM	MM	AGM	SM	
8.	Student	Iya Miss, dari sumber yang saya baca, itu berlaku gak Cuma di banjar aja, tapi di daerah lain juga ada yang seperti itu.	√										They are talking about bidding
9.	Student	Sama Miss, ulun sangat payah dalam menawar.	√										They are talking about bidding
10.	Student	Sama Miss. Tapi mama ulun lihai banar menawar.			√								They are talking about bidding
11.	Student	Saya juga Miss tidak pandai dalam hal tawar menawar, paling sekali nanya apa bisa kurang atau tidak, pas penjualnya bilang tidak bisa ya sudah langsung tidak banyak omong saya langsung beli haha.	√										They are talking about bidding
12.	Student	Uluu Kebalikan pian Miss wkwk.									√		They are talking about bidding
13.	Student	Sorry Miss, there were some “small” misunderstanding in our group, but it’s fine now.	√		√								He had trouble when presenting material

No. Data	Speaker	Utterances	Flouting Cooperative principle				Flouting Politeness Principles						Context
			Qn	Ql	R	M	TM	GM	AM	MM	AGM	SM	
14.	Student	Tapi dari yang pernah saya baca Kanada termasuk ke dalam top 5 negara yang kasus korupsinya palig sedikit, sedangkan Kanada merupakan bagian dari Amerika. Lalu kenapa Kanada menjadi satu-satunya? Dan bisa berbeda dari daerah lain di Amerika? Karena Kanada menetapkan sistem transparan atau setiap pemerintahannya itu harus dijalankan secara transparan. Itulah yang membuat mereka bisa mengurangi kasus korupsi.	√										She explain about corruption in America
15.	Student	Jadi di Amerika kebanyakan ternyata sama juga seperti di Indonesia yang masih sering korupsi, baik sudah dapat dipahami terimakasih saudari atas jawabannya.	√										He conclude the answer from the presentator

No. Data	Speaker	Utterances	Flouting Cooperative principle				Flouting Politeness Principles						Context
			Qn	Ql	R	M	TM	GM	AM	MM	AGM	SM	
16.	Lecturer	Banyak yang hanya ingin mengeruk keuntungan pribadi lewat jabatan yang dimiliki.								√			She give opinion about government
17.	Lecturer	Topik yang dipilih satu aja, bahkan boleh mengambil hanya sub topik dari topik yang ada. Misalnya, kalian pengen ambil topik “culture shock, conflict, and adjustment” kalian boleh aja bahas cuma culture shock nya doing gak harus semua.	√										She explain about middle test project
18.	Lecturer	Ingat, ini tugas individu, kalau tidak mengumpul, tidak ada yang memback up kalian, otomatis nilainya kosong, jadi mohon peratiannya.						√					She want the students to the test properly
19.	Lecturer	Kontennya sesuai apa tidak dengan materi yang sudah dipelajari; keaslian karya (artinya bukan hasil copas); design; jumlah slide. Nilai yang kurang dari 5 slide akan	√										She explain about middle test project

No. Data	Speaker	Utterances	Flouting Cooperative principle				Flouting Politeness Principles						Context
			Qn	Ql	R	M	TM	GM	AM	MM	AGM	SM	
		berbeda dengan nilai yang 5 slide dan berbeda juga dengan nilai yang 7 slide.											
20.	Lecturer	5-7 slide itu memuat satu topic pembahasan. Intinya itu kaya kalian bikin PPT juga tapi formatnya berupa infografis yang banyak gambarnya.	√							√			She explain about middle test project
21.	Lecturer	Okay, bagi yang tidak komen saya anggap sudah paham ya.					√						She consider the students understand
22.	Lecturer	Kita lebih ramah dan kadang agak SKSD gitu sama orang baru.							√				She compare Indonesian with west contries
23.	Student	Miss saya izin komentar yaa. Sebenarnya di luar negeri sama juga kok banyak yang SKSD dan ramah bahkan ga kenal pun kalau pas pasan sesama tetangga mereka negor.							√				She compare Indonesian with west contries
24.	Student	Dua-duanya Miss, tapi yang paling utama muridnya harus menghormati yang lebih tua	√					√					They talked about lecturer-students relationship

No. Data	Speaker	Utterances	Flouting Cooperative principle				Flouting Politeness Principles						Context
			Qn	Ql	R	M	TM	GM	AM	MM	AGM	SM	
		dan yang tua menghargai yang muda.											
25.	Student	Tapi setiap orang beda-beda Miss, kalau ulun bacanya malah kayak orang teriak.									√		They talked about message with capslock writing
26.	Lecturer	Tidak, dua saja. Jadi yang kelompok minggu ini kita pending ke minggu depan.											She explain about next week meeting
27.	Student	Sahabat ulun dipondok dulu sekarang jadi cowo dan suka sama lawas jenis Miss.				√							She inform about her friend
28.	Student	Karena itu perilaku menyimpang menurut ulun harus diluruskan.	√										He give his pinion about abnormal sexuality
29.	Student	Iya Miss, karena hal tersebut sebenarnya tidak wajar. Bahkan menyukai sesama jenis termasuk sebuah kelainan kan?	√										She give his pinion about abnormal sexuality
30.	Student	Nggak Miss, cukup tau aja, kalau deket ya dikasih tau pelan-pelan.	√										She give his pinion about abnormal sexuality

No. Data	Speaker	Utterances	Flouting Cooperative principle				Flouting Politeness Principles						Context
			Qn	Ql	R	M	TM	GM	AM	MM	AGM	SM	
31.	Student	Dari pengalaman ulum Miss menghadapi kawan ulun tu, dinasehati pelan-pelan.	√		√								She give his pinion about abnormal sexuality
32.	Student	Tidak sampai menjudge sih Miss, karena mereka masih berhak atas pilihannya sendiri dan berhak untuk diperlakukan layaknya seperti manusia normal pada umumnya.	√										She give his pinion about abnormal sexuality
33.	Student	Idk, mungkin dikembalikan ke ortunya karna di bawah umur, masih SMP lo.	√	√									He told about the viral child from the news
34.	Student	Tidak Miss, sama ading kelas yang ulun kisahkan tadi pun, kami masih berhubungan baik.	√										She give his pinion about abnormal sexuality
35.	Student	Don't, kalau kamu tau mending simpan sendiri. Orang LGBT aja kadang takut buat come out.	√										She give his pinion about abnormal sexuality

No. Data	Speaker	Utterances	Flouting Cooperative principle				Flouting Politeness Principles						Context
			Qn	Ql	R	M	TM	GM	AM	MM	AGM	SM	
36.	Student	Itu bukan penyakit atau kelainan Miss, it's orientasi sexual mereka aja berbeda.									√		She disagree if LGBT is a disorder case
37.	Lecturer	Sekalian tolong jelaskan apa saja sales taktik yang dpakai di Amerika, kemaren itu yang saya minta, katanya akan dijelaskan via VN, tapi saya belum dengar penjelasan komprehensifnya.						√					She wanted the presenter give more explanation
38.	Student	Gak setuju Miss, malah lebih sering dimahalin duluan kalau beli sesuatu. Jadi pas nawar ya malah dapet harga normal aja, dimarahin mama di rumah iya.									√		She disagree about woman power in bidding
39.	Student	Mana ribut banget di jalan mereka tuh, sok keren dasar.								√			She give her opinion about underage children on the street
40.	Student	Kayanya gabisa Miss, karena mereka menganggap serius soal kecelakaan lalu lintas, I guess.	√	√									She give her opinion about driving in America
41.	Lecturer	Hebat banar lo buhannya kawa mempermainkan		√									She praise American-style shopping

No. Data	Speaker	Utterances	Flouting Cooperative principle				Flouting Politeness Principles						Context
			Qn	Ql	R	M	TM	GM	AM	MM	AGM	SM	
		psikologis penjualnya, sampai merasa kurang manly mun kada menukari.											
42.	Student	Ada banyak faktornya Miss	√										He give less information than needed
43.	Student	Aku kalau lampu merah masih sabar menanti, ada yang ngebut lalu kecelakaan depan mataku, alhasil ku tengok aja lalu cabut, siapa suuh trobos lampu merah.										√	She said she didn't care when the traffic accident happend
44.	Student	Tapi iya soal hukum memang agak sulit. Pelecehan seksual missal, selalu yang dilimpahkan hukum itu si victimnya.	√		√								She talked about something out of topic
45.	Student	Alhamdulillah kawanku yang suah lain aku wkwk.	√		√								He answered lecturer's question with adding more explanation
46.	Lecturer	Saya pernah sekali, gara-gara salah belok.	√										She answer her question
47.	Lecturer	Gak tau, saya belum ibu-ibu, tapi otw jadi emak-emak.	√										She couldn't answered the student's question

No. Data	Speaker	Utterances	Flouting Cooperative principle				Flouting Politeness Principles						Context
			Qn	Ql	R	M	TM	GM	AM	MM	AGM	SM	
		Nanti ya saya jawab kalau sudah jadi emak-emak											
48.	Student	Gimana caranya jadi dosen TBI, sekian.			√								He asked question outside the topic discussion
49.	Student	Maaf Miss, saya loss attention jadi gatau kalau hari ini saya sama Avip.	√		√								He forgot today was his presentation
50.	Student	Sekian jawaban singkat dari saya.		√									He answered other student question
51.	Lecturer	Remember, ini tugas INDIVIDU, jadi kalau tidak dikerjakan, maka tidak ada yang memback up kalian dan nilainya akan kosong.						√					She explained about middle test project
52.	Student	Kebetulan ulun tau dan memang sering nyari itu di pinterest atau di canva, so it's quite new for me, I tried my best, Miss.				√							She give ambiguous statement
53.	Lecturer	Kan tadi sudah dibilang, topik yang diambil itu dari 1-7, politik kan topik 15, jadi kira-kira boleh lah pakai topik ini?	√										She answered student's question
TOTAL			29	5	7	2	1	4	2	3	7	1	61 Datum

Notes:

Qn : Maxim of Quantity TM : Tact Maxim
 Ql : Maxim of Quality GM : Generosity Maxim
 R : Maxim of Relation AM : Approbation Maxim
 M : Maxim of Manner MM : Modesty Maxim
 AGM : Agreement Maxim
 SM : Sympathy Maxim

2. Data Analysis

In data analysis, the researcher explain the selected data from the data collection based on the most common flouting utterances and the closest characteristics of communication principles by Grice (1975) and Leech (1983).

a. Flouting Cooperative Principles

The flouting of cooperative principles is when the speaker does not obey the four maxims during the conversation to make certain meaning or purpose of the hidden meaning behind what is said (Faridah, 2016, p. 17).

1) Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Datum 8

Lecturer: saya pikir teknik itu cuma ada di banjar, ternyata itu berlaku secara general di Indonesia ya.

Student: Iya Miss, dari sumber yang saya baca, itu berlaku gak cuma di banjar aja, tapi di daerah lain juga ada yang seperti itu.

The dialogue above showed that the student flouted the cooperative principles in her conversation. The utterance *dari sumber yang saya baca, itu berlaku gak cuma di banjar aja, tapi di daerah lain juga ada yang seperti itu* or in English *based on my reading sources, this applies not only in Banjar, but also happened in other areas* rising flouting of maxim quantity. The student flouted maxim of quantity with giving more information than required. The student could simply replied “*Iya Miss* or *Yes Miss*,” it was clear enough to respond the lecturer’s utterance. This flouting happened because in the teaching learning interaction, the student wanted to be active and told what she knew to give more knowledge in the discussion. Based on the interview conducted by the researcher with the student, she said that she delivered the respond because after she said *Iya Miss*, she wanted to add more information as an affirmation from the sources she read, and because the lecturer said *saya pikir (I thought)* and *hanya di Banjar (only in Banjar)*, so the student explained more to make the explanation more clearly (Izati, 2021). The student added, she delivered the respond spontaneously without thinking much to explain the fact she knew.

Datum 17

Student: Izin bertanya, Miss. Ini topik yang dipilih satu saja atau bercampur?

Lecturer: Topik yang dipilih satu aja, bahkan boleh mengambil hanya sub topik dari topik yang ada. Misalnya, kalian pengen ambil topik “culture shock, conflict, and adjustment” kalian boleh aja bahas cuma culture shock nya doang gak harus semua.

Lecturer’s utterance in underlined text above was a flouting of cooperative principles. It was because the Lecturer gave more information in the conversation. She was flouting maxim of quantity with the unrequired information. She has simply could answer the student question with *topik yang dipilih satu aja (only one topic can be chosen)*, but the lecturer added more explanation about the question. Based on the interview done by the researcher with the lecturer it could conclude that the lecturer said that because she want to make a clear explanation and gave examples for students, so students can do the task properly without any misunderstanding. Also she wants to avoid more similar questions from the students (Athiya, 2022).

2) Flouting Maxim of Quality

Datum 3

Lecturer: Now, let's move to QnA session guys. You may ask to them,
give comment, critics, or suggestion

Student: I want to ask about sport to group 10

The student utterance above did not obey the principle of cooperative. She was flouting the maxim of quality with delivered false information. In case, the student want to ask about sport to the presenter but she aimed to group 10 which didn't explain about sport, the sport subject was explained by group 9. So, based on characteristics of maxim quality, the student's utterance flout this maxim, and it caused the misinformation in the teaching learning interaction in the class. The student in the interview admitted that she said the false information because she was in a hurry and remembers wrong, usually she remembered topics better than numbers, this could sometimes caused him to accidentally made mistakes in matching numbers with topics. She released her mistake when read again her utterances, after she knew that was false she immediately revised and said sorry to the rest of the class (Sholihah, 2021).

Datum 50

Student: Jani gini, kita bisa bedakan jam terbang low-class businessman sama high-class businessman. Sampai sini nangkap? Jadi low-class businessman ini biasanya hanya menjadi employee, dan apapun tentang tetek bengek sebuah rapat itu masih dibawah manajer tempat dia bekerja, beda dengan high-class businessman yang biasanya berada di divisi humas, manajer, bahkan dirut, dimana dia kerjanya bukan hanya dikantor melainkan mencoba mencari relasi dan kerjasama dengan company-company lain. Nah high-class businessman inilah yang memerlukan personal assisstent, jadi kalau ada urusan eksternal bukan langsung menghubungi orang yang bersangkutan, melainkan menghubungi sekretaris pribadi orang tersebut dan selanjutnya sekretaris tersebut yang memberitahu jadwal orang yang bersangkutan beberapa hari kedepan dimana, kapan, tentang apa, dan dengan siapa.

Student: Sekian jawaban singkat dari saya siti.

The utterance of the student above is flouting cooperative principles. The student flouted maxim of quality by blatantly not saying truth command. He said *sekian jawaban singkat dari saya (that's my*

short answer), in fact he delivered a long answer for the question by his friend. So that, the utterance he said was contrary with the situation in the teaching learning interaction. The students confirmed that he said *singkat (short)* because he just explained one scope of the topic, so he claimed that his utterance is short. He added, as long as he gave the explanation not out of topic it still could say that the explanation was a short one (Anshari, 2021).

3) Flouting Maxim of Relation

Datum 48

Lecturer: *Okedeh karena sudah jam 15:53 dan tidak ada pertanyaan kita cukupkan sampai disini ya guys kuliahnya.*

Student: *Last bu, gimana caranya jadi dosen TBI?, sekian.*

The utterance of the student *gimana caranya jadi dosen TBI?, sekian (how to become lecturer in TBI?)* was flouting cooperative principle. The student was flouting maxim of relation which he asked the question that out of topic discussion. They was discussed about driving behavior in America and Indonesia, but suddenly the student asked about the way to become lecturer which was not in accordance with the topic discuss. So, based on the characteristics in this maxim, the student is flouting maxim of relation. In the interview with the student, this

happened because in the end of the meeting, he suddenly thought about he want to become a Cross Cultural Understanding lecturer because the course was one of the topic he liked, so he asked the lecturer how to become like her. He said it was fine to ask that because they already done discuss about the topic that day and the time he asked is in the ending of the class (Anshari, 2021).

Datum 49

Lecturer: *Materi sudah siap kan?*

Student: *Maaf Miss, saya loss attention jadi gatau kalau hari ini saya sama Avip.*

The utterance of the student in the dialogue was not suitable and gave more information than required. The student's respond was categorize as flouting two maxim of cooperative principles, maxim of relation and maxim of quality. The flouting of maxim relation was because the lecturer asked *materi sudah siap kan?* (*is the material ready?*), it need to answer *yes* or *no* by the student, but in the dialogue above the student made apologize and explain the situation, so he didn't clearly answered that he hadn't created the material. In other hand, the student's utterance above also flouted maxim of quantity because he added more explanation about his condition to the lecturer. Based on the

characteristics explained by Grice (1975) about maxim of relation and quantity, the student's utterance was flout both of the maxim. In the interview did by the researcher with the student, it could conclude that he did that because he aware if the lecturer asked more if he just answered *no*, so he explained his condition and admitted his mistake by saying apologize to the lecturer (Anshari, 2021).

4) Flouting Maxim of Manner

Datum 27

Student 1: *Btw Miss.. ulun ada ading kelas di Aliyah, dilihat dari aktivitasnya di sosial media menunjukkan kalau he's gay.*

Lecturer: *oh yaa?? Sudah terkonfirmasi lah?*

Student 2: *Sahabat ulun dipondok dulu sekarang jadi cowo dan suka sama lawas jenis Miss.*

Lecturer: *Sekarang jadi cowok tu maksudnya dulu cewek?*

The student 2's utterance above is flouting of cooperative principles. Student 2 in her utterance said an ambiguous sentence so she was flouting maxim of manner. She talked about her old friend in boarding school that become boy and like the opposite sex. In her utterance, there was ambiguous information about what she meant by said *sekarang jadi cowo dan suka sama lawas jenis Miss* (now become boy

and like the opposite gender), she didn't told what gender her friend was and what *jadi cowo* or *become boy* meant, it could be her friend's looking or her friend did a trans gender. The student 2's utterance has been make confused the lecturer and the other students and they asked what the student 2 meant. In the interview, the student confirmed that she did an ambiguous utterances and that because she forgot to put punctuation comma (,) and chose wrong word. What she want to said is "*my old best friend in boarding school, now become boy and like the same gender.*" She added, because the class setting was in WhatsApp chat group, everyone could type and gave comments so she was trying to quickly send a message so as not to be preceded by the others, she also said it will need more time if she think more before send message so she did that spontaneously (Azizah, 2021).

Datum 52

Lecturer: *Coba search pakai tagar infografis*

Student: *Kebetulan ulun tau dan memang sering nyari itu di pinterest atau di canva. So it's quite new for me, I tried my best, Miss*

In the dialogue above, the student replied ambiguous so she flouted maxim of manner in cooperative principle. The ambiguous was between her first sentence and her second sentence. Her first sentence told

that she used to looking for infographic, this means she familiar with the thing. But then, in her second sentence, she told that infographic was quite new for her, this means she unfamiliar with the thing. Here, the contrary happened in her utterances and made confuse the reader, based on characteristics in maxim of manner, her utterance flouted this maxim. In the interview with the student, she admitted that she used the wrong word to explain her condition, what she meant was she quite familiar with the kind of task given by the lecturer. She thought that the word *quite new* has same meaning with *quite familiar* or *already know*, so she type that word and made ambiguous utterance for the reader. She added, even though it was an ambiguous utterance, it still a right utterance because the infographics she was familiar with, were infographic about something outside of education field, so making the infographic for the task was something new for her. (Putri, 2022).

b. Flouting Politeness Principles

The same case with flouting cooperative principle, sometimes politeness principles does not follow by the speaker. As mentioned in Chapter II, six maxims of politeness principles must be followed by the speaker to make conversation be polite and goes harmoniously. When the

speaker fails to observe those maxims, it is become flouting on the politeness principle.

1) Flouting Tact Maxim

Datum 21

Lecturer: *Nah kalau ini ada gambar, ada diagram, ada tulisan.*

Student: *Inggih, Paham Miss*

Lecturer: *Okay, bagi yang tidak komen saya anggap sudah paham ya*

The lecturer utterance *saya anggap paham* (*I consider understood*) in the dialogue above is a flouting of politeness principles. It was because the lecturer put benefit for herself by didn't want to receive more comment from student and considered the student understood about what she explained. Tact maxim require speaker to make benefit to other and minimize benefit for self, but here, the lecturer end the opportunities for student who want to give comment, so she was flouting tact maxim. In the interview with the lecturer, it could be concluded that she did that because two reason. First, to provoke students who did not understand to ask questions, so she could give explanation for students. Second, to calm down that the lecturer has explained the topic and all the students understand because no one asked (Athiya, 2022).

2) Flouting Generosity Maxim

Datum 18

Lecturer: I will send you an important information about our middle test project

Student: Yes Miss

Lecturer: Ingat, ini tugas individu, kalau tidak mengumpul, tidak ada yang memback up kalian, otomatis nilainya kosong, jadi mohon perhatiannya.

In the dialogue above, the lecturer flout politeness principle. The lecturer was flouting generosity maxim with her wishes to the student to do the task properly, she made a cost to student by saying *tidak ada yang memback up kalian* (if you don't collect, no one will back you up) and she added *otomatis nilainya kosong* (the score will automatically be empty) as an affirmation to the student. The cost she gave to the student if seen with the politeness principles it categorize as flouting generosity maxim. The lecturer said in the interview, it was a warning for the students, because in the task before there were some students who less serious done that and caused them to be late submit the project, not followed instructions, etc. So, to avoid those mistakes, the lecturer gave

warning to the students so that they could do their task well (Athiya, 2022).

Datum 37

Student: Okay, that all explanation from us, thank you

Lecturer: *yang bagian ini ada penjelasan yang lebih elaboratif lah?*

Sekalian tolong jelaskan apa saja sales tactic yang dipakai di America, kemaren itu yang saya minta, katanya akan dijelaskan via VN, tapi tadi saya belum dengar penjelasan komprehensifnya.

The underlined utterance above is flouting generosity maxim based on Leech's theory in communication. She did not obey the characteristics of the generosity maxim and it caused the flouting of the maxim. The utterance *tolong jelaskan* or *please explain* and *itu yang saya minta* (*that was what I asked for*) categorize as flouting generosity maxim because she made cost to the presenter to give what she asked for. She also added utterance *katanya akan dijelaskan via VN* (*you said it would be explained via VN*), it was reinforcement she used to give more emphasis on her utterances before. Based on the interview did between the researcher and the lecturer, it could conclude that she was disappointed of the students' presentation. From the consultation before

presenting, the lecturer already asked students to add more explanation about sales tactic topic, but when presenting, the students did not do as the lecturer asked. So, the lecturer re-asked the students to be able to give more explanation of their presentation (Athiya, 2022).

3) Flouting of Approbation Maxim

Datum 22

Lecturer: *Selain itu, kalau soal edu and studying ini banyak juga yang berbeda dengan kita terutama soal hubungan antara dosen dan mahasiswanya dan hubungan antar teman. Kita lebih ramah dan kadang agak SKSD gitu sama orang baru.*

The utterance of the lecturer *kita lebih ramah* or *we are friendlier* in her explanation about male-female relationship in America and Indonesia is flout politeness principles. The lecturer did the flouting of approbation maxim because she praised Indonesia—as representative of themselves—more than west countries. Weather the approbation maxim require the speaker to praise other than self, so the utterance of the lecturer flouted that maxim. In the interview she said that because that utterance was a common sense in Indonesia and she thought it was a fact that happened in Indonesia, what she did just for told the truth. She added, this utterance also hoped to be reflective utterance for the

students if they join government they will be good politicians and not be like this utterance (Athiya, 2022).

4) Flouting Modesty Maxim

Datum 16

Lecturer: *Tapi memang, pada kenyataannya, pemerintah kita dikendalikan oleh penguasa yang orientasinya bukan untuk rakyat. Banyak yang hanya ingin mengeruk keuntungan pribadi lewat jabatan yang dimiliki.*

In the dialogue, the utterance of the lecturer *Banyak yang hanya ingin mengeruk keuntungan pribadi lewat jabatan yang dimiliki* (*many just want to make personal gain through the position they have*) categorize as flouting of modesty maxim because in the utterance the lecturer dispraised the people in Indonesian government. In the utterance she also showed her distrust to the Indonesian government based on her viewpoint. In the interview she explain that she wanted to showed the fact that Indonesian people are friendlier than people in west countries. This praising have been common sense in Indonesia and being one of characteristics of Indonesian country, so she thought that utterances did not feel like creating excessive self-praise or demeaning others (Athiya, 2022).

Datum 39

Lecturer: *Iya itu baru bocil, belum lagi yang cabe-cabean.*

Student: *Mana ribut banget di jalan mereka tuh, sok keren dasar.*

The dialogue above shows that the student did not obey politeness principles and flout modesty maxim by saying dispraise sentence aimed to other people. In the requirement of modesty maxim, people should maximize dispraise to self and minimize dispraise to other, but the utterance gave by the student when they conducted a discussion about driving behavior showed that the student flout the modesty maxim because she want to show that what the ‘*cabe-cabean*’ or little whore doing on the street was something bad and annoyed the other driver. The student confirmed in the interview that she said that because she thought it was unethical to drive with a 3 person pillion and shouting on the street that disturbed other drivers, it was impolite thing to do. The little whores on the street usually still underage but they drive so fast made other drivers wary driving around them. Sometimes the little whores felt they were cool doing that, but it could harm themselves. Based on her explanation, it showed that she dispraised them (Salsabila, 2021).

5) Flouting Agreement Maxim

Datum 5

Student 1: *Rugby sama American Football mirip tapi beda. Yang paling kelihatan pakaiannya, Rugby hampir tidak ada pelindung selain kepala, sedangkan American Football pakai helm, pelindung tubuh dll. Selain itu, Rugby dikenal lebih brutal dari American Football.*

Student 2: *Ee bukannya American football ya yang lebih brutal soalnya pakai pelindung segala dan saya melihat di TV ehhhh tabrakannya itu loh geprakkk kenceng bunyinya.*

The dialogue above happened when they discussed about sport in America. They first talked about American football then compared it with Rugby, when they compared the kinds of sport there were disagreement between students. One student claimed that Rugby was more brutal rather than American Football because Rugby didn't wear full body protection custom, while American Football has it. But, the other student disagree and claimed that American Football was more brutal that's why the sport has full-body protection. The disagreement between students if seen from politeness principles include in flouting agreement maxim. In the interview with the student 2, he said he

disagree because he saw it from different point of view from student 1. He explained that American Football wears full-body protection custom and the protection custom was made special for the sport and use iron material. From the way American Football play, if the player got accident, the iron material from the custom can caused the injury worse rather than protect the player, that's why the American Football was more brutal than Rugby, he said (Abdillah, 2021).

Datum 25

Student 1: *Ya Allah di laptop capslock, nanti dikira ngegas*

Lecturer: *Ini juga menarik loh buat dibahas, padahal capslock bisa jadi karena exited ya kan, gak harus dimaknai marah.*

Student: *Tapi setiap orang beda-beda, Miss. Kalau ulun bacanya malah kaya orang teriak.*

Datum 25 contains utterance that flout agreement maxim because student 2 gave her opinion and that's different with the opinion before her. This happened when they discussed about the used of capslock letter in *chatting* or discussion in social media. Most of people translated capslock into meaning that someone mad or angry, but another student disagree and she read capslock utterance like someone screaming but not mad. This disagreement came from the different

perspectives of each person. Based on agreement maxim from politeness principles, the student 2 was flouting agreement maxim. In the interview, she confirmed that the message with capslock letter has some meaning to her, but in the discussion context she read it like someone screaming but not mad or exited. She added, the meaning of message with capslock letter can be influenced by the punctuation used. Capslock message with punctuation and without punctuation has different meaning to her (Salsabila, 2021).

6) Flouting Sympathy Maxim

Datum 43

Lecturer: *Berarti secara umum, orang kita nih kada patuh lawan aturan, apakah karena aturan kita terlalu mudah untuk dilanggar, atau penegak hukumnya yang kurang tegas, atau apa?*

Student: *Dua-duanya, Miss. Pengendara kurang hati-hati, pamong praja minta jatah. Aku kalau lampu merah masih sabar menanti, ada yang ngebut lalu kecelakaan depan mataku, alhasil ku tengok aja lalu cabut, siapa suuh trobos lampu merah.*

Datum 43 above is a flouting of politeness principles which is flouting sympathy maxim because the student didn't care if there was

accident in front of her eyes if the caused of the accident was the speeding up by the driver. She said because of the driver mistake and didn't obey the traffic light, the accident happened because his own self and he has to bear it himself. In other way, the student's utterance also flout cooperative principles, which is the quantity maxim because she gave more information rather than required. In the interview did by the researcher with the student it could be concluded that she thought the accident was caused by the negligence of the driver who violated traffic signs, plus the driver was a child who did not has a driving lesson. The accident can be a lesson for the child to put more attention while driving on the street or could make him deterrent from speeding on the road anymore. In other hand, she thought she did not need to help because besides her there a lot people helped the child, to avoid crowd she chose to stay away from that area (Putri, 2022).

B. Discussion

Flouting communication principles is the condition when people in conversation did not obey the rules of cooperative and politeness principles and caused some other meaning in the conversation than it should be. The meaning can be positive or negative dependent to the speaker and the utterance he/she delivered. In these theories, the flouting of the principles can happen any time in any

conversation when the speaker disobey the characteristics of the maxims. In the findings, the researcher found the flouting happen in the conversation of academic purposes.

Based on findings, the researcher found 61 total data of flouting communication principles from teaching learning interaction of Cross Cultural Understanding Course, there are 43 data of flouting cooperative principles and 18 data of flouting politeness principles. There were types of flouting communication principles and the reason of the flouting of communication principles. Cooperative principles have bigger number of flouting rather than the politeness principles because in the academic discussion the speakers had been polite especially between students and lecturer.

In cooperative principles, there are 4 types of the flouting, flouting maxim of quantity 29 utterances, flouting maxim of quality 5 utterances, flouting maxim of relation 7 utterances, and flouting maxim of manner 2 utterances. Maxim of quantity being the most often maxim that flouted in the interaction because there are some specific purposes that want to express by the speakers. This flouting is natural happen because in a learning discussion the more information can be obtained the better understanding will get by the speaker, that's why this flouting often done by the lecturer.

In other hand, there are 6 types of flouting politeness principles, flouting tact maxim 1 utterance, flouting generosity maxim 4 utterances, flouting approbation maxim 2 utterances, flouting modesty maxim 3 utterances, flouting agreement maxim 7 utterances, and flouting sympathy maxim 1 utterance. In order to be active in the discussion, sometimes there are some different point of view or opinion among the students and the lecturer, the differences rising disagreement between them, then for the result, they flout agreement maxim more than other maxims. The politeness principles set agreement as one of the factors of successful conversation, so when there are disagreement means the conversation needs to be clarify before end it.

In the analysis of the types of flouting communication principles found in Cross Cultural Understanding Course, the researcher uses theories of cooperative principles and politeness principles. The reason of flouting cooperative principles found by the researcher in Cross Cultural Understanding course as follow.

1. Flouting maxim of quantity is the most often flouting occurs in Cross Cultural Understanding Course. Most of the speakers—lecturer and students—who does flouting maxim of quantity give more information than required.
2. Flouting maxim of quality occurs when the speaker give false information.
3. Flouting maxim of relation occurs when the lecturer or students' responses irrelevant with the topic/context they discussed.

4. Flouting maxim of manner occurs when the speaker write ambiguous utterances.

In politeness principles, the flouting found by the researcher in the interaction of the course as follow:

1. Flouting tact maxim happens when the speaker maximize benefit for herself.
2. Flouting generosity maxim happens when the speaker maximize cost to other than her/himself.
3. Flouting approbation maxim happens when the speaker praise her/himself more than others.
4. Flouting modesty maxim happens when the speaker dispraise other.
5. Flouting agreement maxim occurs when there were disagreement between the speakers.
6. Flouting sympathy maxim happens when the speaker didn't care about what happens.

In brief, all speakers that flout maxim of communication principles definitely have some reasons to do that, those reasons usually are based on anything that related to the speaker. In this research, the researcher analyzes the reasons based on the purposes. In addition, it is possible that in a single utterance has one or more reasons of the flouting.