CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDING

In this chapter the researcher presents the data analysis and the research findings. The discussion is based on the statement of the problems which are cited in the previous chapter (Chapter I) under heading of statement of the problems, that is (1) what kinds of conversational maxim are mostly flouted in the short massages?, (2) how are the maxims flouted in the short massages?, (3) why are the maxims flouted in the short massages?.

4.1 Findings

In this section the researcher describes the findings of the flouting of SMS that have already been gathered during the data collection. Then, the process of data findings are exactly like the one that has already been mentioned in chapter 3 page 24 until 28. This is the number of flouting which the researcher has made in form of table.

No.	Short Messages	Flouting of Conversational Maxims			
		Flouting Maxim of Quantity	Flouting Maxim of Quality	Flouting Maxim of Relevance	Flouting Maxim of Manner
1.	Conversation 1			v	
2.	Conversation 2				v
3.	Conversation 3		v		
4.	Conversation 4				v
5.	Conversation 5			v	
6.	Conversation 6			v	
7.	Conversation 7	v			

8.	Conversation 8		v		
9.	Conversation 9	v	v		
10.	Conversation 10	v			
11.	Conversation 11				v
12.	Conversation 12	v	v		
13.	Conversation 13	v			
14.	Conversation 14			v	
15.	Conversation 15	v			
16.	Conversation 16	v	v		
17.	Conversation 17		v		
18.	Conversation 18	v			
19.	Conversation 19		v		
Sum		8	7	4	3

From the table above, it can be seen that conversational maxims are mostly flouted is maxim of quantity. It is mostly flouted because according to table of flouting above, it has found that there are 8 short messages from 19 short messages which are flouted by the participants. There are 12 participants in the flouting of maxim quantity. They are Idda as the sender and her friends (Nazih, Adit, Nian, Samiro, Diana, Anas, Aulia, Mifta, Vita, Dani and Denny) as the receivers.

The second place that is flouted by the participants is maxim of quality. It can be seen from the table of flouting which it shows there are 7 short messages from 19 short messages. There are 9 participants in the flouting of maxim quality. They are idda as the sender and her friends (Nazih, Adit, Nian, Frieska, Samiro, Eko and Denny) as the receivers.

The third place that is flouted by the participants is maxim of relevance. It can be seen from the table of flouting which it shows there are 4 short messages from 19 short messages. There are 4 participants in the flouting of maxim quality. They are idda as the sender and her friends (Nazih, Ulit and Ita) as the receivers.

The least in flouting of conversational maxims are maxim of manner. It is slightly flouted because according to table of flouting above, it has found that there are 3 short messages from 19 short messages which are flouted by the participants. There are 3 participants in the flouting of maxim quantity. They are Idda as the sender and her friends (Nazih and Ria) as the receivers.

4.2 Discussions

After finding the data the researcher discusses by explaining about each flouting by using the appropriate theories.

4.2.1   Maxim of Quantity

Flouting 1

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Nazih, the receiver. Nazih is Idda's boyfriend. He always tells about his salary after he gets it. This conversation shows that he did not tell it to her about his salary in December. So, she asked him to know if he had got it or not. Actually, it is too late for Idda to ask about Nazih's wage on December 16th. If Idda wanted to ask about it, she should have asked him at the beginning of the month. Like other people who usually get their salary at the beginning of the month.

Data: Conversation 7 (Taken on December 16th, 2012 (at 04.40 p.m.)

Idda   : *Pean sudah dapat gaji ta?*
         Have you got your salary?
Nazih : ***Kasih tau gak ya..***

Hemm,, Should I tell you?
Idda   : *Terserah pean wes!!*
      Up to you!!

In the above conversation 7, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Nazih is as receiver who responded to the sender's message flouting the maxim of quantity by saying "***Kasih tau gak ya..***" He gave a little information to the sender. The sender asked about his salary but he did not tell her about it. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quantity is that we make our contribution as informative as is required. Grice says we must give our information which is needed by neither adding nor reducing the information. Cutting also supports that we should give neither too little information nor too much (2002: 34).

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why he flouted because he wanted to hide his salary and did not want Idda knows about it if he has not got it yet from his boss. So that he gave her too little information. In transactional analysis, he becomes a child who always playful. He uses child ego state especially free child to make conversation. According to Solomon (2003: 16), Our Free Child ego state can be playful, authentic, expressive, and emotional. In transactional analysis has happened cross transaction, Idda is as adult who wants to asks something and she hope Nazih gave her information as adult too but he turned the response over to the child that he wants to playful with her.

Flouting 2

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Adit, the receiver. Idda asked Adit about his research because it is related to thesis. Idda wanted to know what is the object that he wants to research for his

thesis. With the result, Idda asked about Adit that he will research about the language of homosexual or not.

Data: Conversation 9 (Taken on December 17th, 2012 (at 10.51 a.m.)

Idda   : *Dit, u neliti tntng bhsax orng homo?*
           Dit, do you research about the language of homosexual?
Adit   : ***Iy aq neliti itu.. Aku udh 2bln nglakuin research.. Data udh ada.. hehehe serem..***
           Yes, I research it. I have done two months for researching. The data have been already. Hehehe, it is scary.
Idda   : *Awas u ntar jdi korbanx lho..*
           Beware, you can be a victim.
Adit   : *Ah, udh biasa, ak jd korbannya nazih sampe 3x malah, tapi ak msh tegar kok,, hahahaha..*
           Ah, it is common, I became the victim of Nazih until three times, but I am still stiff. Hahahaha

In the above conversation 9, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Adit is as receiver who responded the sender's message flouting the maxim of quantity by saying "***Iy aq neliti itu.. Aku udh 2bln nglakuin research.. Data udh ada.. hehehe serem..***". He gave more information to the sender. Idda only asked whether he researched about the language of homosexual or not. She only needs the answer "Yes" or "No", but he gave more information by adding about his data and also the condition when he looks for the data. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quantity is that we do not make our contribution more informative than is required. Actually we have to obey the cooperative principle by saying the words that is needed but Adit is as receiver flouts the maxim of quantity which he made her contribution more informative than is required.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why he flouted because he wanted to show off that he has already been with his data and he wants to tell the condition when he looked for the data. So, he gave more information to Idda.

In transactional analysis, he becomes a child. He uses child ego state especially free child to make conversation. In transactional analysis has happened cross transaction. Idda is as adult who asks information to Adit and she hopes he give her information as adult too but Adit turned the response over to the child that he gave information too expressive and emotional. It is same as Solomon (2003: 16) points of view that our Free Child ego state can be playful, authentic, expressive, and emotional.

Flouting 3

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Vita, the sender and Idda, the receiver. Vita is 12th grade in senior high school now and she is confused to continue her study after graduated from senior high school. All of the students in 12th grade are always confused about their planning after graduated from senior high school. A half of them are confused about the major that they want to choose. Moreover, she asked Idda about the quality of LP3I but actually Vita wants to be a policewoman.

Data: Conversation 10 (Taken on December 17th, 2012 (at 07.15 p.m.)

Vita   : *Miss, LP3I it bagus g?*
        Miss, is LP3I good or not?
Idda   : *Bgus kuq.. u mw msuk situ tha?*
        It is good. Do you want to register there?
Vita   : **Aku bingung. Sebenernya aq pengen jadi polwan.**
        I am confused. Actually, I want to be a policewoman.
Idda   : *U ud dftar?*
        Have you registered?
Vita   : **blum mbak,, nhe mreka cma promosi aj n bg2 10 voucher. Aq dpet tdi dpet potongan voucher 1 juta dri LP3I.**
        Not yet miss. They just promoted and divided ten vouchers. Just now I got discount voucher one million from LP3I.

In the above conversation 10, there are two flouting of cooperative principle. Vita is as sender who responded the sender's message flouting the maxim of quantity

by saying "*Aku bingung. Sebenernya aq pengen jadi polwan.*" and "*blum mbak,, nhe mreka cma promosi aj n bg2 10 voucher. Aq dpet tdi dpet potongan voucher 1 juta dri LP3I*".

First flouting is "*Aku bingung. Sebenernya aq pengen jadi polwan.*" Vita is as sender who asked Idda about the quality of LP3I. Idda answered her question and after that Idda asked to her whether she wanted to register it or not, but Vita gave her more information by saying that sentence. She said what she wants to be. The matter of fact, Idda did not ask about it. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quantity is that we make our contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange) and do not make our contribution more informative than is required.

The second flouting is "*blum mbak,, nhe mreka cma promosi aj n bg2 10 voucher. Aq dpet tdi dpet potongan voucher 1 juta dri LP3I*". Idda only asked whether she had registered or not. The answer which is needed by Idda is "Have done" if she has registered or "Not yet" if she has not registered yet. Actually, Vita has answered not yet but she added other information about LP3I. Substantively, we have to obey the cooperative principle but Vita flouted the maxim of quantity that she made her contribution more informative than is required.

In the conversation through texting there are flouting of maxims and why she flouted because Vita wanted to tell to Idda about her wish that happen to her related to her study and she also wanted to clarify the information about her experience that she got. In transactional analysis, she becomes a child. She uses child ego state to make conversation. She is like a child who tells what her wish to her parent. It happens to Vita because she told her wish and her experience that she has got. In transactional analysis happened cross transaction because Idda is as adult who asks the information

to her and she hoped Vita gave her information as adult too but Vita turned the response over to child.

Flouting 4

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Denny, the receiver. Idda is a Denny's English teacher in course. Idda knows about the ability of Denny in English lesson that he has less ability to understand English lesson. It was the time that all of students faced final examination because of it was last semester. Likewise Denny, he had to face final examination. Idda worried about the result that he would get. So that Idda sent messages to Denny for asking the result of English test.

Data: Conversation 12 (Taken on December 17th, 2012 (at 09.15 p.m.)

Idda   : *Den UAS b.ing u remidi ap g?*
           Den, Do you retake final examination or not?
Denny : **yow gag tau lah miss kn lumb d bgi'in puxa qw, tpi yg UHB 3 gag remidi aqw miss..**
           I do not know miss because my teacher has not given it yet but I do not retake daily examination 3 miss.
Idda   : *Siipp2,,*
           Good.
Denny : *aq dpet 83 miss nlaix,, jlek y,,*
           I get the score 83 miss. It is bad.
Idda   : *Bgus g2 lho.. u ud lbur skolah?*
           It is good. Have you got holiday of school?
Denny : **Ud miss,, malah mlai sbtu kmrin aq lburx,,**
           Have done miss, it starts from last Saturday.
Idda   : *Lburx brp minggu?*
           How many weeks do you get holiday?
Denny : *aq lbur skolahx 1 tahun miss.. hahahahahahaha,,*
           I get holiday one year miss. Hahahahahahaha.

In the above conversation 12, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Denny is as receiver who responded the sender's message flouting the maxim of

quantity by saying "*yow gag tau lah miss kn lumb d bgi'in puxa qw, tpi yg UHB 3 gag remidi aqw miss..*" and "*Ud miss,, malah mlai sbtu kmrin aq lburx,,*".

First, the way he responded the sender's message by responding "*yow gag tau lah miss kn lumb d bgi'in puxa qw, tpi yg UHB 3 gag remidi aqw miss..*" It is called flouting because she gave more information. Idda is as sender who only asked about the result of final examination. She did not ask about other examination. But, Denny gave her more information. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quantity is that we make our contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange) and do not make our contribution more informative than is required. Actually we have to obey the cooperative principle but Denny flouted the maxim of quantity which he made her contribution more informative than is required. Why he flouted when he made conversation in texting, maybe he wanted to give information that he does not retake in third of daily examination because he wanted to show to Idda as his English teacher that he got good score in English examination.

Second, he flouted maxim of quantity by saying "*Ud miss,, malah mlai sbtu kmrin aq lburx,,*". He gave more information for Idda. She only asked whether he had got school's holiday. Denny should have answered her question with "have done" or "not yet", but he gave more information to Idda. He made the flouting because he wanted to show off that he has got the holiday more beginning than other school.

In transactional analysis he becomes a child. He is also like a child who always show off what he has got to the others. He uses child ego state especially free child to make conversation. He is so expressive when he answered Idda's question. According to Solomon (2003: 16), our Free Child ego state can be playful, authentic, expressive, and emotional. In transactional analysis, Idda is as adult and she hoped

Denny gives her information as adult too but he turned the response over to the child. It is called cross transaction.

Flouting 5

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Mifta, the sender and Idda, the receiver. Mifta sent a message to Idda for asking the school fee in December. But, Idda answered her question completely by adding school fee in January and fee for laboratory. Idda did it because it was related to regulation for taking a card of final examination, so that she answered it completely.

Data: Conversation 13 (Taken on December 18th, 2012 (at 08.58 a.m.)

Mifta : *SPP des brp?*
        How much school fee in December?
Idda   : ***300rbu tpi klo mw ngmbil krtu UAS hrus byar SPP januari n lab.***
        It is 300 thousand rupiah but if you want to take a card of final examination, you must pay school fee in January and laboratory.

In the above conversation 13, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Idda is as receiver who responded the sender's message flouting the maxim of quantity by saying "***300rbu tpi klo mw ngmbil krtu UAS hrus byar SPP januari n lab.***" It is called flouting of maxim of quantity because she gave more information. Mifta is as sender who only asked about school fee in December and she did not ask about regulation to take a card of final examination but Idda gave her more information. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quantity is that we make our contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange) and do not make our contribution more informative than is required. Actually we have to obey the cooperative principle. In this conversation, Idda is as receiver flouted the maxim of quantity that she made her contribution more informative than is required.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why she flouted because she wanted to clarify the information by giving more information to Mifta, so that Mifta does not necessary to ask again. In transactional analysis, she becomes a parent. She uses parent ego state especially critical parent to make conversation. In transactional analysis has happened cross transaction because Mifta is as adult and she hoped Idda gave her information as adult too but Idda turned the response over to the parent.

Flouting 6

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Mrs. Hanti, the sender and Idda, the receiver. Mrs. Hanti is Idda's aunt from her mother. Mrs. Hanti visited her home. In there, Mrs. Hanti only met Idda's mother and sisters. Maybe, she has known why Idda was not at home from Idda's mother. However, she wants to know where she was yesterday by herself by sending her messages.

Data: Conversation 15 (Taken on December 19th, 2012 (at 06.38 p.m.)

Mrs. Hanti : *Kemarin idda dimana?*
  Where were you yesterday?
Idda : ***Aq masih kerja tante, murid-murid qw kemarin pada punya pr terus mau di kumpulkan besok. Kalau pr nya gak buat bisa tak bawa pulang tante. Jadinya saya pulangnya gak bisa on time.***
  I was still working auntie, yesterday my students had homework and then it would be submitted tomorrow. If the homework was not for tomorrow, I could bring it in my home auntie. So, I could not go home on time.
Mrs. Hanti : *Tante kemarin kerumah mu tapi kamu nya gak ada.*
  Yesterday, auntie was in your home but you were not there.
Idda : *Maaf ya tante,*
  I m sorry auntie

In the above conversation 15, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Idda is as receiver who replayed messages to Mrs. Hanti with flouting by saying "***Aq masih kerja tante, murid-murid qw kemarin pada punya pr terus mau di***

kumpulkan besok. Kalau pr nya gak buat bisa tak bawa pulang tante. Jadinya saya

pulangnya gak bisa on time." It is called flouting of maxim quantity. The sender only

asked where she was yesterday but she sent texting to the sender by giving more

information. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quantity is that we make our

contribution as informative as is required. Grice says we must give our information

which is needed by neither adding nor reducing the information. Guy also supports

that we should give neither too little information nor too much (1989: 30).

In the conversation through texting why she flouted because she wanted to

clarify information where she was yesterday. She also flouted maxim of quantity that

she wants to be appraised more polite by giving more information. Because of at that

time she talks with her auntie who is older than she and both of them are Javanese

people, so that Idda flouts maxim quality. According to Jazeri (2003) that Javanese

people prefer to give more information in order to be apprised more polite than to talk

necessary.

In transactional analysis she used adult ego state because she is like an adult

who want to be appraise polite by older people. In transactional analysis has happened

cross transaction because Mrs. Hanti is like a parent and Idda sends her messages as

adult.

Flouting 7

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Nian, the

sender and Idda, the receiver. Nian sent Idda messages because she wanted to offer

Idda a job, but Idda refuses it because of Idda has a job at that time. Then, they

continued the conversation by asking the condition each other.

Data: Conversation 16 (Taken on December 25th, 2012 (at 08.19 a.m.)

Nian : *Da, ada yang mau ngelesi ta? Di jojoran 1 – 4 anak SMP; tiap hari senin,*
habis maghrib per datang 50rb (waktu 90 menit)
Da, Do you want to teach a course? In jojoran 1 – 4 children of SMP, every
Monday after maghrib and the fee is 50 thousand rupiah every coming (time
is 90 minuttes)

Idda : *Aq gak bisa,, nanti tak carikan tmen kelas ya*
I cannot. Later I will find my classmate for teaching it.

Nian : *Aq kok sreknya sama kamu ya Da, wes lain kali aja. Sorry, makasih*
I like you than others, Da, Maybe next time. Sorry, thanks.

Idda : *Ok, btw gimana kabarnya?*
Ok. By the way, how is your life?

Nian : ***Alhamdulillah masih hidup, hehehe. Alhamdulillah dapet kerja juga,***
(yang ini gak Tanya yo); dan lagi da, kerjanya gak nyambung sama bidang
yang aku pelajari selama ini. *Kamu piye da?*
Alhamdulillah, I am still alive. Hehehe. Alhamdulillah I also get a new
job, (you do not ask my job); and also my job is illogical with my major
that I have been learning it. How about you?

Idda : *Aq Alhamdulillah juga baik. Emangnya kerja apa?*
Alhamdulillah, I am fine too. What is your job?

Nian : *Something like admin- hehehe*
: Something like admin- Hehehe.

In the above conversation 16, there is flouting of cooperative principle. Nian

flouted the receiver's message by saying "***Alhamdulillah masih hidup, hehehe.***

Alhamdulillah dapet kerja juga, (yang ini gak Tanya yo); dan lagi da, kerjanya gak

nyambung sama bidang yang aku pelajari selama ini." It is called flouting of maxim

quantity because she gave more information. Idda only asked about Nian's condition.

Actually, Idda only needed Nian's answer which is related to Nian's condition, such

as "I am fine" or "I am good" which her answer is related to good news but if she

answered with bad news, she said by responding "I am bad" or "I am not good". Nian

gave her more information by adding about her new job. According to Grice (1975),

maxim of quantity is that we make our contribution as informative as is required (for

the current purpose of the exchange) and do not make our contribution more

informative than is required. Actually we have to obey the cooperative principle but

Nian is as sender who replayed the receiver's messages has flouted the maxim of quantity that she made her contribution more informative than is required.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why she flouted because Nian wanted to show off her new job to Idda. Actually, Nian waits Idda for asking about her job but Idda only asking about her condition. With the result, after answering about her condition, Nian directly told about her new job. So, she gave more information to Idda.

First, in transactional analysis Nian becomes an adult that asked information and Idda also answered by being adult. Both of them use adult ego state and transactional analysis is complementary. But, suddenly Nian turned the conversation became a child. She uses child ego state especially free child to replay Idda's question. Nian is expressive when she showed off about her new job to Idda whereas Idda did not ask about it. In transactional analysis has happened cross transaction because Idda is as adult and she hope Nian gives her information as adult too but Nian turned the response over to the child.

 Flouting 8

In the conversation below, there are six participants. They are Idda, the sender and her friends are as receivers, such as Mifta, the receiver 1, Samiro, the receiver 2, Aulia, the receiver 3, Diana, the receiver 4, and the last, Anas, the receiver 5. Idda sends messages to her friends because she wanted to give announcement that there is postponement for the lecture of Discourse Analysis because the lecturer there was a bussines.

Data: Conversation 18 (Taken on December 26th, 2012 (at 06.57 p.m.)

Idda   : *Tmen2 mata kuliah discourse analysis hari senin gak ada. Bu dwi sedang ad*

>*urusan,, kuliahnya diganti hari rabu.*
>Guys, there is not the lecture of discourse analysis on Monday. Mrs. Dwi is having affair,, the lecture will be changed on Wednesday.

Mifta : *Alhamdulillah.. gak papa banget idda*
Alhamdulillah.. It does not matter Idda.

Samiro : **Okey.. Alhmdulillah Coz aq blum wat makalah..**
Okey.. Alhmdulillah because I have not made paper yet..

Aulia : **Alhamdulillah.. ne lampu mati drmh, paper lom slese**
Alhamdulillah.. My house lights are off, my paper has not done yet.

Diana : *Alhamdulillah*
Alhamdulillah

Anas : *Monggo*
Monggo

In the above conversation 18, there are obeying cooperative principle and flouting of cooperative principle that are made by Idda's friends. When Idda sent message for them, a half of them were replaying by obeying cooperative principle. They did not flout maxim of quantity. When there is someone gives announcement by texting, they should replay by saying "thanks" or "Ok" or the words that show if they agree. It is like Mifta who said "*Alhamdulillah.. gak papa banget idda*", Diana who said "*Alhamdulillah*" and Anas who said "*Monggo*". All of them agree with the announcement and they used words that obey maxim quantity which they did not add more information.

Then, the flouting in conversation above is maxim quantity by showing the way they respond the sender's message are "**Okey.. Alhmdulillah Coz aq blum wat makalah...**" from Samiro is as receiver 2 and "**Alhamdulillah.. *My house lights are off, my paper has not done yet.***" from Aulia is as receiver 3. It is called flouting of maxim of quantity because they gave more information. Idda only sent announcement and she only needed her friends' answer will replay by saying thanks or agreement by saying simple answer. Idda's friends gave her more information by adding about their condition. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quantity is that we make our

contribution as informative as is required (for the current purpose of the exchange) and do not make our contribution more informative than is required. Actually we have to obey the cooperative principle but Samiro and Aulia are as receivers who replayed the sender has flouted the maxim of quantity that she made her contribution more informative than is required.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why they flouted because they agreed with the announcement by answering long words. They added about their condition because they have not finished paper yet that was given by Mrs. Dwi. So, she gave more information to Idda. First, in transactional analysis Idda becomes an adult who give announcement for her friends. Anas, Mifta and Diana answer by being adult too. They used adult ego state and transactional analysis is complementary. But, Samiro and Aulia turned the conversation became a child. She uses child ego state especially free child to replay Idda's message. They were expressive when she showed an agreement with the announcement by adding more information about their condition. In transactional analysis has happened cross transaction because Idda is as adult and she hope their friend, Samiro and Aulia gave her information as adult too but they turned the response over to the child.

4.2.2 Maxim of Quality

Flouting 9

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Nazih, the receiver. Idda sent him massage because Idda wanted to know where he was now, but Nazih wanted to make humour with her so that he answered with false word.

44

Data: Conversation 3 Taken on December 3ʳᵈ, 2012 (at 08.08 p.m.)

Idda   : *Pean dmna?*
             Where are you now?
Nazih   : **Dhati u. Hehehe**
             I am in your heart. Hehehe
Idda   : *Serius kuq.*
             I am serious.
Nazih   : *Aq jga serius kuq*
             I am serious too.

In the above conversation 3, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Nazih is as receiver who responded the sender's message flouting the maxim of quality by saying "**Dhati u..**" It is flouting of maxim quality because receiver's words which he talked are false. It is called false because heart is not place for human can stay. Heart is a place for neutralizing a poison in body. He also did not tell the truth. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quality is that we do not say what you believe to be false and do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. Actually, he had to answer which is related to place because Idda asked about where he was. In truth we have to obey the cooperative principle but Nazih is as receiver flouted the maxim of quality that he said what he believes to be false.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why he flouted because he wanted to make humour with Idda by saying what he believed to be false. According to Jazeri (2003), flouting of maxim quality in first sub maxim is deliberately done by someone because she or he wants to create humor for melting the atmosphere conversation. In transactional analysis, he becomes a child and he uses child ego state especially free child. When they make conversation, it has happened cross transaction. In transactional analysis, Idda is as adult who wanted to ask where he was but he turned the response over to the child that is always playful. He has intimate relationship so that he can turn to be a child. According to Solomon (2003:

16), Our Free Child ego state can be playful, authentic, expressive, and emotional. He adds that having good contact with our own Free Child is an essential ingredient for having an intimate relationship. So that, he uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

Flouting 10

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Adit, the receiver. Idda asked to Adit about his research because it is related to thesis. Idda wanted to know about Adit's research. The matter of fact, Adit wants to research about homosexual language. Because of Adit is male and he is still researching about homosexual language, Idda gave warning to him if he will be a victim from gay.

Data: Conversation 9 Taken on December 17ᵗʰ, 2012 (at 10.51 a.m.)

Idda : *Dit, u neliti tntng bhsax orng homo?*
    Dit, do you research about the language of homosexual? Dit, do you research about the language of homosexual?
Adit : *Iy aq neliti itu.. Aku udh 2bln nglakuin research.. Data udh ada.. hehehe serem..*
    Yes, I research it. I have done two months for researching. The data have been already. Hehehe, it is scary. Yes, I research it. I have done two months for researching. The data have been already. Hehehe, it is scary.
Idda : *Awas u ntar jdi korbanx lho..*
    Beware, you can be a victim.
Adit : ***Ah, udh biasa, ak jd korbannya nazih sampe 3x malah, tapi ak msh tegar kok,, hahahaha..***
    Ah, it is common, I became the victim of Nazih until three times, but I am still stiff. Hahahaha

In the above conversation 9, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. The way Adit responded by sending "***Ah, udh biasa, ak jd korbannya nazih sampe 3x malah, tapi ak msh tegar kok,, hahahaha..***" is flouting the maxim of quality. It is called flouting the maxim of quality because receiver's words which he talked are

false and he also lacked adequate evidence. The researcher says that Adit's words are false because the researcher knows the relation between Adit and Nazih. Both of them are only friend. She knows that Nazih is not gay. Adit also could not give evidence enough to prove that he has become the victim of Nazih. So that the researcher can say if he did not tell the truth and have evidence enough with his words. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quality is that we do not say what you believe to be false and do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why he flouted because he wanted to have intimate relationship which she made a humour with Idda by saying false words. According to Jazeri (2003), flouting of maxim quality in first sub maxim is deliberately done by someone because she or he wants to create humor for melting the atmosphere conversation.

When they make conversation, it has happened cross transaction. In transactional analysis, Idda is as adult who wanted to give warning if he will be a victim of gay because he still researches homosexual language, but he turned the response over to the child that is always playful. In transactional analysis, he becomes a child and he uses child ego state especially free child. He is playful when he does transactional analysis. According to Solomon (2003: 16), Our Free Child ego state can be playful, authentic, expressive, and emotional. He adds that having good contact with our own Free Child is an essential ingredient for having an intimate relationship. So that, he uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

Flouting 11

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Denny, the receiver. Idda sent him messages for asking his final

examination. After that, she wanted to ask about his holiday after he faced final examination. Idda asked about his holiday because every school will give a holiday for their students after facing final examination.

Data: Conversation 12 (Taken on December 17th, 2012 (at 09.15 p.m.)

Idda   : *Den UAS b.ing u remidi ap g?*
              Den, Do you retake final examination or not?
Denny : *yow gag tau lah miss kn lumb d bgi'in puxa qw, tpi yg UHB 3 gag remidi aqw miss..*
              I do not know miss because my teacher has not given it yet but I do not retake daily examination 3 miss.
Idda   : *Siipp2,,*
              Good.
Denny : *aq dpet 83 miss nlaix,, jlek y,,*
              I get the score 83 miss. It is bad.
Idda   : *Bgus g2 lho.. u ud lbur skolah?*
              It is good. Have you got holiday of school?
Denny : *Ud miss,, malah mlai sbtu kmrin aq lburx,,*
              Have done miss, it starts from last Saturday.
Idda   : *Lburx brp minggu?*
              How many weeks do you get holiday?
Denny : **aq lbur skolahx 1 tahun miss..** *hahahahahahaha,,*
              I get holiday one year miss. Hahahahahahaha.

In conversation 12, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Denny is as receiver who responded the sender's message flouting the maxim of quality. The flouting is showed with the way he responded by saying "**aq lbur skolahx 1 tahun miss..**" His words which he talked are false. Every school will not give their students a holiday for one year. It is very impossible if it happen. Every school only gives their students a holiday for two weeks after their faced final examination. It can be seen that he said false and he did not tell the truth. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quality is we do not say what you believe to be false. Actually, we have to obey the cooperative principle but Denny is as receiver flouts the maxim of quality that he says what he believes to be false.

48

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why he flouted because he wanted to make humour with Idda by saying false words for creating intimate relationship. According to Jazeri (2003), flouting of maxim quality in first sub maxim is deliberately done by someone because she or he wants to create humor for melting the atmosphere conversation.

When they make conversation, it has happened cross transaction. In transactional analysis, Idda is as adult who wanted to ask how long he gets a holiday, but he turned the response over to the child that is always playful by saying "*aq lbur skolahx 1 tahun miss.. hahahahahahaha,,*" while he was laughing . In transactional analysis, he becomes a child and he uses child ego state especially free child. He is playful when he does transactional analysis. According to Solomon (2003: 16), Our Free Child ego state can be playful, authentic, expressive, and emotional. He adds that having good contact with our own Free Child is an essential ingredient for having an intimate relationship. So that, he uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

Flouting 12

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Nian, the sender and Idda, the receiver. Nian sent Idda messages because she wanted to offer Idda a job, but Idda refuses it because of Idda has had a job at that time. Because both of them have been long time no see each other, so that Idda asked Nian about her condition.

Data: Conversation 16 (Taken on December 25th, 2012 (at 08.19 a.m.)

Nian   : *Da, ada yang mau ngelesi ta? Di jojoran 1 – 4 anak SMP; tiap hari senin, habis maghrib per datang 50rb (waktu 90 menit).*
Da, Do you want to teach a course? In jojoran 1 – 4 children of SMP, every Monday after maghrib and the fee is 50 thousand rupiah every coming (time is 90 minuttes).

Idda : *Aq gak bisa,, nanti tak carikan tmen kelas ya*
    I cannot. Later I will find my classmate for teaching it.

Nian : *Aq kok sreknya sama kamu ya Da, wes lain kali aja. Sorry, makasih*
    I like you than others, Da, Maybe next time. Sorry, thanks.

Idda : *Ok, btw gimana kabarnya?*
    Ok. By the way, how is your life?

Nian : ***Alhamdulillah masih hidup, hehehe****. Alhamdulillah dapet kerja juga, (yang ini gak Tanya yo); dan lagi da, kerjanya gak nyambung sama bidang yang aku pelajari selama ini. Kamu piye da?*
    Alhamdulillah, I am still alive. Hehehe. Alhamdulillah I also get a new job, (you do not ask my job); and also my job is illogical with my major that I have been learning it. How about you?

Idda : *Aq Alhamdulillah juga baik. Emangnya kerja apa?*
    Alhamdulillah, I am fine too. What is your job?

Nian : *Something like admin- hehehe*
    Something like admin- Hehehe.

In the above conversation 16, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. The flouting is showed with the way she responded by saying "***Alhamdulillah masih hidup, hehehe***". It is called flouting of maxim quality because her words which she talked are false. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quality is that we do not say what you believe to be false. When Idda asked about her condition, she should have answered which is related with her condition. The other way, she answered that she is still alive. Everybody knows that if there is someone asks about condition, it is exactly that she or he is still alive because the person who is asked about the condition still makes a conversation. So, Nian flouted the maxim of quality by saying what she believes to be false. It can be seen that she said false and he did not tell the truth.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why she flouted because she is deliberately creating humor with Idda by saying false words to melt the atmosphere of the casual conversation to intimate. According to Jazeri (2003), flouting of maxim quality in first sub maxim is deliberately done by someone because she or he wants to create humor for melting the atmosphere conversation.

When they make conversation, it has happened cross transaction. Idda is as adult who wanted to ask her condition, but she turned the response over to the child that is always playful by saying "*Alhamdulillah masih hidup, hehehe.*" while she was laughing. In transactional analysis, he becomes a child and he uses child ego state especially free child. He is playful when he does transactional analysis. According to Solomon (2003: 16), Our Free Child ego state can be playful, authentic, expressive, and emotional. He adds that having good contact with our own Free Child is an essential ingredient for having an intimate relationship. So that, he uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

Flouting 13

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Frieska, the receiver. Idda and Frieska are friends in the college. Idda sent her messages because Idda wanted to know the condition of Frieska who was sick at that time.

Data: Conversation 19 (Taken on December 29ᵗʰ, 2012 (at 06.46 p.m.)

Idda   : *Mbak fries,, piye kbare pean?*
           My sis Fries,, how are you?
Frieska: *Alhamdulillah agak mendingan cint ..*
           Alhamdulillah, it is be better cint ..
Idda   : *Ealah yow,, kuq iso loro lho,,?*
           Oh my god,, How is the story that you can get sick?
Frieska: *Iyow cint..* **sbuk syuting nang korea trus qu cint,,** *hahahahahahaha..*
           That's right cint.. **I'm busy to act in Korea cint,,** hahahahahahaha..

In the above conversation 19, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Frieska is as receiver who responded the sender's message flouting the maxim of quality by saying "***sbuk syuting nang korea trus qu cint,,***". The words which she talked are false. She did not tell the truth. According to Grice (1975), maxim of

quality is that we do not say what you believe to be false and do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence. Actually we have to obey the cooperative principle but Frieska is as receiver flouted the maxim of quality that she said what she believed to be false.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why she flouts because she is deliberately creating humor with Idda by saying false words to melt the atmosphere of the casual conversation to intimate. According to Jazeri (2003), flouting of maxim quality in first sub maxim is deliberately done by someone because she or he wants to create humor for melting the atmosphere conversation.

. In transactional analysis, she becomes child. She uses child ego state especially free child. She wants to be playful when she does transactional analysis. According to Solomon (2003: 16), Our Free Child ego state can be playful, authentic, expressive, and emotional. He adds that having good contact with our own Free Child is an essential ingredient for having an intimate relationship. So that, she uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

Flouting 14

In the conversation below, there are four participants. They are Idda, the sender and Eko, the receiver 1, Samiro, the receiver 2, and Nian, the receiver 3. Idda sent messages them to give the announcement that there was ghost house in Tunjungan Plza for them who like adrenalin.

Data: Conversation 8 (Taken on December 16th, 2012 (at 05.30 p.m.)

Idda   : *Pengumuman kpd yg gmar adrenalin. Dibuka RUMAH HANTU THE LOST CITY.. Tgl 20 des '12 smpai 27 jan '13 hnya d'TUNJUNGAN PLAZA (TP)*
Announcement to everybody who likes adrenalin. Has been opened
GHOST HOUSE OF THE LOST CITY at December 20th, 2012 until January 27th, 2013 only in TUNJUNGAN PLAZA (TP).

Eko   : *Tiketnya beli dmn?*
             Where is the ticket sold?
Samiro : *Thankz wat infox da.^_^ bolh tuch d coba*
             Thanks for the information. ^_^
Nian   : *Mbok traktir ta da? Mau mau kalo kamu traktir. Hehe..*
             Do you want to treat me, da? I want it if you treat me. Hehe..
Idda   : *gmna kbre?*
             How are you?
Nian   : *Alhamdulillah apik,, Piye kbare ms faqih?*
             Alhamdulillah I am good,, How is the condition of bro Faqih?
Idda   : ***Dy mnghilang dri muka bumi..*** *hehehehe,,*
             He disappeared from the earth.. hehehehe,,

In the above conversation 8, there are obeying cooperative principle and flouting of cooperative principle. Idda has sent message for them and they replayed by obeying cooperative principle. They replayed Idda's question which is related to the announcement. They will say gratitude because Idda has given information or they will ask about further information. It is like Eko who said "*Tiketnya beli dmn?*", Samiro who said "*Thankz wat infox da.^_^ bolh tuch d coba*", and Nian also said "*Mbok traktir ta da? Mau mau kalo kamu traktir. Hehe..*". The other way, When Nian asked Idda about the condition of Faqih, she answered by flouting maxim of quality. It is showed the way she answered by saying "***Dy mnghilang dri muka bumi..***". She said what she believe false. She said that Faqih disappeared in the earth. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quality is we do not say what you believe to be false.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why she flouted because she wanted to create humour with Idda by saying hyperbole. So, she used exaggerating expression which is the expression are false. According to Cutting (2002: 37), Hyperbole is often at the basis of humour. She flouts maxim of quality because she wants to create the atmosphere of conversation more intimate. According to Jazeri (2003), flouting of maxim quality in first sub maxim is deliberately done by

someone because she or he wants to create humor for melting the atmosphere conversation.

When they made conversation, it has happened cross transaction. In transactional analysis, Nian is as adult who asks about Faqih's condition to her, but Idda turned the response over to the child who is always playful by saying "*Dy mnghilang dri muka bumi.. hehehehe,,*" while she is laughing. She is called a child because she is like children who always say in exaggerating when they are asked something by someone. In transactional analysis, she becomes a child and she uses child ego state especially free child. She is playful when she does transactional analysis. According to Solomon (2003: 16), Our Free Child ego state can be playful, authentic, expressive, and emotional. He adds that having good contact with our own Free Child is an essential ingredient for having an intimate relationship. So that, she uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

Flouting 15

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Frieska, the sender and Idda, the receiver. Frieska sent her a message to inform that she was sick and she could not submit her task on time. Idda also told her that she is getting sick because she works too much.

Data: Conversation 17 (Taken on December 25th, 2012 (at 11.19 a.m.)

Frieska: *Cint tgs tk kumpulkn bsok k Diana.. cz qu lg gk enak bdan..*
      Cint, I will submit the task tomorrow to Diana.. because I am not good..
Idda   : *iya mbak..*
      Yes, sis..
Frieska: *ywes klo gtu.. awak qu legrek n ngedrop..*
      Ok.. My body is so tired and I am drop..
Idda   : *Pean kbnyakan golek duwit.*
      You work too much.
Frieska: *Dapak mek duwit tok.. **Golek duwek ricik koq nang prempatan suramadu,,***

> *hahahahahaha*
> Not only money.. **but also I look for coins in crossroad suramadu,,**
> **hahahahahaha**

Idda   : *Lho kuq iso..?*
            Can it..?

Frieska: ***Kan dirimu yow ngancani qu.. qu seng nyanyi dirimu nggawakno***
            omplonge.. wkwkwkwkwk
            You also accompany me.. I am singing and you are bringing a tin..
            wkwkwkwkwk

In the above conversation 17, there are flouting of cooperative principle. Frieska is as sender who responded the receiver's message flouting the maxim of quality by saying "***Golek duwek ricik koq nang prempatan suramadu,,*** ***hahahahahaha***" and "***Kan dirimu yow ngancani qu.. qu seng nyanyi dirimu*** ***nggawakno omplonge.. wkwkwkwkwk***".

First, she flouted by saying "***Golek duwek ricik koq nang prempatan*** ***suramadu,, hahahahahaha***". She said that she looked for coins in crossroad of suramadu. It can be seen that she said false and she did not tell the truth. Because Idda is as receiver and also researcher in this thesis who knows that her job does not look for coins in crossroad of suramadu like a beggar.

Second, she flouted by saying "***Kan dirimu yow ngancani qu.. qu seng*** ***nyanyi dirimu nggawakno omplonge.. wkwkwkwkwk***". She said that Idda accompany her to look for coins. She also said that she was singing and Idda was bringing a tin. It can be seen that she said false and she does not tell the truth because she knows that between herself and Idda are not a singing beggar. According to Grice (1975), maxim of quality is we do not say what you believe to be false. Actually, we have to obey the cooperative principle but Frieska flouted in first sub maxim of quality which she said what she believed to be false.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why she flouted because she wanted to make a joke with Idda by saying false words for creating intimate relationship. According to Jazeri (2003), flouting of maxim quality in first sub maxim is deliberately done by someone because she or he wants to create humor for melting the atmosphere conversation.

When they make conversation, it has happened cross transaction. In transactional analysis, Idda is as adult who says if Frieska works too much, but Frieska turned the response over to the child that is always playful by saying "*Golek duwek ricik koq nang prempatan suramadu,, hahahahahaha*" while she was laughing . In transactional analysis, she becomes a child and she uses child ego state especially free child. She is playful when he does transactional analysis. According to Solomon (2003: 16), Our Free Child ego state can be playful, authentic, expressive, and emotional. He adds that having good contact with our own Free Child is an essential ingredient for having an intimate relationship. So that, she uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

4.2.3 Maxim of Relevance

Flouting 16

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Nazih, the receiver. She sent him messages for asking that he would go around with her or not. Idda asked him to go around because at that day was Saturday. It is the day which used a couple to go around together. So, Idda sent him the message.

Data: Conversation 1 (Taken on December 1ˢᵗ, 2012 (at 06.32 p.m.)

Idda   : *Jdi jlan2 ap g?*

We will go around or not?
Nazih : *Ad sepak bola antara Malaysia n indo cnta*
         There is football match between Malaysia and Indo my dear..

In the above conversation 1, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Nazih flouts maxim of relevance which is showed by saying "*Ad sepak bola antara Malaysia n indo cnta*". The way he responses the sender's message is flouting of maxim relevance because it is not relevance with Idda's question. Idda asked about he would ask to go around or not, but he answered if there is a football match between Malaysia and Indonesia. When Idda asked about it, Nazih should have answered with the world which related to her question. According to Grice (1975), maxim relevance is that be relevant. If we say something irrelevant, it can be concluded that we flout maxim of relevance.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why he flouted because he wanted to her imagine what he did not said or he wanted to her conclude what he said. He did not want to say truthfully if he did not want to ask her to go around. According to Cutting (2002: 39), if the speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say. In transactional analysis, he becomes a child and he uses child ego state. It has happened cross transaction because Idda is as adult who looks for information from him for asking clarification if he will go around with her or not but he is as a child who cannot say explicitly to her. Like children who cannot say explicitly what they want to their parents and their parents have to be able imagine or conclude it. So that, he uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

Flouting 17

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Nazih, the receiver. She sent him messages for asking about her book because of Nazih has borrowed it for one month.

Data: Conversation 6 (Taken on December 13th, 2012 (at 09.49 p.m.)

Idda   : *Cnta, bku qw ud ta?*
             Honey, has my book done?
Nazih : ***Aq msih nunggu,,***
             I'm still waiting,,
Idda   : *Mksudx?*
             What do you mean?

In the above conversation 6, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Nazih flouts maxim of relevance which is showed by saying "***Aq msih nunggu,,***". The way he responded her message is not relevance with her question. Idda asked about her book, but he answered if he was still waiting. Idda was confused with his answer. Idda did not understand what he said. So, it created misunderstanding in conversation between Idda and Nazih. According to Sperber & Wilson (1989: 15-16 in Wijana, 2004: 85), A speaker who intends an utterance to be interpreted in a particular way must also expect the hearer to be able to supply a context which allows that interpretation to be recovered. A mismatch between the context envisaged by the speaker and the one actually used by the hearer may result in a misunderstanding.

Actually, when Idda asks about it, Nazih should have answered with the world which is related to her question, such as not yet because he still need her book or I will return your book. According to Grice (1975), maxim relevance is that be relevant. If we say something irrelevant, it can be concluded that we flout maxim of relevance.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why he flouted because he wanted to her imagine or conclude what he said but he has made Idda confused with his answer, so that it creates misunderstanding . According to Sperber & Wilson (1989: 15-16 in Wijana, 2004: 85), A speaker who intends an utterance to be interpreted in a particular way must also expect the hearer to be able to supply a context which allows that interpretation to be recovered. A mismatch between the context envisaged by the speaker and the one actually used by the hearer may result in a misunderstanding. Cutting (2002: 39) also adds that if the speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say. In transactional analysis, he becomes a child and he uses child ego state. It has happened cross transaction because Idda is as adult who asks clarification about her book but he is as a child who cannot say explicitly to her. Like children who cannot say explicitly what they want to their parents and their parents have to be able imagine or conclude it. So that, he uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

Flouting 18

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Ulit, the receiver. Idda is a private of English teacher and Ulit is her student. Idda always sends the message to ask what time Ulit wants to study the day before she teaches her. She sent her messages for asking what time Ulit wanted to study with her.

Data: Conversation 5 (Taken on December 14th, 2012 (at 07.33 p.m.)

Idda : *Bezoq les jm brp?*
        Tomorrow, what time will I give a course?
Ulit : **Mbak g ktoko bku?**
        Sis, do not you want to go to bookstore?
Idda : *Koq u jwbx g nymbung c*

59

Your answer is disconnect

In the above conversation 5, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Ulit flouts maxim of relevance which is showed by saying "***Mbak g ktoko bku?***". The way she responded the message is not relevance with Idda's question. Idda asked about what time she wanted to study with her, but she answered her with the question which asked Idda wanted to go to bookstore or not. Actually, Ulit should have answered with the words which related to Idda's question. According to Grice (1975), maxim relevance is that be relevant. If we say something irrelevant, it can be concluded that we flout maxim of relevance.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why she flouted because she wanted to her imagine what she did not said or she wanted to her conclude what she said but she has made Idda confused with her answer, so that it creates misunderstanding . According to Sperber & Wilson (1989: 15-16 in Wijana, 2004: 85), A speaker who intends an utterance to be interpreted in a particular way must also expect the hearer to be able to supply a context which allows that interpretation to be recovered. A mismatch between the context envisaged by the speaker and the one actually used by the hearer may result in a misunderstanding. Cutting (2002: 39) also adds that if the speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say.

In transactional analysis, she becomes a child and she uses child ego state. It has happened cross transaction because Idda is as adult who asks about time for studying with her but she is as a child who cannot say explicitly to her. Like children who cannot say explicitly what they want to their parents and their parents have to be able imagine or conclude it. So that, he uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

Flouting 19

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Ita, the sender and Idda, the receiver. Ita sent Idda messages because she asked her to accompany in mall for shopping. The other way, Idda is Ita's sister who knows everything about her especially her English homework, because Ita always asks Idda's help to do her homework.

Data: Conversation 14 (Taken on December 18th, 2012 (at 10.16 a.m.)

Ita   : *Mbak ntar mw gak nemenin aq shopping?*
          Would you like to accompany me for shopping later?
Idda   : **Gimana PR b.ing u?**
          How about your English's homework?
Ita   : *Ya ampun.*
          Oh, my God.

In the above conversation 14, there is a flouting of cooperative principle. Idda flouts maxim of relevance which is showed by saying "**Gimana PR b.ing u?**" This is not relevance with Ita's question. Ita asked Idda to accompany her for shopping, but Idda asked about Ita's homework. Actually, when Ita asked about it, Idda should have answered with the word which related to her question. According to Grice (1975), maxim relevance is being relevant. If we say something irrelevant, it can be concluded that we flout maxim of relevance.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why she flouted because she wanted to remind her that she should not go for shopping because she had much homework which she has to finish it. According to Cutting (2002: 39), if the speakers flout the maxim of relation, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say. In transactional analysis, she becomes a parent who always remind about homework to their children and she uses parent ego

61

state. It has happened cross transaction because Ita is as adult who asks her to accompany for shopping but she turned over the parent.

4.2.4 Maxim of Manner

Flouting 20

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Nazih, the sender and Idda, the receiver. Nazih is one of the members from the community of Capoeira. He wanted to go to STIKOM for exercising Capoeira at the moment. So that he told to Idda for giving to her information because Idda is Nazih's girlfriend.

Data: Conversation 2 (Taken on December 3ʳᵈ, 2012 (at 06.06 p.m.)

Nazih : *Au mau berangkat latihan di STIKOM*
         I want to go to exercise in STIKOM
Idda   : *Aq leh ikut?*
         May I come with you?
Nazih : ***Pean ntar dsna cenggur,, au wez jrang lat dteng2 cm lead.. Truz au g pngen kjadian yg ud trjadi, trjadi lg cnta.. Au dsna jga rncana g lat tpicuma lead tok..***
         Maybe you will not have activity there. I also seldom exercise and I only come for watching. Then, I do not want the last incident will happen again my dear. I plan I do not exercise but just watch it in there.

In the above conversation 2, there is flouting of cooperative principle. Nazih flouted maxim of manner by saying "***Pean ntar dsna cenggur,, au wez jrang lat dteng2 cm lead.. Truz au g pngen kjadian yg ud trjadi, trjadi lg cnta.. Au dsna jga rncana g lat tpi cuma lead tok..***". Nazih could not say clearly. He is convoluted when he answers Idda's request. His words are extremely long-winded. According to Grice (1975), maxim of manner is avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and be orderly. Actually, Nazih should have obeyed the cooperative principle when he answered Idda's will. He could simply replay "Yes" or

"Ok" if he wanted to Idda came with him but if he refused, he could simply replay "No".

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why he flouted because he did not have the ability to say clearly. He also said indirectly because he did not want if Idda would come with him. So that he wanted to her imagine or conclude what he said. According to Cutting (2002: 39), if the speakers flout the maxim of manner, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say. In transactional analysis, he becomes a child and he uses child ego state. It has happened cross transaction because Idda is as adult who asks clarification about her book but he is as a child who cannot say explicitly to her. Like children who cannot say explicitly what they want to their parents and their parents have to be able imagine or conclude it. So that, he uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

Flouting 21

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Nazih, the receiver. Idda was sick at that time and she wanted her boyfriend to look her in. Because of Nazih did not look her in, so that she sent message to ask him to look her in.

Data: Conversation 4 (Taken on December 6th, 2012 (at 06.26 p.m.)

Idda   : *Pean g mw jenguk aq ta?*
         Don't you want to look me in?
Nazih : **Smw gru dskolah lho pada skit smw. Au tdi izin. Kpla qw pusing. Au lge g enk bdan.**
         All of the teachers at the school are sick. I asked permission. My head is getting headache. I am not well.
Idda   : *Ywd wes.*
         It is Ok.

In the above conversation 4, there is flouting of cooperative principle. Nazih flouted maxim of manner by saying "*Smw gru dskolah lho pada skit smw. Au tdi izin. Kpla qw pusing. Au lge g enk bdan.*". Nazih could not say clearly. He was convoluted when he answered Idda's question. His words are extremely long-winded. According to Grice (1975), maxim of manner is avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and be orderly. Actually, Nazih should have obeyed the cooperative principle when he answers Idda's question. He could be simply replay "Yes" or "Ok" if he wanted to look her in but if he refused, he could be simply replay "No" or "Sorry, I cannot".

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why he flouted because he wanted to her imagine or conclude what he said. He wanted to refuse her request. So, he gave information indirectly by saying the convoluted words and he also did not have the ability to say clearly. According to Cutting (2002: 39), if the speakers flout the maxim of manner, they expect that the hearer will be able to imagine what the utterance did not say. In transactional analysis, he becomes a child and he uses child ego state. It has happened cross transaction because Idda is as adult who asks him to look her in book but he is as a child who cannot say explicitly to her. Like children who cannot say explicitly what they want to their parents and their parents have to be able imagine or conclude it. So that, he uses child ego state in transactional analysis.

Flouting 22

In the conversation below, there are two participants. They are Idda, the sender and Ria, the receiver. Idda, Ria and Nope are close friends when they were in Senior high school and until now they are still close friends. Because of this month is

64

Nope's birthday Idda asked Ria to buy a present for her. So that she sent message to Ria for asking a present.

Data: Conversation 11 (Taken on December 17th, 2012 (at 07.42 p.m.)

Idda : *U ud bli kado wat ultahx Nope?*
        Have you bought a present for Nope?
Ria : ***Kmaren aq ud k'delta wat cari kado. Smwx bgus2 terus ada yg co2k bgt wat kadox dy. Trus aq mw bli, trnyta wktu ngmbil uang, dompet qw ktnggalan. Jdi aq lum bli.***
        Yesterday I have gone to Delta for seeking a present. All of the presents are good and then there is a present which is suitable for her. Then, I wanted to buy, evidently when I took my money, my purse left behind. So, I have not bought it yet.

In the above conversation 11, there is flouting of cooperative principle. Ria flouted maxim of manner by saying "***Kmaren aq ud k'delta wat cari kado. Smwx bgus2 terus ada yg co2k bgt wat kadox dy. Trus aq mw bli, trnyta wktu ngmbil uang, dompet qw ktnggalan. Jdi aq lum bli.***". Ria could not say clearly and briefly. She is convoluted when she answered Idda's question. She also said unnecessary prolixity. Her words are extremely long-winded. According to Grice (1975), maxim of manner is avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and be orderly. Actually, Ria should have obeyed the cooperative principle when she answers Idda's question. She can simply replay "Yes" or "Have done" if she has bought a present for Nope but if she has not bought it yet, she could simply replay "Not yet". Idda only needed simple answer from her, because Idda did not ask her with "Why". If Idda asks her, Why do not you buy a present for Nope?, Ria could answer with long words because Idda's question asks about reason.

In the conversation through texting there is flouting and why she flouted because she did not have the ability to say clearly and briefly. She also hid her feeling because of she is shy that she canceled to buy a present because her purse left behind.

So, she added some information which is not needed by Idda. According to Jazeri (2003), if the speakers flout the maxim of manner, they will say information which is convoluted and is not brief, so that the hearers do not get the information that they want. In transactional analysis, she becomes a child and she uses child ego state. It has happened cross transaction because Idda is as adult who asks clarification about a present for Nope but she is as a child who cannot say explicitly to her. Like children who cannot say explicitly what they want to their parents and their parents have to be able imagine or conclude it. So that, she uses child ego state in transactional analysis.