JOURNAL OF
PRAGMATICS
RESEARCH

Flouting Relevance Maxim Benefits of Hillary Clinton's President Candidate Debate on 2016

Agung Budi Kurniawan [1*] , **Lilia Indriani** [2]
Universitas Tidar, Indonesia

*) Corresponding Author
Email: agungbudikurniawan@untidar.ac.id

Abstract

This research has an objective to analyze and reveal the benefits of flouting the relevance maxim of Hillary Clinton's speech in the 2016 USA candidate presidential debate. The data consist of the debate transcript which was taken from the Washington Post website, and a video that could be watched on YouTube. They are analyzed by confirming the relevance of semantic answers to every question within the context of speech. In the end, there are nine findings of the benefits of flouting the relevance maxim, which consists of increasing positive self-impression, avoiding giving direct agreement to a sensitive issue, closing potential negative attacks, decreasing the rival's credibility, guessing truthfulness, beating the rival's credibility, increasing effort to show positive personal credibility, telling the rival's past negative history, and proposing indirect conclusion. The findings are the implication of the complex use of verbal speech that is combined with action. The formal situation of the debate supports the maximum benefit of every flouting relevance maxim. The main conclusion of this research is that flouting the relevance maxim only sometimes negatively impacts both a speaker and an interlocutor. The impact is influenced by complex factors such as the background of the occasion, past conditions, and passion for an interaction.

Keywords: *Flouting, Relevance Maxim, Benefits*

JOURNAL OF PRAGMATICS RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

Pragmatics knowledge and skill application help people to follow social communication properly, effectively, and efficiently which is also served in this research. This research proposes pragmatic application results for social contact related to irrelevant feedback or answer, so readers can understand that not all irrelevant speeches have negative communication purposes. Pragmatics is about studying people's meaning from specific kinds of speech situations (Kreidler, 1998). Interpreting and understanding meaning especially hidden meanings behind specific incoherent speech or actions are more complex than translating vocabulary meaning using a dictionary. It needs particular skills, linguistics, and non-linguistic knowledge and experience. The advantage of studying pragmatics is that people can express and talk about their intended meanings, assumption, purposes, and specific action (Helmie & Lestari, 2019). The advantages strengthen the valuable position of Pragmatics for human social interaction and communication.

Moreover, human communication is unique because everyone has a passion that is different from one another. Types of meanings generally could be divided into 1) referential meaning; the formal logic of dictionary definition, and 2) conveyed meaning; meaning that is not explicitly stated but can naturally be implied or inferred (Betti & Khalaf, 2021). The pragmatic area of study and application is on the conveyed meaning, but the position of referential meaning is also significant. The referential meaning could be positioned as a first step that must be fulfilled before entering the conveyed meaning. Human life interaction often involves the application and implication of pragmatics unconsciously. It is not about natural talent but a type of knowledge and skill that must be learned.

One of the pragmatics applications is a cooperative principle or CP, which is an application to construct and interpret meaning. It is one of the old communication principles for social interaction. CP is very familiar and known as the pragmatic maxim application that is often applied for field research. This research proposes a new

perspective of CP research in a very formal and well-prepared debate as an object, so this research's main finding and discussion could be one recommendation for speakers who would like to perform in a similar occasion type. To achieve good conversation, the participants should cooperate in the process of linguistic exchange that could be understood by both participants' sides (Jiwalno et al., 2020). A cooperative attitude in conversation could be identified as the first step to getting accurate, effective, and efficient communication based on the pragmatic perspective. All participants should cooperate in the ideal condition of a suitable conversation and interaction. The cooperative principle is how to make our conversational contribution, such as required at the stage in which it occurs, but the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which we are engaged (Yule, 1996). Applying CP is similar to fulfilling a sequence of maxims. Maxim is a rule that participants should obey to make effective communication (Jiwalno et al., 2020). It is a set of principles that are offered to construct unified communication. (Grice, 1975) in (Tajabadi et al., 2014) propose a complete cooperative principle and its maxim that consists of 1) the maxim of quantity; a) be truthful, b) only say that for which you have adequate evidence, 2) the maxim of quality; a) provide as much information as required, b) do not provide more information than is required, 3) maxim of relevance; be relevant, 4) maxim of Manner: a) avoid obscurity of expression b) avoid unnecessary ambiguity, c) be brief, d) be or orderly. The cooperative principle is proven to be applicative based on several theory reviews. The participants' position is placed to be the perfect applicant for the cooperative principle maxims.

On the opposite side, interpreted meaning could also be proposed by breaking the rule of the cooperative principle. Breaking the rule cannot be conducted, just taken for granted. It requires certain pragmatic concepts. Breaking the rule of the cooperative principle could be described into two types of actions: flouting the maxim and violating the maxim. Flouting the maxim is breaking maxim rules unintentionally, and violating the maxim is breaking the maxim rules for certain purposes (Abed & Jebu, 2022). The difference between flouting maxims and violating maxims is on purpose. This research focuses on

analyzing flouting maxims because the object is a formal debate among politicians. A flouting maxim is a form of the non-observing maxim that is utilized in the practical aspects of a study because it does not require participants' intention (Betti & Yaseen, 2020). In addition, the flouting maxim is one kind of implicature that is not following some maxims to exploit communicative purposes ((Bahrami, 1999) cited in (Betti & Khalaf, 2021)). The communicative purpose is one of the concerns of this research. The communicative purpose is about what objectives of a speaker in presenting their speech. In this term, the flouting maxim is described as a method to construct and analyze indirect communicative purposes in social interaction. The communicative situation is concluded to involve flouting the cooperative principle with the use of various pragmatic functions (Komorowska, 2020). The communicative situation is one step to analyze the communicative purpose that had been applied in this research. The communicative purpose could be understood as the final destination of social interaction.

Participants or speakers of a communicative could explore their implicit communicative purposes by exploring flouting maxim. Flouting maxim gives opportunities to speakers to exploit their conversational implicature. The flouting maxim is carried out through indirect and contradictive utterances, understatement, tautology, and hyperbole statements (Hossain, 2021). Flouting maxims need to consider special conditions. Flouting maxim to get benefits in social communication needs deep preparation. This research proposes the benefits of flouting relevance maxim as one recommendation to prepare speakers to succeed in the social communication process and results, especially for debate. Setting refers to the place and time of flouting maxim application (Jiwalno et al., 2020). The flouting maxim represents failure and success, implying implicit meaning. Speakers' failure to follow maxim rules refers to flouting maxims (Juma'a, 2020). In addition, speakers should release their position before applying the flouting maxim. The failure to follow the maxim could be understood as success to imply hidden meaning in communication.

This research focuses on revealing the communicative purpose behind flouting the relevance maxim. The researcher analyzed the main objectives behind the flouting relevance maxim in a specific formal debate occasion. Maxim of relevance is the current utterance that has to do with context and comes before the conversation ((Birner, 2013) cited in (Betti & Yaseen, 2020)). In addition, the context has two types: linguistic context or co-context and context of the situation (Yule, 2010). Flouting the relevance maxim could be understood simply as an act of breaking the relevance maxim. Simply, it is about giving an unrelated answer to certain questions for specific communicative purposes. The maxim of relation is flouted when the response is irrelevant to the questions asked (Thomas, 1995). Flouting relevance maxim is very hard to be described as an unconscious situation or answer normally. The relevant answer is the basic requirement to join a normal situation in which it is difficult to be denied to practice it by accident. Conversation or social communication needs preparation, at least for the related answer. It is why the researcher would like to reveal the object to obtain the benefits of the flouting relevance maxim in a formal political debate.

Based on the background and theories, this research analyzed flouting relevance maxim benefits of Hillary Clinton's speech in the presidential candidate debate in 2016. The debate is a formal and crucial occasion as one of the biggest political even in the USA. The speaker is assumed to have prepared the speech performance before joining the debate. The relevance maxim is chosen because it is in line with the background that considers it a conscious action. This research proposes one objective: to reveal the benefits of flouting the relevance maxim of Hillary Clinton's speech in the US presidential candidate debate in 2016. There are nine findings.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research applied qualitative research. The data is a transcript and video of a debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump debate on 2016. The transcript was taken from the website of the Washington Post. In addition, the video was viewed on one of the social media platforms. This research focuses on analyzing the flouting relevance

maxim based on Appraisal and discussion concerns. Nine pieces of data from Clinton's speech The Appraisal consists of organizing key results, maintaining consistent terminology, creating a concept, and analyzing results (Yadav, 2022). The discussion session was finished by directly addressing the research question and placing the findings in the context of existing literature (Yadav, 2022). The unit of analysis is Clinton's answer to every question. The technique of collecting data is to identify the semantic or literal meaning of the answer of Clinton by analyzing its relevance with the semantic question meaning. The irrelevant answer is categorized as a finding. Then, the technique of analyzing data is to analyze the impact of the finding in the video. In addition, the potential impact of the benefit is also discussed by comparing it with previous studies. Every data discussion is presented separately because every data has a different context and background. The data was also explored for its potential future study by comparing them with related previous studies.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Nine findings can be seen in Table 1 below. The data and findings are presented in summary format. Then, it continued the discussion by comparing with relevant previous studies for the benefits of flouting the relevance maxim.

Table 1. Sample of Data Findings

Number	The data	Finding Summary
Data 1	CLINTON: Thank you very much, Chris. And thanks to UNLV for hosting us. 1 ..... a Supreme Court that will stand up on behalf of women's rights, on behalf of the rights of the LGBT community, that will stand up and say no to Citizens United, a decision that has undermined the election	Increasing self-positive impression by giving serious care to a certain group of persons whose sensitive issues
Data 2	CLINTON: Well, I strongly support Roe v. Wade, ... now in America. So many states are putting very stringent regulations on women that block them from exercising that choice to the extent that	Avoiding giving or expressing a direct agreement to a sensitive issue and avoiding getting contradictive questions about the sensitive issue
Data 3	CLINTON: You know, I've had the great honor of traveling across the world on behalf of our	Preventing getting pressure and potential questions that

	country. I've been to countries where governments ...., like they used to do in Romania. And I can tell you: The government has no business in the decisions that women make with their families in accordance	could decrease the speaker's position in front of many persons
Data 4	CLINTON: ..... Donald knows a lot about this. He used undocumented labor to build the Trump Tower. He underpaid undocumented workers, and when they complained, he basically said what a lot of employers	Decreasing the debate rival's credibility by explaining the debate rival's past negative action which is an irrelevant answer
Data 5	CLINTON: Well, if you went on ..... than we trade with the rest of the world combined. And I do want us to have an electric grid, an energy system that crosses borders. I think that would be a great benefit to us.	Encouraging viewers and interlocutors to guess the speaker's answer because of avoiding getting a negative effect to a sensitive issue
Data 6	CLINTON: ... that the Russians have engaged in cyberattacks against the United States of America, that you encouraged espionage against our people, that you are willing to .... We have 17 -- 17 intelligence agencies, civilian and military, who have all concluded that these espionage attacks......	Beating the rival's direct statement that had attacked the speaker's personal credibility
Data 7	CLINTON: We're going to pull the country together. We're going to have trade agreements that we enforce. That's why I'm going to have a trade prosecutor for the first time in history. And we're going to enforce those agreements, and we're going to look for businesses to help us by buying American products.	Introducing the speaker's exploration for a future program that could increase the speaker's personal credibility
Data 8	CLINTON: But I think it's really an important issue. He raised the 30 years of experience, so let me just talk briefly about that. You know, back in the 1970s, I worked for the Children's Defense Fund. And I was taking on ..... from his father to start his businesses.	Decreasing the debate rival's credibility by describing the rival's past history
Data 9	CLINTON: He went after Mr. and Mrs. Khan, the parents of a young man who died serving our country, a Gold Star family, because ......This is a pattern, a pattern of divisiveness, of a very dark and in many ways dangerous vision of our country, where he incites violence, where he applauds people who are pushing and pulling and punching at his rallies. That is not who America is.	Proposing an indirect conclusion that increases the speaker's credibility and decreases the debate rival's credibility

The question of the Supreme Court for the next quarter of a century was answered broadly in data 1. Clinton explains some examples of previous or past pearls of wisdom that are relevant to the question. One center of the irrelevant

answer is about the proposition of "stand up for women's and LGBT community's rights". The benefit of the irrelevant answer is to increase the self-positive impression of giving deep caring to a group of persons that are generally underestimated. In addition, one interesting thing is that Clinton did not state her support for the existence of the society based on a personal perspective but a legal perspective. It has another benefit: saving her credibility in front of a particular society that contradicts the previous society. A study found that "avoiding disagreement" is one of the politeness strategies to face the threatening context of a discourse (Dowlatabadi et al., 2014). Saving a personal positive impression or image is an important benefit of giving an irrelevant answer to a sensitive issue or material. In this case, their position of Clinton was a success, not bringing the exploration of her response to be a "boomerang" that could be against herself. She places it in proper quantity. The amount of information must have something to do with a particular context; that's why an irrelevant utterance participates in inferring the intended meaning in certain conversations (Betti & Yaseen, 2020). The quantity of irrelevant information must be considered to construct an effective and efficient intended meaning. She did not develop it in a broader area that could invite another question or further social questions. Flouting relevance maxim indicates a shift in conversation topic (Betti & Yaseen, 2020). In addition, maxims of the cooperative principle could generate inferences of semantic meaning, meaning when one violated maxim often adds an additional implicit force to an utterance (Felemban, 2011). A speaker who would like to flout or violate one maxim should consider the possibility of another maxim violation. This study also concludes that the use of irrelevant answers to develop the main answer needs deep spontaneous consideration. Moreover, if it applies a certain uncommon group of persons as the object, the speaker will have to consider the social impact for a long time. The speaker only gets a few seconds to think on the longitudinal effects.

The second finding implies the use of irrelevant analogy to avoid giving a direct agreement to a sensitive issue. The sensitive issue of the question is about the personal position on women's right to do an abortion. It is in line with a finding that speakers' flouted maxims could communicate messages to readers through inductive inference (Abualadas, 2020). Clinton follows her rival in a debate who states a "pro-life" perspective. The strategy of seeking agreement could be represented by more than statements whose similar orientations (Dowlatabadi et al., 2014). In this article finding, Clinton avoids giving similar disagreement by stating it as "planned parenthood." The irrelevant answer also is intended to avoid getting a negative perception from society who agree with abortion action for any reason. Avoiding getting further contradictive questions is also the benefit of giving an irrelevant answer to express indirect agreement with the debate rival. The technique is similar to a finding that the sender of information may propose his or her hidden means by using apparent questions (Komorowska, 2020). It is also very interesting that Clinton gave another irrelevant answer simultaneously that follows the abortion issue, which is the cancer screening program for women in the country. The second benefit is giving a positive analogy for the previous irrelevant answer. The analogy is placed as beneficial as the irrelevant previous answer. Both of the irrelevant answers are in a similar scope of health. It is a unique technique because the second answer could be an entry point to change the discussion or question to move to another safer area. Clinton would like to minimize the potential negative movement of the question or discussion. The second irrelevant answer is an alternative way to keep the conduciveness of debate. Clinton did not want the debate to turn into a crucial issue that is not worth enough to be debated.

The irrelevant answer is carried out by giving personal experiences of traveling around the world to compare abortion issues with other countries' governments'' regulations of having an abortion or getting birth in the data 3. The benefit of the irrelevant answer is to close other potential questions that could press

the speaker to a lower position. The irrelevant answer proposes the speaker's plan that is better than other countries' governments' wisdom. At the end of the statement, Clinton states, "And I will stand up for that right, " implying a logical perspective and attitude. Clinton was a success in keeping her position in the debate section and not to get strong pressure. Making hearers turn their attention to a certain topic could be a success if a speaker could share his or her implicature based on a certain background (Al-Shboul, 2022). In addition, it is proven that flouting is an important language aspect of communication that could help hearers to grasp the intended meaning (Al-Shboul, 2022). Comparison among the irrelevant answer implies that positive values can still be gained in the middle of controversy. On the other hand, the key point to get a conducive situation is to manage voice intonation in the middle position. A character does not only need to perform a flouting maxim but also an illocutionary act to avoid getting into conflict (Jiwalno et al., 2020). In this finding, there is no surprise expression for the news. The frequency of giving a speech with political, social, and economic language use represents respect (Porto, 2020). In addition, the comparison also opens the opportunity to end the topic sub-debate or discussion of the controversy itself. Arguing the irrelevant answer in a soft approach is also a main technique to keep the calm position or situation of the debate.

An irrelevant answer also gives benefits to decreasing the debate rival's credibility, especially if the answer is a negative aspect or history of the rival in the data 4. Clinton counters Trump's statement of Clinton's views about the US border with Mexico. Clinton states that Trump benefited from an underpaid undocumented worker who had crossed the border. The statement closes other potential attacks on her perspective about the border and undocumented workers or immigrants. The irrelevant answer increases Clinton's positive values because she explains directly that she is not as bad as her rival's statement. There are eight effects of flouting maxims: annoying, boring, convincing, causing, getting hearers to realize or

do something, insulting, and surprising (Saputri & Sari, 2022). Clinton's counter-attack statement could be described as indirectly surprising to her debate rival. All hearers must not think about it before joining the debate. Moreover, she could prove the opposite condition. Clinton's statement, "He used undocumented labor to build the Trump Tower. He underpaid undocumented workers, and when they complained, he said what a lot of employers do: "You complain, I'll get you deported." that gives a direct justification for her rival's position on the discussion topic. The statement is irrelevant to the question of border security, but it gives a direct negative implication for her rival. The relevance maxim is found to be flouted more than the quantity and quality maxim in politics because it often involves some consideration (Juma'a, 2020). In this research, Clinton also would like to imply an indirect message the debate topic should move to other valuable issues rather than giving negative perspectives to each other. It is similar to a finding that one of the reasons for flouting the maxim is about stating an opinion (Yustika et al., 2022). The position of Trump could be described as a stop to giving defense. Even the host also agreed indirectly to move to other valuable issues rather than continuing to attack personal reputation.

Another irrelevant answer benefit is to ask the audience to guess the truthfulness of the speaker's perspective toward an issue in the data 5. Clinton was asked whether she would like to open the border of the country, and she answered, "You know, we trade more energy with our neighbors than we trade with the rest of the world combined. And I do want us to have an electric grid, an energy system that crosses borders". The answer indicates that she had no certain decision about the issue, but she would like to imply that the situation will determine her action. A figure excited to a certain object could also lead to a flout relevance maxim in Jackie's speech research (Marlisa & Hidayat, 2020). In this case, Clinton flouts the relevance maxim consciously to avoid getting a negative effect. She did not want to speculate about the negative impact of a global issue involving two different

countries. A speaker's politeness, respect, and rudeness could be managed through implicature use (Betti & Khalaf, 2021). Clinton's answer also represents her respect for another country whose border with the USA. The benefit of the irrelevant answer is to indicate that the audience could prove her definite answer in different time. It is not the right time to decide because she was not in charge of making the decision. Flouting maxim is also found to be conducted as the last action because the participants have no sufficient knowledge of the related meaning (Betti & Yaseen, 2020). Another aspect is that Clinton probably would like to avoid getting an audience to construct an opinion of the border that they have insufficient knowledge about. Clinton was very brilliant in softening the situation of the debate for the question. The border issue is crucial because it involves another country's position and wisdom. It could give a longitudinal effect because of the question itself.

The direct irrelevant answer was applied to beat the rival's direct statement that had attacked personal credibility in the data 6. The benefit of the method is to defend personal credibility without leading the audience to believe based on argumentation. Clinton proposes past and future predictions of their country's relationship with Russia for the related issue. The irrelevant answer also implies a serious indirect message that the issue or country's relationship with another big country is not for a game or soft discussion. It should be taken for a special serious discussion rather than placing it in a spontaneous topic. Another benefit of giving a direct irrelevant answer is to give an indirect warning that a topic should be suitable for recent and future country positions. The indirect warning represents how serious the issue is. Fortunately, the debate rival understood the issue directly. The irrelevant answer is also found to be applied to present relaxation situations such as humor (Abed & Jebu, 2022). Flouting relevance maxim cannot be judged to be a negative proposition directly. The interaction shows us the professional debate that senior and wise politicians carry out. A lack of pragmatic competence could cause a

problem in conversation (Betti & Yaseen, 2020). In this research, Clinton and her rival have sufficient knowledge to avoid serious problems by exploring implicit information propositions. The benefit also realizes all speakers with similar responsibilities for the country regardless of their political competition. It is a good example of a limitation of proper action in competition. Not all action could be allowed in political debate.

Giving an irrelevant answer is also found to give the benefit of showing the speaker's exploration of her plans for a further program which also means an effort to increase personal credibility in the data 7. Clinton explains her plan to "look for businesses to help the country by buying American products". The benefit could be managed very well so that it could increase the speaker's credibility. Politicians were also found to flout almost all maxims in an interview session because of not knowing the cooperative maxim proposed by Grice (Hassan, 2022). Applying the principle of maxims and the Manner of flouting the maxim could help speakers to manage a good strategy for giving a public speech. In this research, the answer of Clinton represents her indirect promise for the country's prospects. It is a good example of how to maintain flouting relevant maxims for positive purposes. Clinton is successful in ascertaining her position as the best choice for the audience. She did not discuss previous micro material of economics and marketing, so she arranges her ideas sequentially from the beginning to the end. The question's impact could be managed very well by giving an irrelevant answer. On the other hand, the jumping topic is proposed to be an important strategy to change the topic for a different purpose (Al-Shboul, 2022). In this case, Clinton's action could also be described as applying to change topics conveniently. The audience is placed on waiting for the irrelevant answer rather than the real related answer. It is a good method to construct an interesting approach for students. The application of flouting relevance maxing is possible combined with other types of flouting maxim to construct more efficient communication. Looking for irrelevant answers forces

interlocutors to connect irrelevant implicature and its context (Porto, 2020). The benefit opens a good opportunity to introduce other related ideas for the speakers. In this case, it is proven that an irrelevant answer does not always represent a negative position.

The Irrelevant answer of describing the debate rival's past history gives benefits of decreasing the rival's credibility simultaneously in the data 8. Clinton did it very well when she was asked about her possible negative past experience of "missioned $6 billion in the State Department". Clinton could defend herself with the issue totally by proposing her rival's negative potential on other sides, and she told her past social sacrifice to help children against discrimination. Clinton states, "I worked for the Children's Defense Fund. And I was taking on discrimination against African-American kids in schools. He was getting sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination in his apartment buildings". Her irrelevant answer could explain directly that the issue of the missed fund is not true. Everyone is supposed to be able to check the fact on how to use all materials properly. On the other hand, giving an unrelated question is another technique to set up a situation (Al-Shboul, 2022). Another benefit of the irrelevant answer is to explain a defensive answer that could make viewers understand logical denying. Relevance is a matter of the degree that its application could be very strong and clear or unclear and indirect (Felemban, 2011). In addition, other types of flouting maxims are competitive, collaborative, convivial, and conflictive (Helmie & Lestari, 2019). Defensive denying should be managed carefully before choosing the type of application situation. In addition, the proper method of explaining the irrelevant answer also needs to be accompanied by the chronological occasion as the supporting points of the truthfulness of the irrelevant answer. Clinton was a success in defense of her credibility for a sensitive issue that could attack her.

The last benefit of giving an irrelevant answer is to propose an indirect conclusion that could defend the speaker's credibility and decrease the rival's

credibility in the data 9. There are three main points of information in the finding. The first is Trump, who explained Clinton's negative actions in the past that could probably encourage her to be a law violator. The second point is Clinton's direct denying by explaining Trump's past experience to a certain subject that allows the audience to check its truthfulness. The last point is an irrelevant answer to explaining the sacrifices of three figures, namely Mr. and Mrs. Khan and John McCain. She proposes those three figures' sacrifices as a comparison of her effort for country and society. It is a good method of proposing indirect analogy based on popular persons' empiric stories. Maintaining flouting maxim positively could be categorized as applying positive politeness (Al-Shboul, 2022). Defending credibility should be carried out without applying a negative statement. In addition, a speaker may flout a maxim for a certain reason that is expected to happen smoothly (Marlisa & Hidayat, 2020). In this finding, Clinton also would like to realize audience that sacrifice for the country is more important than the status and position of the winner of the debate or election. The closing statement, "And I hope that as we move in the last weeks of this campaign, more and more people will understand what's at stake in this election. Claiming common ground is another way to seek agreement (Dowlatabadi et al., 2014). It does come down to what kind of country we are going to have is also parallel with the implied meaning of the irrelevant answer. It is an emphasis on the previously implied meaning of the irrelevant answer.

CONCLUSION

The benefits of flouting the relevance maxim do not always reflect negative implications. Its usage could be prepared to be a strategy to get certain successful results in social communication. Although the condition of both casual and formal conversation cannot be ensured perfectly, speakers could identify their interlocutor candidates' background and their potential questions. Giving irrelevant answers must still be proposed in the logical border because it still makes sense with the supporting variables of social communication. The positive impacts of flouting the

relevance maxim can be gained by preparing and considering the context of use. It means the flouting relevance maxim is supposed to be carried out consciously. Speakers should understand and recognize who their interlocutors are and the context of the conversation. Effective and efficient flouting relevance maxims also sometimes involve other types of flouting maxims to gain a positive impact. Flouting the relevance maxim could involve the quality maxim to maximize another topic value proposition. The positive impact of flouting the relevance maxim needs to place in a proper situation because both speakers and hearers would like to get a similar position in social interaction. One essential benefit of flouting the relevance maxim is avoiding social conflicts and fluctuation for a sensitive issue or question by flouting the relevance maxim in a debate or social conversation.

REFERENCES

Abed, A. K., & Jebu, H. N. (2022). Flouting Grice's maxims in some selected clean jokes: A pragmatic study. *Lark Journal*, *47*(4), 1060–1075. https://doi.org/10.31185

Abualadas, O. A. (2020). Conversational maxims in fiction translation: New insights into cooperation, characterization, and style. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *9*(3), 637–645. https://doi.org/10.17509/ ijal.v 9i3.23214

Al-Shboul, O. K. (2022). Flouting of Grice's maxims by Jordanian speakers in everyday communication. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *18*(Special Issue 1), 229–239. https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/3439

Bahrami, A. (1999). *A dictionary of discourse analysis*. Rahnama.

Betti, M. J., & Khalaf, N. S. (2021). A pragma-stylistic study of implicature in Shakespeare's hamlet and twelfth night. *International Linguistics Research*, *4*(3), 12–31. https://doi.org/10.30560/ilr.v4n3p12

Betti, M. J., & Yaseen, K. S. (2020). The Iraqi EFL learners' use of conversational

maxims at the university level. *Education, Language and Sociology Research*, *1*(1), 43–60. https://doi.org/10.22158/elsr.v1n1p43

Birner, B. (2013). *Introduction to pragmatics*. Wiley Blackwell.

Dowlatabadi, H., Mehri, E., & Tajabadi, A. (2014). Politeness strategies in conversation exchange: The case of council for dispute settlement in Iran. In U. University (Ed.), *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 98, pp. 411–419). Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.434

Felemban, F. H. (2011). A new method of teaching drama: The pragmatic approach. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *15*, 2982–2988. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.227

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In A. P. Martinich (Ed.), *Philosophy of Language* (pp. 165–175). Oxford University Press.

Hassan, J. S. (2022). Pragmatic study of non-observance maxims in selected political speeches. *Journal of Language Studies*, *5*(2), 38–48. http://jls.tu.edu.iq

Helmie, J., & Lestari, N. G. (2019). An analysis of flouting maxims in conversation speaking of the main character in the movie of home alone 2 "lost in New York" by John Hughes. *Journal of English Pedagogy, Linguistics, Literature, and Teaching*, *7*(1), 1–11. https://jurnal.unsur.ac.id/jeopallt

Hossain, M. M. (2021). The application of Grice maxims in conversation: A pragmatic study. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *3*(10), 32–40. https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.10.4

Jiwalno, Valiantien, N. M., & Setyowati, R. (2020). Flouting maxims performed by the characters in Jackie movie: A pragmatics analysis. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, Dan Budaya*, *4*(1), 173–187. https://e-journals.unmul.ac.id/index.php/jbssb

Juma'a, T. R. (2020). Flouting Grice's cooperative principle in a political interview (Trump's interview with time on 2020). *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology*, *17*(5), 1403–1413. https://archives.palarch.nl/index.php/jae/article/view/6898

Komorowska, E. (2020). Language communication in a pragmatic perspective: Flouting the cooperative principle. *Beyond Philology*, *17*(2), 27–49. https://doi.org/10.26881/bp.2020.2.02

Kreidler, C. W. (1998). *Introducing English semantics*. Routledge.

Marlisa, R., & Hidayat, D. N. (2020). The analysis of flouting maxim in Good Morning America (GMA) talkshow. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, *7*(2), 132–142. https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v7i2.6630

Porto, M. D. (2020). Flouting the Gricean maxims in satire. *Arts, Humanities, and Social Science Open*, *11*(2), 58–64. humanitiesopen.com

Saputri, A. F., & Sari, P. (2022). Flouting maxims in the movie "zootopia" 2016: Pragmatics Study. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, *5*(2), 13496–13507. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i2.5206

Tajabadi, A., Dowlatabadi, H., & Mehri, E. (2014). Grice's cooperative maxims in oral arguments: The case of dispute settlement councils in Iran. In U. University (Ed.), *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 98, pp. 1859 – 1865). Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.616

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Routledge.

Yadav, D. (2022). Criteria for good qualitative research: A comprehensive review. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *31*(6), 679–689. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-021-00619-0

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Yustika, L. S., Setiawan, S., & Retnaningdyah, P. (2022). Flouting maxim in "the hundred-foot journey movie": An opportunity to improve students' intercultural literacy. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, *04*(02), 137–151. https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v4i2.137-151