

Flouting Maxims Found in Children Novel

Gusti Ayu Ketut Pradnyawati^{a,1}, Made Susini^{b,2*}, Kuntayuni^{c,3}

^{a,b,c} Universitas Warmadewa, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia

¹Pradnyaayu70@gmail.com; ²madesusini@yahoo.com*; ³kuntayuni@warmadewa.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 24/4/2026

Revised: 14/6/2026

Accepted: 15/6/2026

Keywords:

Flouting maxim;
Cooperative principle;
speech act;
dialogues.

ABSTRACT

This study is aimed at analyzing flouting maxims in the novel *The Christmas Pig* by J.K. Rowling. It focuses on identifying their types based on Grice's Cooperative Principle and their functions based on Searle's speech act theory. This research employs a descriptive qualitative method. The data are in the form of dialogues that contain flouting maxims found in the novel. The findings reveal that all types of flouting maxims are found in the novel. They include maxim of quality, quantity, relation, and manner. In terms of the functions, the flouting maxims found show four speech act categories, namely assertive, directive, commissive, and expressive. Declarative function is not found in the data, indicating that flouting maxims in this novel are not used to create direct changes in social or institutional contexts.

I. Introduction

A conversation is a form of verbal communication between two or more people, where participants exchange information, ideas, thoughts, or feelings in a back-and-forth manner. A conversation between individuals or groups is based on communication, which requires certain rules to ensure it runs smoothly. According to [1], maxims of conversation are of four principles and a maxim is a simple rule or statement that helps maintain clear and cooperative interaction. The four principles include maxim of quality, quantity, relation, and manner. However, not all conversations follow these rules. Sometimes the speaker intentionally violates a maxim to convey a hidden message, which is known as a flouting maxim [2]. In this situation, the listener is expected to understand the real meaning through context or implication. This often happens in real life as well as in literary works like comics and novels. Why someone violates a maxim in his or her conversation depends on his or her purpose because every utterance implies a purpose. For instance, someone may use impoliteness strategy to emphasize power [3] and [4] has investigated how impoliteness works within a play.

The flouting maxims include maxims of quality, quantity, relation, and manner [1]. Flouting maxim of quality occurs when a speaker deliberately provides information that is literally untrue to convey an implied meaning that can be understood by the listener based on the context of the conversation. This flouting maxim often appears in the form of irony, sarcasm, hyperbole, or statements that contradict facts. Flouting the maxim of quality can function as expressive (to convey emotions such as sarcasm), directive (to prompt the listener to understand the hidden meaning), or representative (to state something indirectly). Maxim of quantity requires speakers to provide information that is sufficient, neither too little nor too much, while avoiding unnecessary details in the context of the conversation. However, in flouting the maxim, the speaker deliberately violates this rule to convey a message indirectly. Flouting maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker intentionally provides either too much or too little information compared to what is required in the conversation. This violation is done consciously to create an implicature, allowing the listener to infer additional meaning beyond what is explicitly stated. Flouting the maxim of relation occurs when a speaker deliberately provides information that appears irrelevant to the topic of conversation but actually contains an implied meaning (implicature) that the listener must interpret. According to the theory of the Cooperative Principle, the maxim of relation requires speakers to contribute relevant information to the conversation. However, when a speaker flouts this maxim, they are actually trying to communicate something indirectly by prompting the listener to find a hidden connection between their

statement and the conversational context. Flouting the maxim of manner occurs when a speaker deliberately uses unclear, wordy, or ambiguous language to convey an implicit meaning (implicature) to the listener. Maxim of manner requires speakers to communicate in a clear, structured, and unambiguous way so that the message can be easily understood. However, in flouting, the speaker intentionally breaks this rule, not due to a lack of communication skills, but to convey something indirectly. Violating the maxim of manner often occurs in sarcasm, metaphors, humor, or responses that avoid direct clarity.

Flouting maxims have become researchers' concern. Several studies investigated flouting maxims in movies. Flouting maxim in the fantasy film *Onward* was carried out by [5]. The title of the study is "The Types of Flouting Maxims Found in the *Onward* Movie". Applying [6] Cooperative Principles theory to analyze types of maxims flouting and Leech's theory [7] to understand the reasons behind it, the study found that all four kinds of maxims: quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, were flouted by the characters, with relevance being the most dominant (40%). The reasons for flouting maxims in the film fall into four categories according to Leech: collaborative, competitive, convivial, and conflictive, with collaborative being the most frequent. This flouting serves to convey meaning more subtly, avoiding offense to the listener. Other researchers who also worked on flouting maxims in movie include [8], [9], and [10].

The next study focusing on flouting maxims in the talk show "The Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Good Morning America (GMA) Talk show" was investigated by [11]. Using Grice's Cooperative Principles [4] as its main framework, the study aims to identify types of maxims flouting and the reasons behind them. It concludes that the reasons for flouting maxims are to create a more relaxed and entertaining conversation, enrich the information shared, and add humor. Since flouting maxims deal with communication, several studies also examined flouting maxims in general communication such as in classroom interaction [12] and everyday communication [13].

The previous studies show that the data are taken from sources with different characteristics such as movie, talk show, classroom interaction, and everyday communication. The data source of this present study is a novel with a specific genre, that is children novel. In terms of the language used in communicating with children and how children communicate to express meaning through dialogues, children novel has specific characteristics. Besides, studies on flouting maxims in children literature are limited, especially those focusing on the implicit meaning implications within these violations. Therefore, this research is expected to contribute to the field of pragmatics by expanding knowledge, particularly in the analysis of flouting maxim functions in children novel. This study not only provides insight into the application of flouting maxims but also offers a deeper understanding of their role in shaping interactions and meaning within children literature. Thus, this research can serve as a reference for pragmatic studies, especially in understanding how flouting maxims contribute to character development, plot progression, and the dynamics of communication between characters in children novel. Deploying Gricean Cooperative Principles, this study is aimed at identifying the types of flouting maxims found in the novel *The Christmas Pig* and their functions based on Searle's speech act theory.

II. Method

This study employs a qualitative method focused on data collection to analyze the types of flouting maxims and their functions in the dialogues of *The Christmas Pig* by [14]. According to [15], qualitative research gathers data through interviews, observations, as well as documents or other artifacts, emphasizing rich, context-driven data to identify patterns, themes, or categories. This method was chosen because the study aims to examine how flouting maxims occur in the novel's dialogues and what functions they serve in communication. The primary data source is the English children's novel *The Christmas Pig*, as it contains various conversational exchanges that reflect flouting maxims based on Grice's Cooperative Principle. The novel was selected due to its relevance to the research objectives, providing sufficient data for identifying instances where characters deliberately flout maxims for pragmatic effects.

The data of this research are in the form of dialogues. The dialogues selected are those which exhibit flouting maxims such as maxim of quality, quantity, relation, and manner. The dialogues must express how characters in the novel violate conversational maxims and the underlying pragmatic functions behind these violations. The data were collected through document observation. Firstly, the

novel was read carefully. Secondly, instances of flouting maxims of the dialogues were identified using note-taking method. Lastly, the occurrences of the flouting maxims were then categorized based on Grice's maxim theory to classify the types of maxims flouted and Searle's speech act theory to identify the communicative intent behind it. The collected data were analyzed using Grice's theory of maxims [1] and Searle's classification of speech acts [16], ensuring that each flouting maxim was examined in relation to its role in character interaction, humor, emphasis, persuasion, or emotional expression.

III. Results and Discussion

Based on the data collected, it is found that all four types of flouting maxims proposed by [6] appear in *The Christmas Pig*. The types include flouting maxim of quality, quantity, relation, and manner. The following analysis describes how each type of flouting maxim is utilized in the novel's dialogues, along with supporting examples. This explanation includes the original dialogue, the identified flouting maxim, and the reasoning behind its use in character interactions and narrative development. Additionally, the discussion explores the speech act functions associated with these maxims, highlighting how they contribute to expressing emotions, sarcasm, and character beliefs throughout the novel.

A. Flouting Maxim of Quality

The followings are the data found in the novel's dialogues which flout the maxim of quality.

Datum 1.

Jack : "But will I have to leave the school?"
Mum : "Yes, but there's a school very near our new house. I know you'll love it!" [14].

Based on the dialogue between Mum and Jack, Mum flouts the maxim of quality because she does not have concrete evidence that Jack will like his new school. She is merely assuming and trying to reassure Jack with something that is not necessarily true. The maxim of quality requires the speaker to say something truthful and supported by sufficient evidence. However, in this context, even though Mum does not literally state something that is proven, Jack can understand that his mother is trying to reassure him. By saying, "I know you'll love it," she intends to build optimism in Jack so that he becomes more open to his new school.

According to Searle's speech act theory [16], Mum's utterance is classified as a directive speech act because it aims to persuade Jack to accept his new school. Directives are used to influence the actions or thoughts of the listener, whether in the form of commands, invitations, or persuasion. In this context, Mum does not directly command Jack but uses subtle persuasion through a positive assumption. The statement "I know you'll love it" can be interpreted as an attempt to encourage Jack to be more open to the idea of changing schools. This is a way of reassuring someone indirectly without giving an explicit command. Mum's utterance is intended to guide and convince Jack to accept his new school, using positive assumptions as a form of persuasion.

Datum 2.

Comb : "Oh no—oh no—the shame of it! We're disposable?!".
Scissors : "Not complaining, are you? Because at least you're getting a roof over your head.

There's plenty that don't. If you'd rather be Surplus, it could be arranged!" [14].

Based on the conversation between Comb and Scissors, Scissors performs flouting maxim of quality. According to Grice's theory [1], the maxim of quality requires the speaker to say something true and supported by sufficient evidence. However, in the sentence "If you'd rather be Surplus, it could be arranged!", Scissors sarcastically states something that is not literally true. This sentence is not a statement of fact but rather a sarcastic remark meant to imply that Comb should be more grateful for his situation. Sarcasm often involves flouting maxim of quality because the literal statement is not meant to be believed. In the sentence "Not complaining, are you?", Scissor asks a sarcastic question, even though he actually knows that Comb is complaining. By using sarcasm, Scissors intentionally flouts the maxim of quality to convey the implied meaning that Comb's situation is not as bad as he complains, as there are others who are worse off. The function of this flouting maxim is expressive.

Referring to Searle's speech act theory [16], expressive function is used to convey the speaker's feelings, emotions, or attitudes toward something. In this conversation, Scissors uses sarcasm to express dissatisfaction or annoyance toward Comb's attitude. Scissors not only provides information about other objects that are worse off than Comb but also expresses emotions in the form of sarcasm and dissatisfaction. If Scissors only intended to provide information, he could have said, "Your situation isn't that bad," but he chose a more expressive and sarcastic approach by saying, "If you'd rather be Surplus, it could be arranged!" This sarcastic tone indicates that Scissors might feel annoyed or frustrated by Comb's excessive complaining.

Datum 3.

Sheriff Specs : "That wasn't kind, Scissors."
Scissors : "Kind? It's the truth. Things need to know their place. That's how we all stay out of trouble" [14].

Based on the conversation between Scissors and Sheriff Specs, Scissors flouts the maxim of quality. The flouting of the maxim appears when Scissors responds, "Kind? It's the truth. Things need to know their place. That's how we all stay out of trouble." Scissors maintains his assumption as the truth, even though he lacks strong evidence to support it. The statement "Things need to know their place." is also a subjective opinion rather than a concrete fact, further reinforcing the flouting of the maxim of quality. Additionally, in this statement, Scissors implies that old items should accept that they will be replaced by new ones. This suggests how Scissors views the world, without considering the emotions or hopes of other objects.

The function of the flouting maxim above is assertive. According to Searle's theory [16], assertive speech acts are used to state something that the speaker believes to be true. Scissors is not merely expressing feelings but claiming something as a fact that old items will indeed be forgotten and that kindness is irrelevant in this situation. By saying "It's the truth," Scissors tries to justify his cynical attitude as if it were the truth.

Datum 4.

Penknife : "Haven't you heard? Seems there's a Thing down here that shouldn't be in the Land of the Lost at all."
Sheriff Specs: "Shiver my screws, you don't say? [14].

In this conversation, Specs flouts the maxim of quality by using hyperbolic expressions and idiomatic phrases. In English, "Shiver my screws" is an idiomatic expression that cannot be interpreted literally, as Sheriff Specs is not actually experiencing vibrations in his screws. Instead, this phrase is a form of hyperbole used to express surprise. Additionally, "you don't say?" is an expression commonly used ironically or sarcastically. Pragmatically, the speaker is not genuinely asking a question, but rather expressing their feelings.

The function of the flouting maxim above is expressive. Specs is flouting the maxim of quality by using hyperbole. Based on Searle's theory [16], expressive speech acts are used to communicate the speaker's feelings, emotions, or attitudes toward something. He expresses surprise in an exaggerated manner, both in the source language (SL) and the target language (TL), to convey his emotional reaction to Penknife's statement. The use of hyperbole in "Shiver my screws" and the idiom "you don't say?" emphasizes that his main intention is not to provide new information, but rather to dramatically express his astonishment.

B. Flouting Maxim of Quantity

The data found in the novel's dialogues that flout the maxim of quantity are as the followings.

Datum 5.

Jack : "But how will we find our way without Compass?"
CP : "I don't know yet, but we'll think of something"[14].

In the conversation, CP flouts the maxim of quantity by providing less information than Jack expects. Jack asks for a clear explanation of how they will navigate without a compass in a snowstorm, but CP simply responds that he doesn't know yet, without offering a concrete solution. However, he maintains hope by adding, "we'll think of something," implying they will find a way despite the

uncertainty. This deliberate withholding of information classifies the utterance as a commissive speech act, as CP's statement not only acknowledges his uncertainty but also serves as a commitment to finding a solution. The phrase suggests a promise to act in the future, reinforcing the commissive function, even though CP lacks a clear plan at the moment.

Datum 6.

Jack : "Why she hates you?"
Poem : "She's very mean and underhand, "I'm not scared to say so, so I'm banned [14].

In the conversation above, Poem flouts the maxim of quantity because she provides more information than needed to answer Jack's question. Jack only asks why Addie hates her, which could have been sufficiently answered with "She's very mean and underhand." However, Poem adds extra information: "I'm not scared to say so, so I'm banned.", which is not directly related to Jack's question. This additional information indicates that Poem is not only explaining the reason for Addie's hatred but also highlighting the consequences she faces for speaking out. Thus, she does not merely answer Jack's question but also expresses her sense of injustice, making it clear that she is flouting the maxim of quantity.

The function of this flouting maxim is expressive because Poem is not just sharing information, she is also expressing her emotions about how she has been treated. Expressive speech acts are used to show feelings, emotions, or attitudes. In this conversation, when Poem says, "I'm not scared to say so, so I'm banned," she feels herself as a victim whose voice has been silenced. At the same time, she makes it clear that she is not afraid and is willing to speak up, even if it means being excluded or rejected.

Datum 7.

Jack : "Will Holly be my sister?"
Mum : "Your stepsister. You like Holly, don't you?" [14].

Based on the conversation between Jack and Mum above, Mum flouts the maxim of quantity. This is because, according to Grice's theory [1], the maxim of quantity requires speakers to provide just the right amount of information, not more and not less than what is needed in the conversation. In this context, Jack only asks, "Will Holly be my sister?", which could be answered with a simple "Yes" or "No." However, Mum does not just give a direct answer but also adds extra details by saying, "Your stepsister." This information emphasizes that Holly is not his biological sister but rather his stepsister. Additionally, Mum adds a persuasive statement: "You like Holly, don't you?" This is not a direct answer to Jack's question but rather a form of persuasion. By providing more information than required, Mum deliberately flouts the maxim of quantity to convey a certain implicature to Jack, guiding him to think positively about the situation. By saying, "You like Holly, don't you?", Mum attempts to build Jack's emotional acceptance of Holly as his stepsister.

The function of Mum's flouting maxim is directive. According to [16], directive speech acts are used to influence or guide the listener's actions. The phrase "You like Holly, don't you?" uttered by Mum is not just an ordinary statement but also a form of persuasion. Mum does not merely provide information but also subtly guides Jack's feelings to help him accept Holly as part of their family. Although this is not a direct command, it still serves as a gentle way to influence Jack's emotional response to their new situation.

Datum 8.

Sheriff Specs: "All righty, I'll take these folks inside and give 'em the introduction. Have a shot of lubricant before you head off, Scissors?"
Scissors : "No time." [14].

In the conversation above, Scissors flouts the maxim of quantity. According to [6], flouting the maxim of quantity happens when a speaker provides either too much or too little information compared to what is needed in the conversation. Here, Sheriff Specs offers something to Scissors by saying, "Have a shot of lubricant before you head off, Scissors?" However, Scissors only responds with "No time" without giving any further explanation. His answer is too brief and lacks enough information, it does not clarify why he has no time. Is he in a hurry? Does he have an important task? Or is there another reason? Scissors could have given a more complete response, such as "I don't have

time, I need to do something else,” but he deliberately keeps his answer very short, leaving the listener to figure out the reason on their own. Since he provides less information than expected, this is considered as flouting maxim of quantity.

The speech act function in this conversation is categorized as an assertive. This is because Scissors’ response implicitly contains information. According to Searle’s theory, an assertive speech act is used to inform, report, explain, and state facts. By simply saying “No time,” Scissors wants to inform that he will not accept the lubricant being offered because he has no time.

C. *Flouting Maxim of Relation*

Positioning Some data found in the novel's dialogues which show flouting maxim of relation are elaborated in the followings.

Datum 9.

Holly : “How—how did you know that? I haven’t told anyone!”
Jack : “You find things out, in the Land of the Lost.” [14].

In the conversation between Jack and Holly, Jack flouts the maxim of relation. This occurs because Jack deliberately provides an answer that is not directly relevant to Holly’s question. In this context, Holly asks in surprise, “How—how did you know that? I haven’t told anyone!” This question demands a concrete answer about how Jack discovers Holly’s feelings that she no longer enjoys gymnastics and prefers music. However, instead of giving a clear explanation, Jack simply responds, “You find things out, in the Land of the Lost.” This answer does not directly explain how Jack knows Holly’s feelings but still provides an implicit clue that the Land of the Lost has its own way of revealing secrets. If Jack had wanted to answer Holly’s question directly, he should have given a specific explanation, such as saying that he observed her expressions, overheard something, or possessed a special ability in the Land of the Lost. However, because Jack chooses to remain ambiguous and does not explicitly provide relevant information, he intentionally flouts the maxim of relation and creates an implicature that the Land of the Lost has a mysterious power that allows people to uncover unspoken truths. Thus, this conversation serves as an example of flouting maxim of relation, where Jack gives a response that is not directly relevant to the question but still carries a hidden meaning that can be interpreted by Holly and the listeners.

The function of flouting maxim of relation in this conversation is assertive. Jack’s response does not explicitly answer Holly’s question but still conveys interpretable information. He does not provide a concrete explanation of how he knows Holly’s feelings, but by saying “You find things out, in the Land of the Lost.”, he asserts that something in the Land of the Lost enables people to uncover certain things. The function of Jack’s flouting maxim can be classified as assertive because assertive speech acts are used when someone states something as a truth or belief. Jack does not issue a command, make a promise, or express strong emotions; rather, he presents a fact about how knowledge is acquired in the Land of the Lost. In other words, Jack is asserting the phenomenon of discovery in the Land of the Lost as something real, even though he does not explain how it happens.

Datum 10.

Jack : “Why are they treating him like that? Is it because he’s dirty?”
CP : “Never mind the bunny, this is your chance, Jack. Crawl!” [14].

In the conversation between Jack and CP, CP flouts the maxim of relation by deliberately providing a response that does not directly answer Jack’s question. Jack asks, “Why are they treating him like that? Is it because he’s dirty?”, which should ideally be answered with relevant information about the rabbit’s treatment. However, CP ignores the question and instead says, “Never mind the bunny. This is your chance, Jack. Crawl.” Rather than explaining the reason of the rabbit’s treatment, CP shifts Jack’s focus to a more urgent situation, the opportunity to escape. While CP’s response seems irrelevant to the initial question, it carries an implicit meaning. He wants to emphasize that discussing the rabbit is unimportant at that moment and that Jack should seize the chance to act.

From the perspective of speech act theory by Searle, CP’s response falls into directive category because he directly instructs and urges Jack to crawl. Directive speech acts are used when a speaker wants to persuade, command, or direct the listener to take action. In this case, CP firmly tells Jack to stop focusing on the rabbit and start moving immediately. The flouting maxim of relation in this

conversation serves to redirect Jack's attention from an irrelevant question during a critical moment while encouraging him to take action.

Datum 11.

Jack : "You can talk?!"

CP : "Clever, aren't you?" [14].

In the conversation between Jack and CP, CP flouts the maxim of relation by giving a response that is not directly relevant to Jack's question. In the dialogue, Jack expresses his surprise by asking, "You can talk?!", which implicitly asks for an explanation of how CP is able to speak. However, instead of giving a relevant answer, CP responds with a sarcastic remark, "Clever, aren't you?". This response does not directly address Jack's question but instead mocks his delayed realization. According to [6] on flouting the maxim of relation, speakers sometimes deliberately give an irrelevant response to imply a hidden meaning. In this case, CP is implying that Jack should have already figured out that he can talk, making the question unnecessary.

From the perspective of speech act function, this conversation falls under expressive function, based on Searle's theory [16], because CP's response reveals his emotions and attitude toward the situation. By replying sarcastically, CP expresses a sense of mockery, showing a mix of confidence and mild annoyance at Jack's slow realization.

Datum 12.

Jack : "You aren't going to give us to the Loser, are you?"

Poem : "What kind of traitor do you take me for?"

You needed help, so I opened my door!" [14].

In the conversation between Jack and Poem, Poem flouts the maxim of relation. It is because Poem does not answer Jack's question directly but instead responds with a rhetorical question and a statement that seems irrelevant. According to [6], the maxim of relation requires speakers to provide relevant answers. However, in flouting the maxim of relation, the speaker intentionally gives information that appears unrelated but actually contains an implied meaning that the listener can interpret. In this conversation, Jack directly asks, "You aren't going to give us to the Loser, are you?", which could have been answered with a simple "yes" or "no." However, Poem chooses to respond with, "What kind of traitor do you take me for? You needed help, so I opened my door!" Poem's response does not explicitly answer Jack's question but indirectly suggests that they had no intention of betraying them. Poem's response is categorized as flouting maxim of relation for several reasons. First, Poem does not answer Jack's question directly and instead shifts her response to a rhetorical question. Second, even though Poem's answer is not explicit, its meaning is still understandable to Jack, who can infer that Poem feels offended by his accusation and has no plans to betray them. Third, [6] states that flouting maxim of relation often appears in the form of sarcasm, irony, or rhetorical questions. In this case, Poem uses a rhetorical question to indirectly express her disagreement, requiring the listener to interpret the implied meaning in her response.

In terms of function, Poem's response falls into expressive category according to Searle's speech act theory. Her statement is not merely intended to convey facts but also to express her feelings, particularly offense, anger, and disappointment toward Jack's question. If her main goal were simply to provide information, she could have answered straightforwardly, such as "No, I will not turn you in." However, she chooses to respond with a rhetorical question "What kind of traitor do you take me for?" and reinforces her past actions "You needed help, so I opened my door!". This choice of words indicates that Poem feels doubted, and through her statement, she wants to assert that she has helped them without any intention of betrayal. In other words, her response is not just a logical answer, but also a reflection of her emotions. The use of a rhetorical question and emphasis on her past actions makes her response more than just informative, she wants Jack to understand how unfair his accusation is. Therefore, Poem's response can be classified as an expressive speech act, as it does not only convey facts but also contains a strong emotional expression.

D. Flouting Maxim of Manner

Flouting maxim of manner is also found in the dialogues in the film. The following is the datum found.

Datum 13.

Mum: "I'm so sorry about DP, Grandpa told me what happened. When I didn't find you in bed, I thought you might have sneaked out to try and find him and I—".

Jack: "I did go to look for DP! And I was just nearly eaten by the Loser, and I escaped, I don't know how—oh! That's how! Santa said he might be able to help me later! He knocked the angel loose!"

Mum: "What?" [14].

In this conversation, Jack flouts the maxim of manner because he delivers information in a disorganized and confusing way. Initially, Mum starts apologizing and explaining DP based on Grandpa's story, but Jack interrupts with a messy and unstructured explanation. He talks about his journey to find DP, nearly getting eaten by The Loser, escaping in an unclear way, and finally mentioning that Santa might have helped him by 'knocking down an angel.' According to [1], flouting maxim of manner happens when someone provides information in a disorganized, ambiguous, or overly complex way, making it difficult for the listener to understand. In this case, even though Jack is trying to explain his experience, his chaotic and unstructured storytelling makes it hard for Mum to follow, as shown by her reaction, "What?". Therefore, Jack flouts the maxim of manner because his explanation is unclear, making it difficult to understand, even though it still conveys facts and experiences.

According to [16], flouting maxim of manner in this case serves an assertive (representative) function, as Jack is stating something that he believes to be true, such as the fact that he was almost eaten by The Loser, he successfully escaped, and Santa might help him. However, his hurried and unstructured speech also reflects his panic and shock. This maxim flouting does not only convey information but also reveals Jack's emotional state in a stressful situation. By speaking rapidly and jumping between ideas, he indirectly shows how intense and overwhelming his experience was, making it difficult for him to structure his words clearly. In this case, flouting the maxim of manner helps readers or listeners understand the emotion of Jack, that he is in panic. This then has the implication that disorganized utterance can indicate the speaker's uncomfortable feeling.

IV. Conclusion

This study analyzed how flouting maxims appear in *The Christmas Pig* by [14] and their functions. The results show that all four types of flouting maxim, as defined by [1] namely quality, quantity, relation, and manner are found in the novel. These maxims are not violated to deceive but rather to create implicatures that add depth to the dialogue, aligning with Grice's theory. By flouting maxims, characters enhance humor, develop personalities, and add emotional layers, making their conversations feel more natural and engaging.

From the perspective of speech act functions, this study identifies directive, assertive, expressive, and commissive functions, based on [16]. However, declarative function is not found in the dialogues, meaning that none of the characters violates the maxim for formal declarations or official statements. These findings emphasize how flouting maxims serve different communicative purposes, such as persuasion, emotional expression, and character interaction, reinforcing their importance in both pragmatics and literary storytelling.

While acknowledging its limitations, this study aims to contribute to the understanding of flouting maxims in children literature, highlighting that all types of maxims are possibly to be flouted in expressing meaning through dialogues in children literary work. By this study it is recommended that future research explores flouting maxims statistically to examine the tendencies of the contexts which influence the maxims flouted by the speakers. The theory recommended is the one which puts language in context such as [17]. Future research on flouting maxim combined with translation theory such as [18] is also an interesting room for further interpretations.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank the Rector of Universitas Warmadewa and the lecturers at English Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Warmadewa for their academic support.

References

- [1] P. Grice, *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.

- [2] J. Cutting, *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- [3] T. S. Santoso and H. M. Tedjaatmadja, "Impoliteness Strategies Used by Sylvie Grateau Toward Emily Cooper in Emily in Paris Season One," *K@ta Kita*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 329–335, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.9744/katakita.10.2.329-335.
- [4] Ö. Şekerçi, "CULPEPER'S IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES IN NEIL SIMON'S BILOXI BLUES," *Balt. J. English Lang. Lit. Cult.*, vol. 13, pp. 125–141, May 2023, doi: 10.22364/BJELLC.13.2023.09.
- [5] N. K. Ardianti, I. G. K. V. W. Putri, and I. D. A. D. M. Santika, "Types of Flouting Maxims Found in the Onward Movie," *Elysian J.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 107–116, 2022.
- [6] H. P. Grice, *Logic and Conversation [In: Syntax and Semantics, Vo.3, Speech Act, ed. By Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan*. New York: Academic Press, 1975.
- [7] G. N. Leech, *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman, Inc., 1983.
- [8] D. P. B. Simarmata, T. L.A., S. Prasetyo, and D. A. Pratama, "Flouting Maxims in Inside Out 2 Movie," *Linguist. J. Bhs. Sastra*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 7–19, 2026, doi: <https://doi.org/10.31604/linguistik.v11i1>.
- [9] M. Wahyuni, M. B. Arifin, and I. S. Lubis, "Analysis of Flouting Maxims Done by Main Characters in La La Land Movie," *Ilmu Budaya J. Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 384–392, 2019.
- [10] N. L. M. U. Arundati, N. W. Suastini, and I. G. A. V. W. Putri, "The Flouting Maxims in Alladin Movie," *Travers. J. Lang. Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 191–199, 2022, doi: <https://doi.org/10.22334/traverse.v3i2.152>.
- [11] R. Marlisa and D. N. Hidayat, "The Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Good Morning America (GMA) Talkshow," *Englisia J. Lang. Educ. Humanit.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 132–142, 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v7i2.6630>.
- [12] A. Wahyudi, S. Yusuf, and Z. Lestari, "Maxim's Flouting: An Analysis of Classroom Interaction," *J. English Educ. Teach.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 219–231, 2020, doi: <https://doi.org/10.33369/jcet.4.2.219.231>.
- [13] O. . Al-Shboul, "Flouting at Grice's maxims by Jordanian speakers in everyday communication," *J. Lang. Linguist. Stud.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 229–239, 2022.
- [14] J. K. Rowling, *The Christmas Pig*. United Kingdom: Hachette Children's Group, 2021.
- [15] J. W. Creswell and J. D. Creswell, *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method*, 6th ed. Sage Publication, Ltd, 2023.
- [16] J. R. Searle, *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- [17] M. A. K. Halliday, *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, Fourth Edi. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- [18] J. House, *Translation Quality Assessment: Past and Present*. New York: Routledge, 2015.