



TWIST

Journal homepage: [www.twistjournal.net](http://www.twistjournal.net)

## Flouting Maxim Strategy in Literary Narratives: A Study of Pragmatic in Fictional Story

**Dwi Suryani\***

Magister of Linguistic, Faculty of Cultural Science,  
Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, 57126, Indonesia  
[\*Corresponding author]

**Djatismika**

Magister of Linguistic, Faculty of Cultural Science,  
Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, 57126, Indonesia

**Hanifullah Syukri**

Magister of Linguistic, Faculty of Cultural Science,  
Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, 57126, Indonesia

### Abstract

This study examines the use of strategy of flouting maxims in fictional narratives through a pragmatic approach. The study used a qualitative approach and content analysis methods. The study also used purposive sampling for collecting the data. The data were analyzed using Grice's cooperative principle (1975) and theory of flouting maxim strategy based on Cutting's (2002). The study findings 31 data that classified into 7 strategies of flouting maxim, such as hyperbole, sarcasm, giving too much information, giving too less information, being irrelevant, being ambiguous, and being not brief. These results demonstrate how authors use strategy of flouting maxims as a tool for narrative enrichment, not merely as conversational deviations. The study contributes to literary pragmatics by explaining how pragmatic operate in fictional narratives. The implications of this study are applied on language teaching, literary analysis, and the development of pragmatic theory in narrative contexts. This study highlights how authors strategically manipulate conversational norms to achieve specific literary effects, offering a new perspective on understanding the relationship between pragmatics and fiction.

### Keywords

flouting maxim, pragmatics, Gricean theory, narratives

### INTRODUCTION

In relation to the strategy of flouting maxims, we should first examine the four maxims of cooperation proposed by Grice (1975). Grice state that for effectiveness of conversation, the speaker and hearer must obey four maxims (on Citra & Fatmawati, 2021). These maxims are the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner. When these four maxims are deliberately or blatantly violated, flouting maxims occurs. As per Cutting's (2002) theory, when someone engages in maxim flouting, several strategies may be employed, including tautology, providing too much information, providing too little information, metaphor, hyperbole, irony, banter, sarcasm, being irrelevant, and being obscure. According to Thomas (1995) flouting happens if "speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said, with deliberate intention on generating implicature".

Previous studies related to this pragmatic approach, particularly in relation to cooperation principles and maxim flouting strategies, have been conducted. For example, the study by Mangilaya (2020), which examined the novel titled *The Handmaid's Tale*, Listiana's (2022), Fitri & Qodriani (2019), Saragih & Johan (2020), and the study by Cantikawati et al (2024). The analysis of these studies only yielded the percentage of maxims that had been flouted, without linking them to flouting maxim strategies.

It has been established in previous studies that the Grice cooperative principles have been widely used in various forms of media, such as novels, movies, interviews, and talk shows; yet, the focus of these studies has been more focused on determining the categorization of the maxims and measuring the flouting of the maxims. Rahmawati et al. (2022)) considered Tere Liye novel, Pergi, through the lens of the cooperative principle and the principle of politeness, but their study did not explore the details of the cooperative principle flouting. Besides, Cantikawati et al. (2024) revealed that the most notable flouting of the maxim of quantity appeared in the novel *It Starts with Us*, yet the authors did not distinguish the patterns of flouting by narrative stages. Similar investigations have been made in the studies of film, such as Mirayanti et al. (2024) on the film *Jack Reacher*, Widiani et al. (2021) on the film *Avengers: Endgame*, and Putra et al. (2021) and Gustary and Anggraini (2021), who mainly concentrate on categorizing the errors in maxims and providing their rates within the dialogues of characters. Also, the research on the topic of interviews and televised discussions, such as Asif et al. (2020), Ayasreh et al., (2019), Firda et al. (2021), Hussain (2023), Marlisa and Hidayat (2020), Nuzulia (2020), Rasool (2022) and Rashid (2019) follow the same pattern because the discussion is confined to the flouting of the principles of cooperativity but does not consider the strategies. Therefore, although the scope of the analysis of the flouting of cooperative principles in the media is rather extensive, a gap has remained, namely, there is a lack of studies that explicitly examine the strategic process of such flouting of the maxim within the novels, performing a subtle analysis of flouting patterns.

Although previous pragmatic studies have focused on natural conditions, where conversations occur directly and naturally, pragmatics in fiction cannot be overlooked. This aligns with the views of Locher & Jucker (2021), who state that conversations between characters in literary narratives (such as novels) are also empirical data that can be studied pragmatically. Novel is one of the mediums to deliver messages from one to another, from author to reader (Saragih et al., 2021). The novel contains narrative text and also written dialogs/conversation. The written conversations between characters in the novel also contain flouting of the principle of cooperation and its strategies. Therefore, this study attempts to explore how the flouting maxim strategy occurs in conversations between characters in the novel *Senopati Pamungkas* by Arswendo Atmowiloto, A novel written by an artist from Solo, Indonesia, who has produced many famous works such as the novel “*Keluarga Cemara*” (The Pine Family), which was eventually made into a film. This novel tells the story of Upasara Wulung as the main character, focusing on the martial art of *silat* as a traditional Indonesian sport and art, along with intrigue and conflict around *Keraton/Kingdom*. This study also examines how the flouting maxim strategy is related to the characterization of each character in the novel.

Based on the research objectives, this study will examine in depth the flouting maxim strategy in Arswendo Atmowiloto's novel *Senopati Pamungkas*. The detailed research questions are as follows: (1) What are the types of flouting maxims in Atmowiloto's novel *Senopati Pamungkas*? (2) What are the strategies for flouting maxims in Atmowiloto's novel *Senopati Pamungkas*?

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research is a qualitative descriptive study involving a content analysis method. The data in this study are written conversations or dialogues from characters in the novel *Senopati Pamungkas* by Atmowiloto that contain flouting maxim strategies. The data source for this study is a written document in the form of a novel titled *Senopati Pamungkas* by Atmowiloto published by Gramedia Indonesia. In determining the source, this study uses purposive sampling technique, which is based on specific criteria according to the research objectives. In analyzing the data, this study uses Spradley's method (2006), which involves domain analysis, taxonomic analysis, component analysis, and cultural theme analysis. To validate the data, this study uses source triangulation method. This is based on the fact that written documents already contain participants, locations, times, and events in their entirety.

The results of the study consist of 31 data points divided into 7 categories of flouting maxim strategies, indicating that the plot of the fiction and the characterization of the characters also contain communication strategies.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study found 31 data points, which were then classified and analyzed as follows:

### Types of Flouting Maxims

From the research that has been conducted, the data shows a total of 31 dialogues containing flouting maxims. These flouting maxims are divided into four categories: flouting the maxims of quality, flouting the maxims of quantity, flouting the maxims of relation, and flouting the maxims of manner. The following is a tabulation of the flouting maxims:

**Table 1** Types of Flouting Maxims

| Flouting the Maxims | Data |
|---------------------|------|
| Maxim of Quality    | 4    |
| Maxim of Quantity   | 5    |
| Maxim of Relation   | 5    |
| Maksim of Manner    | 27   |

Of the 31 data that were collected, there are 4 dialogues flouted the maxim of quality, 5 dialogues flouted the maxim of quantity, 5 dialogues flouted the maxim of relation, and the last 27 dialogues flouted the maxim of manner.

Flouting the maxim of quality occurs when the information conveyed does not correspond to reality, or when the conversation conveys incorrect information (Cutting, 2002). The following is an example of dialogue data containing flouting the maxim of quality.

- Rama Guru's statement contains a flouting of the maxim of quality because the speaker makes a statement that is literally excessive and does not correspond to reality. He says, "Even the gods need to learn that movement for two months. How could you possibly imitate it after seeing it just once?" which is logically incorrect, because the word "god" here is only an extreme form of comparison, but at the same time, this statement validates that there is nothing wrong with any of Jagaddhita's movements. Flouting the maxim of quality occurs when the speaker deliberately says something that is not literally true, not to deceive, but to convey another meaning. In this case, Rama Guru did not intend to lie, but used hyperbole to express his disbelief.

Flouting the maxim of quantity occurs when, in a conversation, one interlocutor provides too much or too little information than requested by the other interlocutor (Thomas, 2013). The following is an example of data containing flouting the maxim of quantity.

- In this conversation, there is a flouting of the maxim of quantity. This flouting does not necessarily occur because Toikromo does not fulfill the principle of cooperation, but he does so deliberately and with another intention so that Upasara Wulung understands. This flouting of the maxim would not have occurred if Toikromo had simply answered with the word “Yes,” because that would have fulfilled the information requested by Upasara Wulung. Instead of simply answering with the word “yes,” Toikromo continued with information that was not needed by his interlocutor. He explained that he always took the same route even though Upasara Wulung did not ask him to. Therefore, in this utterance, there is flouting of the maxim of quantity.

Flouting the maxim of relation occurs when the speaker changes the topic of conversation, but in changing the topic, the speaker still expects the listener to understand what he or she is saying. Cutting (2002) states that flouting the maxim of relation is related to changing the topic of conversation with irrelevant answers or comments.

- 377

rencana lain. Apakah adik mengetahui?”

*“Here's the thing. When you were captured by Rawikara, I heard that Ugrawe had three plans. The attack on the Cloud Academy was one of them. There are still two other plans. Do you know anything about them?”*

Kawung Sen

:

**“Aku memang bodoh, Kakang.”**

***“I am indeed foolish, brother.”***

(FM/QN/SP1/13)

Kawung Sen's statement, “I am indeed stupid, brother,” shows a disregard for the maxim of relevance. This is because Upasara's question and Kawung Sen's answer about his stupidity are not relevant. Kawung Sen's answer does not provide information that directly answers Upasara's question about Ugrawe's two plans.

### ***Flouting the Maxim of Manner***

Flouting the maxim of manner occurs when the speaker says something that is unclear, not concise, and tends to cause ambiguity (Cutting, 2002). As a result, listeners are sometimes unable to fully understand the information.

Datum 4 This conversation took place at the beginning of the meeting between Kawung Sen and Upasara Wulung. The two introduced themselves by showing off their respective martial arts skills. A brief but fierce argument was inevitable in this situation.

Kawung Sen : “Bagus. Bagus. Aku suka lelucon seperti ini. Mari kita jajal lagi. Kau pakai jurus ap itu tadi?”

*Good. Good. I like jokes like this. Let's try it again. What move did you use just now?*

Upasara Wulung : **“Dalam sekejap melihat mestinya kau sudah tahu. Masakan pakai bertanya segala macam.”**

*You should have known in an instant. Why are you asking all these questions?*

FM/R/SP1/145

In the conversation above, the sentence ***“You should have known in an instant. Why are you asking all these questions?”*** does not provide a clear answer and is even ambiguous. The speaker expects an answer about what technique the listener has used, but the listener instead gives a vague and unclear answer and asks back, ***“Why are you asking all these questions?”*** Therefore, in this conversation, there is a flouting of the maxim of manner. The response containing the flouting aims to convey that the speaker should already know the technique without needing to ask, as the listener assumes that the technique they used is not something difficult to understand. However, such a response is unclear and does not provide the information requested by the speaker.

### **Strategy of Flouting Maxims**

In accordance with the second research objective and question, this section describes the flouting maxim strategies employed by the characters in the novel Senopati Pamungkas. In the previous subchapter, four flouting maxims were explained according to Cutting (2002). Furthermore, in flouting the four maxims mentioned above, Cutting (2002) also explains further the strategies used by speakers in flouting these maxims, including: tautology, providing too much information, providing too little information, metaphor, hyperbole, irony, banter, sarcasm, being irrelevant, and being obscure. However, in this study, the 31 data points were classified into 7 strategies of flouting maxims, adjusted to what was found in the novel Senopati Pamungkas.

When flouting the maxim of quantity occurs, there are strategies such as giving too much information and giving too little information. Then, for flouting the maxim of quality, the strategies used are hyperbole and sarcasm. In the data that flout the maxim of relation, the data shows that the characters in the novel Senopati Pamungkas give answers or utterances that are irrelevant and tend to divert the topic, so the strategy used is being irrelevant. Additionally, for flouting the maxim of manner, this relates to how someone provides an answer, whether it is clear, concise, or overly elaborate. Therefore, the strategy for flouting the maxim of manner is being ambiguous and being not brief.

**Table 2** Strategy of Flouting Maxim

| <b>Strategy of Flouting Maxims</b> | <b>Data</b> |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| Giving too much information        | 4           |
| Giving too less information        | 1           |
| Hyperbole                          | 4           |
| Sarcasm                            | 1           |
| Being Irrelevant                   | 5           |
| Being Ambiguous                    | 6           |
| Being Not Brief                    | 11          |

Of the 31 conversations/dialogues, all flouting maxim strategies were used. However, there was a significant difference between sarcasm, which was the least used strategy, and being irrelevant, which was the most used strategy. It can be understood that in the storyline of the novel *Senopati Pamungkas*, the characters tend to frequently change the topic of conversation when they are in dialogue. However, when categorized by the maxims flouted, the maxim of relation is the most frequently flouted. This confirms that the characters in the novel tend to provide either ambiguous or not brief information, meaning they often make statements that are not straightforward in response to what the other speaker requests. For further explanation, please refer to the analyses below:

Here is an example of dialogue data that flouts the maxim of quantity with a strategy of giving too much information than what is needed by the speaker or listener.

Toikromo : “Pasar ramai sekali, Paman?”  
*The market is very crowded, isn't it, Uncle?*

FM/QN/SP1/210

This strategy differs from the hyperbolic strategy in that the information provided is literally true, whereas the hyperbolic strategy is not literally true. Accurate information is still provided even if it is not requested by the interlocutor. This is indicated by Toikromo's statement, "After delivering this item, my uncle will also pick up another item," which is information related to a series of activities that was not requested by Upasara

Contrary to the previous strategy, flouting the maxim can also sometimes involve providing too little information. This occurs when the information provided does not meet the speaker's expectations.

Mahapatih : “I don’t have much time, Upasara. If you want to say something, now is the time. These guards are palace guards whose loyalty is beyond doubt.”

Upasara Wulung : **“Maaf, Mahapatih. Masalah ini ada sangkut pautnya dengan peristiwa di Perguruan Awan.”**  
*“I'm sorry, Mahapatih. This matter is related to the incident at Perguruan Awan.”*

FM/QN/SP1/210

The strategy used in this flouting of the maxim is to provide too little information. The piece of information provided by Upasara Wulung was indeed related to the question that needed to be answered, but he did not provide complete information about his reasons for meeting with His Majesty the King. This was related to his respectful attitude towards the Prime Minister, even though he could not provide a complete answer.



## Hyperbole

Similar to metaphor, another strategy for flouting maxims is hyperbole. In flouting maxims, someone who uses hyperbole usually exaggerates their statements about existing facts (Cutting, 2002). An example of hyperbole as a strategy for flouting maxims is as follows:

Datum 7 This conversation took place between Dewa Maut and Jagatri in the Lawang Sewu Cave. It concerns the battle that ensued when Ugrawe and his gang discovered the hiding place of Jagatri and his friends. Ugrawe invited anyone who wanted to come out to fight him and his gang first.

Dewa Maut : “Tole, kita ikut main?”  
“Tole, are we joining in?”

Jagatri **“Relax, I still want to watch this village fight. If I get involved, once my hand touches someone, no one will be able to breathe again.”**

FM/QL/SP1/168

In this utterance, Jagatri flouts the maxim of quality. The maxim of quality requires speakers to provide information that is true, not exaggerated, and not said without sufficient evidence. Jagatri flouts this maxim when she replies that if she “uses her hands, once she touches someone, no one can breathe again.” This statement is clearly an unrealistic claim and reflects an exaggerated portrayal of her own strength. There is no evidence to support the claim that a single touch from her can immediately stop her opponent's breathing, thus flouting the maxim of quality.

The strategy used by Jagatri is hyperbole, which is the exaggeration or drastic overstatement of facts to create a certain effect. This hyperbole is deliberately used to give the impression that Jagatri's power is so extraordinary that the fight is not comparable to him. With this strategy, he not only intends to provide factual information, but also to show his stronger position while belittling the abilities of his opponents.

## Sarcasm

Sarcasm is one strategy that flouts the maxim of quality. Sarcasm occurs when the speaker expresses something contradictory, usually accompanied by a derogatory tone (Cutting, 2002). This strategy is used with the intention of mocking or criticizing the behavior of others, usually using language that disregards ethics and manners.

Datum 8 This conversation took place between Bagus Respati and Kiai Sangga Langit when the competition was about to begin.

Kiai Sangga Langit : “Anak dusun, inilah permainan itu. Kau sudah siap?”  
“Village boy, this is the game. Are you ready?”

**Bagus Respati: “Yang begini anak-anak juga bisa melakukan. Permainan *dakon* semacam ini apa susahnya?”**  
“Even children can do this. What's so difficult about a game like *dakon*?”

FM/QL/SP1/444

This question essentially requires a direct answer in the form of readiness or unpreparedness. However, instead of giving the required answer, Bagus Respati replied: “Even children can do this. What's so difficult about this kind of *dakon* game?” which in no way directly confirms his readiness. Bagus Respati flouts the maxim of quality because he makes a statement that is not entirely meant as a literal truth. Literally, he states that the game is so easy that even children can do it. However, the actual meaning is not merely a statement of fact, but rather sarcasm.

In flouting the maxim of quality, the strategy employed was sarcasm. This sarcasm was evident in the way Bagus Respati compared the contest to a children's game. He did not give a serious answer, but rather mocked the level of difficulty of the challenge.

## Being Irrelevant

In the flouting maxim of being irrelevant strategy, the answer given is usually irrelevant to the question asked, or in other words, it has nothing to do with the question asked (Cutting, 2002). The purpose of being irrelevant is to provide information that is not necessary to the topic of conversation. The following is an example of this flouting maxim strategy.

Datum 9 This conversation took place between Upasara Wulung and Mahapatih when Upasara Wulung intended to bury the body of Kawung Sen, who had been killed by Mahapatih without knowing that Kawung Sen was Upasara Wulung's younger brother.

Mahapatih : “Akan pergi ke mana kamu?”  
*“Where are you going?”*

Upasara Wulung : **“Mengubur Dimas Kawung Sen sebagaimana layaknya seorang ksatria. Menghadang kedatangan prajurit Gelang-Gelang. Keraton harus tetap dipertahankan dari keangkaramurkaan.”**  
*“To bury Dimas Kawung Sen as befits a knight. To block the arrival of the Gelang-Gelang soldiers. The palace must be defended from tyranny.”*

FM/R/SP1/468

The Mahapatih's question was specific and demanded an answer about location or destination. However, Upasara Wulung responded by mentioning a series of activities, namely burying Kawung Sen as befits a knight, blocking the Gelang-Gelang soldiers, and defending the palace. The answer did not explicitly mention “where” but rather “what to do.”

In this case, Upasara Wulung flouted the maxim of relevance, because his response was not directly relevant to the form of the question. The question asked for information about a place, while the answer that emerged was in the form of actions and moral objectives. This irrelevance was not because he did not want to answer, but because he deliberately shifted the focus of the conversation from the physical location to the reasons and principles behind his actions.

The flouting strategy used is irrelevant, which is to give a response that appears to stray from the core of the question, but actually conveys an implied meaning behind it. By explaining his activities, Upasara wants to emphasize the principles and responsibilities of a knight that underlie his journey.

### ***Being Obscure***

In complying with the maxim of manner, a person is required to express their intentions clearly. When they convey information in an unclear, vague, and ambiguous manner, they have flouted the maxim of manner with the strategy of being obscure (Cutting, 2002). This strategy differs from being not brief, because the information mentioned contains meanings that we cannot directly understand. In other words, the information is still ambiguous and unclear.

Datum 10 This conversation took place between Mahapatih and his subordinate, Karmamuka. Mahapatih discussed his decision to detain someone in an underground cave, and asked Karmamuka to express his opinion on the matter.

Mahapatih : “Karena ia berbuat kurang ajar dan lancang, aku menghukumnya. Sekarang ia berada di gua bawah tanah. Apa pendapatmu, Karmuka?”  
*Because he was insolent and presumptuous, I punished him. Now he is in an underground cave. What do you think, Karmuka?*

Karmamuka : **“Saya kurang tahu. Mahapatih lebih bijak dari saya.”**  
*I don't know. Mahapatih is wiser than me.*

FM/QN/SP3/85

The conversation above discusses the punishment given by the Prime Minister (Mahapatih) to someone who has flouted royal regulations. He explains that the flouter has been put in an underground cave. Wanting to know whether what he did was right or not, he intends to ask his subordinates for their opinion on the action. However, the subordinate whose opinion was sought did not express his opinion but instead responded with the vague statement, **“I don't know. The Mahapatih is wiser than me.”** In this statement, Karmuka indirectly agrees with all of Mahapatih's opinions. The statement “Mahapatih is wiser than me” does not directly answer yes, but it implicitly confirms that he will agree with whatever Mahapatih says and considers Mahapatih's decision to be the most correct. Statements that are not like this are included in the flouting maxim against the way maxim. This is because the answer given seems vague and does not directly address the point.

The strategy used in flouting the maxim of manner is the strategy of ambiguity. The answer should provide an explanation of Karmuka's opinion. However, what happens is a statement that validates that the Prime Minister is wiser. Indirectly, it emphasizes that Karmuka's opinion will always follow the Prime Minister's decision.

### ***Being Not Brief***

In employing the flouting maxim strategy, the strategy of being not brief involves the speaker deliberately using excessive, convoluted, or repetitive speech without the intention of adding new information (Cutting, 2002). In this strategy, there is no principle of linguistic economy; the speaker tends to use more words than necessary. Of course, this strategy differs from being obscure, which is more than just “unclear,” as the focus is on the length of the utterance, not the ambiguity of meaning. Here is an example:

Datum 11     In this story, Ngabehi Pandu came to break up the fight between Jaghana and Upasara Wulung. After that, Ngabehi Pandu asked Jaghana

Ngabehi Pandu:     : “Satu pertanyaan lagi. Apakah dalam sebulan ini ada *Tamu dari Seberang* datang kemari?”

“*One more question. Have any guests from across the river come here this month?*”

Jaghana             : “**Entah kenapa begitu banyak yang menanyakan hal yang sama. Hal yang saya sendiri tidak tahu. Ketika Eyang Sepuh memilih desa tanpa nama ini, rasanya sudah tak ada tempat lain yang lebih sunyi. Akan tetapi nyatanya sekarang ini jadi tempat berkumpul para jagoan di seluruh jagat. Oi, tak ada lagi tempat sepi.**”

*“I don't know why so many people are asking the same question. It's something I myself don't know. When Eyang Sepuh chose this nameless village, it felt like there was no other place that was more secluded. But now it has become a gathering place for heroes from all over the world. Oi, there is no more secluded place.”*

Flouting the maxim of manner occurs when the speaker deliberately responds with convoluted or ambiguous information. The speaker still answers the question, but the information provided does not get straight to the point. In this utterance, the speaker could have simply answered “I don't know,” but instead of answering directly, he added other details. In this utterance, there is actually the phrase “I don't know myself,” but the speaker's delivery seems long-winded. Therefore, this utterance clearly contains a flouting of the maxim of manner. Even though there is a flouting, the interlocutor can still grasp the other meaning conveyed, which is that the speaker often gets asked the same question, making them annoyed by it.

In relation to this, the strategy used by the speaker is to answer in a long-winded manner. This convoluted answer is not without purpose; it indicates that the speaker has been asked similar questions so often that they say, “I don't know why so many people ask the same thing.” This information was not requested by the interlocutor, but the speaker still said it along with other details that conveyed their annoyance with the matter. Therefore, in this conversation, there is a strategy of flouting the maxim of manner in the form of being not brief.

Furthermore, from the above discussions, the flout of the quantity maxim with the strategies of giving too much information and giving too little information in this novel are intended to divert the conversation. This is because the listener tends to refuse to give the answer desired by the speaker. Additionally, for flouting the maxim of quality, strategies such as metaphors, hyperbole, sarcasm, irony, and banter are also occasionally used to divert the conversation. However, their purpose is different, namely to create humor between novel characters, warn about something, and threaten something according to the context of the conversation between the characters. Meanwhile, the purpose of the being irrelevant strategy in flouting the maxim of relevance is usually done with the aim of changing the topic of conversation, but still expecting the listener to understand the speaker's intention. Lastly, flouts of the maxim of manner with the being obscure and being not brief strategies aim to create certain effects or responses from the listener.

Based on the results and discussion above, when compared to previous research such as Listiana's (2022) study, which determined the percentage of flouting maxim, this study does not merely focus on determining the percentage of maxims violated or flouted. This is related to the purpose of this study, which is that flouting maxims and their strategies are employed by authors to achieve certain effects. Similarly, the study by Fitri & Qodriani (2019) only examined the flouting maxim, without delving into the strategies of flouting maxims and their purposes.

Similarly, the study by Saragih & Johan (2020) on the novel *The Fault in Our Stars* only observed flouting maxims along with their percentages. This study attempts to delve deeper, not only into the flouting maxims themselves but also into the strategies and their purposes.

### **CONCLUSION**

This study has described how maxims are flouted through existing strategies. The study shows that the novel *Senopati Pamungkas* has extensively used flouting maxim strategies, meaning that there are flouts and comprehensive use of flouting maxim strategies. In flouting the maxim of quantity, there are strategies such as giving too much information and giving too little information, with the aim of diverting the conversation. In flouting the maxim of quality, strategies such as hyperbole and sarcasm, with the aim of diverting the conversation and creating a humorous atmosphere, and not



infrequently to express threats in accordance with the context of the story. In flouting the maxim of relevance, being irrelevant is the strategy used, and this strategy is often employed for the development of the story. Additionally, to flout the maxim of manner, being ambiguous and being not brief are strategies employed, indicating that the author aims to evoke a specific image or effect for the novel's characters.

## FUNDING INFORMATION

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

## DECLARATION OF CONFLICT

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

## REFERENCES

1. Asif, M., Zhiyong, D., Majeed, S., Rasool, S. F., & Nisar, M. (2020). An Investigation of the Flouting of Grice's Maxims with Reference to Capital TalkShow on Geo TV Private Channel of Pakistan. *Pakistan Vision*, 20(2), 338–364.
2. Ayasreh, A. M., Al-Sabti, N., Awwad, A. S., Mansoor, M., & Razali, R. (2019). Instances of Violation and Flouting of the Maxim by Gaddafi Interview during the Arab Spring. *International Journal of English and Education*, 8(1), 185–193.
3. Cantikawati, T., Tawami, T., & Purwanisari, R. (2024). Maxim violation in the novel It Starts with Us. *Proceeding of International Conference on Business, Economics, Social Sciences, and Humanities*, 7, 759–769. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.34010/icobest.v7i.587>
4. Citra, Y., & Fatmawati. (2021). Alasan pelanggaran prinsip kerja sama Grice dalam program Mata Najwa di Trans 7. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 7(2), 437–448. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v7i2.1278>
5. Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*.
6. Firda, I. N., Hidayat, D. N., Alek, & Nurhalimah. (2021). An Analysis of Flouting Maxim in a Talkshow Program in Indonesia. *Journal of English Education and Development*, 4(2).
7. Fitri, E., & Qodriani, L. U. (2019). A study on flouting maxims in Divergent Novel. *Teknosastik*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33365/TS.V14I1.84>
8. Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. Harvard University Press.
9. Gustary, D. T., & Anggraini, S. (2021). The Analysis of Flouting Maxim in “UP!” Movie. *Jurnal Ilmiah Lingua Idea*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jli.2021.12.2.4118>
10. Hussain, S. A. (2023). A Study of Maxims Flouting in Malala Yousafzai's Interview. *PRJAH: Progressive Research Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 5(2).
11. Listiana, I. (2022). An analysis of the flouting of conversational maxims by Grice on ‘A Clean, Well-Lighted Place’ short story. *J-Lalite*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jes.2022.3.1.5733>
12. Locher, M. A., & Jucker, A. H. (2021). *The pragmatics of fiction*. Edinburgh University Press.
13. Mangilaya II, V. M. (2020). A rat in a maze: Analysis of violation and flouting maxim in Margaret Atwood's the Handmaid's Tale. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 198–213. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.24127/pj.v9i2.3038>
14. 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). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.22373/ej.v7i2.6630>
15. Ni Kadek Mirayanti, Ni Luh Sutjiati Beratha, & Ni Wayan Sukarini. (2024). Violations Of Grice's Maxim. *International Journal of Education, Language, Literature, Arts, Culture, and Social Humanities*, 2(2), 84–93. <https://doi.org/10.59024/ijellacush.v2i2.792>
16. Nuzulia, I. F. L. (2020). Pragmatic Analysis of Flouting Maxim in Donald Trump's Interview with TIME in the Oval Office 2020. *JELTL: Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 5(3).
17. Putra, I. P. A. A., Ariyaningsih, N. N. D., & Juniarta, I. W. (2021). Flouting of Conversational Maxims In “Ready Player One” Movie. *International Journal of English Learning and Applied Linguistic*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21111/ijelal.v1i2.5633>
18. Rahmawati, W., Haryanti, D., & Laila, M. (2022). A Pragmatic Equivalence of Violating Maxims in Novel Translation of Divergent. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30603/al.v7i2.2584>
19. Rashid, B. N. (2019). Flouting of Cooperative Principle in Jane Austen's Pride and Prejudice. *Journal Od Research in Applied Linguistics*, 10(Special Issue), 1176–1185.

20. Rasool, S., Zahra, T., & Khawar, Z. (2022). An Investigation of Grice's Cooperative Principle in an Interview with Ishaq Dar. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research*, 25(2), 1–21.
21. Saragih, A. K., Manik, N. S., & Samosir, R. R. Y. B. (2021). Analisis pertahanan diri tokoh utama dalam novel Lembata karya F.Rahardi. *Asas: Jurnal Sastra*, 10(2), 100–110. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22460/semantik.v13i1.p71-86>
22. Saragih, S., & Johan, M. (2020). Maxims in novel “The Fault in Our Stars” by John Green. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24256/IDEAS.V8I1.1401>
23. Spradley, J. P. (2006). *Metode etnografi (M. Z Elizabeth, Trans)*. Tiara Wacana.
24. Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman.
25. Widiani, D. A. I., Candra, K. D. P., & Suasthi, N. W. (2021). Flouting of Conversational Maxims In “Avengers: Endgame” Movie. *International Journal of Englis Learning and Applied Linguistics*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21111/ijelal.v2i1.5688>

