



An Analysis of the Flouting of Gricean Conversational Maxims in the Novel ‘Animal Farm’ by George Orwell

Witsanuphong Suksakhon

Department of English, College of Liberal Arts, Rangsit University, Thailand

Abstract

Grice’s Cooperative Principle (CP) and its four conversational maxims are claimed to be important principles that reflect how people should behave in conversation in order to achieve effective communication. The present study aimed to analyze the extent to which the Gricean maxims are flouted by the characters in George Orwell’s novel, *Animal Farm*. In addition, it sought to identify and categorize the purposes behind the flouting of the maxims. In order to fulfill these objectives, eleven conversations exchanged between the characters were purposively selected for the analysis. The analytical framework used for the analysis was Gricean conversational maxims, which include the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner. The findings of this study indicated that the flouting of all types of the Gricean maxims can be found among the selected conversations between each character, and that there are three main purposes behind the flouting of the maxims, including persuading interlocutors, concealing unpleasant truths, and defaming others. The results highlight the intricate nature of communication dynamics within the story and reveal the manipulative strategies utilized by the characters to wield power over their peers.

Keywords: *Cooperative Principle, Maxims of Conversation, Animal Farm, George Orwell*

1. Introduction

Humans are inherently social beings who seek connections and interactions with others. From the moment we are born, our language proficiency begins to develop innately and continues to evolve throughout our lives. This proficiency allows us to communicate effectively and engage with the world around us. Communication, therefore, becomes an inevitable part of human existence, as we engage in daily interactions for various purposes such as sharing information, expressing ideas, and conveying emotions. Generally, people communicate using both written and spoken methods. In spoken conversations, individuals usually engage in communication with two main roles, the speaker and the listener, alternating roles to share information. Therefore, both the speaker and the listener are required to cooperate and follow specific conversational guidelines to ensure that the conversation proceeds smoothly. This cooperation helps maintain effective and efficient communication, ultimately assisting in achieving the desired conversational goals (Ikawati, 2022).

Many pragmaticists consider cooperation between interlocutors essential for effective conversation (Jia, 2008). To successfully convey meaning through conversation, interlocutors often adhere to specific strategies outlined by Grice (1975), known as the Cooperative Principle. This principle comprises four conversational maxims including the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner. These maxims serve as rational principles that are observed by people and guide their behavior in typical conversations, facilitating effective communication. However, interlocutors do not always adhere to these conversational maxims. There are instances where the maxims are violated or flouted during conversation. In this study, conversations among the characters in George Orwell's novel "*Animal Farm*" will

[148]



be analyzed to identify which Gricean maxims of conversation the characters flout, and to understand the purposes behind these instances of flouting.

2. Theoretical Background

The current investigation is grounded in the Cooperative Principle (CP) and Gricean Maxims of conversation, formulated by Grice in 1975. The core assumption of the Cooperative Principle is that individuals aim to communicate effectively with each other. As Grice (1975) stated, "Make your conversational contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." This implies that speakers and listeners must engage in cooperative dialogue and mutually accept how they intend to be understood. The Cooperative Principle (CP) can be elaborated into four maxims of conversation: the maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. These maxims serve as guiding principles for effective communication. However, it is not expected that interlocutors will strictly adhere to these maxims in every instance of communication. In everyday interactions, speakers may sometimes violate or flout the maxims of conversation.

2.1 Violation of the Maxims

According to Grice (1975), a violation of the maxims occurs when interlocutors deliberately choose not to adhere to certain maxims in their conversation for specific purposes, such as deception or to maintain politeness. Below are examples illustrating violations of the four maxims of conversation:

Mother: "Have you finished your homework already?"

Son (who has been playing games all day long): "Yes, I have."

In this dialogue, the boy deviates from the truth and violates the maxim of quality. He resorts to lying to evade unpleasant consequences, such as facing punishment from his mother.

Debby: "Where have you been? I searched for you everywhere!"

Jack: "I wasn't around."

From this interaction, Debby poses a question directed at Jack, expecting a detailed response. However, Jack's answer is inadequate and lacks the necessary specific information to satisfy the questioner. He fails to provide as much detail as is needed to make his contribution cooperative. Therefore, it is probable that Jack violated the maxim of quantity. Jack's behavior might be motivated by a desire to avoid providing Debby with the answer or for other undisclosed reasons.

Student A: "You know what? Susan is so stupid. She can't even answer a simple question."

Student B: "The weather today is so fine indeed."

In this dialogue, Student B's response does not align with the question posed by Student A, indicating a violation of the maxim of relation. Student B's inconsistency may stem from a reluctance to express their opinion on the topic raised by Student A.

Simon: "When are you coming home?"

Elizabeth: "I will codify that question to my superiors and respond at such a time as an adequate answer can be prepared."



From the conversation exchange, it seems that the maxim of manner has been violated. Elizabeth's response to Simon is composed of unnecessarily convoluted and perplexing language. Her answer lacks clarity and is likely to confuse Simon.

2.2 Flouting of the maxim

Unlike the violation of maxims, the flouting of maxims occurs when speakers deliberately choose not to adhere to the maxims in their conversation and expect the interlocutors to uncover the implicit meaning of their utterances. In other words, speakers employ implicature in their conversation. Furthermore, individuals may flout the maxims to implicitly convey an ironic tone, as exemplified below.

Alex: "Oh! You are a punctual person."

Bill: "I'm so sorry. It will never happen again."

From this conversation, it is evident that the maxim of quality has been flouted. Alex's intention in uttering such a phrase is not to genuinely compliment his friend but rather to be sarcastic. Moreover, it appears that Bill is able to discern the hidden meaning behind the utterance, as evidenced by his apology to Alex. Importantly, cooperation between the speaker and listener still occurs, though it operates on a non-literal level.

Alex: "Do you have any plans for this coming weekend?"

Bill: "Oh, just a few things."

In this conversation, Bill's reply of "just a few things" deliberately goes against the maxim of quantity by providing insufficient details about his weekend plans. His purpose might be to maintain privacy or create an element of mystery. Nonetheless, he anticipates Alex to grasp the implied meaning behind his concise response, leading him to infer more details or recognize his preference for not divulging further information.

Alex: "What are your thoughts on our new project?"

Bill: "Speaking of our new project, have you tried the new restaurant downtown?"

In this conversation, Bill's reply "Speaking of our new project, have you tried the new restaurant downtown?" flouts the maxim of relation. Rather than addressing Alex's inquiry about the new project, Bill introduces an entirely unrelated topic about restaurants. He may aim to steer the conversation in a different direction or introduce a more casual tone. Bill anticipates that Alex will perceive the implicit change of subject and possibly engage in a more informal discussion.

Alex: "Can you give me an update on the project's progress?"

Bill: "Well, it's like navigating through a maze blindfolded with one hand tied behind your back."

In this exchange, Bill's response "Well, it's like navigating through a maze blindfolded with one hand tied behind your back" flouts the maxim of manner. Instead of providing a straightforward update on the progress of the project, Bill offers a metaphorical comparison that could be perceived as overly elaborate. His intention might be to convey the complexity or challenges of the project, but his statement could confuse the listener. Bill expects Alex to infer the challenges of the project without providing a direct and clear update.

2.3 Previous Studies on Gricean Maxims of Conversation

[150]



Over time, the Gricean maxims of conversation have garnered significant attention from researchers, who have explored this theory from various perspectives. Among these, some researchers have delved into the violation and flouting of the maxims of conversation in real-life interactions. For instance, ES (2015) examined instances of the flouting of conversational maxims in interactions between teachers and students in EFL classrooms, aiming to understand how implicatures were generated. Surprisingly, the findings revealed that most students adhered to the maxims of conversation quite effectively, with a notably low occurrence of flouting. This trend could be attributed to the students' limited linguistic and actional competence.

Likewise, Fahmi (2016) delved into the interactions among selected students to identify instances where the maxims of conversation were violated and to determine the factors influencing such violations. The study revealed that each conversational maxim was violated to varying degrees, with culture emerging as a predominant factor influencing such violations. Specifically, Indonesian culture was highlighted as a significant factor contributing to the breach of conversational maxims since indirectness in conversation was emphasized to preserve interlocutors' dignity and promote politeness.

In addition to studies focusing on authentic interactions, numerous scholars have also explored conversational maxims in interactions depicted in television shows and movies. In a study conducted by Manurung (2019), the primary focus was on identifying the predominant form of flouting maxims observed in an Indonesian talk show, *Hitam Putih*, and examining the motivations behind speakers' decisions to flout these maxims. The findings indicated that the maxim of quality emerged as the most frequently flouted maxim. Speakers commonly violated this maxim as a means of humorously engaging with the audience.

In the same vein, Fitri & Qodriani (2016, as mentioned in Ikawati, 2022) examined instances of maxim flouting in the *Divergent* novel, aiming to categorize the types of flouted maxims and explore the underlying reasons for such behavior. Their findings revealed that three types of maxims were flouted within the narrative: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, and the maxim of relevance. The maxim of quantity was often disregarded to provide detailed explanations, emphasize specific points, or avoid cooperative dialogue. Meanwhile, the flouting of the maxim of quality served various purposes, including expressing panic, reassuring the listener, or concealing information. Lastly, the maxim of relevance was flouted to introduce unrelated topics or to decline discussions on certain subjects.

What could be drawn from the examples aforementioned was the fact that various factors potentially contributed to the violation or flouting of conversational maxims, depending on the context of interaction. Moreover, the flouting of conversational maxims is purposeful and aligned with specific communication goals that speakers seek to achieve.

The present study aims to deepen understanding of the Gricean maxims of conversation by analyzing the interactions between characters in the novel entitled "Animal Farm", written by George Orwell, which is an allegorical story carrying a powerful satire on the Russian Revolution of 1917 and Stalinist totalitarianism principles. By personifying the animals in the allegory, Orwell symbolizes real historical political figures who made false promises in pursuit of powerful political positions. However, once these goals were achieved, the promises were abandoned in favor of greed and self-fulfillment. Since each character in "Animal Farm" represents a real historical figure, the researcher found it intriguing to analyze the conversations among these characters using the Gricean maxims of conversation. The study seeks to address the following questions:

- 1) What Gricean maxims of conversation are flouted by the characters?
- 2) What are the purposes of the flouting of the conversational maxims?

3. Methodology



3.1 Source of Data

In this study, the primary data source is the novel "Animal Farm", written by George Orwell, an English novelist, essayist, journalist, and critic (published in 1945). To collect data for analysis, all dialogues exchanged between characters in the novel were extracted. Subsequently, the collected dialogues were classified based on the cooperative principle, specifically whether they violated, flouted, or observed any of Grice's conversational maxims. To define the scope of the study, only instances where the Gricean maxims of conversation were flouted were considered for analysis. Additionally, soliloquies or extended monologues by any character without an interlocutor, as well as utterances that adhered to or violated the maxims without implicature, were excluded from the analysis. A total of eleven segments of conversational dialogue were selected for analysis. Each of these selected dialogues was examined based on Grice's theory of conversational maxims proposed in 1975, and the findings are presented in the subsequent section.

3.2 Summary of *Animal Farm* by George Orwell (1945)

The story begins one night when all the animals on Mr. Jones' Manor Farm are summoned to hear an old Major, a pig, describe his strange dream of a world where all animals live peacefully, free from the tyranny of human masters. He instills the philosophy of Animalism into the minds of all the animals and urges them to rebel against their cruel human masters until victory is theirs. Two pigs, Snowball and Napoleon, emerge as key planners of this bold plan. The day of rebellion arrives when Jones neglects to feed his animals, and he and his wife are eventually driven away from the farm. The animals decide to rename the property Animal Farm and establish the Seven Commandments of Animalism, which all animals are to follow and remember by heart.

After the successful rebellion, all the animals lived a happy life. They grew crops, harvested them, and convened every Sunday to debate farm policies. The pigs crowned themselves as supervisors of the farm due to their superior intelligence. However, Animal Farm faced an attack by Jones and his men, who attempted to reclaim their property from the animals. The attempt failed, and Jones was once again chased away from the farm. Following this incident, Snowball encouraged all the animals to establish a windmill in the hope of providing electricity and improving their lives. However, Napoleon, who disagreed with Snowball, summoned a pack of ferocious dogs to chase Snowball off the farm forever.

Under Napoleon's rule, Animal Farm faced its most challenging period. Regardless of the hardships that befell the farm, Napoleon consistently used Snowball as a scapegoat, attributing all difficulties to him. He began engaging a human solicitor and trading with neighboring farms, actions that directly contradicted the core principles of Animalism. Napoleon's thirst for power grew, leading him to become an absolute dictator who mercilessly executed innocent animals by having his dogs tear their throats out in front of the entire farm. The pigs, including Napoleon, now resided in Jones' house, enjoying lavish meals while the other animals received less food and grew thinner. To make matters worse, the pigs secretly altered the Seven Commandments of Animalism, revising all principles.

As time passed, life became increasingly harsh for all animals on the farm. The pigs eventually began walking on their hind legs and adopting other qualities of their former human oppressors. The Seven Commandments were reduced to a single decree: "All Animals Are Equal / But Some Are More Equal Than Others." The novel concludes with Pilkington sharing drinks with the pigs in Jones' house, while other animals watch from outside the window, unable to distinguish the pigs from the humans.

4. Results and Discussion



From the analysis of 11 selected segments of dialogue made by characters in the novel, it was found that the flouting of all types of Gricean maxims of conversation was found. The distribution of the flouting of the conversational maxims is presented in the table below.

Table 1 Distribution of the flouting of the conversational maxims in the novel 'Animal Farm'

No	Conversational Maxim	Frequency	Percentage
1	Maxim of Quality	3	27.27%
2	Maxim of Quantity	2	18.18%
3	Maxim of Relation	3	27.27%
4	Maxim of Manner	1	9.09%
5	More than one Maxim	2	18.18%
Total		11	100%

The analysis revealed that the highest frequency of flouting occurred in the maxims of quality and relation, each being flouted with a frequency of 27.27%. This was followed by the flouting of the maxim of quantity, which occurred at a frequency of 18.18%. In addition, it was found that the maxim of manner was flouted with the least frequency (9.09%). Remarkably, the study identified three instances where characters flouted more than one conversational maxim within the same segment of dialogue (18.18%).

According to Grice (1975), a speaker might not observe the maxims of conversation and employ implicature during communication. Implicature refers to the process by which speakers convey additional meaning that is beyond the literal interpretation of their own words during communication. This additional meaning is inferred by the listener based on the context of the conversation, shared knowledge, and the speaker's intentions. A speaker might employ implicature for various reasons. Implicature can be used to soften the statement or avoid directness in communication, especially in sensitive, confrontational situations. In addition, implicature also enriches communication, allowing speakers to express multiple layers of meaning beyond the obvious. In this study, the purposes of flouting the maxims of conversation, or using implicatures, were also analyzed. It was found that, when characters employed implicatures, the purposes could be categorized into three types, as demonstrated below.

Table 2 Purposes of the flouting of the conversational maxims in the novel 'Animal Farm'

No	Purposes of Using Implicature	Frequency	Percentage
1	To persuade the interlocutors	5	45.45%
2	To conceal an unpleasant truth or thought	4	36.36%
3	To defame other people	2	18.18%
Total		11	100%

In Table 2, characters observed in the novel "Animal Farm" intentionally flouted conversational maxims to convey additional meanings. It was found that they did so primarily to indirectly persuade their interlocutors, representing the highest frequency at 45.45%. The primary characters responsible for discourse in the novel were predominantly the pigs, who perceived themselves as leaders on the farm. Hence, they often aimed to indirectly persuade other animals to believe in their way of ruling as well as the truth they had generated. The second purpose identified was to conceal unpleasant truths or thoughts, accounting for 36.36% of occurrences. Characters tended to avoid telling the truth and instead conveyed messages they wanted others to believe. The final purpose of using implicature in the novel was to defame other individuals, representing 18.18% of occurrences. This was notably done by one character, Squealer, appointed as the spokesperson for the leadership group. He communicated with other animals on the farm and occasionally defamed Snowball,



the banished pig, attributing all misfortunes to him. The results suggest that the purposes of flouting conversational maxims largely depend on the situations and positions of the speakers.

Examples of dialogue demonstrating the flouting of each conversational maxim and the purposes behind the flouting are provided as follows.

An example of the flouting of the maxim of quality

The dialogue depicts an exchange between Squealer, the spokesperson, and Boxer, the hard-working horse, concerning Snowball, the banished pig. Squealer informs all the animals on the farm that Snowball had allegedly sold himself to a human and had been in league with Mr. Jones, the previous farm owner, from the very beginning.

*'I do not believe that,' Boxer said, 'Snowball fought bravely at the battle of the Cowshed. I saw him myself. Did we not give him "Animal Hero, First Class", immediately afterwards?
'That was our mistake, comrade. For we know now – it is written down in the secret documents that we have found that, in reality, he was trying to lure us to our doom.'*

This conversation took place after several unfortunate events occurred on the farm during the night. Snowball, the banished pig accused of treason, was held responsible for a range of mischief. Following Napoleon's investigation, he instructed Squealer, the spokesperson, to assemble all animals and declare that Snowball was the mastermind behind all the farm's recent troubles, claiming that Snowball had aligned himself with humans. However, Boxer, the horse, remained skeptical of these accusations.

Squealer's response to Boxer's statement and question is likely to flout the maxim of quality because it lacks truthfulness and reliability. According to Grice's maxims of conversation, the maxim of quality requires speakers to provide accurate and truthful information.

In Squealer's response, he turns down Boxer's assertion that Snowball fought bravely at the Battle of the Cowshed and received the "Animal Hero, First Class" award. Instead of addressing Boxer's point directly and providing evidence to counter it, Squealer simply states, "That was our mistake, comrade. For we know now – it is written down in the secret documents that we have found that, in reality, he was trying to lure us to our doom." Squealer's response lacks transparency and fails to offer any concrete evidence or documentation to support his claim. Instead, he relies on vague references to "secret documents" without providing any verifiable information. This lack of transparency and reliance on secretive documentation suggests that Squealer's response may not be truthful or reliable, thus flouting the maxim of quality.

An example of the flouting of the maxim of relation

This dialogue features Old Benjamin, the donkey, responding to inquiries from other animals on the farm, as depicted below.

Old Benjamin, the donkey, seemed quite unchanged since the rebellion. He did his work in the same slow obstinate way as he had done it in Jones's time, never shirking, and never volunteering for extra work either. About the Rebellion and its results, he would express no opinion. When asked whether he would not be happier now that Jones was gone, he would say only:



“Donkeys live a long time. None of you has ever seen a dead donkey.”

After the incident where Mr. Jones, the proprietor of Manor Farm, was chased away due to the unbearable hunger and brutality imposed on the animals, Old Benjamin, the donkey, responded to inquiries from other animals on the farm. His utterance flouts the maxim of relation due to the irrelevance of his response to the question posed. Instead of directly addressing whether he was happier with Mr. Jones gone and the farm now belonging to all animals, he replied, ‘Donkeys live a long time. None of you has ever seen a dead donkey’, which appears unrelated to the inquiry.

Looking closer, Benjamin's response implies his hidden skepticism toward the success of the animals' rebellion. He refuses to be inspired by the Rebellion, believing that life for animals will remain unpleasant regardless of who is in charge. Having witnessed numerous changes throughout his long life, Benjamin comprehends these changes better than shorter-lived animals. This conversation demonstrates the flouting of conversational maxims when there is an attempt to provide an indirect answer or explanation to the interlocutor's question.

An example of the flouting of the maxim of quantity

This conversation features an exchange between Snowball, the pig, and Mollie, the white mare, known for her beauty but considered foolish by nature.

Mollie: ‘Will there be sugar after the rebellion?’

‘NO’ said Snowball firmly ‘We have no means of making sugar on this farm. Besides, you do not need sugar. You will have all the oats and hay you want.’

Mollie: ‘And shall I still be allowed to wear ribbons in my mane?’

‘Comrade,’ said Snowball, ‘those ribbons that you are so devoted to are the badge of slavery. Can you not understand that liberty is worth more than a ribbon?’

This conversation occurred before the rebellion on the farm, where Old Major encouraged all animals to rebel against their human master. Some animals, including Mollie, expressed confusion and posed questions about the concept of Animalism. Mollie's inquiry to Snowball regarding whether she could still wear ribbons after the rebellion's success is one such instance.

Snowball's response appears to violate the maxim of quantity, as defined by Grice (1975), which states that speakers should provide neither more nor less information than required for the situation. Instead of a simple yes or no, Snowball's response contains additional information. However, Snowball's answer implies that wearing ribbons would be inappropriate and prohibited under the principles of Animalism, as ribbons are associated with humans. He indirectly persuades Mollie to prioritize liberty over human possessions.

An example of the flouting of manner



The conversation depicted is between Clover, the horse, and Mollie, the mare. The incident occurred when Mollie was found with one of the men from the neighboring farm, who was stroking her nose. Clover, who witnessed the entire incident, now confronts Mollie and asks for the truth.

'Mollie,' Clover said, 'I have something very serious to say to you. This morning I saw you looking over the hedge that divides Animal Farm from Foxwood. One of Mr. Pilkington's men was standing on the other side of the hedge. And – I saw this – he was talking to you and you were allowing him to stroke your nose. What does that mean, Mollie?'

'He didn't! I wasn't! It isn't true!' cried Mollie, beginning to prance about and paw the ground.

'Mollie! Look me in the face. Do you give me your word of honor that the man was not stroking your nose?'

'It isn't true!' repeated Mollie, but she could not look Clover in the face, and the next moment she took to her heels and galloped away into the field.

Mollie's response violates the maxim of manner as it lacks clarity and explicitness. According to Grice's conversational maxims, speakers should aim for clarity, coherence, and brevity in their communication. In Mollie's response, she repeatedly states "It isn't true!" without offering further explanation. This repetition and lack of elaboration make her statement ambiguous and unclear. Additionally, Mollie's avoidance of eye contact with Clover while repeating her denial adds to the uncertainty and suggests evasion. A direct and clear response would have involved Mollie addressing Clover's question directly and providing a clear denial or explanation. However, Mollie's response lacks the clarity and coherence expected in effective communication, thus violating the maxim of manner. By flouting the maxim of manner, Mollie may be attempting to obscure the truth of her interaction with humans and evade further questioning from Clover.

An example of the flouting of more than one maxim

The dialogue occurs between an animal on the farm and Napoleon, the pig. The incident transpired when the cows, who hadn't been milked for several hours after the rebellion, were milked for the first time. Upon obtaining several buckets of milk, the animals pondered what to do with the milk now that Jones was no longer in charge of selling it.

'What is going to happen to all that milk?' said someone.

'Jones sometimes used to mix some of it in our mash,' said some of the hens.

'Never mind the milk comrades!' Cried Napoleon, placing himself in front of the buckets, 'That will be attended to. The harvest is more important. Comrade Snowball will lead the way. I shall follow in a few minutes. Forward, comrades! The hay is waiting.'

Napoleon's response likely flouts the Gricean maxim of quantity, as it fails to provide sufficient information to answer the question and satisfy the interlocutor. By stating that the milk would be attended to without specifying how it would be used, Napoleon's response lacks clarity and provides less information



than the interlocutors require. The questioner seeks concrete information about the fate of all the milk and expects a more substantial response than what Napoleon provided.

Furthermore, when Napoleon redirects the conversation to the importance of the harvest, he appears to flout the maxims of relation by introducing a topic unrelated to the question posed by the animal. This sudden shift in the topic may implicate Napoleon's attempt to divert attention away from the milk to something else to conceal his wicked thoughts and the plan behind what he was going to do with the milk.

5. Conclusion

In the previous section, eleven selected conversations exchanged between the characters in the novel "Animal Farm" by George Orwell were analyzed. Through the examination of instances where conversational maxims were flouted, it was discovered that the speakers did so with three primary purposes: persuasion, concealing unpleasant truths and thoughts, and defaming others. Consequently, it can be inferred from the findings of the study that, despite the flouting of conversational maxims, effective communication still occurs. Grice (1975) suggests that individuals strive to cooperate in conversations to ensure mutual understanding and further the discourse.

The findings of this study offer valuable insights into the complexities of dialogue writing for novels, particularly concerning character development and plot advancement. These results can serve as instructive examples for writers on how to strategically craft dialogues that reveal characters' true intentions while flouting conversational maxims. Moreover, the study suggests that the purposeful manipulation of conversational norms can enhance reader engagement and interpretation. By authentically portraying characters' speech patterns and interactions, writers encourage readers to actively analyze the dialogue, fostering a deeper understanding of the characters' motives and the underlying themes of the novel.

Despite the value of its findings, it is important to acknowledge certain limitations in the present study. These include the relatively small number of conversations selected for analysis and concerns regarding the credibility of the data collection procedure. These limitations stem from the focus of the study, which was solely on analyzing conversations that flout the conversational maxims. From these limitations, this study suggests several avenues for future research. Firstly, further investigation into the detailed analysis of violations or flouting of conversational maxims is recommended. This study did not explore instances where interlocutors violated one maxim to adhere to another, which could provide valuable insights. Secondly, this study was conducted on a novel, so it would be intriguing to extend the research on the cooperative principle to other sources such as advertisements or dramas, expanding the understanding of communication dynamics across different mediums. Lastly, incorporating inter-raters could significantly enhance the reliability of the analysis results.

6. Acknowledgements

The author would like to express personal heartfelt appreciation to several people who have provided their mental support during the process of writing this or any research paper. First and foremost, gratitude is extended to our Heavenly Father for His wisdom and unwavering love. Your grace knows no bounds. In addition, the author would like to express gratitude to his parents who offered their enduring support in every way. Last but not least, the author is profoundly thankful to Mr. Chayan Charoenpakdee, a life partner who has given his love freely and instilled the belief that all tasks can be accomplished with mindfulness and effective strategies.

7. References

[157]



- ES, A. D. (2015). An Analysis of Flouting Maxim in EFL Classroom Interaction. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 4(2), 243-259.
- Fahmi, R. (2016). An Analysis of Grice's Maxims Violation in Daily Conversation. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 4(2), 91 - 97.
- Fitri, E., & Qodriani, L. U. (2016). A Study on Flouting Maxims in Divergent Novel. *Teknosastik*, 14(1), 32 - 40.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. *Syntax and Semantics*, 3, 41-58.
- Ikawati, L. (2022). An Analysis of the Flouting of Conversational Maxims by Grice on 'A Clean, Well-Lighted Place' short story. *Journal of English Studies*, 3(1), 46-59.
- Jia, L. I. (2008). The Violation of Cooperative Principle and the Four Maxims in Psychological Consulting. *Canadian Social Science*, 4, 87-95.
- Manurung, L. W. (2019). Flouting Maxims in Hitam Putih Talk Show. *Suar Betang*, 14(2), 151 - 166.