

INVESTIGATING THE PRAGMATIC IMPLICATIONS OF MAXIM FLOUTING IN *PETER PAN AND WENDY* MOVIE DIALOGUE

Hilayatul Fatira ¹⁾, Nine Febrie Novitasari ^{2)*}, and Ahmad Yusuf Firdaus ³⁾

¹⁾ Department of English, Universitas Abdurachman Saleh Situbondo

²⁾ Department of English, Universitas Abdurachman Saleh Situbondo

³⁾ Department of English, Universitas Abdurachman Saleh Situbondo

Received on 22 April 2025 / Approved on 24 October 2025

Abstract

Peter Pan and Wendy (2023) is one of the many adaptations of the classic story Peter Pan and is considered a good example to study how people communicate in everyday situations. This research looks at how the characters in the movie flout conversational maxims, rules that people usually follow when they talk to each other. The research focuses on what types of maxim flouting happen in the movie and why the characters do it. To analyze this, the researcher used Grice's theory (1975) to identify the types of maxims being flouted and Leech's theory (1983) to find out the reasons behind them. The data were collected from the characters' dialogues that show maxim flouting, and then analyzed using Spradley's analytical procedures, namely domain analysis, taxonomic analysis, componential/contextual analysis, and cultural theme analysis. This study uses a descriptive qualitative method because it helps explain the meaning behind the characters' utterances. The results indicate that there are thirty-one instances of maxim flouting in the movie, encompassing four types: manner, relevance, quantity, and quality. The most frequently flouted is the maxim of manner, while the least is quality. As for the reasons, the majority of the maxim flouting occurs due to collaborative purposes. In this context, the speaker intends to convey information or facilitate understanding without causing disruption or conflict in the interaction.

Keywords: maxim flouting; pragmatic; reasons of maxim flouting; types of maxim flouting

Abstrak

Peter Pan and Wendy (2023) merupakan salah satu dari banyak adaptasi cerita klasik Peter Pan dan dianggap sebagai contoh yang baik untuk mempelajari bagaimana orang berkomunikasi dalam kehidupan sehari-hari. Penelitian ini membahas bagaimana para tokoh dalam film tersebut melanggar maksim percakapan—yaitu aturan yang biasanya diikuti dalam percakapan. Fokus penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui jenis-jenis pelanggaran maksim yang terjadi dalam film serta alasan di balik terjadinya pelanggaran tersebut. Untuk menganalisis hal ini, peneliti menggunakan teori Grice (1975) untuk mengidentifikasi jenis maksim yang dilanggar dan teori Leech (1983) untuk mengetahui alasan pelanggarannya. Data dikumpulkan dari dialog para tokoh yang menunjukkan pelanggaran maksim, lalu dianalisis menggunakan tahapan analisis dari Spradley: analisis domain, taksonomi, kontekstual, dan tema budaya. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode deskriptif kualitatif karena cocok untuk menjelaskan makna di balik ujaran para tokoh. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa terdapat 31 kasus pelanggaran maksim dalam film, yang mencakup empat jenis: maksim cara, relevansi, kuantitas, dan kualitas. Maksim yang paling sering dilanggar adalah maksim cara, sedangkan yang paling sedikit adalah maksim kualitas. Adapun alasan pelanggaran maksim paling banyak dilakukan untuk tujuan kolaboratif.

Kata Kunci: pelanggaran maxim; pragmatik; alasan pelanggaran maxim; jenis – jenis pelanggaran maxim

INTRODUCTION

The story of Peter Pan, renowned for its magical adventures and the concept of never growing up, has captivated people across generations. It is considered one of the most timeless

*Author(s) Correspondence:

E-mail: ninefebrie@gmail.com

works of children's literature. Since J.M. Barrie first wrote it, Peter Pan has been adapted into many forms, like books, movies, cartoons, and stage plays. Each brings a unique take while still keeping the core message about freedom, imagination, and childhood. Its iconic characters like Peter Pan, Wendy, Tinker Bell, and Captain Hook have made the story easily recognizable and relevant across different eras. Because of that, Peter Pan is not just fun to watch, but also interesting to study, especially when it comes to language and how the characters communicate. The story of *Peter Pan* has been the subject of numerous studies across a wide range of topics. Researchers have examined *Peter Pan* from various perspectives, including gender, psychology, audience, and culture. Studies have explored its characters, dual appeal to children and adults, narrative structure, and numerous adaptations (Brewer, 2007; Javier, 2013; Segran, 2014; R. Thomas, 2020; Safira et al., 2020; Oktafiyani & Anindita, 2022). These varied approaches reflect *Peter Pan*'s lasting relevance and richness as a subject of academic study.

Literature often reflects human experiences. It provides a platform for authors to explore issues and share insights (Ibrahim et al., 2018). One important genre in literature is fiction, which is frequently adapted into films. Through the use of audiovisual elements, movies can represent reality in a powerful and engaging way (Fauziah & Thahara, 2018). While some view movies as entertainment, they also hold value as educational tools. Tasyarasita and Wibowo (2022) emphasize that movies are highly effective for studying linguistic phenomena because they capture not just spoken language, but also gestures, tone, context, and facial expressions (elements that closely mirror real-life communication). This makes movies a valuable resource for understanding how language functions in everyday situations. Language itself plays an essential role in shaping social interactions (Ibrahim et al., 2018). In movies, the way characters interact plays a vital role in driving the storyline and helping the audience understand the plot. These interactions often reflect how people communicate in real life. Yule (1996) stresses that effective communication requires mutual understanding of words and meanings, and without shared knowledge, communication can fail, especially when conversational maxims are flouted.

Cutting (2002) explains that flouting conversational maxims happens when a speaker intentionally ignores the expected norms of conversation, relying on the listener to read between the lines and grasp the implied meaning. Then, Algoddri and Wiwoho (2022) highlight that this kind of flouting is a purposeful act, where the speaker breaks conversational rules with the assumption that the listener will understand the hidden message. For communication to run smoothly, both speakers and listeners need to follow Grice's cooperative principles, or conversational maxims, as mentioned by Yule (1996). These principles serve to minimize ambiguity and ensure that messages are delivered clearly and completely, thereby helping to prevent misunderstandings. In any conversation, every utterance is produced with a specific intention, which is referred to as its illocutionary force. This function reflects the speaker's purpose and can vary depending on the context and goals of the interaction. Leech (1983) expands on this by classifying illocutionary functions into four main categories, each playing a role in facilitating effective communication and supporting social harmony within a community.

Several studies have explored Grice's Cooperative Principle and the phenomenon of maxim flouting. Marlisa and Hidayat (2020) analyzed an episode of *Good Morning America* featuring Jackie Chan, using a transcript of the conversation to identify the occurrences of maxim flouting and discuss how these contribute to engaging communication. They found that the guests and hosts often flouted maxims, which helped maintain audience interest by creating moments of surprise and humor. Another study (Ulfah and Afrilia, 2018) focused on the movie *The B.F.G.*, examining the dialogues between Sophie and the BFG to understand how and why maxims are flouted in the film's script. It was discovered that the characters flouted maxims to emphasize the magical and surreal elements of the story. Ibrahim et al., (2018) studied maxim flouting in the movie *Se7en*, identifying all four types of maxim violations and the motivations behind them. Their research categorized the

*Author(s) Correspondence:
 E-mail: ninefebric@gmail.com

motivations for flouting as competitive, collaborative, and conflictive, showing that these violations were crucial for building tension and revealing character dynamics.

Despite these valuable contributions, a gap remains in exploring how maxim flouting specifically affects the audience's interpretation of character relationships and narrative development, particularly in recent film adaptations of classic stories like *Peter Pan and Wendy* (2023). Most existing studies focus on the film dialogue itself, but less attention is given to how audience expectations and cultural context influence the interpretation of maxim flouting. This opens up opportunities for future research to investigate the impact of flouting conversational maxims on audience perception and understanding across various genres and cultural backgrounds.

Previous studies show that movies are often chosen for research due to their wide recognition and ability to communicate values in a relatable way. Wardhaugh (2010) highlights that the variety of genres and actors in movies enhances their appeal, making them a valuable medium for language learning through literary analysis. Films offer valuable insights into the connection between language and society, providing a rich context for studying social interaction. This research differs from prior studies in both focus and methodology. While earlier studies focused on analyzing maxim flouting using Grice's theory of conversational implicature, this study focuses specifically on the movie *Peter Pan and Wendy* (2023). It combines Grice's theory to identify types of maxim flouting with Leech's theory of illocutionary functions to explore the reasons behind these floutings. By integrating both theories, this study offers a more comprehensive analysis of character interactions in the movie, shedding light on the deeper communicative dynamics that shape the narrative and character relationships.

However, a gap exists in the literature regarding the specific application of Grice's and Leech's theories to newer movie adaptations of classic stories, particularly *Peter Pan and Wendy* (2023). Most existing research has focused on analyzing maxim flouting in general or in more traditional movies, with limited attention paid to how these concepts play out in modern reimaginings of well-known tales. This presents an opportunity to explore how maxim flouting functions in the context of contemporary adaptations and how it influences the audience's understanding of character interactions and narrative development.

The goals of this research are to identify the types of maxims flouted by Peter Pan and Wendy in the movie *Peter Pan and Wendy* (2023) and to explore the reasons behind their flouting of these maxims. In addressing this, the study will integrate Grice (1975) cooperative principles and Leech (1983) illocutionary functions to provide a more nuanced analysis of character interactions. By accommodating the research gap, this study aims to offer insights into how maxim flouting works within contemporary adaptations of classic stories, an area that has been underexplored in existing literature. The researcher hopes that this study will contribute to a deeper understanding of maxim flouting in modern movie adaptations, enriching the field of linguistic research focused on conversational implicature. This research will serve as a useful resource for students and scholars in literature, linguistics, and pragmatics, particularly those utilizing Grice's and Leech's theories. Additionally, it aims to provide practical guidance for screenwriters on how to effectively use maxim flouting to create specific conversational effects and enhance character development in movies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Pragmatic

Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics that focuses on how context influences meaning in communication. According to Yule (1996) Pragmatics examines how people interpret meaning in specific situations and how context shapes understanding beyond the literal expression of words. It is concerned with both the speaker's intended meaning and the listener's interpretation. Mey (1993)

*Author(s) Correspondence:
 E-mail: ninefebric@gmail.com

adds that Pragmatics explores how language is effectively used in various contexts, including unconventional ones where speakers deliberately convey meaning beyond what is explicitly said.

In this research, pragmatics serves as the foundation for analyzing maxim flouting in *Peter Pan and Wendy* (2023). By applying Grice's theory of implicature and Leech's (1983) theory on illocutionary functions, this study uncovers the deeper meanings behind flouted maxims and how characters use language to build relationships, advance the narrative, and create emotional impact. These pragmatic theories help reveal how language achieves communicative and narrative goals in the movie.

Cooperative Principle

Conversation is a cooperative activity that relies on the active participation of multiple parties, making it essential for effective communication (Wardhaugh, 2010). For communication to be successful, both speakers and listeners must collaborate, ensuring mutual understanding and alignment with the conversational goals (Thomas, 1995). Language is a system and mode of communication originating from indigenous cultures (Tran & Tran, 2022). This concept is encapsulated in Grice's Cooperative Principle, which posits that participants in a conversation should work together to ensure clarity and efficiency in their exchanges. The principle emphasizes that effective communication requires both parties to adhere to certain conversational norms, promoting understanding and minimizing misunderstandings.

Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle lays the foundation for analyzing how people communicate implicitly, allowing for a deeper understanding of the underlying structures in everyday conversation. As explained by Thomas (1995) and further explored by Wahyuni et al., (2019) conversations are often full of implicit messages, where speakers do not explicitly state everything, but instead rely on shared knowledge, context, and conversational norms. To make sense of these subtleties, Grice introduced four conversational maxims: quality, quantity, relation, and manner that serve as guidelines for maintaining effective communication (Yule, 1996b)

Maxim Flouting

Flouting a maxim involves intentionally disregarding the Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975) to convey hidden meanings. Unlike violating a maxim, which involves misleading the listener, flouting encourages the listener to infer additional meaning without deception. Thomas (1995) distinguishes between the two, noting that violating a maxim creates false implicature, whereas flouting aims to guide the listener to interpret what is implied. Andresen (2013) further emphasizes that violations typically involve deception, which can confuse the listener.

Grice (1975) highlighted that violating maxims risks misunderstanding, while flouting requires the listener to read between the lines, interpreting the speaker's unspoken intention. Flouting can occur with any of Grice's four maxims: quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, and each guides how much information is provided, its truthfulness, its relevance, and how clearly it is expressed. By flouting these maxims, speakers invite listeners to infer meanings beyond the surface level of the conversation.

a. Manner Maxim Flouting

The manner maxim, as defined by Grice (1975), requires speakers to express themselves clearly, concisely, and in an organized way, avoiding ambiguity and unnecessary complexity. Effective communication relies on structuring thoughts so listeners can follow and understand them. This maxim ensures that information is presented in a clear, well-structured manner, allowing for smooth interpretation by the listener.

Flouting the manner maxim occurs when a speaker's message is unclear, disorganized, or overly complex. This could involve vague language, long-winded explanations, or using unfamiliar slang or jargon. Such flouting can confuse the listener or marginalize them if they

*Author(s) Correspondence:
 E-mail: ninefebric@gmail.com

cannot fully understand the speaker's message. To maintain effective communication, speakers should aim for clarity and simplicity, ensuring that their message is accessible and easily understood.

b. Relevance Maxim Flouting

The maxim of relevance dictates that speakers should contribute information that is directly related to the ongoing conversation and respond appropriately to the questions or topics raised. This ensures that the flow of conversation remains coherent and focused on the subject at hand. Adhering to this maxim helps maintain a logical and meaningful exchange of ideas, making it easier for the listener to follow and engage with the conversation. By keeping their contributions relevant, speakers contribute to a more efficient and effective dialogue.

Flouting the relevance maxim occurs when a speaker introduces topics that are unrelated to the current conversation or intentionally shifts the discussion away from the main subject. This can be done for various reasons, such as to change the topic, avoid a particular subject, or create humor or tension. In some cases, irrelevance may be used strategically to communicate indirectly, implying something without stating it directly. It may also serve to withhold information or redirect the conversation to more comfortable or favorable territory. While this may cause confusion or disrupt the flow of communication, it can also be a deliberate tactic in certain contexts, adding layers of meaning or nuance to the interaction.

c. Quality Maxim Flouting

The maxim of quality asserts that speakers should only make statements that they believe to be true and avoid presenting false or unsupported claims. This maxim emphasizes the importance of truthfulness in communication, as it ensures that participants in a conversation rely on factual evidence and accurate information when making assertions. Adhering to this principle helps maintain trust and clarity between speakers and listeners, promoting a more reliable exchange of ideas.

Flouting the quality maxim occurs when a speaker knowingly makes false statements or provides inadequate evidence to support their claims. This can involve deliberately misleading the listener or offering information without proper justification, violating the expectation of truthfulness and accuracy in conversation. While flouting this maxim may disrupt communication by causing confusion or misleading the listener, it can also serve strategic purposes in certain contexts, such as creating irony, sarcasm, or emphasizing a point by exaggerating. However, such flouting risks undermining the integrity of the conversation and may lead to misunderstandings or mistrust.

d. Quantity Maxim Flouting

The quantity maxim emphasizes the appropriate amount of information to be shared in a conversation. It consists of two key principles: providing just enough information to meet the current communicative purpose and avoiding the delivery of excessive or unnecessary details. By following this maxim, speakers can ensure that their contributions are relevant and to the point, helping to maintain an effective and cooperative exchange. Striking the right balance in the amount of information shared prevents confusion and allows for clearer communication between conversational participants.

Flouting the quantity maxim occurs when a speaker either provides too little information, leaving gaps or ambiguities that the listener must fill, or offers excessive details that overwhelm or confuse the listener. This can result in misunderstandings or make the

*Author(s) Correspondence:
 E-mail: ninefebric@gmail.com

conversation inefficient. Sometimes, speakers intentionally flout the quantity maxim to create suspense, emphasize a point, or avoid answering a question directly. While this may have strategic or rhetorical purposes, it can also disrupt the flow of communication and hinder the listener's ability to understand the intended message.

Implicature

According to Grice (1975) conversations can still progress smoothly even when speakers do not explicitly state their intentions. This is where implicature comes into play, as it refers to the process by which the listener infers the speaker's intended meaning beyond the literal interpretation of their words (Yule, 1996). Implicature is a key component of effective communication, as it allows listeners to extract deeper meanings and understand what is being communicated beyond surface-level statements. Yule further emphasizes that implicatures demonstrate how conversations often convey more than what is directly said, highlighting the role of context and shared understanding in interpretation.

The relationship between flouting a maxim and generating implicatures is particularly significant in pragmatics. When a speaker intentionally flouts a conversational maxim, they create room for implicatures to emerge. This means that breaking the cooperative principles can lead to the generation of implicit meanings, which the listener must interpret based on context. Both maxim flouting and implicature are rooted in pragmatics, the subfield of linguistics that focuses on how meaning is constructed through contextual and situational factors. By examining how implicatures arise from maxim flouting, we gain a better understanding of how meaning is conveyed and understood in everyday communication.

Reasons for Maxim Flouting

Leech (1983) discusses various illocutionary functions that convey hidden meanings in communication, which can explain why people flout conversational maxims. These functions allow speakers to achieve indirect illocutionary force by deliberately flouting maxims, leading the listener to infer additional meanings through implicatures. In doing so, speakers can fulfill specific communicative goals, such as expressing sarcasm, issuing indirect commands, or subtly signaling disagreement. Thus, the motivations behind flouting maxims are closely linked to the purposes of illocutionary acts, where speakers manipulate the structure of their communication to achieve a particular effect.

The reasons for flouting the cooperative principle maxims can be categorized into four main types: collaborative, convivial, competitive, and conflictive.

a. Collaborative

Collaboration in communication occurs when the illocutionary goal, or the speaker's communicative intention, is neutral and aligned with the social goal. In this context, the speaker intends to convey information or facilitate understanding without causing disruption or conflict in the interaction. Actions such as asserting, reporting, announcing, and instructing are typical of this type of collaborative communication. These acts aim to convey facts, share knowledge, or guide others while maintaining harmony in the conversation. The alignment between the illocutionary goal and the social goal ensures that the conversation flows smoothly, contributing to mutual understanding. By flouting conversational maxims in a collaborative manner, speakers can subtly encourage the listener to infer additional meanings, all while preserving the cooperative nature of the interaction. This approach allows for more nuanced communication and strengthens the relationship between the speaker and the listener.

b. Convivial

The convivial reason for flouting a maxim occurs when the illocutionary goal aligns harmoniously with the social goal, often in situations where the speaker's intention is to create a positive, supportive, or friendly interaction. This is commonly seen in actions such as

*Author(s) Correspondence:
 E-mail: ninefebric@gmail.com

offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, and congratulating. These speech acts are meant to promote goodwill and strengthen social bonds. This implies that flouting the maxims may serve to convey warmth, politeness, or encouragement, and the conversational exchange benefits both the speaker and the listener. By flouting maxims in these contexts, the speaker can signal a deeper, more social meaning beyond the literal interpretation of their words, thus enhancing the sense of community and shared understanding. These types of interactions contribute to maintaining positive social relationships and are inherently cooperative, with no negative consequences for either party.

c. Conflictive

The conflictive reason for flouting a maxim arises when the illocutionary goal of the speaker directly conflicts with the social goal, often leading to tension or discomfort in the conversation. In these cases, the speaker intentionally flouts maxims to convey negative or confrontational intentions, such as threatening, accusing, cursing, or reprimanding. These types of speech acts are designed to challenge or criticize the listener, and the speaker's goal may not align with maintaining a harmonious social relationship. Flouting the maxims in these situations can serve to emphasize the seriousness or intensity of the message, often making the interaction more forceful or confrontational. While this approach can achieve the speaker's communicative goal, it can also create conflict, disrupt social harmony, and potentially lead to misunderstandings or hostility. In contrast to convivial speech acts, the conflictive use of maxim flouting may reflect a breakdown in cooperative communication and a deliberate attempt to assert power or express dissatisfaction.

d. Competitive

The competitive reason for flouting a maxim occurs when there is a conflict between the illocutionary goal of the speaker and the social goal of the conversation. In this case, the speaker's primary focus is on fulfilling their personal interests, often at the expense of the needs or well-being of others. This is seen in speech acts such as ordering, asking, demanding, or begging, where the speaker intends to achieve a specific personal outcome, even if it may not align with promoting cooperation or benefiting the social group. Flouting the maxims in these situations often results in tension, as the speaker prioritizes their own goals over the social harmony or balance of the conversation. For instance, demanding something from someone can cause discomfort or resentment, as it disregards the social expectations of politeness or reciprocity. While the illocutionary goal is directed at fulfilling the speaker's needs or desires, the competitive nature of these acts can lead to a breakdown in communication, where social cooperation is compromised for individual gain.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research used a descriptive qualitative method to analyze maxim flouting in *Peter Pan and Wendy* (2023). It focuses on how the four conversational maxims: quantity, quality, relevance, and manner that are flouted in the movie's dialogue, and explores the reasons behind these violations, based on Leech's categories: collaborative, convivial, conflictive, and competitive. These motives help explain why characters may deliberately break conversational norms, whether to build understanding, maintain social harmony, assert personal goals, or disrupt communication.

The research involves identifying words, phrases, or sentences that flout these maxims, such as giving too much information, being untruthful, going off-topic, or using vague language. The context and motivation behind each instance are then analyzed.

Data analysis followed Spradley's (1980) ethnographic approach, which includes four steps:

1. Domain analysis – identifying key categories like types and reasons for flouting
2. Taxonomic analysis – organizing data by type and motive

*Author(s) Correspondence:

E-mail: ninefebric@gmail.com

3. Componential analysis – comparing different examples to highlight differences
4. Cultural theme analysis – exploring the broader social meanings behind the characters' language choices.

Through this process, the research aims to provide insight into how maxim flouting shapes character interactions and narrative development in the movie.

Table 1. Componential Analysis of Types and Reasons of Maxim Flouting

Types of Maxims flouting	Reasons flouting of maxims			
	R1	R2	R3	R4
T1				
T2				
T3				
T4				

Notes :

- T = Types of Maxim Flouting
 R = Reasons of Maxim Flouting
 T1 = Quality Maxim Flouting
 T2 = Quantity Maxim Flouting
 T3 = Relevance Maxim Flouting
 T4 = Manner Maxim Flouting
 R1 = Competitive
 R2 = Convivial
 R3 = Collaborative
 R4 = Conflictive

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The following presents the findings derived from the data analysis, providing an in-depth understanding of the key themes and patterns that emerged from the research. Here are some examples of the collected data and the analyses.

Manner Maxim Flouting

Datum 3/T4/R1 (05.36)

Mother : You really set a better example for your brothers. They look up to you so much.

Wendy : **That's what they have you for.**

Mother : They need me to be their mother and your father to be their father. But they need you to be their big sister.

In this scene, Wendy flouts the **manner** maxim, which requires clarity and directness in communication. Instead of addressing her mother's advice clearly, Wendy replies, "That's what they have you for," a deliberately vague and ambiguous statement. Rather than directly engaging with her mother's suggestion, Wendy's response introduces uncertainty, leaving her true feelings unstated but implicitly understood. This strategic vagueness avoids confrontation while subtly signaling her internal conflict. By not clearly accepting or rejecting her mother's guidance, Wendy creates an emotional barrier, expressing her reluctance to fully embrace the role of a role model for

*Author(s) Correspondence:

E-mail: ninefebric@gmail.com

her younger brothers. The ambiguity allows her to avoid direct disagreement while still communicating that she feels unprepared and inadequate for the responsibility. Wendy's use of indirect language is not meant to mislead, but rather to maintain social harmony by not confronting her mother's expectations head-on, while still conveying her discomfort.

The flouting of the manner maxim serves a dual purpose. Wendy's illocutionary goal is to communicate her desire for her mother to recognize her reluctance and vulnerability. At the same time, her social goal is to appear respectful and attentive toward her mother's advice, which she listens to without outright disagreement. The **competitive** reason for this flouting emerges from the tension between these two goals. Wendy's social goal (appearing obedient and respectful) conflicts with her illocutionary goal to express her feelings of inadequacy. Through vague language, Wendy aligns her response with both her social and illocutionary goals, maintaining politeness while subtly conveying her reluctance without directly confronting her mother's authority.

Relevance Maxim Flouting

Datum 17/T3/R4 (49:20)

- Wendy : Where are you two from? Where is his mother and father? Where are yours?
 Peter Pan : **Uh, that is a trick question. This is Neverland, where there are no mothers and fathers.**
 A lost boy : Why are not there?
 Another one : I do not remember my mother. I would not mind seeing my mother again.
 Peter Pan : Yes, you would. If you went back home, it would be the end of our fun. All our adventures. All you have left... is growing up. (Peter Pan left them and slammed the door to his room)

In this datum, Peter Pan flouts the **relevance** maxim as described by Grice (1975), which states that conversational contributions should be relevant to the ongoing discussion. When Wendy asks about the origins of the Lost Boys and their parents, Peter Pan responds with, "Uh, that is a trick question. This is Neverland, where there are no mothers and fathers." His response is unrelated to Wendy's inquiry about the Lost Boys' parents and shifts the conversation toward the broader idea of Neverland, where parents do not exist. This answer does not directly address Wendy's question, thus flouting the relevance maxim. Instead of providing a relevant and direct response, Peter Pan deliberately chooses to change the subject.

Peter Pan's response can be seen as an attempt to avoid discussing his origins, a topic that clearly makes him uncomfortable. By responding irrelevantly, he attempts to deflect Wendy's questions and discourage further probing into a subject he does not want to engage with. The **conflictive** reason for this maxim flouting arises from a clash between Peter Pan's illocutionary goal and his social goal. His illocutionary goal is to assert that in Neverland, the rules are different from what Wendy expects, particularly regarding the concept of family and parental figures. However, his social goal is to maintain politeness and respect in the conversation with Wendy, while also avoiding being too direct or offensive. By flouting the relevance maxim, Peter Pan creates a form of indirect resistance to Wendy's line of questioning, allowing him to express his discomfort without overtly rejecting her or causing offense. This illustrates how maxim flouting can serve as a subtle method of communication when the speaker wishes to avoid conflict or uncomfortable topics.

Quantity Maxim Flouting

Datum 24/T2/R3 (01:14:45)

- Captain Hook : How did you do it, boy? How did you survive? Faith, trust, and pixie dust?

*Author(s) Correspondence:
 E-mail: ninefebric@gmail.com

Peter Pan : No. No pixies dust this time. No magic. No tricks. **Just a little help from my friends.**

Captain Hook : You dare to speak to me of friends when all of yours now belong to me?

In this datum, Peter Pan flouts the **quantity** maxim, which suggests that speakers should provide the right amount of information, neither too much nor too little. When Captain Hook asks Peter Pan, "How did you survive?" Peter Pan's response, "No. No pixie dust this time. No magic. No tricks. Just a little help from my friends," includes unnecessary details that go beyond the scope of Hook's original question. The question only asked for an explanation of how Peter Pan survived, but Peter Pan goes on to mention "a little help from my friends," adding extra information that is not essential to the core of the inquiry. This additional information seems deliberately designed to provoke or distract Captain Hook, making the conversation less efficient and adding unnecessary emotional weight to the exchange.

Peter Pan's **collaborative** reason for flouting the quantity maxim becomes clear when considering his illocutionary and social goals. The illocutionary goal of Peter Pan is to subtly highlight the importance of friendship and to assert that his survival was not dependent on magic or tricks, but on the support of his friends. By emphasizing the role of friends, Peter Pan also aims to contrast himself with Captain Hook, who, as an antagonist, is often portrayed as lacking meaningful relationships. His social goal aligns with this illocutionary goal, as he intends to provoke Captain Hook by demonstrating that while Hook may have power over others, Peter Pan has the strength of true friendship. Thus, Peter Pan flouts the quantity maxim not for the sake of inefficiency, but to emphasize the emotional and social contrast between himself and Hook, reinforcing the central role of friendship in his world.

Quality Maxim Flouting

Datum 23/T1/R2 (01:14:29)

Peter Pan : **Miss me?**

Captain Hook : More than you will ever know.

A pirate : Well, wake me up if one of them kills the other.

In this scene, Peter Pan flouts the **quality** maxim, which requires speakers to be truthful and avoid saying things they believe to be false. By asking, "Miss me?" Peter Pan knowingly presents a question based on an insincere assumption that Captain Hook, his enemy, would miss him. He is not genuinely inquiring about Hook's feelings but is using the moment to inject irony and create a dramatic, tension-filled atmosphere upon his reappearance. Given the history between them, the statement is clearly not based on belief or evidence, making it a clear violation of the maxim of quality.

The reason for this flouting is **convivial**, where the illocutionary goal (to greet and tease Captain Hook) aligns with the social goal (to reestablish the adversarial bond between them in a playful, theatrical manner). Peter Pan's ironic remark serves both to provoke a reaction from Hook and to lighten the tension with a bit of humor, setting the tone for their confrontation. The convivial reason supports this dynamic by allowing Peter Pan to communicate indirectly and create a lively interaction that resonates with the whimsical and adventurous spirit of the narrative.

*Author(s) Correspondence:

E-mail: ninefebric@gmail.com

Table 2. Componential Analysis of Types and Reasons of Maxim Flouting

Types of Maxims flouting	Reasons Flouting of Maxims				Total
	R1	R2	R3	R4	
T1	0	1	1	1	3
T2	0	1	7	1	9
T3	2	1	5	1	9
T4	1	1	8	0	10
Total	3	4	21	3	31

The componential analysis of maxim flouting types and their reasons in *Peter Pan and Wendy* (2023) reveals several patterns in the movie's dialogue. Out of thirty-one occurrences of maxim flouting, the types of maxim (Quality, Quantity, Relevance, and Manner) are analyzed according to four reasons: Competitive (R1), Convivial (R2), Collaborative (R3), and Conflictive (R4). Quality Maxim Flouting (T1) occurs three times (9.68%) with Collaborative, Convivial, and Conflictive reasons, each contributing one datum. Quantity Maxim Flouting (T2), the most frequent type, occurs nine times (29.03%), with Collaborative (R3) dominating at 77.78%, followed by Convivial and Conflictive reasons. Relevance Maxim Flouting (T3) also appears nine times (29.03%), with Collaborative reasons again prevailing (55.56%), while Competitive reasons appear twice (22.22%). Manner Maxim Flouting (T4), the most frequent type at 32.26%, is primarily driven by Collaborative reasons (80%), while Competitive and Convivial reasons appear once each, and Conflictive reasons are absent. Overall, the analysis shows that Collaborative reasons (R3) are the most common motivation for flouting maxims, accounting for 67.74% of the data, suggesting that characters use maxim flouting to enhance mutual understanding and maintain social harmony. In contrast, Competitive and Conflictive reasons are less common, indicating that the movie's dialogue focuses more on fostering connection than on dominance or disruption. These patterns align with the movie's themes of fantasy, emotion, and evolving relationships.

Discussion

This research found that the most frequently flouted maxim in *Peter Pan and Wendy* (2023) is the maxim of manner (ten times), followed by quantity and relevance (nine times each), and then quality (three times). Most of this flouting was done for collaborative reasons (twenty-one out of thirty-one cases), showing that characters often break the rules of conversation not to confuse or offend others, but to share deeper feelings or maintain a good relationship.

This supports what Ulfah and Afrilia (2018) found in *The B.F.G.*, where characters also flouted maxims to fit the magical tone of the story. Similarly, in Ibrahim et al. (2018)'s research on *Se7en*, flouting was used to build tension and show character emotions, though that movie was more serious and dark. In contrast, *Peter Pan and Wendy* uses flouting in a softer, more emotional way to show characters' struggles with growing up, family, and friendship.

The use of collaborative and convivial reasons is also similar to what Marlisa and Hidayat, (2020) found in *Good Morning America*, where flouting added fun and surprise to conversations. However, *Peter Pan and Wendy* adds a new layer. In fact, it uses flouting not just to entertain, but to show how characters deal with pressure and emotions they do not know how to express clearly. For example, Wendy's unclear answer to her mother shows that she feels unsure and uncomfortable, even though she does not say it directly.

The "thin line" here is how flouting helps tell the story in a deeper way. In this movie, flouting is not just about making the conversation interesting. It shows how characters feel inside and how they try to balance being honest with being polite. Unlike earlier studies that focused more on humor or drama, this research shows that flouting is also used to show emotional tension and

*Author(s) Correspondence:

E-mail: ninefebrie@gmail.com

character growth. By using both Grice's and Leech's theories, this research shows not only how characters break conversation rules, but also why they do it. For instance, Peter Pan's vague answers about his past are not just meant to avoid the topic. They show his discomfort and desire to protect himself emotionally.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

This research shows that the maxim of manner is the most frequently flouted in the movie *Peter Pan and Wendy* (2023). This means that characters often use vague or unclear language to hide their true feelings or protect their identities. For example, Wendy avoids expressing her honest emotions because she does not want to hurt her mother or admit she's unsure about becoming a good older sister. This reflects how people in real life often hold back their true thoughts out of fear of being judged, especially during big life changes.

The research also finds that the main reason for flouting maxims is collaborative. In other words, characters flout maxims not to lie or avoid conversation, but to keep the conversation smooth, build understanding, and avoid conflict. Peter Pan, for instance, avoids giving straight answers because he wants to protect the magic of Neverland or express discomfort without being harsh. This mirrors how people in everyday life sometimes choose indirect communication to express feelings or manage difficult topics.

These findings show that flouting maxims does not always harm communication. Instead, it can actually add emotional depth, help characters express themselves more meaningfully, and make the story more engaging. In the movie, this contributes to both character development and the emotional flow of the story.

Suggestions

Future studies are encouraged to explore how maxim flouting affects the flow and meaning of conversations in movies or real-life settings. Movies are great materials for this kind of research because they reflect everyday communication and social interaction. Researchers should also look deeper into the intended meaning behind flouted maxims and why characters choose to say things indirectly. It would also be helpful to consider cultural influences, since people from different backgrounds may interpret indirect language differently. Since many movie scripts and dialogue materials are now available online, future research can also use digital resources to study maxim flouting more widely. This kind of research is useful not just for language researchers but also for scriptwriters, who can learn to create more natural and emotionally rich conversations. In conclusion, this research helps us understand how people use language in subtle ways to express emotions, build relationships, and shape narratives, both in fiction and real life.

REFERENCES

- Algoddri, A. S., & Wiwoho, G. (2022). Analysis of Flouting Maxim in the Yoon. *Linguamedia*, 3, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.56444/lime.v3i01.2869>
- Andresen, N. (2013). Flouting the maxims in comedy. *Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences*, 29.
- Brewer, M. (2007). Peter Pan and the white imperial imaginary. *New Theatre Quarterly*, 23(4), 387–392. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X07000309>

*Author(s) Correspondence:
 E-mail: ninefebric@gmail.com

- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse* (P. Stockwell (ed.)). Routledge.
- Fauziah, W., & Thahara, Y. (2018). An Analysis of Hegemony in Zootopia Movie. *PIONEER*, 10(1), 40–51. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36841/pioneer.v10i1.187>
- Grice. (1975). *Grice-Logic.pdf* (pp. 41–58). <https://doi.org/1975>
- Ibrahim, Z., Arifin, M. B., & Setyowati, R. (2018). the Flouting of Maxim in the Se7En Movie Script. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 2(1), 81–94. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v2i1.1016>
- Javier, M. L. (2013). the Stolen Fairy Dust: an Analysis of the American Film Adaptations of Peter Pan. *Philologica Urcitana Revista Semestral de Iniciación a La Investigación En Filología*, 9(Septiembre), 1989–6778.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.
- 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), 137. <https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v7i2.6630>
- Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Oktafiyani, E., & Anindita, D. S. (2022). Unconventional Narrative Structure and The Problem of Latency Phase in Peter Pan Novel. *Buletin Al-Turas*, 28(2), 207–220. <https://doi.org/10.15408/bat.v28i2.23610>
- Safira, A., Aeni, E. N., & Sudja'ie, M. A. (2020). Deconstruction of Peter Pan's Character in Edward Kitsis' and Adam Horowitz's Once Upon a Time, Season Three (2013). *J-Lalite: Journal of English Studies*, 1(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jes.2020.1.1.2688>
- Segran, M. G. (2014). A Critical Study of James Barrie's Peter Pan. In *Consultant* (Vol. 54, Issue 11). <https://doi.org/10.7328/jurpcb20132811201>
- Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant Observation*. Waveland Press, Inc.
- Tasyarasita, A. Z., & Wibowo, A. H. (2022). Flouting of Conversational Maxims Analysis of Characters and Social Contexts in “All The Bright Places” Movie. *Surakarta English and Literature Journal*, 5(2), 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.52429/selju.v5i2.24>
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction; An Introduction to Pragmatics* (P. E. Limited (ed.)). Routledge.
- Thomas, R. (2020). Deconstructing the Peter Pan / Captain Hook Binary in Peter and Wendy Deconstructing the Peter Pan / Captain Hook Binary in Peter and Wendy. *ALETHEIA: The Alpha Chi Journal of Undergraduate Scholarship*, 5(2), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.21081/ax0257>
- Tran, T. Q., & Tran, T. V. (2022). Speech Acts in Disney Animated Movie: Cinderella 3 a Twist in Time. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, 13(1), 57–71. <https://doi.org/10.30813/jelc.v13i1.3406>
- Ulfah, R. A. A. N., & Afrilia, R. (2018). an Analysis of Flouting Maxim in “the B.F.G” Movie. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 1(5), 687. <https://doi.org/10.22460/project.v1i5.p687-695>

- Wahyuni, M., Arifin, M. B., & Lubis, I. S. (2019). an Analysis of Flouting of Maxims Done By Main Characters in La La Land Movie. *Jurnal Ilmu Budaya*, 3(3), 384–392. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v3i3.2212>
- Wardhaugh, R. (2010). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics Volume 16 dari Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics* (H. G. Widdowson (ed.)). Oxford University Press.