

Violating and Flouting the Conversational Maxims in Situation Comedy 2***Broke Girls: The Two Opening, Season 6, Episode 1*****Icih Safitri, S.Hum.****Frina Diniarta Nur, S.E., M.Hum.****Institut Bisnis Nusantara****chichi.s.fitria@gmail.com****frinadiniarta@gmail.com****Abstract**

This research aims at analyzing violation and flouting the conversational maxims that occurred in the situation comedy *2 Broke Girls: The Two Opening, Season 6, Episode 1*. The study uses qualitative methods and intends to answer four research questions, i.e., kinds of maxims that are violated, kinds of maxims that are flouted, characters who violate and flout the maxims, and reasons of violating and flouting the maxims. The theory used is Grice's theory of cooperative principle, conversational maxims, and implicature. This research used qualitative method. The result of the analysis showed that violation and flouting of the conversational maxims appeared in the *2 Broke Girls*. Thirty-one data were found. Twelve data contains violation, and nineteen data contains flouting. All the maxims were violated and flouted, i.e., maxim quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The speaker violated and flouted the maxim for various reasons according to what maxim that was violated and flouted. Almost all characters violated and/or flouted the maxims.

Keywords: conversational maxims, violation, flouting, situation comedy

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan menganalisis pelanggaran *violation* dan pelanggaran *flouting* dalam maksim percakapan yang terjadi dalam komedi situasi *2 Broke Girls: The Two Opening, Season 6, Episode 1*. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif dan bermaksud menjawab empat pertanyaan penelitian, yaitu maksim apa saja yang mengalami pelanggaran *violation*, maksim apa saja yang mengalami pelanggaran *flouting*, karakter yang melakukan pelanggaran *violation* dan pelanggaran *flouting*, dan alasan melakukan pelanggaran *violation* dan pelanggaran *flouting*. Teori yang digunakan adalah teori Grice tentang prinsip kerja sama, maksim percakapan, dan implikatur. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa pelanggaran *violation* dan pelanggaran *flouting* dalam maksim percakapan muncul di *2 Broke Girls*. Penulis menemukan tiga puluh satu data. Dua belas data merupakan pelanggaran *violation*, dan sembilan belas data merupakan pelanggaran *flouting*. Seluruh maksim kuantitas, kualitas, relasi, dan pelaksanaan mengalami pelanggaran *violation* dan pelanggaran *flouting*. Penutur melakukan pelanggaran *violation* dan pelanggaran *flouting* karena berbagai alasan sesuai dengan maksim apa yang dilanggar. Hampir seluruh karakter melakukan pelanggaran *violation* dan/atau *flouting*.

Kata kunci: maksim percakapan, pelanggaran violation, pelanggaran flouting, komedi situasi

I. INTRODUCTION

Grice (1991) proposes a theory of cooperative principle which is expected to be followed by the speaker whenever a conversation occurs. He formulates the cooperative principle as “make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged” (Grice, 1991, p.26). A basic underlying assumption people make when people speak to one another is that people are trying to cooperate with one another to construct meaningful conversations.

Grice (1991) also points out that the participant in a conversation does not always follow these rules to the letter, but both conversationalists still assume that the cooperative principle is still in effect and can therefore make sense of what is said. To be cooperative in a conversation, Grice designs four conversational maxims that speakers must follow. The first maxim is maxim of quality. In fulfilling maxim of quantity, the speaker should be as informative as it is required. He/she should not give too little or too much information). The second maxim is maxim of quality refers to the truth contribution which is given by the speaker in the conversation. Maxim of quality expects the speaker to give the listener the true information, or she/he must not say something which she/he believes to be false. The third is maxim of relation. Maxim of relation requires the speaker be relevant in a conversation. The fourth and last conversational maxim is maxim of manner. This maxim requires the speaker to avoid obscurity of expression and ambiguity in her/his utterances; moreover, the speaker must also say something briefly and orderly.

Grice then continues by differentiating between observance and non-observance of the maxims (in Cutting, 2008). Observing the maxim means that the speaker is able to fulfill the maxims of cooperative principle, so she/he is considered as being cooperative in the conversation. The example of observing the four maxims can be seen below:

Example 1

Situation: It is in the morning. A husband and wife are at home. The husband is about to go to the office.

Husband: "Where are the car keys?"

Wife: "They're on the table in the hall."

(Thomas, 1995:64)

The conversation shows that the wife has answered clearly (Manner) and truthfully (Quality). She also has given the right amount of information (Quantity) and has directly addressed her husband's goal in asking the question (Relation). She has said precisely what she meant, no more and no less, and has generated no implicature, i.e., there is no distinction to be made here between what she says and what she means, and there is no additional level of meaning.

On the other hand, non-observing the maxims means that the speaker fails in fulfilling the maxims of cooperative principle. According to Grice (1991) there are many occasions when a speaker fails to observe the maxims. Thomas (1995: 64-75) categorizes five occasions that make a speaker fail to observe a maxim. These are violating a maxim, flouting a maxim, infringing a maxim, opting out, and suspending a maxim. This study focuses only on violating and flouting a maxim.

1.1 Violating a Maxim

Grice said that violation is the simplest non-observance of a maxim, a speaker that is violating a maxim is liable to mislead (Grice in Thomas 1995). Violation can occur in all four maxims:

quantity, quality, relation, and manner. Violation of maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker provides more or less information than the situation requires, as can be seen in example 2.

Example 2

Situation: A man meets a woman with a dog.

Man: "Does your dog bite?"

Woman: "No."

The man reaches down to pet the dog. The dog bites the man's hand.

Man: "Ouch! Hey! You said your dog doesn't bite."

Woman: "He doesn't. But that's not my dog."

(Yule, 1996:36)

The problem of the conversation lies in the man's assumption towards the woman's reply. The woman's answer provides less information than expected, so the man assumes that the dog belongs to the woman. The woman is considered to violate the maxim of quantity because she gives less information to the man without the intention of generating an implicature.

Violation of maxim of quality occurs when the speaker says something which is untrue or for which s/he lacks adequate evidence. Maxim of relation is violated when the speaker gives a response which is irrelevant to the topic which is being discussed, or s/he tends to change the topic in the conversation. Violation of the maxim of manner occurs when the speaker gives ambiguous statement or the statement that s/he gives is not orderly, obscurity, and prolixity. Violation of maxim of quality, relation, and manner can be seen in the wife's different replies to her husband's same question as stated in example 3.

Example 3

Situation: A husband is asking his wife who has just bought a new dress.

Husband: "How much did that the new dress cost, honey?"

(a) Wife: "Thirty-five pounds (wrong information)."

(b) Wife: "I know. Let's go out tonight."

(c) Wife: "A tiny fraction of my salary, though probably a bigger fraction of the salary of the woman that sold it to me."

(Cutting, 2002:40).

In (a), the wife does not tell the truth about the price of the dress to her husband. Thus, she is considered to violate the maxim of quality because she lies to her husband. The reason why she violates the maxim might be to avoid her husband of getting mad. She violates the maxim of quality without the intention of generating an implicature. In (b), the wife does not want to answer her husband's question and even tries to avoid the question by uttering another topic. It is considered that the wife violates the maxim of relation because she changes the topic of the conversation to hide something. She violates the maxim of relation without the intention of

generating an implicature. In (c), the wife is considered to violate the maxim of manner because her answer is not clear. She violates the maxim of manner to hide the actual price of the dress, but she does not intend to generate implicature.

1.2 Flouting a Maxim

Flouting occurs when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim, not with any intention of deceiving or misleading, but because the speaker wishes to prompt the hearer to look for a meaning which is different from the expressed meaning (Grice, cited in Thomas, 1995). In other words, the speaker ignores one or more maxims to generate an implicature or implied meaning. Thus, the speaker's real purpose is to make the hearer look for the other meaning.

A flout of the maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker blatantly gives more or less information than the situation requires. An implicature is generated when the speaker flouts the maxim of quantity, as can be seen in example 4.

Example 4

Situation: Charlene and Dexter are having a gathering.

Charlene: "I hope you brought the bread and the cheese."

Dexter: "Ah, I brought the bread."

(Yule, 1996: 40)

Surely, this example is categorized as the flouting of maxim of quantity. Dexter tries to say that what is not mentioned is not brought. He intentionally gives too little information to respond to Charlene's utterance, so Charlene realizes the unstated meaning, i.e., the cheese was not brought.

Flouting the maxim of quality occurs when the speaker says something which is blatantly untrue or for which the speaker lacks evidence. An implicature is generated when the speaker flouts the maxim of quality (Grice in Thomas 1995), as can be seen in example 5.

Example 5

Situation: Ellie and Sam are having a conversation about the weather.

Ellie: "Ough. Winter has come."

Sam: "Right. My house is a refrigerator right now."

(Quoted in Siti, 2015:25)

Sam is flouting the maxim of quality because he says something that is not true. Both understand that Sam's house is not a refrigerator. Sam tries to express his agreement and informs A implicitly that his house is very cold, as cold as in a refrigerator. According to Grice (1975:53), "maxim under the category of quality also can be flouted by giving irony, metaphoric, litotes, and hyperbole expressions."

The maxim of relation is flouted when a speaker is giving a response or making an observation which is obviously irrelevant to the topic that is being discussed (Grice, 1991). The example of flouting the maxim of relation is when the participant of a conversation changes the

subject, fails to keep the topic, or overtly fails to address the other person's goal in asking a question. However, being irrelevant does not purely mean that the speakers do not want to be relevant. Sometimes, the speakers are being irrelevant because they want to hide something or to say something to others indirectly, as in example 6.

Example 6

Situation: A and B are at home.

A: "Where is my box of chocolates?"

B: "The children were in your room this morning."

(Leech, 1983: 94)

B's answer does not seem to be relevant to the question. A is talking about chocolate while B is talking about the children. By flouting the maxim of relation, the implicature is generated. B is suggesting that the children ate the chocolates, or B is suggesting that the children know where the chocolates are.

The maxim of manner is flouted when a speaker deliberately fails to observe the maxim by not being brief, using obscure language, not being orderly or using ambiguity. This creates an implicature which makes the participants look for an additional set of meanings (Thomas 1995:71). Flouting of the maxim of manner can be seen in example 7.

Example 7

Situation: The interviewer is asking the official about politics.

Interviewer: "Did the United States Government play any part in the Duvaliers' departure? Did they, for example, actively encourage him to leave?"

Official: "I would not try to steer you away from that conclusion."

(Thomas 1995:71)

The official could simply reply "yes". The actual response is extremely long-winded and convoluted, so that the official fails to observe the maxim of manner. The implicature in this case tells the interviewer that the official does not want to admit their involvement directly, but s/he does so indirectly by not being direct with the answer (Thomas 1995:71).

Savorelli (2010:21) defines "Situational comedy is a radio or television comedy series that involves a continuing cast of character in a succession of episode". He also adds that the situation comedy is typically half an hour in length. In short, situation comedy is a kind of entertainment that is made based on social phenomena, social interest, and cultural value. Moreover, the language used in the situational comedy represents everyday speech in most everyday situations. The story of situation comedy *2 Broke Girls: The Two Opening*, season 6, episode 1 is about the lives of two young women, Max Black and Caroline Channing, who are waitresses at the Williamsburg Diner. Their friendship started to develop when Caroline, who was having a bad luck due to her father's scandal which caused her to lose all her money, started working at the Diner. At that time, Caroline

had no place to stay. Max found her in the subway and let Caroline stay in her apartment. Since then, they have lived together in Max's apartment and have become best friends. Max is good at baking cupcakes. Knowing this talent, Caroline convinced Max to build a cupcake business seriously. Now, they are working at the Diner and also have a cupcake business at the Dessert Bar.

In addition, Pearson and Simpson (2005) explain that situation comedy focuses on a group of main characters who hold the action of the story. They also explain other types of roles, which are supporting characters and transient characters. Supporting characters are regular casts who interact with main characters on various scenes, while transient characters appear as guest star, occasional characters or one-time characters.

There are two main characters of the situation comedy *2 Broke Girls: The Two Opening*, season 6, episode 1. The first main character, Max Black, is a waitress at the Williamsburg Diner. She is a poor working-class girl. She never knows what her father looks like and she lives separately from her mother. She can bake cupcakes and sell them at the Diner to get extra money. She always wears knee-high brown leather boots while waitressing. Caroline Channing, the second main character, joined the Williamsburg Diner as a waitress after a string of bad lucks. She was formerly a rich high society girl. She lost all of her money when her father was arrested and thrown in jail for a Ponzi scheme. Caroline always wears large pearl necklaces as well as high-heeled shoes.

There are five supporting characters in this episode. The first supporting character, Han Lee, is the owner of the Williamsburg Diner. He is originally from South Korea. He is a target of jokes, especially from Max, because of his short height. The second supporting character, Sophie Kachinsky, is a Polish woman who owns a cleaning company and lives in the apartment unit above Max and Caroline's. She always enters the Diner saying "Hey, everybody!" and always sits in her favorite booth. She was involved in a serious relationship with Oleg. Finally, she married him and had a baby girl. The third supporting character is Vanko Oleg Golishevsky or Oleg, a Ukrainian. He cooks at the Williamsburg Diner. He flirts to Max and Caroline constantly with inappropriate jokes. He met Sophie and fell in love with her. The fourth supporting character is Earl Washington, a cashier of the Williamsburg Diner. He is a former jazz musician and still sells his CD at the Diner. He is close to Max. Finally, the last supporting character is Randy. He is Max's ex-boyfriend who lives in New York. He is still in love with Max.

There are four transient characters of this episode. They are J. Petto, 2Chainz, Vanessa Nibotita, and Dr. Gomulka.

The writers decide to choose *2 Broke Girls* as the data because this situation comedy is entertaining, and it contains many violations and flouting of the conversational maxims that happen among the characters of *2 Broke Girls* when they are communicating with one another. The fact that besides it receives good review, it also receives bad reviews due to stereotyping issues makes

this sitcom more interesting to study. This research tries to answer four research questions, i.e., what kinds of maxims are violated, what kinds of maxims are flouted, which characters violate and flout the maxims, and what are the reasons of violating and flouting the maxims.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research uses qualitative method. The data are taken from the dialogues of situation comedy 2 *Broke Girls: The Two Opening*, season 6, episode 1. The type of the data is spoken data in a form of utterance. All the dialogues of the situation comedy 2 *Broke Girls* are used as the source of data population. The data that are analyzed in this research are the dialogues which violate and flout the maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

III. DISCUSSION

Thirty-one (31) data that contain violation and flouting of the conversational maxims are found.

3.1 Kinds of Maxims that are Violated

The result of the analysis shows that the speakers do not always obey the conversational maxims. The writers find twelve (12) data of violation. The study shows that all the conversational maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner are violated. These are three (3) data of maxim Quantity (Data 7, 9, and 22), three (3) data of maxim Quality (Data 10, 12, and 14), three (3) data of maxim Relation (16, 19, and 20), and three (3) data of maxim Manner (11,24, and 31).

3.1.1 Violating Maxim of Quantity

Three (3) data contain violation of the maxim of quantity. Data 7 is one of them.

Data 7: scene 3 (00:09:24 – 00:09:42)

Context

It is the conversation between Han and Caroline. Han is the owner of the Diner, but at that time he also takes a job as flower delivery man. Caroline is the waitress who works at the Diner and the owner of the Dessert Bar along with Max. This scene takes place in the Dessert Bar. The Dessert Bar is a place where Max and Caroline run their new business of cake and cocktail. The Dessert Bar will be opened in two days, but Max and Caroline have not found a bartender yet. They have been interviewing some applicants but there is no qualified person. In this scene, Max and Caroline just interviewed an applicant named J. Petto. After he left, Max goes to check out the bathroom and Caroline stays in the bar. Han who works as flower delivery man comes to the Dessert Bar to send the Daisy flowers from Randy to Max and Caroline for the opening of the Dessert Bar. Randy is Max's ex-boyfriend. He lives in Los Angeles while Max lives in Brooklyn. Their relationship recently broke up. Han is wearing the uniform: a green shirt and a hat.

Dialogue

Han: "Delivery for Max and Caroline!"

Caroline: “What are you wearing? And I don't know how this is possible, but you have a camel toe.”

Han: **“It's my flower delivery uniform. I picked up a shift so I could pay you two shrews faster and get my Diner back. Now, could you please sign? I left my bicycle unlocked.”**

Caroline: “It says, ‘Max and Caroline, congratulations on your dessert bar, Randy’. These are from Randy! Oh, my God! Get these out of here!”

Analysis

Instead of directly answering Caroline's question with brief answer, Han replies with an exceptionally long answer, thus violates the maxim of quantity. This answer is not the information that Caroline needs because what she wants to know is only a short answer such as ‘It's my flower delivery uniform’. In this dialogue it can be assumed that Han's utterance contains violation of maxim of quantity. The reason why Han violates the maxim of quantity is because he feels insulted, and he wants to explain that he needs to do another job to earn more money to pay his debt to Caroline and Max.

3.1.2 Violating Maxim of Quality

This study finds three (3) data that contain violation of the maxim of quality. Data 10 is one of them.

Data 10: scene 4 (00:10:59 – 00:11:17)

Context

It is a conversation among Caroline, Sophie, and Max. Sophie lives in the same apartment with Max and Caroline. Her room is located above Max and Caroline's room. They become friend since Sophie moved to that apartment. This scene takes place at Max and Caroline's apartment. Sophie who is pregnant comes in and brings the flowers. Caroline and Max are in the kitchen talking about the puddle in the hallway in front of their apartment which is almost like a pool, liquor license that has not come yet, and carbon monoxide detector whose battery runs out. Seeing Sophie coming, Caroline approaches Sophie. She knows that what Sophie is bringing is the flowers from Randy to Max which was sent by Han earlier, and which she refused to accept. She does not want Max to know about the flowers, so she tries to make Sophie go away.

Dialogue

Caroline: “Sophie, where did you get those Upsy Daisies?”

Sophie: “Oh, Han gave them to me. Yeah, and he tried to sell me a time-share in the Poconos. Yeah, but I got to say, I was a little intrigued.”

Caroline: **“Sophie, you shouldn't be down here. There's a probable carbon monoxide leak. You should go check out our pool.”**

Max: “Why did Han give you flowers? Is he trying to hit that?”

Analysis

It can be assumed that Caroline violates the maxim of quality. She lies to Sophie about carbon monoxide leak. By saying this utterance, Caroline wants to frighten away Sophie because this gas is dangerous for a pregnant woman. She wants Sophie to leave so that Max will not notice about the flowers. If Max knows that Caroline refused to accept the flowers, Max will be mad at her. In their apartment, there is a carbon monoxide detector, but the battery runs out at that time. So, Caroline makes a lie about the probable carbon monoxide leak. She says something that she lacks adequate evidence. Besides, she also lies about the pool which does not exist. She says things which are not true. She violates the maxim of quality to distract Sophie's attention and makes Sophie go out.

3.1.3 Violating Maxim of Relation

The study finds three (3) data that contain violation of the maxim of relation. Data 16 is one of them.

Data 16: Scene 6 (00:20:53 - 00:21:38)

Context

It is the conversation among Sophie, Earl, Caroline, and Oleg. Earl is the cashier and Oleg is the chef of the Diner where Max and Caroline work. Oleg is also Sophie's husband. This scene takes place at Williamsburg Diner. Sophie, who is pregnant, comes to the Diner. She stands in front of the door and greets all people as usual. Suddenly, she sneezes and makes her water broke. Earl is in his cashier table, while Max and Caroline stand in front of the Diner's bar. Max, Earl, and Caroline see it and ask Oleg to bring a mop bucket to clean the floor.

Dialogue

Sophie: "Hey, *every-baby*. Still *pregachoo!* (water breaks). Are you guys seeing this, too?"

Earl: "I'm never *gonna* forget it."

Sophie: "I think my water broke."

Caroline: "Oleg! Get out of here and bring the mop bucket. Sophie's in labor."

Oleg: "**Oh I'm calling the car right now. It says, 'your Lyft driver is already here'.**"

Han: "Did somebody order a car?"

Max: "Look, it's *Minnie* Driver."

Analysis

Oleg's response is irrelevant to Caroline's request, thus violating the maxim of relation. Caroline orders Oleg to bring the mop bucket for Sophie, but Oleg prefers to call a car rather than bringing the mop bucket. It is considered that Oleg's contribution is not appropriate to the current conversation though it might be an appropriate contribution for a later conversation. The reason why Oleg violates the maxim of relation is that Oleg is in panic so he cannot understand what Caroline mean and he does another action instead.

3.1.4 Violating Maxim of Manner

This study finds three (3) data that contain violation of the maxim of manner. Data 11 is one of them.

Data 11: Scene 4 (00:11:18 – 00:11:31)

Context

It is a conversation between Max and Sophie. This scene takes place in Max and Caroline's apartment. Caroline is talking to Sophie while Max approaches Sophie. She asks Sophie about the flowers and why Han gave it to Sophie. Max still does not know that the flowers are from Randy. Caroline who is standing behind Max gives Sophie a clue not to talk about the flowers to Max, but Sophie does not understand it. Finally, Sophie talks about the flowers to Max.

Dialogue

Max: "Why did Han give you flowers? Is he trying to hit that?"

Sophie: **"Oh, well, he'd have to reach that first. No, they were for you guys. Yeah, Caroline didn't want them. Yeah, but I'm not above garbage flowers."**

Max: "These are from Randy for me. You!"

Caroline: "Max, I didn't want to tell you about the flowers. I didn't want to upset you."

Analysis

Sophie violates the maxim of manner because she is not orderly and not brief in her response to Max's question. First, her response to Max's question is not orderly answered because Max's first question is answered in Sophie's second utterance, and Max's second question is answered in Sophie's first utterance. Second, her utterances are not brief because she gives excessive information. The excessive information in Sophie's utterance that makes her utterance not brief is "Yeah, but I'm not above garbage flowers." If she observes the maxim, she just needs to tell Max that Han gave her the flower which was for Max and Caroline because Caroline refused it. The reason why Sophie violates the maxim of manner is because she does not want to keep the flowers which are not for her.

3.2 Kinds of Maxims that are Flouted

The writers find nineteen (19) data of flouting, namely six (6) data of maxim Quantity (6, 18, 21, 27, 28, and 30), four (4) data of maxim Quality (3, 4, 5, and 25), five (5) data of maxim Relation (2, 8, 13, 15, and 17), and four (4) data of maxim Manner (1, 23, 26, and 29). It shows that all the conversational maxims (Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner) are flouted.

3.2.1 Flouting Maxim of Quantity

Six (6) data contain flouting of the maxim of quantity. Data 6 is one of them.

Data 6: Scene 3 (00:08:15 – 00:08:52)

Context

It is a conversation among Max, Caroline, and J. Petto. This scene takes place in the Dessert Bar. Max and Caroline are looking for a bartender for their Dessert Bar. They just interviewed a person

named Randall. Caroline did not accept Randall because his nickname is Randy. Then a person named J. Petto comes to apply for the job. They have met before when Max and Caroline have a cake store in the city hall and J. Petto used to play the puppet in front of their store. Max did not allow J. Petto to play the puppet in front of the store because it blocked the customers from entering their store. Accidently, Max broke his puppet and J. Petto sued them to replace his loss. Of course, Max and Caroline did not accept J. Petto as a bartender for their Dessert Bar because of a bad experience with J. Petto in the past.

Dialogue

Max: “We don't like to work with Nemesises. Nemesi? Let's just go with creepy people that we hate.”

J. Petto: **“Fine. You two, with your porcelain skin and your businesses. I'll go back to my crappy daytime job, but FYI, Cagney and Lacey, nobody knows what the hell a Dessert Bar is.”**

Caroline: “What is so hard to understand? It's signature cocktails paired with dessert confections.”

J. Petto: “Why do all my enemies have to be geniuses?”

Analysis

J. Petto seems to deliver too much information. Thus, it can be assumed that the maxim of quantity is flouted by J. Petto. He gives a response which is more than expected or needed. His first utterance is the information that is required to response to Max's statement, but the other utterances are unnecessary information that might be confusing. He flouted the maxim because he was upset with Max and Caroline who did not accept him as a bartender. He also felt humiliated because Max called him creepy people. So, he mocked Max and Caroline who were close with each other like Cagney and Lacey. Cagney and lacey are the characters of the 80's American television series *Cagney and Lacey*, who are partners and friends. J. Petto says that nobody knows what a dessert bar is to mock the girls. The implied meaning of his utterances is that he was jealous to Max and Caroline who had a successful business. J. Petto also says, “I'll go back to my crappy daytime job”, which implies that he felt depressed in his present job.

3.2.2 Flouting Maxim of Quality

This study finds four (4) data that contain flouting of the maxim of quality. Data 3 is one of them.

Data 3: Scene 2 (00:03:30-00:03:55)

Context

It is a conversation among Earl, Caroline, Han, and Max. This scene takes place at Williamsburg Dinner. There are five participants in this conversation. Max, Caroline, Earl, and Oleg are sitting on a booth of the Diner and Han is standing in front of them in his Diner's uniform. In the meeting, Caroline explains that she and Max have another business (the Dessert Bar) which is going to open

in two days, but Earl has no idea about what the Dessert Bar is. Han says that he does not know it either.

Dialogue

Earl: “Girls, while you have us trapped here, what the hell is a dessert bar? Is it cake with alcohol in it? Or alcohol with cake? 'Cause either way, nobody wants to make love after eating a big hunk of pie.”

Caroline: “**Earl, everybody understands the concept.**”

Han: “I don't get the dessert bar thing either.”

Max: “**Who wants to hear from a human mustard packet?**”

Han: “Randy, Randy, Randy. Zing!”

Analysis

In this conversation, there are two participants that can be assumed to flout the maxim of quality. First is Caroline, and the second is Max. Caroline flouts maxim quality because Caroline says something that lacks adequate evidence. She says that everybody knows what the Dessert Bar is. Caroline believes that everybody understands the concept of the Dessert Bar. If everybody understands, so why Han says that he also does not understand about what the Dessert Bar is. The implied meaning of Caroline’s utterance is that the concept of the Dessert Bar is similar with other bars. Second, Max also flouts the maxim of quality because Max’s response to Han’s statement is untrue. She says the utterance to mock Han who is wearing a waiter uniform whose color is yellow like mustard, so Max mocks Han by using a phrase “a human mustard packet”. The implied meaning of Max’s utterance is that she does not care if Han does not understand the concept.

3.2.3 Flouting Maxim of Relation

Five (5) data that contain flouting of the maxim of relation are found. Data 2 is one of them.

Data 2: Scene 2(00:02:56 -00:03:23)

Context

It is a conversation among Caroline, Earl, and Han. This scene takes place in Williamsburg Diner. Max, Caroline, Oleg, and Earl are sitting in one of the tables, and Han is standing in front of them wearing the Diner’s uniform. The five of them are having a meeting about some topics. The owner of the Diner is not only Han. Max and Caroline are also the owners. Han made a mistake: he lost in a gambling, and he owes Caroline and Max \$25,000. Besides managing the Diner, Max and Caroline also have to manage the Dessert Bar. They try to balance their job, so they ask Han to be a waiter and wear the Diner’s uniform as well.

Dialogue

Caroline: “Han, since the Diner is now owner operated, if we have to wait on tables, so do you. You're gonna cover our shifts because our other business, the Dessert Bar, is opening in two days.”

Earl: “Did you say you own a dessert bar? Huh pill time.”

Han: **“I don't know why I can't catch a break from you two. I had to put up with Max's heartbreak over her L.A. boyfriend Randy for months. It was more indulgent than Beyonce's Lemonade.”**

Max and Caroline (both): “How dare you? She’s a queen.”

Analysis

Han flouts the maxim of relation because his response is not relevant to Caroline’s statement. Instead of saying ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to Caroline’s utterances, he talks about another topic about Max and Randy. Han intends to show that he is upset with Max and Caroline who always put him in difficult situations. There is an implicature behind Han’s utterance. The implied meaning of his utterances is he does not want to be a waiter at his own Diner, and it is embarrassing to wear the uniform.

3.2.4 Flouting Maxim of Manner

Four (4) data that contain flouting of the maxim of manner are found. Data 1 is one of them.

Data 1: Scene 2 (00:01:53 – 00:02:09)

Context

It is a conversation between Max and Oleg. This scene takes place at Williamsburg Diner. Max, Caroline, Oleg, and Earl are sitting at the table while Han is standing in front of them. Max and Caroline are holding a meeting and they ask Oleg and Earl to join. Oleg and Earl do not know what the meeting is for.

Dialogue

Oleg: “So what's this meeting for? The baby's almost here and I still have a bunch of new father stuff to do: build a crib; get rid of 60 yards of butt-beads.”

Max: **“You can build a crib?”**

Caroline: “Anyway, the big change we're talking about is changing right now.”

Analysis

Max is considered to flout the maxim of manner because her utterance is ambiguous or has more than one meaning. The first meaning of her utterance might be an actual question for Oleg, or she really wants to know whether Oleg can build a crib or not. The second meaning is that Max is mocking Oleg. It is weird that Oleg can build a crib because he is a chef, not a carpenter. Max flouts the maxim of manner because she underestimates Oleg who says that he can build a crib. Max’s utterance generates implicature. The implied meaning of her utterance is that Max does not believe Oleg can build a crib.

3.2 Characters who Violate and Flout the Maxims

Of all eleven characters in the episode, eight characters conduct violation and flouting. From the result of the analysis, the writers find that Max does not observe the maxim eight times. She violates the maxims two times, i.e., violating maxim Quality (data 14) and maxim Manner (data 31). She also flouts the maxims six times, i.e., flouting maxim Quantity (data 27), Quality (data 5),

Relation (data 13 and 15), and Manner (data 1 and 26). Caroline does not observe the maxim six times. She violates the maxims four times, i.e., violating maxim Quantity (data 22), Quality (data 10 and 12), and Relation (data 19). She also flouts the maxims two times, i.e., flouting maxim Quantity (data 30) and Quality (data 3). Han does not observe the maxim five times. He violates the maxim one time, i.e., violating maxim Quantity (data 7). He also flouts the maxims four times, i.e., flouting maxim Quantity (data 18) and Relation (data 2, 8, and 17). Sophie does not observe the maxim six times. She violates the maxims three times, i.e., violating maxim Quantity (data 9) and Manner (data 11 and 24). She also flouts the maxims three times, i.e., flouting maxim Quantity (data 21) and Quality (data 4 and 25). Oleg only violates the maxim of Relation (data 16). 2Chainz flouts the maxim two times, i.e., flouting maxim Quantity (data 28) and Manner (data 29). J. Petto only flouts the maxim of Quantity (data 6). Dr. Gomulka does not observe the maxim two times. He violates maxim of Relation (data 20) and he flouts maxim of Manner (data 23).

3.2 Reasons of Violating and Flouting the Maxims

From the result of the analysis, the writers find some reasons which influence the speaker to violate and flouting the conversational maxims in the situation comedy 2 Broke Girls. The reasons of violating and flouting maxim of Quantity are to give more specific information or provide additional information, to show and express speaker's feeling, excitement, and confusion, to clarify or explain something by giving too much information. While by giving less information, the speaker intends to hide or cover something, and to keep other's feeling. The reasons of violating and flouting maxim of Quality are to hide or cover the truth, real condition, or feeling from the listeners, to avoid something, to convince the listeners, to keep other's feeling, and to insult someone using sarcasm or irony. Finally, the reasons of violating and flouting maxim of Relation are to show that the topic being discussed is not important or is not interesting, the speaker does not understand the topic being discussed; the speaker wants to change the topic to avoid talking about something, and to show disagreement. Finally, the reasons of violating and flouting maxim of Manner are to stress something and to make the listeners confused.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the analysis and discussion, violation and flouting of conversational maxims are found in the conversations among the characters in the situation comedy 2 Broke Girls: The two opening, season 6, and episode 1. The result of the analysis shows that the speakers do not always obey the conversational maxims. In other words, the writer finds violations and flouting in this situation comedy. The writer found thirty-one (31) cases of violation and flouting of the conversational maxims in the dialogue of the situation comedy.

The first research question seeks to find kinds of maxims that are violated. The writers find twelve (12) data of violation. The study shows that all the conversational maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner are violated.

The second research question seeks to find kinds of maxims that are flouted. The writers find nineteen (19) data of flouting. The study shows that all of the conversational maxims: Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner are flouted.

The third research question is to know which characters do the violation and flouting. Of all the eleven characters in the episode, eight characters conduct violation and flouting.

The fourth research question is to analyze the reasons of the speaker when she/he violates and flouts the conversational maxims. The result of the analysis shows that the conversational maxim of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner can be violated and flouted by the Character of 2 Broke Girls sitcom for various reasons. When the character violates or flouts the maxim, she/he seems to have her/his own reasons and the reasons are various according to what maxim that is violated and flouted. Flouting of conversational maxims generated implicature or hidden meaning while violation of conversational maxims generated no implicature.

REFERENCES

- A. van Dijk, Teun, and Walter Kintsch. 1983. *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- A. van Dijk, Teun. 1977. *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. New York: Longman.
- Adawiyah, Robiatul. 2016. *Flouting Maxim Used by the Characters in "FOCUS" Movie*. Malang: Maulana Malik Ibrahim State Islamic University of Malang.
- Allan, Keith, and Kasia M. Jaszczolt. 2012. *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, Jonathan, and Millicent Poole. 2001. *Assignment and Thesis*. Milton: John Wiley and Sons Australia, Ltd.
- Coulthard, Malcolm. 2014. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis 2nd*. New York: Routledge.
- Cruse, D. Alan. 2000. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cutting, Joan. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Dean Brown, James, and Theodore S. Rodgers. 2002. *Doing Second Language Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Grice, Paul. 1991. *Studies in The Way of Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Horn, Laurence R., and Gregory Ward. 2006. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Jorgensen, Marianne, and Louise J. Phillips. 2002. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, Michael. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mey, Jacob L. 2001. *Pragmatics: An Introduction 2nd*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mills, Brett. 2005. *Television Sitcom*. London: BFI.
- _____. 2005. *The Sitcom*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nadar, F.X. 2009. *Pragmatik dan Penelitian Pragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

- Nur Khasanah Fatmawati, Siti. 2015. *A Pragmatics Analysis of Maxim Flouting Performed by Solomon Northup in 12 Years a Slave Movie*. Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta State University.
- Paul Gee, James, and Michael Handford. 2012. *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Pearson, Roberta, and Philip Simpson. 2005. *Critical Dictionary of Film and Television Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Renkema, Jan. 2004. *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Savorelli, Antonio. 2010. *Beyond Sitcom: New Direction in American Television Comedy*. New York City: McFarland.
- Thomas, Jenny. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Yule, George, and Gillian Brown. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, George. 2010. *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.