

The Flouting of Conversational Maxims by Male and Female Characters in the British TV Series *Broadchurch*

Andrian Yonathan Damanik, Sharifah Hanidar*
English Department, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: sharifah@ugm.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research focuses on examining the flouting of the Gricean conversational maxims on the British TV series *Broadchurch*. It also investigates the use of rhetorical strategies in flouting the maxims by male and female characters in the series. The research data were the utterances that flout the maxims. The data were collected from Season I of the Series, containing 8 episodes. The data were analyzed by applying Grice's theory of cooperative principle (1975). Moreover, the data were also analyzed in terms of the rhetorical strategies employed by the characters when they flout the maxims. The results show that 97 cases of maxim flouting were found. The characters most frequently flout the maxim of relation (44.33%) and least frequently the maxim of quality (13.40%). Furthermore, in flouting the maxims, male characters tend to use the irrelevant statements as their preferred rhetorical strategy (63.46%), whereas female characters tend to use obscure expressions as their preferred rhetorical strategy (33.33%).

Keywords: *cooperative principle, maxims, flouting, rhetorical strategies, utterances.*

INTRODUCTION

The main topic of this research is about Cooperative Principle. It is conducted under the study of pragmatics. According to Cutting (2002), pragmatics is an approach that can be used to analyze "language's relation to the contextual background features." Contextual background features mean the situational context, what speakers know about what they can see around them, background knowledge context, and the co-textual context (pp. 2-3). In other words, pragmatics is aimed to investigate the meaning beyond what is said. Yule also stated that pragmatics can be used to know the intended meanings of the speaker (1996, p. 3). There are several topics in pragmatics that can be explored to understand the

intended meaning of the speaker such as the study of request strategies (to see the directness level of speaking in making a request), politeness strategies (how the speakers speak indirectly to save the hearer's face) and the cooperative principle (the study of implicatures or implied meanings).

In order to explain how people should participate in a conversation, Grice (1975) proposed the theory of cooperative principle with its four conversational maxims. The cooperative principle is a general principle where participants are expected to observe the maxims while speaking. Grice (1975, p. 45) divided conversational maxims into four types: maxims of quantity, quality, manner, and relation. It is only flouting that generates implicature. A flout

occurs when a speaker blatantly fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said, with the deliberate intention of generating an implicature. In other words, the speaker wishes to prompt the hearer to look for a meaning which is different from the expressed meaning (Thomas, 1995, p. 65).

Thus, it is interesting to investigate how people deliver their thoughts in conversations. Sometimes speakers express their thought explicitly so that hearers do not need to observe the implied meaning of the utterance. However, when the utterances imply something, the speaker has disobeyed one or more conversational maxims because the meaning is not delivered explicitly. In other words, when speakers say something implicitly, they have generated an implicature by flouting the maxims of the cooperative principle. Joan Cutting (2002) has proposed several rhetorical strategies while flouting the maxims such as irony, metaphor, sarcasm, etc. These rhetorical strategies can be applied to investigate the differences between male and female characters in flouting the maxims of the cooperative principle.

This research attempts to investigate the flouting of conversational maxims found in a British TV series entitled *Broadchurch* (Stokes, 2013). It addresses the following questions:

- 1) Which conversational maxims are flouted in the TV series *Broadchurch* and what strategies are used to flout the maxims?
- 2) Do male and female characters differ in flouting the conversational maxims?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Several studies have examined the flouting of the conversational maxims. One such study was conducted by Bukka (2015). She examined the creation of humor by flouting the maxims of the cooperative principle as seen in the situational comedy *Seinfeld*. She also identified and classified the rhetorical strategies in flouting the maxims. There are seven rhetorical strategies in flouting the maxims: irony, banter, sarcasm, too much information, too little information, changing the topic, and lexical ambiguity. The results show that

irony was the most used rhetorical strategy (31.39%), and the flouting of the quality maxim was the most frequently used strategy (62.80%).

Setiawati (2016) also investigated maxim flouting in skin care advertisements published in *Elle* Canada magazine. This research attempts to find how flouting the maxims in the headlines and slogans of skincare advertisements found in *Elle* Canada Magazine is a way to attract people's attention. In addition, it also classifies the data based on flouting the maxims of the cooperative principle, and explains the implied meanings of each flout. The results show that 32 headlines and slogans of the skin care advertisements flout the maxims of the cooperative principle. Ten of the data flout the maxim of quantity. Interestingly, this research finds some flouting combinations which are; eight of the data flout quantity and quality maxims, seven data flout quantity and manner maxims, three data flout Quantity and Relation maxims, two data flout Quantity, Quality and Manner maxims, and one data flouts Quantity, Manner, and Relation maxims. It also concludes that by flouting the maxims, the advertisers could only provide little information about the product, state something that digresses from the topic, use figurative language, or state something ambiguous.

Kurniati and Hanidar (2018) presented an analysis of the flouting of the Gricean maxims in two horror movies entitled *Insidious* and *Insidious II*. This study investigated the maxims that are flouted by the characters and the functions of the flouting of the maxims. The results show that in *Insidious* the characters flout all the maxims. From 23 occurrences, flouting the maxim of quantity was the strategy most frequently used with nine occurrences (39.1%). Meanwhile, in *Insidious II* there were only two occurrences of flouting of maxims; the maxim of quantity and relation. The researchers found seven occurrences; four flouting the maxim of relation and three flouting the quantity. It also showed several reasons why the characters flout the maxims: avoiding making the character upset, providing a comprehensive explanation, convincing the hearer, and criticizing someone's action.

Ramadhan (2017) investigates the flouting and violating of conversational maxims in the American series entitled *The Flash*. This study is similar to the

previous researches that identify and classify the maxims. However, the researcher expands the discussion into two points: firstly, to find out how the main character flouts and violates the maxims and the function of each violation, and Secondly, to analyze the topic of conversation that the main character flouts and violates. The results show that the main character, Barry Allen flouts the maxims 34 times and violates the maxims six times. The maxim which is most frequently flouted is the maxim of relevance (14 times) followed by maxim of quality which occurred 13 times. In addition, flouting and violating the maxims happen when the conversation is casual such as conversing about movie, work, news, etc.

Addiningrum (2018) analyzed the creation of humor through the use of rhetorical strategies in flouting Gricean maxims. The data of this research were collected through the utterances that flout the maxims in an American TV series *Hannah Montana*. Unlike Bukka (2015), who applied Joan Cutting's theory in investigating the rhetorical strategies to create humor, this research attempted to identify the rhetorical devices based on the theory proposed by Berger (1997). The results show that there were 126 cases of flouting the maxims in *Hannah Montana*. It also conveyed that the characters flout the maxim of quality the most with 60 occurrences. In addition, hyperbole/exaggeration is the most frequently used rhetorical device in flouting the maxims to create humor with 28 occurrences.

In sum, three of the researchers used American TV series as their data sources. Bukka (2015) and Addiningrum (2018) examined the creation of humor by flouting the maxims through the use of rhetorical devices. The difference in these two researches is their theory while analyzing the rhetorical devices. Meanwhile, Ramadhan (2017) investigated the flouting and violating of the maxims found in an American TV series *The Flash*. Unlike the previous researchers, Setiawati (2016) used Magazine advertisements as the data source in analyzing the flouting of the maxims. The present research also has a similarity with the previous researches that analyze and classify the flouting of the maxims. However, this research attempts to provide a different analysis by comparing male and female characters flouting the maxims of the cooperative principle.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This research uses the theory of cooperative principle proposed by Grice (1975). Grice argues that the participants of a conversation should speak cooperatively or "make the conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchanges in which the participants are engaged" (p. 45). This cooperative principle can be considered as a rule. The participants should obey the rule by saying things that are appropriate for the kind of conversation they are having. He proposed general principles which are known as the four maxims of conversation.

- (1) Maxim of quality: Try to make your contribution one that is true. You should have enough evidence to back up what you're saying.
- (2) Maxim of quantity: Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange). Do not make your contribution more or less informative than is required.
- (3) Maxim of relation: Be relevant.
- (4) Maxim of manner: Talking appropriately (be brief, orderly, clear and stay away from ambiguity).

However, the interlocutors of the conversation may fail to observe these maxims. According to Grice (1975), there are four ways in which a speaker fails to observe a maxim: violating, flouting, opting out, and infringing (p. 49). This research only focuses on examining the flouting of the maxims of the cooperative principle.

In terms of the differences between male and female characters in flouting the maxims, this research discusses the rhetorical strategies used by the characters. The analysis of the rhetorical strategies were based on Cutting's theory. According to Cutting (2002), there are 9 types of rhetorical strategies that can be used in flouting the maxims of cooperative principle namely, irony, metaphor, sarcasm, banter, hyperbole, giving too little information, giving too little information, irrelevant statement and obscure expression.

METHODS

The primary data of this research were taken from a British TV series entitled *Broadchurch* (Stokes, 2013). There are three seasons of the TV series, but the present research focused only on Season I, containing eight episodes. The researchers also used the English subtitles and transcripts of the dialogue to get accurate data. The subtitles were downloaded from www.subscene.com. Meanwhile, the drama series was downloaded from www.imdb.com.

This series was selected because there are many occurrences of flouting of the maxims of the cooperative principle. In addition, the characters of the TV series, both male and female characters carried out the conversation intensively. *Broadchurch* is classified as a crime drama. It has some investigation scenes, in which the characters speak implicitly. Because of these reasons, the researchers try to find the frequency and types of the flouting of conversational maxims and the differences between male and female characters in flouting the maxims by comparing the tendency of rhetorical strategies used.

The data of this research were collected from the utterances which are produced by the characters of the TV series which flouted the conversational maxims. The following steps were taken to collect the data.

- 1) The first step was watching the series from episodes 1-8, making sure that the transcript matches the dialogue. If there was a discrepancy between the transcript and the dialogue, a correction was made.
- 2) The second step was noting down the utterances containing any flouting of the maxims.
- 3) The third step was reselecting the data. The researchers reselected the data to determine whether the data analyzed were accurate. Any replacement was done if the data did not fulfill the flouting criteria (the data might belong to other types of non-observance of the maxims such as opting out, violating, or suspending).
- 4) We formulated the data format, including the coding system.

The data were analyzed using a descriptive and quantitative approach. The quantitative approach is used to calculate the occurrences or the frequency of the data, which was then tabulated. Meanwhile, the descriptive approach was used to explain the implied meaning of the data and also to describe the differences between male and female characters in flouting a maxim. In terms of analyzing the differences between male and female characters in flouting a maxim, the researchers analyzed the tendency to use rhetorical strategies. The results of the research are presented in tables along with the explanation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results show that the characters in the British TV Series *Broadchurch* flout all the maxims. The maxim of relation was most frequently flouted using irrelevant statements as the rhetorical strategy with 43 occurrences (44.33%). The second maxim that was most frequently flouted is the maxim of quantity with 21 occurrences (21.65%). The third most frequently flouted maxim was the maxim of manner with 20 occurrences (20.62%). The least frequently flouted maxim is the maxim of quality with 13 occurrences (13.40%). Table 1 below presents the frequency of maxim flouting in the TV series.

Table 1. Frequency of maxim flouting in *Broadchurch*

| No. | Maxim Flouting | Token | % |
|--------------|-------------------|-----------|---------------|
| 1. | Maxim of quality | 13 | 13.40 |
| 2. | Maxim of quantity | 21 | 21.65 |
| 3. | Maxim of relation | 43 | 44.33 |
| 4. | Maxim of manner | 20 | 20.62 |
| Total | | 97 | 100.00 |

The flouting of the Quality Maxim

The flouting the quality maxim happens when the speaker's utterance is blatantly untrue or she or he lacks adequate evidence (Thomas, 1995, p. 67). As mentioned previously, the quality maxim was flouted 13 times (13.40%). In these quality maxim floutings, sarcasm was the most frequently used strategy with seven occurrences, followed by banter with three occurrences, irony with two occurrences,

and metaphor with only one occurrence. Meanwhile, hyperbole was not used at all.

Irony

According to Cutting (2002, p. 38), an irony is an expression of a positive sentiment but implying a negative one, in order to be offensive in a friendly way (mocking-politeness). Leech (1983, p. 142) states that irony enables a speaker to be impolite while seeming to be polite; it does so by breaking the cooperative principle, but ultimately upholding it.

- (1) 00:28:57,290 → 00:29:05,160
(E02 / QL1 / Category C #14 /)

Context: *In this scene, Miller met Alec in his room to report the progress of the investigation of Danny's murder case.*

Miller: They didn't kill Danny.

Alec: You have to learn not to trust.

Miller: Oh, do...? Oh right. ***That's what you've been sent to teach me—the benefit of your experience.***

From the dialogue, it is clear that Miller flouts the maxim of quality by saying something that is untrue. It can be seen through her utterance, “You’ve been sent to teach me—the benefit of your experience”. In the series, it is shown that the Latimer and Miller’s families are neighbors. They also get along and used to spend their time to have lunch together. In other words, Miller knows the family quite well. So, she believes that the Latimer did not kill one of their family members, Danny. However, Alec’s response seems a bit annoying for Miller. In order to save her face, she uses irony to reply to Alec’s response. She says that Alec comes to Broadchurch to teach her how to work as a detective in a good way. In fact, Alec came to Broadchurch to solve a murder case, and Jenkinson (The Chief Super) appointed Miller to work together with him as his partner. In particular, Alec came to Broadchurch without any intention to teach Miller about his experience. It can be said that Miller’s utterance is ironic because it conveys a positive sentiment but implies a negative one to be offensive in a friendly way. In this case, Miller flouts the maxim of quality by using irony as the rhetorical strategy.

Metaphor

According to Cutting (2002), when speakers flout a maxim using a metaphor, they may express something by mentioning something else. For example, “He kicked the bucket” means “He died”. Cutting (2002) adds that when using a metaphor, the implied meaning of the words is “so well-established that the expression can only mean one thing” (p. 38).

- (2) 00:04:10,008 → 00:04:17,836
(E06 / QL2 / Category D #14 /)

Context: *During the investigation of Danny's murder case, Beth spent her time at home and did not go anywhere. She was very sad to know the truth that her son had been killed. In this scene, it was shown that Beth was daydreaming near the window inside their house. Liz came to her and they started to talk.*

Liz: You still have me, love. Or you could go back to the Tourist Information.

Beth: ***I'm just a dead woman walking every day. How can I give'em directions?***

From the conversation above, it is obvious that Beth flouts the maxim of quality by saying something that is blatantly untrue. It can be seen through her utterance, “I’m just a dead woman walking every day.” This utterance should not be taken at the surface meaning because it implies something else. In this scene, Beth is still very sad to know the fact that her son had been killed. By saying ‘a dead woman’, Beth conveys a metaphor in her utterance. In this case, she compares her emotional state to the act of being dead. In other words, she implies that she could not sense anything because of her sadness, which makes her comparable to a dead person. As mentioned above, metaphor can be used to compare something with something else which is more concrete. By observing the implication of Beth’s utterance, it can be said that she flouts the maxim of quality by using metaphor as the rhetorical strategy.

Sarcasm

Sarcasm is an expression that is not so friendly which is intended to hurt (Cutting, 2002, p. 38).

- (3) 00:15:26,769 --> 00:15:36,569
(E01 / QL3 #1 / Category B #1 /)

Context: *The dialogue happened between Miller and Alec. They were going to Mark's house by car to clarify something to the family. They were talking about strategies that they could use to handle the problem. However, both of them have different point of views in solving the case that makes them argue.*

Miller: I know them.

Alec: How many deaths like this have you worked?

Miller: This is my first.

Alec: **You can't make it better. Don't try.**

Miller: You don't know how I work.

Alec: Most likely premise is abduction.

In this dialogue, it is obvious that Alec flouts the maxim of quality because he says something that he lacks adequate evidence. The lack of adequate evidence can be seen through the fact that Alec cannot fully ensure that Miller will not be able to complete the job properly because it has not happened yet. By saying 'you can't make it better' it is clear that Alec does not speak in a cooperative way to Miller. His utterance can be categorized as sarcasm because it is an expression that is not so friendly intended to hurt Miller. Miller replies, 'you don't know how I work' because she feels offended. Alec's utterance may imply that Miller does not know anything about the case that makes her unable to finish it. In this case, Alec flouts the maxim of quality because he blatantly says something lacking evidence by using Sarcasm as the rhetorical strategy because his utterance is intended to hurt Miller.

Banter

According to Cutting (2002, p. 38), banter is an expression of a negative sentiment but implying a positive one in order to be friendly but in an offensive way (mock-impoliteness). One example is when two close friends greet one another, by saying "Here comes trouble". Leech (1983, p. 144) states that the underpoliteness can have the opposite effect of establishing a bond of familiarity.

(4) 00:19:28,536 → 00:19:35,816
(E04 / QL4 / Category B #20 /)

Context: *The dialogue happened between DS Miller and Alec. They were walking to Paul's house to do some investigation. DS Miller started a conversation about her religious life. She told Alec what she used to do during Easter. The conversation took quite long, and then DS Miller asked Alec about his personal life.*

Miller: What about you, then? You religious?

Alec: Yeah. **I pray nightly you'll stop asking me questions.**

In the conversation, it is clear that Alec flouts the maxim of quality because he blatantly says something untrue. Alec and Miller have been working together for several weeks in this scene. They seem to know each other quite well, which makes Miller not hesitate to ask a very personal question. The scene shows that Miller is more active in the conversation, making Alec feel annoyed in answering all her questions. Thus, he does not speak in a cooperative way to Miller. It can be seen through his utterance, 'Yeah, I pray nightly you'll stop asking me questions.' This utterance flouts the maxim of quality, because it is impossible for Alec to pray every single night in the hope that Miller will stop asking him questions. In addition, Alec uses Banter as the rhetorical strategy. As we know, Banter is an expression of a negative sentiment but implying a positive one, in order to be friendly but in an offensive way. In this case, when Miller asks, 'Are you religious?' The proper answer to this question should be, 'Yes, I am. I go to church every Sunday.' However, his response conveys a negative sentiment by saying, 'I pray nightly you'll stop asking me questions.' In this case, Alec flouts the maxim of quality by using banter as the rhetorical strategy.

The flouting of the Quantity Maxim

The flouting the quantity maxim happens when the speaker gives too little or too much information (Cutting, 2002, p. 37). The quantity maxim was the second most frequently flouted maxim with 21 occurrences (21.65%). This maxim was flouted 16 time with the strategy of giving too much information and 5 times with the strategy of giving too little information.

Giving Too Much Information

This strategy is used when speakers express their thought excessively, although some of their utterances are not at all necessary (Cutting, 2002, p. 37).

- (5) 00:17:38,728 → 00:18:26,026
(E07 / QN1 / Category A #18 /)

Context: *Mark and Beth went to church to meet the reverend, Paul. They wanted to have counseling and discuss their problem with the reverend. In the middle of the counseling, Mark expresses his regret about his mistakes in the past.*

Paul: Are you all right, Mark?

Mark: Yeah... We just need some answers, don't we? Some help. **You have a line to the big man. Why don't you ask him? We're drowning down here. We just want it done, don't we? I mean... When we met, she was 15, Beth. She was... just beautiful. She was so sunny all the time. And now this life with me, it's just destroyed her, hasn't it? That girl's gone.**

From the dialogue, it is clear that Mark has flouted the maxim of quantity by giving too much information as a rhetorical strategy. In his utterance, Mark gives unrequired information. Paul only asks a simple question, "Are you all right Mark?" that can be simply answered by saying, "Yes, I'm okay." However, Mark expresses all his feelings to show the regret of his past mistakes, which is not necessarily needed in the context.

Giving Too Little Information

This strategy is used when speakers do not provide enough information. In other words, speakers give insufficient information than what is required (Cutting, 2002, p. 37).

- (6) 00:39:28,508 --> 00:39:36,948
(E01 / QN2 / Category B #6/)

Context: *In this scene, Beth and Mark were in the dining room having dinner. They had a conversation while they were eating. Beth had asked Mark where he was when Danny got killed. However, she did not trust him and decided to clarify it again.*

Beth: Where were you last night?

Mark: I told you. **I was on a job.**

Beth: What is it? Tell me.

Mark: (did not respond)

From the dialogue, it is obvious that Mark flouts the maxim of quantity. In this scene, Mark is lying to Beth about where he was on the night of Danny's murder. He actually has an affair with another woman, Becca Fisher. From his utterance "I was on a job", it can be said that Mark does not respond in a cooperative way or Mark's response is not like what Beth expected. It can be seen that Beth realizes that Mark is lying to her, so she asks a further question "What is it. Tell me." As we know, when someone asks "where", an adequate answer will be something like "at the hotel, at restaurant, or something that indicates a place." In the dialogue, Mark does not give the right amount of information. In that series, Mark is depicted as a plumber. Thus, he may give an example of a proper answer, such as, for example, "I was at Miller's house repairing their pipe." However, he chooses to give only a little information in replying Beth's question by saying "I was on a job." In this case, Mark flouts the maxim of quantity because the information he gives is less informative than required. In other words, Marks uses too little information as the rhetorical strategy in flouting the maxim of quantity.

The flouting of the Relation Maxim

The flouting of the relation maxim occurs when the speaker's response is irrelevant to the topic in hand (Thomas, 1995, p. 70). The relation maxim was the most frequently flouted maxim. It was flouted 43 times (44.33), all with the strategy of giving irrelevant statements.

Giving Irrelevant Statements

This strategy is used when speakers give information which is unrelated to the topic in hand. When speakers use this strategy, they expect that the hearers will be able to imagine the hidden meaning of the utterance, by making connection between their utterance and the preceding one(s) (Cutting, 2002, p. 39).

(7) 00:24:51,752 → 00:25:01,872
(E01 / R / Category B #3 /)

Context: Miller found out that Alec had a conversation with their Chief Super, Jenkinson. Since they were working on the same case, Miller thought that there might be important information that she needed to know, so she decided to meet Alec. However, Alec tried to change the topic of the conversation because he felt annoyed talking about the conversation that he had with Jenkinson, which was not related to Danny's case but his personal life.

Miller: What did Jenkinson want?

Alec: Jenkinson?

Miller: The Chief Super. I saw you walking with her.

Alec: No.

Miller: I did, you were having 99s.

Alec: **Miller, your son went to school with Danny. Does he know yet?**

The dialogue shows that since the beginning of the conversation, Alec does not speak in a cooperative way to Miller. When Miller asks about what Jenkinson wants, Alec is actually lying by saying that he did not talk to Jenkinson. However, Miller insists that she needs to know what they talked about. In response to Miller's question, he asks Miller about her son who went to school with Danny. In other words, he changes the topic of the conversation. By uttering an irrelevant statement, Alec implicitly asks Miller to stop questioning him. In this case, Alec flouts the maxim of relation because he is deliberately uttering something irrelevant to the topic of the conversation.

The flouting of the Manner Maxim

The flouting of the manner maxim occurs when the speaker is trying to be obscure (Cutting, 2002, p. 39). The manner maxim was flouted 20 times (20.62%) using the obscure expression rhetorical strategy.

Using Obscure Expressions

Speakers may play with words to heighten the ambiguity, in order to make a point. Usually speakers try to exclude a third party (Cutting, 2002, p. 39).

(8) 00:25:34,387 → 00:25:37,027
(E01 / M / Category B #4 /)

Context: DS Miller found out that Jack Marshall was a suspect for Danny Latimer's murder. She came to Jack's book store to do an investigation.

Miller: How was Danny yesterday?

Jack: **No different from usual.**

In the dialogue, it is clear that Jack's utterance "No different from usual" is ambiguous. As the interrogator, Miller needs the exact activity that Danny did for example, "Danny came here at 7 a.m., and will do paper round, and will be back here at 9 a.m." If he speaks cooperatively, he will explain Danny's daily activity in an orderly and clear way. However, Jack's response is not exactly what Miller expected. In this case, Jack flouts the maxim of relation by conveying an ambiguity in his utterance and uses an obscure expression as the rhetorical strategy.

Gender Differences in Maxim Flouting

Table 2 show the frequency of maxim flouting by male and female characters in the TV series *Broadchurch*.

Table 2. Maxim flouting by male and female characters in *Broadchurch*

| No. | Maxim Flouting | Male | | Female | |
|--------------|----------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|---------------|
| | | Token | % | Token | % |
| 1. | Quality | 6 | 11.54 | 7 | 15.56 |
| 2. | Quantity | 8 | 15.38 | 13 | 28.89 |
| 3. | Relation | 33 | 63.46 | 10 | 22.22 |
| 4. | Manner | 5 | 9.62 | 15 | 33.33 |
| Total | | 52 | 100.00 | 45 | 100.00 |

Table 2 shows that the characters of the TV Series *Broadchurch* flout all the categories of the maxims. The table also shows that the male characters in the TV series flout the maxims slightly more frequently than the female characters. Male characters most frequently flout the maxim of relation by using irrelevant statements with 33 occurrences (63.46%). On the other hand, female characters most frequently flout the maxim of manner by using obscure expression as the rhetorical strategy with 15 occurrences (33.33%). This finding seems to suggest that while male characters tend to

use irrelevant statements when flouting the maxims, female characters tend to opt for obscure expressions.

In the case of flouting the quality maxim, both male and female characters almost have the same number of occurrences. Male characters flouted the maxim of quality 6 times (11.54%) whereas female characters 7 times (15.56%). There is no significant difference between male and female characters in flouting the maxim of quality.

In the case of flouting the quantity maxim, female characters tend to flout the maxim of quantity more often than male characters do. Female characters flouted the maxim of quantity 13 times (28.89%) by giving too much information 10 times (22.22%) and too little information 3 times (6.67%). On the other hand, male characters only flouted the maxim of quantity 8 times (15.38%) by giving too much information as the rhetorical strategy with 6 occurrences (11.54%) and too little information with 2 occurrences (3.85%).

CONCLUSION

This research has shown that the characters in *Broadchurch* flout all types of the conversational maxims. They most frequently flout the relation maxim and least frequently the quality maxim. In flouting the maxims, the characters used various rhetorical strategies: irony, metaphor, sarcasm, banter, too much information, too little information, irrelevant statement, and obscure expression. The most frequent strategy that they employ is the strategy of giving irrelevant statements while the least frequent is the strategy of using metaphors and no maxim was flouted using hyperbole.

Furthermore, this study has also shown that male characters more frequently flout the maxims than female characters. In terms of the strategies used to flout the maxims, female characters most frequently use obscure expressions while male characters most frequently employ irrelevant statements in their maxim flouting. Thus, it can be concluded that in flouting the conversational maxims, female characters tend to be obscure in their utterances whereas male characters tend to digress as

they use irrelevant statements as their preferred rhetorical strategy.

REFERENCES

- Addiningrum, B. (2018). *The flouting of Gricean maxims through the use of rhetorical devices to create humor in the TV series Hanna Montana*. Unpublished undergraduate thesis. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Berger, A. A. (1993). *An Anatomy of Humor*. Transaction Publishers.
- Bukka, S. (2015). *The creation of humor by flouting the maxims of cooperative principle as seen in the sitcom Seinfeld*. Unpublished undergraduate thesis. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. (1975) Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Volume 3): *Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
- Kurniati, M. & Hanidar, S. (2018). *The flouting of the Gricean maxims in Insidious and Insidious 2*. *Lexicon* 5(1), 65-76.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman Group Limited.
- Ramadhan, L. (2017). Flouting and violating of Grice's maxims in *The Flash* series done by Bary Allen. Unpublished undergraduate thesis. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Setiawati, R. (2016). Flouting maxims of skin care advertisements found in *Elle Canada* magazine. Unpublished undergraduate thesis. Universitas Gadjah Mada.
- Stokes, R. (Producer) (2013). *Broadchurch* [Television Series]. ITV, STV, UTV.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.