CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

This chapter concludes the whole analysis which was conducted in the previous chapter. After gathering data and analyzing the data, it is found that the main characters of *Damages* series seasons 1 and 2 break the cooperative principles of maxims by mostly opting out of a maxim. From all data collected, there are sixteen cases of opting out of maxim, four cases of flouting the maxim of manner, four cases of flouting the maxim of relation, three cases of flouting the maxim of quantity and three cases of violating a maxim.

The most dominant non-observance case is opting out of a maxim. Refusal to give the information the hearers require and also wanting the hearers to stop talking about certain topics are the main reasons why the chosen characters opt out of a maxim. The chosen main characters opt out of a maxim because they do not want to cooperate with the hearer's utterances, for example, in data 26, which is "Cut the shit." In this data, the speaker, who is Claire Maddox, refuses to cooperate with Walter Kendrick's utterance which talks about carpentry. Claire does not want to talk about carpentry, but she wants to know where the

44

the board is, so she opts out of a maxim .

Meanwhile, there are eight data showing flouting the maxim of relation. Refusal to cooperate in the way that is required in the situation is the main reason why the chosen main characters flout the maxim of relation. They also flout the maxim of relation because they disagree about something, for example, in data 2, which is "Don't be stupid. Everyone's hiding something." In this utterance, Patty flouts the maxim of relation because she wants to show a disagreement with Ellen's statement which says that she does not believe that Katie is lying.

It is also found that some of the chosen main characters flout the maxim of quantity. Reassurance that the speakers can solve the problems is basically the main reason the chosen main characters flout the maxim of quantity. There are six cases of flouting the maxim of quantity found in this thesis. An example is in data 17, which is, "I told you I would handle it." Ellen does not give the information which Katie asks for, because she wants to reassure Katie that everything is okay. On the other hand, Ellen's reassuring act does not make Katie calm but brings conflict between them both.

The next dominant non-observance is violating a maxim. Attempting to hide the truth and also wanting to mislead the hearers are basically the reasons the chosen main characters violate a maxim. I find there are four cases of violating a maxim. An example can be seen in data 9, which is "Gregory worked for me. That's all." In this data, Ray violates a maxim. Moore wants to know if Ray was the one who gave Frobisher's stock to Gregory Malina. He lies about not giving Gregory some of Frobisher's stock. In this case, Ray violates a maxim because he wants to hide the truth from Moore.

45

Aside from violating a maxim, I find there are two data showing flouting the maxim of manner. Emphasizing certain things and also wanting the hearers to be aware of something are the main reasons the chosen main characters flout the maxim of manner. This can be seen in data 16, which is, "Is there anything else you understand?" In this data, Daniel Purchell flouts the maxim of manner. The implicature of his utterance is that Patty is stupid.

Related to this research, it is found that there are no cases of flouting the maxim of quality, infringing or suspending a maxim. A speaker flouts the maxim of quality when the speaker tells a lie, while the hearer already knows about the truth. In this thesis, the chosen main characters tend to choose to violate a maxim rather than flouting the maxim of quality. Since the data are taken from two series about a powerful yet sly lawyer, the characters often lie to hide something.

Infringing a maxim usually occurs when a speaker fails to observe a maxim, without any intention to deceive the hearer. There is no case of infringing a maxim in this thesis because the characters are all adult and they are also come from an English-speaking country with good language skill.

Suspending a maxim occurs when a speaker replaces some words which are considered to be taboo. In this series, the chosen main characters never use any taboo. Apart from this, they tend to utter their thoughts without using any special words.

The occurrence of non-observance of Gricean maxims often leads a speaker and a hearer to a misunderstanding. This misunderstanding often brings them to a conflict. To sum up, I found the non-observance of Gricean maxims are important in *Damages* series seasons 1 and 2: by analyzing the maxims, I could

46

find the real intention from the implicature made by the characters, who in this case are mostly lawyers.

As the writer of this thesis, I am aware that my thesis is far from excellence and perfection. With this thesis, I also found that it is important not to fail to observe the Gricean maxims in conversations. By observing these maxims, we can make a cooperative conversation and we can also avoid misunderstandings between the speakers and the hearers. I hope this thesis may be beneficial for everyone who is going to make a research about the result of non-observance of Gricean maxims. For those who are going to conduct research in the same field as mine, I suggest that they choose their data source from drama television with a few seasons so that they can find more data for their research. I also suggest that they analyze the conflict in each data, because it is easier to recognize conflict rather than humour.

(1006 words)