CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

Having analyzed the data of my thesis, I would like to make some concluding points. In conversations, people do not always follow the rules of conversation. They do not always simply and straightforwardly state what they mean. Sometimes even when they say something they apparently mean, they are trying to imply something else. They want the hearer to interpret the implied meaning behind their utterances. However, there will be times that the speaker and the hearer have different assumption so that misunderstanding occur. That is the reason why the hearer has to be aware of what the speaker means in accordance with a particular context and utterance.

In relation to my research, I analyze the non-observance of Gricean maxims which are sometimes done by the contestants in the reality show The Apprentice. I found that the contestants refuse to obey the maxims for certain reasons. For example: Omarosa, as the contestant, misleads the team by saying that there is nothing to be worried about. In fact, there is a big problem because she does not do the job well. Considering that her big mistake will have the consequence of losing the game, she hides something that she knows.

Based on the data that I have analyzed, there are four types of the non-observance of maxims which the contestants fail to observe, namely, flouting, violating, infringing, and opting out of a maxim. There is no suspending a maxim that I found in my data. Suspending a maxim is not found because no taboo words are used. This happens because The Apprentice is a reality show which represents the workplace in real life so it uses formal conversation.

The type of the non-observance of maxims which mostly appear in my analysis is violating the maxim. This happens when the contestant is unwilling to cooperate to answer the question clearly by not saying the truth in order to save his or her life. In my analysis, violating a maxim is done by Omarosa when she is trying to cover her mistakes. In this situation, Omarosa does not do the job well. Owing to the fact that she does not want to be blamed on by other contestants, she really means to give misleading information to the hearer. From this, I conclude that someone would do anything to keep his or her life safe. For the reason not to be punished or fired, he or she tends to violate the maxims by absolutely giving wrong information or hiding information.

I found flouting the maxim in my analysis. This happens when the contestant has a strategy not to cooperate by answering the question clearly. Instead, he or she conveys something directly. For example, Sam is being asked by Donald Trump to describe Jason's performance as the team leader. However, he gives an ambiguous answer by asking the same question back to Donald Trump. He could simply have said that Jason was a good or terrible leader. Yet, he refuses to give a plain answer. Donald Trump even judges Sam's statement as his justification not to be chosen by Jason. From this, I conclude that someone

who intentionally flouts the maxims may cause such as misunderstanding, if the hearer does not give a response to the implication. The hearer may have a different interpretation if someone actually has other information to reveal.

I also find an example of opting out of the maxim, as we can see in data number 3. In my data, Jason, as the team leader, choose to be uncooperative in answering Sam's question. As he has some important information which could hurt other people, he does not reply with an informative and brief answer. By replying in this way, he opts out of the maxim. From this, I conclude that sometimes people want to say something directly, but the situation is not proper to convey the information. Whether it is because of an ethical reason or because it might hurt other people, someone is inclined to opt out of the maxim by refusing to answer the question directly as his or her strategy.

Infringing a maxim once arises in the contestants' utterances. This happens when Bill is in the condition of being under pressure, so he cannot answer the question clearly. From this, I conclude that in some circumstances, especially in the condition of nervousness, someone could infringe a maxim because he or she cannot answer the question clearly.

In my analysis, I also found that the contestants fail to observe the four of the conversational maxims. The four maxims are maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. The conversational maxim which is mostly observed in my analysis is the maxim of Manner. It arises when the contestant is unwilling to give direst and brief answer. Sometimes he or she says ambiguous things that will make the hearer have another interpretation. For example, in data number 2, Sam gives uninformative information and his reply does not answer the question. It

makes Donald Trump, as the hearer, have another interpretation which think that it is Sam's strategy not to be fired.

The maxim of Manner sometimes appears to follow the maxim of Relation. This happens when the contestant does not want to give information that he or she has; otherwise, if the contestant does not want to talk in detail about the topic, he or she diverts to an irrelevant topic. From this, I conclude that someone changes the topic of conversation or adds some statements which are not requires in order to make the other person aware that he or she does not want to talk about the topic.

The implicature that the contestant implies by their utterances are various. For example, in my data analysis number 1, Kwame is being asked by Donald Trump about the person who really does a bad job. He does not straightforwardly judge Jason as the person who is responsible for losing the game; on the contrary, he gives a long-winded answer. From this, I conclude that sometimes someone is reluctant to say something explicitly. This may happen because of one or some reasons. Consequently, even when someone say something what he or she really means, he or she is trying to imply something else and wants the hearer to interpret the meaning behind his or her utterance.

The contestants fail to observe the maxims because they have some reasons behind their utterances. For example, Kwame is protecting Jason so as not to make Jason disqualified in this game, Omarosa wants to cover her mistakes, Sam defends his life, and Heidi want to keep her life safe. They make some justification to keep themselves stay in the game. However in my analysis, I conclude that every contestants has their own strategy to keep stay in the game.

Because of their only motive is to win the game, they try to make such an effort in order not to be fired by Donald Trump.

In analyzing the non-observance of Gricean Maxims in the contestants' utterances in <u>The Apprentice</u> reality show, I come to the conclusion that people do not always say something directly. They have some reason not to say something in a simple and straightforward way; besides, they even mean to say something that is not true. This happens because of their effort to keep in the game. Consequently, they would do anything to make them stay in the game. The contetstants make either right or wrong justifications in order to cover their mistakes, to defend, to save their life, and most importantly, to win the competition. Therefore, the uses of the non-observance of Gricean maxims in the contestants' utterances in <u>The Apprentice</u> makes the reality show interesting to watch.

Further research could also be done in order to generalize these findings so that some contribution, both practical and theoretical ones, can be proposed. This study could be elaborated in other research. Because my research is from season 1, I would like to pose rhetorical questions for further research as the end of my conclusions, such as whether the analysis would be different in the non-observance of Gricean maxims in the contestants' utterance in <u>The Apprentice</u> season 2? Or would the analysis be more significant if we apply the theory of Politeness or Speech Act?

(1379 words)