

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **CONCLUSION**

Having analyzed the data of my thesis, I would like to make some concluding points. In conversations, people do not always say what they mean. They sometimes convey something indirectly. That is why a listener has to guess what a speaker means in accordance with a particular context of the utterances. This study is known as pragmatics. Pragmatics deals with the study of meaning that is communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener. The branch of pragmatics that I choose to analyze the data is conversational maxims.

Conversational maxims are significant for people to be aware that they do not always say what they actually mean in speaking. A speaker's message is sometimes not found directly. Therefore, they have to interpret the speaker's meaning in order to get the speaker's intended meaning and avoid misunderstanding.

In relation to my research, I include suspense, which is a state that creates mental uncertainty, excitement or indecision which involve awaiting the outcome

an event or decision. Suspense is created when the suspects, witnesses, Monk, or the other police officers fail to observe the maxim. Their failing to observe a maxim creates a question in the audience's mind about the story. The audience will ask why the suspect or the police officer violates, flouts or opts out the maxim. They will also wonder who the real murderer is, and how Monk or the police officer will prove that. Another question that the audience may ask is what will happen next.

Based on the data that I have analyzed, the character fails to observe the maxim by flouting, violating and opting out of a maxim. There are no infringing and suspending a maxim that I found in the data. Infringing and suspending a maxim is not found because when the suspect is being interrogated by Monk or the other police officers, they tend to lie or mislead the interrogators, refuse to give any information or force the interrogators to look for the hidden meaning behind their utterances. I do not find any dialogues in which the speaker says something in a condition of being drunk, too nervous or excited.

The maxims that the characters fail to observe mostly are violation. This happens because when the suspect is being interrogated by the detective, Monk, or the other police officers, the suspect tries to mislead them and hide something for he or she does not want to be charged of the murder. This also happens because the suspect has an intention of challenging Monk or the other police officers if they can come up with a motive that may have driven the suspect to kill the victim.

Flouting a maxim is done by Monk when he discusses a murder case with the other police officers. It is also done by the suspects when they do not have any intention of misleading or they only want to tell Monk or the police officers that actually they are not involved in that crime. Flouting a maxim is also done by the real murderer when he or she cannot hide anything from Monk because Monk strongly believes that he or she is the real murderer. This is seen in data 2. It can also happen when the suspect wants the hearer to look for another meaning behind what he says. This happens in data 9.

Opting out of a maxim is also done either by the detective or the suspect. It is done by the lead detective, Monk, when he does not want to put others in danger. It is done by the suspect when he or she is unwilling to give any information for he or she does not want Monk or the other police officers to know that he or she has committed the murder.

Different from opting out and flouting a maxim, violating a maxim is only done by the suspect or the killer. A suspect or the murderer does this when he or she has an intention to mislead or deliberately chooses to lie. In analyzing the data, at first I do not find any opting out of the maxim because on the surface all utterances containing the non-observance of maxims that the characters do seem to involve just flouting and violating. It seems that the characters always violate the maxims because they are afraid that Monk or the other detectives know that they are hiding something. That is why they choose to lie on purpose. But when I check it again carefully, there is an intentions of the characters to refuse to give the exact answer or they indicate unwillingness to reply in the way it is normally expected.

The conversational maxim that the character fails to observe the most is the maxim of relation. The characters tend to give an irrelevant answer in answering a question in order to express the hidden meaning, mislead and refuse to answer. The suspect mostly gives an irrelevant answer because he or she has an intention to move Monk or the other police officers' attention away from him or her.

The conversations between the suspect and the police officers in Monk detective series contain non-observance of Gricean maxims. When the suspect is being interrogated, they usually fail to observe a maxim. The non-observance of Gricean conversational maxims makes people aware that they are not always cooperative in speaking. The hearer has to find out the speaker's hidden meaning in the utterance to avoid misunderstanding. In addition, the non-observance of Gricean maxims creates suspense that makes the audience excited to find out what happens next in the story.

For those who want to choose a similar topic for their thesis, they can choose detective movies, humorous films, or action movies that contain suspense, humor or conflict to analyze Gricean conversational maxims. In addition, I also want to suggest they find other additional theories besides Grice's.

Word count: 986 words.