

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **CONCLUSION**

After analysing the data that I have found, I would like to present some concluding points. Based on my findings, I find that there are four kinds of non-observance of the maxim done in the data. They are flouting, infringing and violating and opting out the maxims.

Mostly, flouting the maxim happens because the characters do not give clear and the right amount of information which is needed. This can be seen in Cooper's utterances. Cooper always utters incomplete statements or asks incomplete questions. This leads to conflicts between him and Charlotte. In the four scenes that I analyze, I find that Cooper fails to observe the maxims more than Charlotte does.

In the four scenes that I analyze, I find the four maxims quantity, quality, manner and relation are flouted. Mostly, the speaker flouts the maxim of relation. There are six utterances that show flouting the maxim of relation. Five utterances show flouting the maxim of quantity. Four of them show flouting the maxim of manner, and the other two utterances show opting out of the maxims. One utterance

shows infringing of the maxims. One utterance shows flouting the maxim of quality and one utterance shows violating of the maxims.

In data 1, 3, 9, 10, and 11, I find that the speakers flout the maxim of quantity in their utterance because they expect that the hearer understands their goal. Unfortunately, the hearer does not get the point. As a result, it creates misunderstanding. In the analysis, I find that in the conversation, the speakers flout the maxim of relation many times. It can be seen in data 4, 7, 8, 13, 16, and 17. The speakers flout the maxim of relation since they give irrelevant responses to the other person's utterances. The maxim of relation is the type of maxims which is mostly flouted in the four scenes. The flouting of the maxim of relation is done when the speaker does not want to discuss the topic further.

In my data analysis the speaker flouts the maxim of manner because she/he is not straight to the point as in data 3, 12, 15, and 17. I can see that flouting the maxim of manner may occur at the same time with flouting of the maxim of quantity and relation like in data 3 and 17.

Meanwhile, there are two data showing opting out of the maxim. The speaker opts out of the maxim when he wants to stop the conversation as in data 4 and 5. Besides, opting out of the maxim may also occur together with flouting the maxim of relation, like in data 4.

There is an utterance in scene two which shows that the speaker is violating the maxims together with flouting the maxim of quality. It happens because the speaker not only wants to mislead but also have the intention to lie as in data 6.

One of the data in my analysis shows infringing the maxim as we see in data 2. The speaker infringes since the condition make him nervous and then stutter. I find one data showing violating the maxim. A speaker violates the maxim when the speaker wants to mislead the hearer.

Concerning the implicature, I find that in some data the hearer does not recognize the implicature. This happens because the hearer is not smart enough to catch it or simply because the hearer already has had different interpretation as in scene 1, 3, and 4. However, although the implicature is understood, sometimes the hearer keeps being non-observant of the maxim, especially when he or she makes satirical in respond to the speaker. This happens in scene 4. When the hearer gives a response in a sartical way, it may be assumed that the hearer does not care about the person he or she is talking to. As a result, the implicature is used to mislead each other.

In this thesis, the misunderstanding which happens in each scene is caused by the non-observance of the Gricean maxim between the characters. The non-observance creates misunderstanding and leads to a conflict.

After doing my analysis, I believe that the non-observance of the Gricean maxim is tricky to recognize. Sometimes people unintentionally fail to observe the maxim. This happpens when people do not have any implied meaning in their utterance, but their response to other person's utterance does not seem to obey. Non-observance of the maxims usually happen in certain situations when people want to criticize someone in a polite way or they are hesitant to speak up.

The awareness of the hearer may help him or her to interpret the speaker's utterance. As a hearer, one has to understand what the speaker means first even if it is not explicitly stated. In other words, when the speaker tries to contribute a meaningful utterance in the conversation, it should be followed with the hearer's proper response. Thus in this way the speaker and the hearer can be cooperative.

However, a hearer does not always understand what the speaker means. It can be seen when the hearer fails to give a proper response to the speaker's utterance. When this happens, the conversation can end in a misunderstanding. Therefore, the ability to understand the implied meaning in an utterance is important to make people able to respond properly. As a result, it will not make misunderstanding which leads to a conflict.

The non-observance of the maxims can actually can be found not only in the dialogues of a film but also in daily situations. There some circumstances when the speaker or the hearer do not want to cooperate. This happens when the speakers involved in a conversation does not want to hurt each other's feelings, intends to lie, or mock each other.

Personally, I consider that my thesis is still imperfect. The study of the non-observance of Gricean maxims in *Private Practice* television series can be developed for better finding. I suggest that further researchers can make better analysis and can use another theory of conflict. I hope that my analysis can bring benefit to those who want to learn about non-observance of the maxims.

(1025 words)