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ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine how the non-observance politeness maxim and its implicature in the video TV Show "Kids Say The Darndest Things" used by the host and children as the guest star. The method applied by the researcher in this study was descriptive qualitative by combining two main theories. Firstly, to identify the type of politeness maxim most frequently unobserved by hosts and children, the author used Leech's theory (1983). Second, analyze the conversational implicature contained in utterances of hosts and children that unobserved maxim politeness with Grice's theory (1975). As a result, the researcher found 37 non-observance of politeness maxims and conversational implicatures used by hosts and children as guest stars. The modesty maxim was the most common type used in this TV show, with 27%, followed by the approbation maxim, with 22%. Then, the same percentage of tact maxim and generosity maxim with 16%. Followed by a low rate of agreement maxim of 11% and a maxim of sympathy with 8%. The dominant conversation implicature on this TV Show is an implication that imply arrogance as a result of the non-observance of modesty maxim. The researcher suggests for further research that wants to examine the same topic to conduct research with different indirect interaction.
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INTRODUCTION

The politeness maxim and its implicature in language use have become an interesting topic of linguistics. According to Daulay et al. (2022), languages are tools that cannot be separated from human life. In social interactions, language is utilized to facilitate interaction between people. Sometimes in language interaction someone does not express it directly, but through the intention hidden behind their utterances. In the interaction process,
speakers and opponent must keep the communication going well. If the opponent can accept and understand the speaker's use of language, communication will run smoothly. It can be done by using the right diction and paying attention to politeness in language. Lakoff (1990) asserts that the goal of politeness is to encourage interaction by lowering the risk of conflict and disagreement in social interactions, which naturally arise. Therefore, paying attention to politeness maxim and its implicature which exist outside of language is crucial.

Politeness maxims are unwritten rules that govern how people interact with one another in social situations. These maxims help to maintain social harmony and avoid offending others. However, there are instances where people may not observe these maxims, leading to miscommunication and conflicts. When the speaker intentionally fails to observe a maxim, the purpose may be to effectively communicate a message (Thomas, 1995). The observance of politeness maxims is crucial in maintaining social harmony and avoiding conflict. When these maxims are not observed, it can result in miscommunication and negative consequences. Therefore, it is important for individuals to be mindful of these maxims and makes an effort to observe them in their interactions with others.

The non-observance maxim of politeness has a certain implicit purpose. The speech partners and speakers often have hidden intentions behind the use of language because unobserved the politeness maxim. Grice (1991) stated the additional conveyed meaning belongs to conversational implicature. To find out the implicature, it is necessary to have an understanding of the context of the speech, namely the things that become the background of the utterances. The context has an important role related to the acquisition of implicature. Thus, if the context is well understood, then the hidden meaning can be obtained correctly or precisely.

The phenomenon of language development in the modern era is increasingly rapid through mass media, one of which is television shows. The TV show is relevant to study of non-observance politeness maxim because the host and guest stars must show courtesy in polite language when communicating. The non-observance maxim of politeness committed by public figures can be found on talk shows. It is related to Pramujiono et.al (2020) that stated currently, the use of polite language is increasingly rarely applied, especially someone who is influential, such as a public figure. They fail to set an example in using polite language when speaking. It can lead to implicature as a result of the conversation from violating the principles of conversation (Rustono,1998). Therefore, this research examined the non-observance politeness maxim and its implicature used by the hosts and children on the TV show Kids Say the Darndest Things.

Similar research on the non-observance maxim of politeness still garnered attention among academics, particularly on the television show. First, Avianty et al. (2018) found that the maxim of generosity was the most unobserved, while the least was the maxim of tact on tv show. Then, the studies conducted by Lubis et al. (2019) show that the event unobserved four maxims by Leech, namely the maxim of wisdom, the maxim of praise, the maxim of generosity, and the maxim of humility. While the research by Agustina et al. (2019) did not find the unobserved in the presenter’s utterances on the non-observance of the generosity maxim. In this study, the dominant non-observance of the politeness principle in this study occurred in the maxim of praise to create a humorous effect in speech and reduce stiffness. The results of these studies proved that tv shows were very attractive to the audience. However, the use of language in such events was still found to unobserved the principle of
politeness. Thus, the similarities between some previous study and this study discussed the politeness maxim in the context of the TV show.

Several studies had differences focus in the non-observance of politeness maxim by Leech (1983) theory on various subjects. The research with natural data on the interaction between teachers and students was conducted by (Febriadina et al., (2018); Kuswor & Rokhman, (2019); Nurdiyani & Sasongko, (2022); Santoso et al., (2020). These four studies found that the interaction did not follow all of the politeness maxims. The research on the subject of films was carried out by Indrajaya and Mulatsih, (2021); Rosyidha, (2019) in identifying the types of non-observance politeness maxims. What made them different was that Rosyidha (2019) found six maxims that indicated humor situations to create inappropriate meaning in conversations. Meanwhile, Indrajaya & Mulatsih (2021) found that the characters unobserved the wisdom maxim. Therefore, the research still needed exploration from the differences in examining non-observance maxim used by the hosts and children, especially on the TV show.

There were several studies have also focused on politeness maxims that occurred in elderly and children, such as the research conducted by Umaroh, et al. (2017) who investigated young children on the principle of politeness. The results of this study showed that children used a lot of maxims of sympathy. The research conducted by Arisanti, et al. (2017) in the film objects on the characters were mothers and daughters. Therefore, this study examined the non-observance politeness maxim that occurred in the age difference between the host and the children on the TV show.

This research was carried out based on the gap found in the previous studies. Several previous studies only examined by politeness maxim theory in formal situasion. For example, the research on the formal TV show that interviewed influential people and celebrities were conducted by (Putri et al., 2019; Ahsanurrijal & Setiaji, 2019); Sintyani et al., 2019; Tampubolon et al., 2021; Satwika et al., 2022). Meanwhile, this research further investigated by combining two theory of Leech maxim (1983) and Grice conversational implicature (1975) on TV show that were informal and comedic. Therefore, the research gap needed to be studied further focused on the non-observance politeness maxim and its implicature in the utterance used by the host and children, especially on TV shows.

TV show was increasingly popular, especially talk shows that invited children as guest stars with linguistic uniqueness to be studied. The author was interested in exploring the non-observance politeness maxim in the utterances on the TV show “Kids Say the Darndest Things”. This TV show had a significant audience, as proven by the 5.5 million viewers on the official ABC YouTube page. In addition, this TV show's topics were enjoyable and entertaining, creating an atmosphere to provoke laughter and entertain the viewers. This subject had linguistic uniqueness that needed to be explored on non-observance politeness maxim in the utterances used by the host and children. Tiffany as a host brought a TV show update on this talk show that highlighted kids talking about their perspectives on things. At the beginning of the interview, the host would ask children about everyday life. They would respond by providing insight that made linguistic uniqueness existed with natural, honesty, and cuteness in children's language. In addition, this TV show was presented interestingly, ran exciting and was not boring. Therefore, this made the author interested in examining the non-observance maxims in this TV show.

Based on the linguistic uniqueness that existed, the author focused on the non-observance maxim and its implicature used by the host and children on the TV show. This
study departed from the assumption that the eased of mass media access on the TV show *Kids Say The Darndest Things* provided language flexibility by unobserved the politeness maxims used by the host and children as guest stars. Additionally, this research assumed this TV program unobserved the politeness maxim that raised implicit meaning or implicatures that could be used as data. Then, the analysis of this study was assumed to generate different findings from previous studies. Therefore, the aims of this research were to investigate in describing the non-observance politeness maxim using Leech’s maxims (1983) theory and its implicature that occurred in the utterances by the host and children as guest stars on the TV show using by Grice (1975) theory.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

The descriptive qualitative method was used in this research to get a better understanding of the non-observance politeness maxim. This study analyzed the politeness maxims that unobserved used by the host and children on the TV show. According to Creswell (2014), qualitative was a method for deciphering meaning. The author used qualitative to explain the data systematically so that the research results were accurate and factual. The principal instrument in this study was the author as the human instrument and the data collected. In order to answer the research question, the author looked up, downloaded, watched, and analyzed the conversation used by host and children on the TV show “*Kids Say The Darndest Things*” season 1 in the full version via the Bflix streaming website. Moreover, the author collected, analyzed and described the data to give an explanation and interpretation to the reader.

The data source for this study was derived from the conversation in the original TV Show “*Kids Say the Darndest Things*” season 1 in 2019-2020, which was obtained from ABC TV show from Bflix streaming website. Moreover, the selected videos were written using their episode and titles, such as Season 1 Episode 1 “You’re Famous, But You Ain’t All That”; Season 1 Episode 5 “Marriage Seems Like a Huge Commitment”; Season 1 Episode 6 “You’ve Been Lying to Your Momma?”; Season 1 Episode 11 “A Thousand Thumbs Up.”

The data were collected using several steps: the first step was downloaded and watched the selected video of the TV show “*Kids Say The Darndest Things*” season 1 of 2019, in full version from Bflix streaming websites. Second, the author was transcribed and listed the transcription to specify the host’s utterances and children’s utterances as the guest stars. Third, the author did note-taking techniques to collect the data. Fourth, apply data reduction or selection by marking the utterance that contained the non-observance maxim of politeness from the existing data. The last was data display based on the data collected of utterances used by the host and children in the form of a word, phrases, or sentences.

In this study, several stages were needed to analyze the process because the spoken words must be interpreted in qualitative data to produce implied meaning. The stages to answering the research questions; first, examining the data that un-observe the politeness maxim utilized by the host and children on TV shows. Second, categorizing utterances that contained non-observance in the six types of maxims proposed by Leech (1983) for data identification in words, phrases, and sentences. Then, specify the answer to the research questions analyzing how the host and children’s utterances unobserved the politeness principles using Leech’s (1983) theory. Next, describing the implicature that arise as a result of non-observance maxim using Grice (1975) theory.
FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

This chapter presented the findings and discussion of the research. There are two theories used to identify and analyze the data. In this chapter, the author presented the results of the data and analysis of the problems mentioned above.

Findings

Types of Non-Observance Politeness Maxim and Its Implicature

The first result was about the types of non-observance politeness maxim. It would be displayed in the table 1. However, the researcher also described the implicature of non-observance the principle of politeness in each maxim directly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Tact Maxim</th>
<th>Approbation Maxim</th>
<th>Sympathy Maxim</th>
<th>Agreement Maxim</th>
<th>Generosity Maxim</th>
<th>Modesty Maxim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author found in the table 1 that the host unobserved the politeness maxim with a total of 12 non-observance politeness maxims in her utterances on four videos TV show *Kids Say The Darndest Things*. In detail, the host unobserved 3 tact maxims, 2 approbation maxims, 3 modesty maxims, 1 generosity maxim, and 3 sympathy maxims. Here, the author found that the host mostly unobserved the tact, modesty, and sympathy maxim rather than the approbation and generosity maxims.

On the other hand, the author found in the column 2 that children were more unobserved by the politeness maxim with a total of 25. In detail, the children unobserved 2 tact maxims, 6 approbation maxims, 4 agreement maxims, 7 modesty maxims, and 6 generosity maxims. The author also found that children were frequently unobserved with modesty, generosity, and approbation maxim rather than tact and agreement maxims.

Furthermore, there were 37 conversation implicatures from dialogue that unobserved the principle of politeness in each maxim was intended to state: 8 data arrogance, insulting as many as 7 data, disapproval of something as 4 data, refusal of a thing as 2 data, sarcasm 3 data, insinuating things 1 data, request something as many as 2 data, and condescending other as 5 data. The implicature of the conversation intended to state the command as many as 5 data. The dominant conversation implicature on this TV Show was an implication that imply arrogance as a result of the non-observance of modesty maxim by the host and children on the TV Show.

Non-Observance of Tact Maxim

The tact maxim implied minimizing utterances other people's losses or maximize other people's benefits (Cutting, 2008). The utterances that unobserved tact maxim were utterances that created the interlocutor was forced to do something according to the speaker's intention. Thus, the non-observance of tact maxim occurred when the speaker maximized the cost of others and minimized the benefits of others.

Datum 1

*Host: Any other celebrities you admire?*

*Emily: Taylor Swift and Adele*
Host: Taylor Swift is my friend.
Grace: Really?
Host: Yeah, she is, I could call her right now
Emily and Paige: Do it, do it.
Grace: I believe you when I see it

The context of the above conversation occurred when the host asked the child as a guest star, namely Emily. She asked about the celebrity she admired. Emily replied that she admired Taylor Swift and she was a friend of the host. The children on the stage also could not believe that the host was a friend of Taylor Swift. And the host dared if he could call Taylor Swift right now.

The children’s utterances above unobserved the tact maxim with the utterance “Do it, do it“ and Grace’s utterance “I believe you when I see it.” The children intended to command the host to call Taylor Swift. It was not following what was required by the maxim of tact where the children did not minimize the loss of other people, especially the host. The children should be able to make more polite remarks to the host, for example, by saying “please” or asking the question, ”Would you call Taylor Swift?“ so that the host could have an alternative answer of no or yes.

The non-observance of the tact maxim above caused the emergence of conversational implicatures, namely, to imply a command. The child’s utterances by Grace, ”I believe you when I see it,” implicitly told the host to call Taylor Swift if she believed seeing it directly that the host called her to prove that the host was a friend of Taylor Swift. Thus, the implication that arose was an expression of the doubts of a child asking the host to prove whether it is true. She only believed by seeing it directly.

Non-Observance of Generosity Maxim

According Leech (1983) the generosity maxim required the speaker to always minimize the advantage to himself if the speech partner wanted to be considered as a polite person. The generosity maxim was expected the speech participants to respect other people. Thus, if the speaker maximized the benefits for himself and minimized the benefits of the speech partner, it could be said that the speaker had unobserved the maxim of generosity.

Datum 2
Jules: Are you single?
Host: Yes I’m very single
Jules: Are you ready to mingle?
Host: I’am so ready for mingling, where is the good place to meet lot here in philadelphia?
Jules: Nowhere, get tinder!

The context of the conversation above occurred when the child, namely Jule, switched roles with Tiffany Haddish as the host. Jule was the host asking the question with Tiffany, which she was single that ready to mingle. Thus, Tiffany asked Jules where the best place to meet many people in Philadelphia was.

The child’s utterances above unobserved the generosity maxim with the utterance "Nowhere, get tinder!" These utterances minimized the cost to self and maximized the benefit to self. The child answered by insinuating she for making a benefit for herself. The child wanted to avoid cost to self by recommending a place where many people could meet when the host asked for a good place to mingle in Philadelphia. Instead, the child insinuated the
host to get Tinder. It was a dating application for finding partners in a relationship. Thus, this utterance was considered to unobserved the maxim of generosity.

The non-observance of the generosity maxim above caused the emergence of conversational implicatures, namely to imply satire. The child's utterances by Jule, "Nowhere, get tinder!" implicitly meant getting a boyfriend on the Tinder application because she was single and ready to date someone into a relationship. Tinder itself was a dating application that was easily accessible; this dating application made it easy to find a partner according to one's criteria.

Non-Observance of Modesty Maxim

Leech (1983) stated the maxim of modesty with praise yourself as little as possible, criticize yourself as much as possible. Thus, if someone utterances that shown pride in himself or arrogance, then his utterances was considered had unobserved the maxim of modesty. The maxim of modesty required the speech participant to be humble by reducing self-praise. People would be said to be arrogant if in speaking activities they always praised and excelled themselves.

Datum 3
Host: And what do you like to do for fun?
Elliot: I like to play Dungeons and Dragons with my friends.
Host: I know this game. I'm pretty good at it. I'm actually like the best.

The above conversation occurred when Tiffany Hadish as the host, asked the child as a guest star, Elliot, about what he did for fun. Elliot liked playing Dungeons and Dragons games with his friends. The host responded that she knew this game and felt pretty good in playing this game.

The host's utterances were above unobserved the modesty maxim with the utterances, "I know this game, I'm pretty good at it. I'm actually like the best". This utterance did not minimize praise of self and maximize dispraise of self. It was shown by the host’s utterances condescending to the child and trying to maximize praise to herself if she was the best at playing the game. It was included in the modesty maxim, especially the criterion of being arrogant. The host showed this arrogant attitude by to imply condescending to other games.

The implicature that implied arrogance could be found in the host's utterances above. The host's utterances contained the implicature that unobserved the maxim of modesty because the host did not try to minimize self-deprecation. The utterances "I know this game, I'm pretty good at it. I'm actually like the best" implicitly told that the host responded in an arrogant tone if she was undefeated and thought she was the best in this game. The host felt that she was better than him at playing Dungeons and Dragons games. Thus, there were implications for pride in others if the host is unbeatable in this game because she was the best.

Non-Observance of Approbation Maxim

Datum 4
Host: And what do you want to be when you grow up?
Jessica: A dancer teacher, a gymnastics teacher. And someone that gives people food.
Host: Somebody who gives people food? So gives people food. Like how?
Jessica: Like a waitress.

Host: Where the money’s at?

The context of the above conversation occurred when the host asked the child as a guest star, namely Jessica. When she grew up, the host asked the guest star what she wanted to be. Then, Jessica answered if she wanted to be a waitress who gave food to people. The host felt the waiter’s job was insufficient to earn money.

The host’s utterances above unobserved the approbation maxim with the utterances "Where the money’s at?" It showed that the host minimized praise of others and maximized dispraise and minimizing disrespect to others by giving insults about the child’s dream to be a waiter. It happened because of the non-observance of the approbation maxim, namely indirectly criticized the wishes of other parties in public. The host answered Jessica’s statement about her dream of becoming a waiter by denouncing and belittling the child that working as a waitress had no money. It made the humiliated participant feel embarrassed and immediately became silent.

The implicature that implied insults could be found in the host’s utterances above. The host’s utterances contained the implicature that unobserved the maxim of approbation because the child did not try to minimize dispraise and maximize praise of others. The utterances “Where the money’s at?” implicitly told the job of being a waiter had no money. It could be seen that the host’s contempt for Jessica was because the host degraded the work of a waiter as something that had no money. Even though a small child wished to become a waiter when they grew up, the host would even insult the job.

Non-Observance of Agreement maxim

The agreement maxim required speech participants to maximize the agreement and minimize the disagreement between other. (Leech, 1983). Therefore, if a speaker’s utterances that expressed disagreement, the utterance was deemed to have unobserved the maxim of agreement. In the utterances by the host and the child, the non-observance agreement maxim was found.

Datum 5

Host: Do you think I’m tough?
Hannah: No.
Host: What? I like that answer, though, because I am very fragile. Like a flower. Would you say you’re fragile?
Hannah: Well, I’m not fragile. I’m just a human.

The above conversation occurred when Tiffany Hadish as the host, asked the child as a guest star, Hannah, about her opinion on being a tough person. Hannah thought that a host was a person who was not tough, then the host agreed that she was very fragile and asked whether Hannah considered herself a fragile person or not.

The child’s utterances were above unobserved the agreement maxim: "Well, I’m not fragile. I’m just a human”. In these utterances, Hannah maximized disagreement by disagreeing that she was fragile and minimized agreement by telling her reason that she was only human, not fragile.

The implicature that implied disapproval could be found in the child’s utterances above. The child’s utterances contained the implicature that unobserved the maxim of agreement. The utterance “Well, I’m not fragile. I’m just a human” showed her disagreement
that she was fragile. Here there was an implication that she was not a sensitive person or a fragile person. She was just a human being who could feel any feelings, not just a fragile person.

*Non-Observance of Sympathy Maxim*

Leech (1983) stated the sympathy maxim requires a speaker to maximize sympathy for others and minimize antipathy for others. If an utterance does not show sympathy or shows antipathy towards other people, the utterance is considered to unobserved the sympathy maxim. When the interlocutor gets luck or happiness, the speaker is obliged to congratulate him. As for the opponent when experiencing difficulties or misfortune, the speaker should express his sorrow or condolences as a sign of sympathy.

Datum 6

**Host:** Can you do the robot dance?
**Elli:** I'll Try.
**Host:** Come on. Bust the robot.
**Elli:** (Doing robot dance)

**Host:** Elli you look like you are the robot malfunction

The context of the above conversation occurred when Tiffany Hadish was the host and the child was a guest star, namely Elli. The host asked if Elli could do a robot dance or not. As a guest star, Elli would try to do a robot dance in front of the stage. The host was also insulted by Elli's robot dance performance, which looked like a robot malfunction.

The host's utterances were above the unobserved sympathy maxim: "Elli, you look like you are the robot malfunction." It could be seen that the host maximized antipathy and minimized sympathy between self and other. The host's utterances showed no sympathy for Elli as a guest star. This dis-sympathy was realized by not sympathizing with Elli, who has tried to do the robot dance. In the non-observance sympathy maxim, the host was more likely to express arguments in the form of insults instead of supporting and praising the child who has dared to perform the robot dance. The host was seen insulting the child's dance which looked like a malfunctioning robot.

The implicature that implied humiliation could be found in the host's utterances above. If someone got success the trophy, he got the speaker would congratulate him on the success he got. The host's utterances' Elli, you look like you are the robot malfunction," implicitly told it was insulting if a child's dance was bad. Robot malfunction, there was a simile with the robot dance, which looked like a malfunction or error robot. The host insulted with the implicit meaning because of his bad dance. Thus, it included the sympathy maxim because the speaker did not maximize his sympathy for others, instead of providing support and congratulations to the guest star who has tried to try the robot dance he was doing.
The author found the data of 37 non-observance politeness maxims on the figure 1. The modesty maxim was the most dominant type used in this TV show, with 27%, followed by the approbation maxim, with 22%. Then, the same percentage of tact maxim and generosity maxim with 16%. Followed by a low rate of agreement maxim of 11% and sympathy maxim of 8%. The dominant characteristic of the non-observance modesty maxim in this TV show was a principle of politeness that suggested to avoid expressing ourselves in too boastful or self-promoting ways. Thus, the host and the guest star children frequently unobserved the modesty maxim because they wanted to excel over each other, not to look inferior. Therefore, they were arrogant by making statements that were too grandiose about themselves by setting aside the modesty maxim.

There are 37 conversation implicatures from dialogue that unobserved the principle of politeness in each maxim was intended to state arrogance with 22%, insulting with 19%, The implicature of the conversation intended to state the command with 14%, condescending other with 13%, disapproval of something as 11% sarcasm 8%, refusal of a thing with 5%, request something with 2%, and insinuating things with 3%. The dominant conversation implicature on this TV Show was an implication that implied arrogance as a result of the non-observance of modesty maxim by the host and children on the TV Show.

Discussion

In the first discussion, the author explained the non-observance modesty maxim from the 10 data found. The modesty maxim was a principle of politeness that suggested to avoid boasting or making overly grandiose statements about ourselves. In the context of being a host or guest star on a show, different social expectations that could override the modesty maxim. As a host, it may be expected that the host was confident and knowledgeable about the topic of discussion. To fulfill this role effectively, the host may need to speak assertively and with authority, even if it meant making statements that could be perceived as immodest.

Similarly, the children as the guest stars expected to showcase their talents and achievements to demonstrate why they were invited to the show. The children may need to fully understand the politeness maxim in conversation or even the language used on TV shows. The children may not realize that flaunting their superiority or success could be seen as rude or inappropriate. In addition, the children were often very enthusiastic and excited in attention-grabbing situations, such as when appearing on television triggered children’s
behavior to show off their superiority or success to attract more attention. Therefore, the host and guest star could discuss accomplishments, experiences, and expertise in an immodest way. Thus, the implications that arose from the non-observance maxim of modesty by the host and children as the guest star were conversation implicatures that implied arrogance and condescending to others. The children used more implicatures that implied arrogance, while the host implied condescending to others.

The data that the author would discuss next was the approbation maxim. The author found 8 non-observance approbation maxims in host and children’s utterances. The approbation maxim was a principle of politeness that suggested we should express approval and praise for others when warranted. However, in the context of being a host or guest star on a show, different social expectations that could make it difficult to observe this maxim. The child unobserved the approbation maxim with a total of 6 more times than the host with a total of 2. As a host, the role was to facilitate discussion and asked questions rather than to express personal opinions or offer praise. The host must also maintain a certain level of neutrality to keep the conversation balanced and avoid favoritism. Similarly, the guest stars expected to discuss their experiences and opinions rather than praise others.

Likewise, the children were positioned as guest stars who could unobserved the approbation maxim. The children could not understand the situation and wider context of the event and may not understand how they were positioned as guests of honor. In addition, the children tended to be less able to control their words properly. They could easily say something inappropriate for the situation because of their natural in answering guest star questions, so they spoke frankly and frontally with contempt. The implications that arose from the non-observance maxim of approbation by children were conversation implicatures that implied insult and sarcasm to others. In comparison, the implication from the host was conversation implicature that implied sarcasm and condescending to others.

The non-observance tact maxim by hosts and children as guest star data were found in the data with a total of 5. The hosts unobserved more tact maxims than guest stars. The host’s unobserved tact maxims to create the children as the guest star was forced to do something according to the speaker’s intention. The tact maxim was one of the principles in conversation theory one must choose words carefully and pay attention to the feelings and interests of the interlocutor so that the message conveyed could be well received. The hosts on TV shows may unobserved the tact maxims to provide interesting entertainment for the audience.

The children as guest stars unobserved the tact maxim because they did not fully understand the concept of being polite or tactful in conversation. In addition, children may be more inclined to speak as it was and expressed their feelings without thinking about the effects or impacts that could arise from their words to order others. Thus, the non-observance of tact maxim occurred when the speaker maximized the cost of others and minimized the benefits of others. The implications arising from the non-observance of tact maxim were the implicature of the conversation that implied command and request in the utterances of children and the host on the TV show.

The non-observance of the generosity maxim found on the TV show showed a total of 7. The children unobserved the generosity maxim more frequently than the hosts, with a total of 6. The generosity maxim minimized the possibility of offense felt by the speaker. In the maxim of generosity, the speaker maximized losses and minimized benefits for himself as much as possible. In this maxim, the speakers were also expected to be able to use polite
sentences to express their feelings. It happened because of the unobserved generosity maxim shown by the children by not wanting to sacrifice to explain in more detail the statement uttered by the host. The implications of the non-observance generosity maxim were the implicature of conversation that implied satire, refusal, request, and insult in the children’s utterances. In addition, the implications that arose in the host implied the command.

The data on non-observance of agreement maxim found on tv shows by children with a total of 4. The agreement maxim was a principle in conversation theory that in speaking, people tried to comply with agreements made with their interlocutors so that the message could be well received. However, the children on talk shows may unobserve the agreement maxim that young children generally had limitations in terms of self-control, including in speaking. They could easily get carried away by emotions and speak without paying attention to the rules and norms that applied in conversation. The guest star realized the disagreement on the talk show by giving reasons and no reasons about the topic that made the disagreement on the show. It was made by one of the discussion participants who made a statement but was rejected and felt disappointed, and there was an argument. The implications arising from the non-observance agreement maxim by the children as the guest star were the conversation’s implications that implied disapproval of things.

Furthermore, it was found in the data that the host unobserved the sympathy maxim with a total of 3. The sympathy maxim was one of the principles in conversation theory, which stated that in speaking, one must show empathy or sympathy for the other person’s feelings so that the message conveyed could be received properly. However, the hosts on TV shows unobserved the sympathy maxim to maintain the excitement and involvement of the audience in the show. It could make the host more inclined to ignore or even show no empathy for the feelings and experiences that the guest star was facing. Therefore, the hosts should still show empathy and sympathy for their interlocutors, especially if the topics discussed were related to personal matters. By showing empathy, the host could create a more positive conversational environment and strengthen audience engagement in the event.

The implications arising from the non-observance sympathy maxim was the implicature of a conversation by the host that implied insult to others. Based on the research findings, the implication was that using maxims of politeness principle containing tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim was important to make good communication. Using maxims of the politeness principle made the spoken utterances polite. When the speaker spoke politely, the addressee would be pleasant. Thus, the maxims of the politeness were important to be applied in daily life to produce and comprehend polite utterances in communication.

CONCLUSION & SUGGESTION

Based on the findings and discussions in this study, the author could draw the following conclusions. The author concluded that the host and children as the guests non-observed six types of politeness maxims on the TV show Kids Say The Darndest Things. There were causative factors that influenced the occurrence of non-observance of the politeness maxim on the TV show, namely the age actor between the speaker as the host and the speech partner of the child as the guest star which was the result of a factor analysis of the occurrence of a non-observance politeness maxim.
The dominant type of non-observance politeness maxim used on this TV show was the modesty maxim. It showed that both the host and children as the guest star frequently unobserved the modesty maxim because they wanted to excel over each other so as not to look inferior. As a host, it was expected that the host was confident and knowledgeable about the topic of discussion, even if it meant making statements that could be perceived as immodest. Similarly, the children as the guest stars were often very enthusiastic and excited in attention-grabbing situations to show off their superiority or success to attract more attention.

The author also concluded the dominant conversation implicature on this TV Show was an implication that implied arrogance as a result of the non-observance of modesty maxim by the host and children. The resulting implicatures in TV shows were mainly due to the non-observance between the host and the guest star on the principle of politeness. To understand the implicature, context was the most essential thing in determining what the speaker implied. Thus, the existence of these implications could allow the speech partner to make answers that hide information, confuse other speech partner.

Finally, the author concluded the politeness maxims were a set of rules that existed to minimize the impact of being impolite in social interactions. Also, the conversational implicature that arose from non-observance politeness maxim was important to understand through the implied utterance of a sentence in a context, even though that meaning was not a part or fulfillment of what was said. Thus, the maxims of the politeness principle made the spoken utterances polite. When the speaker spoke politely, the addressee would be pleasant. For future authors, it was expected to be able to study objects in different fields of study in indirect interaction such as online media and text messages to identify current trends in non-observance politeness maxim in the context of modern technology. It was hoped that future authors would be able to develop or seek new ideas related to this research and renewal in researching the non-observance politeness maxim by Leech (1983) and conversational implicature by Grice (1975).

In addition, it was hoped that the study space would be narrower so that it could be analyzed to a more advanced stage to analyze the problems that occurred, such as other talk show programs on television by combining politeness maxim theory with other theories to produce specific results and broaden the topic. For readers, this research could provide a deeper understanding of how the most common types of politeness maxims could be reduced or prevented from non-observance of politeness principles on TV shows and other mass media. Therefore, the author hoped that further research could develop and enrich new ideas related to analysis or research in the field of linguistics.
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