



## **AN ANALYSIS OF VIOLATION OF COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE MAXIM IN THE RUSH HOUR MOVIE 1**

**Afiq Pahril<sup>1</sup>, M.Zaim<sup>2</sup>**

English Language and Literature

Faculty of Languages and Arts

Universitas Negeri Padang

email: [ashraffarsiandi@gmail.com](mailto:ashraffarsiandi@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

This study aims to find out the maxim that are classified as violating by the main characters in Rush Hour Movie 1 and to find out the maxim violation by the main characters influence to the characterization in the movie. This study uses a descriptive approach. Data and data sources are taken from the dialogues of the main characters which they are Lee and Carter in the Rush Hour Movie 1 movie. Data collection was carried out by analyzing using Grice's theory (1975). The results of the data obtained from this study are that there are 4 maxims that are violated in Rush Hour Movie 1 with a total of 27 maxim violations. Of the 4 maxims, there are 14 violations of the maxim of quality, 2 violations of the maxim of quantity, 6 violations of the maxim of relevance, and 5 violations of the maxim of manner. This study provides valuable insight into how the cooperative principle does not occur properly due to the violation of maxims in their communication, then, the characterizations main characters that are violated from the four maxims are Liar, Braggart, Narcissitic, Overstate, Not Relevant, Unresponsive, Ambiguity, and Insolent.

**Keywords:** Maxim violation, Cooperative principle, Characterization, Rush Hour Movie 1

### **A. INTRODUCTION**

In pragmatics, the idea of conversational implicature deals with issues of language meaning that ordinary semantic theory cannot fully address. Implicature helps explain the gap that often exists between the literal words spoken and the intended meaning. Grice, a key figure in pragmatics, introduced a theory that elaborates on how people use language, further developing the concept of implicature.

The principle of cooperation refers to a guideline in communication where speakers and listeners work together to ensure that their conversation is effective and mutually beneficial. This principle suggests that speakers should provide accurate, correct, and clear responses to questions, thereby contributing to a cooperative and meaningful exchange (Grice, 1975). He introduced the Cooperative

<sup>1</sup> English ELLSP of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang graduated on September 2024

<sup>2</sup> Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang



principle. The principle is based on the belief that people in a conversation work together to make their communication effective. To achieve this, they strive to be honest, provide relevant information, and express themselves clearly and accurately.

The researcher identified a gap in understanding how the Cooperative Principle is violated across different regions, cultures, and geographies. To explore this, the researcher chose a movie featuring characters from diverse backgrounds, as it highlighted various violations of the principle within their interactions. This research aims to contribute to the fields of semantics and pragmatics by examining how cooperative principles are applied and challenged in cross-cultural communication. The study is titled "An Analysis of Violations of the Cooperative Principle Maxim in Rush Hour Movie 1" to reflect its focus on these dynamics.

Pragmatics examines how language and context interact to determine meaning. This field highlights the importance of considering context when analyzing language, as understanding meaning often depends on the situational factors surrounding communication (Levinson in Rusminto, 2015: 58). So Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that explores how language use is influenced by context. It focuses on understanding the speaker's intentions by analyzing not just the language itself, but also the context in which communication takes place. This includes considering factors such as the participants' backgrounds, the timing, and the location of the conversation. Effective communication requires interlocutors to interpret and understand these contextual elements to accurately grasp and convey the speaker's intended meaning.

In communication, both the speaker and listener need to uphold the cooperative principle for the process to proceed effectively. If this principle is not followed, communication can break down. The cooperative principle is implemented through various conversational rules. Collaboration can be understood as the active participation of individuals in creating a conversation with all the essential components. Grice (in Arifin and Rani, 2013: 1149) stated The principle of cooperation means that you should contribute to the conversation in a manner that is appropriate for the current stage and aligned with the accepted purpose or direction of the exchange. Grice identified four key maxims. The first, the maxim of quantity, advises providing just the right amount of information, enough to be useful but not overwhelming. The second, the maxim of quality, highlights the need for truthfulness and accuracy, discouraging false or misleading information. The third, the maxim of relevance, underscores the importance of staying on topic and ensuring that contributions are pertinent to the current discussion. Finally, the maxim of manner recommends clear and coherent communication, avoiding ambiguity and unnecessary complexity in expression.

In violations of the maxim of cooperation can happen when its application fails to adhere to established guidelines (Roekhan, 2013: 191). Such violations can disrupt the ongoing communication process. Violations of the maxim of cooperation occur when speakers deviate from the prescribed rules, often due to circumstances that cause them to neglect these rules. According to Roekhan (2013: 191), such situations include when a speaker fails to grasp or understand the topic being discussed, or the context of the communication. These violations can manifest

as providing excessive or insufficient information, presenting falsehoods, being irrelevant, or lacking clarity. Such deviations can result in miscommunication, confusion, or failure to effectively convey the intended message.

Then there is characterization, it refers to the way an author depicts and reveals the personality of characters in a story. According to DiYanni (2001, p. 56), characterization is the process through which an author describes and brings a character to life. It differs from the character itself, as characterization involves the traits and attributes that shape the character in a narrative. Authors typically use two primary methods to describe characters: the direct method, which involves explicit storytelling, and the indirect method, which reveals character traits through actions, dialogue, and interactions in the movie.

"Rush Hour" is a 1998 action-comedy directed by Brett Ratner. Jackie Chan stars as Detective Inspector Lee, a talented Hong Kong police officer, while Chris Tucker plays Detective James Carter, a quick-witted and talkative LAPD detective. The story follows Lee as he travels from Hong Kong to Los Angeles to help with the investigation of the kidnapping of the Chinese Consul's daughter, Soo Yung. Though the FBI is initially hesitant to include Lee in the case and assigns Carter to keep him out of it, Carter and Lee eventually join forces to solve the case, leading to a series of comedic and action-filled escapades.

Given the problem limitations outlined, the research problem can be articulated as follows: "What are the specific violations of the Cooperative Principle maxims in the movie Rush Hour 1, and how do these violations impact the characterization of the main characters?" This leads to the formulation of two key research questions: (1) Which maxims are consistently violated by the main characters in Rush Hour 1? and (2) In what ways do these violations contribute to the development and portrayal of the characters throughout the film?

## **B. RESEARCH METHOD**

In this research, researchers will use descriptive research methods as the methodology. According to Zaim (2014), a descriptive approach is research that is not statistical, the data collected in language research are words that represent linguistic phenomena. Researchers decided to use the film entitled "Rush Hour Movie 1" as a source of research data. The data used as the focus of the research are conversations between film characters which are suspected of containing maxim violations in them.

Researchers employ human instruments in the research process, as highlighted by Sugiyono (2017:147-148). The data was analysed using the descriptive method. This study focused on analysing the characters in the story. Moleong (2017) defines the qualitative methodology as a method that produces descriptive data about the issues faced by the subject in the form of action, behaviour, perception, or motivation. The selection of words and arrangement of sentences significantly influence this technique. Prior to starting analysis, the researcher first, the researcher downloaded the movie. Second, the researcher watched the movie. Third, the researcher inputted the data into data tabulations.

**C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

**1) The Analysis of Violation maxims**

It was found in the interaction between the two main characters in the film Rush Hour Movie 1 which violates the principles of the Cooperation Principle. The table below is presented to show the violations of the maxim of the Cooperative Principle and the strategies used by the characters to violate the maxim.

Table 1 Maxims Violation done by main characters

No	Maxim Violation	Main Characters		Frequency	Percentage (%)
		Carter	Lee		
1	Quality Maxim	13	1	14	52
2	Quantity Maxim	1	1	2	7
3	Relevance Maxim	5	1	6	22
4	Manner Maxim	2	3	5	19
Total		21	6	27	100

All of the maxims of the Cooperative Principles have been violated. From 27 violations of the four maxims there are 21 total violations of Carter where 13 violations of the maxim of quality, 1 violation of the maxim of quantity, 5 violations of the maxim of relevance, and 2 violations of the maxim of manner. Then there is also Lee there are 6 violations where 1 violation of the maxim of quality, 1 violation of the maxim of quantity, 1 violation of the maxim of relevance and 3 violations of the maxim of manner.

Table 2 The characterization impact of maxims violations

No	Characterization	Carter	Lee
1.	Liar	9	1
2.	Braggart	3	-
3.	Narcissistic	1	-
4.	Overstate	1	1
5.	Not relevant	4	1
6.	unresponsive	-	1
7.	Ambiguity	2	2
9.	Insolent	-	2

There is a characterization found in the violation of maxims in the two main characters where the violation of quality is the characterization of a liar where there are 9 in Carter and 1 in Lee, then there is the characterization of Braggart which is 3 in Carter, then there is the characterization of Narcissistic which is 1 in Carter. In the violation of the maxim of quantity there is the characterization of overstate where 1 in Carter and 1 in Lee. In the violation of relevance there is the characterization of Not relevant where 4 in Carter and 1 in Lee, then there is the characterization of unresponsive which is 1 in Lee. In the violation of manner there is the characterization of ambiguity where 2 in Carter and 2 in Lee, then there is the characterization of insolent where there are 2 in Lee.



**Maxim Quality**

The speaker violates the maxim of quality by providing incorrect statements or information, tell lies, narcissitic, and braggart.

Context: Carter is being held hostage by Clive who is pointing a gun at Carter's head and two officers are pointing guns at Clive.

Carter: Yes, he is, officer.  
Clive: I'm not playing!  
Officer: Drop the gun!  
Carter: He's my cousin. We're just talking.

In this dialogue, Carter provides incorrect information by stating that he is Clive's cousin. In fact, Carter is actually a member of the LAPD detective team who wants to catch Clive. (Liar)

Context: Carter is about to be killed by Juntao's men and Lee shows up lying and claiming to be from LAPD so that Carter won't be killed.

Carter: Let me go.  
Lee: **LAPD.**

In this dialogue, Lee makes a false statement by claiming to be a detective from the LAPD during the scene where Carter is being held by Juntao's men. In fact, Lee is an inspector from China who works with the FBI to catch Juntao. (Liar)

**Maxim Quantity**

The speaker violates the maxim of quantity by providing too much information.

Context: Carter is blamed by FBI agents for his actions on the street that attracted a lot of attention and were carried out in the name of the FBI.

FBI Agent: What happened, Carter?  
Carter: ain't supposed to be  
jumping on buses!  
I do not do that.  
I am not Carl Lewis..

In this dialogue Carter gives too much information to the FBI agent when it should have been enough with "I do not do that." However Carter added unnecessary information because it was already clear there with the answer. (Overstate)

Context: Context: Carter and Lee are at a Chinese street food place, Lee is bragging about his father in front of Carter.

Lee: Your daddy was a policeman?  
Carter: Fifteen years LAPD.

Lee: My father was also a policeman.  
Carter: Your daddy was a cop?  
Lee: Not a cop, an officer.  
**A legend all over Hong Kong.**

In this dialogue Lee gives too much information to the FBI agent that should have been enough in "Not a cop, an officer." However, Lee added unnecessary information because of Lee's intention to brag about his father. (Overstate)

### ***Maxim of Relevance***

The speaker violates the maxim of relevance by changing the topic and giving irrelevant answers.

Context: Carter is having a conversation in the LAPD office with Jonson, Jonson is upset because Carter didn't invite him to the mission to catch Clive.

Jonson: why you're the only cop in the department without a partner.  
Carter: **Johnson, look, first of all, If you want a date with me... you have to wait on the list like every other woman, OK?**

In this dialogue, Carter violates the maxim of relevance by giving an irrelevant answer. Even though the topic being discussed is about why Carter doesn't want to have a partner at work. (Not relevant)

Context: Carter picks up Lee at the airport, Lee does not answer Carter's questions because he thinks it is better to act directly than to talk a lot.

Carter: Do you understand the words that are coming out of my mouth?"  
Lee: .....  
Carter : "I cannot believe this shit!  
First, I get a bullshit assignment,  
now, Mr. Rice-a-Roni...  
don't even speak American.

In this dialogue, Lee violates the maxim of relevance by not providing an answer to Carter's question. Even though Lee can actually speak English, he just doesn't want to answer Carter's questions. (Not relevant)

### ***Maxim Manner***

The speaker violates the maxim of manner by providing ambiguous information and being impolite in providing information.

Context: Lee tries to greet a Shopkeeper like Carter did earlier.

Lee: **What's up my nigga?**

Shopkeeper: What did you just say?

Lee: What's up, my nigga?

In this dialogue, Lee violates the maxim of manner by using the word "Nigga" for black people, making it ambiguous and causing a fight over it. Even though Lee didn't really know what was meant by the word "nigga", because Carter had previously greeted the shopkeeper with that word, Lee wanted to imitate him, ending in ambiguity. (Insolent)

Context: Carter and Lee are heading to a bar, Lee wants to meet with consul Han but Carter insists on searching the bar first.

Lee: I must get to the consulate.

What are we doing here?

Carter: It's called **a shakedown**.

Very serious police work.

In this dialogue, Carter violates the maxim of manner by using the vocabulary "a shakedown" which Lee does not understand, thus causing ambiguity. Although Carter could have said "we're doing a search here". (Ambiguity)

## 1. The Influence of The Violation of Maxims

### The Influence of Maxim Quality

The speaker violates the maxim of quality by providing incorrect statements or information, and tell lies.

Carter: Yes, he is, officer.

Clive: I'm not playing!

Officer: Drop the gun!

Carter: **He's my cousin**. We're just talking.

After Carter violates the maxim of quality by lying to Officer and Clive. The police and Clive do not believe Carter and a shootout ensues.

Carter: Let me go.

Lee: **LAPD**.

After Lee violates the maxim of quality by lying to Juntao's men to save Carter by saying that he is LAPD but Juntao's men ignore him because they know Lee is lying and immediately attack Lee.

### The Influence of Maxim Quantity

The speaker violates the maxim of quantity by providing too much information.

FBI Agent: What happened, Carter?

Carter: ain't supposed to be

jumping on buses!  
I do not do that.  
**I am not Carl Lewis.**

After Carter violates the maxim of quantity by adding unnecessary information by saying he is not Carl Lewis, the FBI agent feels bad for Consul Han with Carter's angry state.

### **The Influence of Maxim Relevance**

The speaker violates the maxim of relevance by changing the topic and giving irrelevant answers.

Jonson: why you're the only cop in the department without a partner.  
Carter: **Johnson, look, first of all, If you want a date with me... you have to wait on the list like every other woman, OK?**

After Carter violated the maxim of relevance because his statement was irrelevant to the topic of his discussion with Jonson, Jonson finally ignored Carter.

Carter: Do you understand the words that are coming out of my mouth?"  
Lee: .....  
Carter : "I cannot believe this shit!  
First, I get a bullshit assignment,  
now, Mr. Rice-a-Roni...  
don't even speak American.

After Lee violated the maxim of relevance, Carter felt annoyed because Lee did not respond to Lee's question which made Carter assume that Lee could not speak English.

### **The Influence of Maxim Manner**

The speaker violates the maxim of manner by providing ambiguous information and being impolite in providing information.

Lee: What's up my nigga?  
Shopkeeper: What did you just say?  
Lee: What's up, my nigga?

After Lee violates the maxim of manner, the shopkeeper is angered by Lee's ambiguity in the meaning of the word "nigga" which the shopkeeper considers rude and ends in a fight.

Lee: I must get to the consulate.  
What are we doing here?



Carter: It's called a shakedown.  
Very serious police work.

After Carter violates the maxim of manner, Lee feels confused and left out of their case.

## **2) Discussion**

Based on the findings, four violations of the maxims were found, namely violations of the maxim of quality, violations of the maxim of quantity, violations of the maxim of relevance, and violations of the maxim of manner in the film *Rush Hour Movie 1*. These four maxims are violations based on the theory of Grice (1975). Researchers found data from two main figures, namely Carter and Lee

From the data found, the most dominant data among the four maxim violations was the violation of the maxim of quality, utterances were found to violate the maxim. Even though the maxim of quality is the most widely used in this film, this is different compared to Afriana (2020), Ambalegin (2022), where there are the most violations of quantity. This happened because Carter had to maintain a secret mission that required him to be dishonest.

From the results of as Afriana (2020), Ambalegin (2022) which also analyzed violations of maxims in films, there was a tendency to be more dominant towards violations of the maxim of quantity, which is different from the results of the research conducted by the researcher which was more dominant towards violations of the maxim of quality. This is because the story of the film *About Time* tells about time travel which requires a complicated explanation so it is difficult to explain concisely and precisely which makes this film have many violations of the maxim of quantity and the film *Turning Red* tells the story of a 13 year old boy who wants to prove himself by means of wants to be independent which makes him do a lot of oversharing. This is very different from the film *Rush Hour*, where the characters are mostly adults, but Carter happens to be someone who likes to give wrong information.

The influence of the maxim that is most violated by each main character is Carter in the maxim of quality and Lee in the maxim of quantity. Carter can be characterized as an unreliable and attention-seeking person because Carter often violates the maxim of quality. According to (Grice, 1989) people who provide information that is not based on facts and do not provide clear evidence are considered to have violated the maxim of quality. Lee can be characterized as an ambiguous person because he does not express himself through words but rather through actions. This happens because of the differences in culture and norms in speaking and behaving in the country he is visiting.

## **D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

### **1) Conclusion**

In conclusion, the cooperative principle does not work well in this film because there are four maxims violated in the *Rush Hour Movie 1* with The maxim that is most often violated is the maxim of quality, then there is the maxim of relevance, then the maxim of manner and the maxim that is least violated is the maxim of

quantity. The influence of the violation of maxims to the characterization of the main characters has described how the character of each main character and the impact of the violation on the four violated maxims. The most characterization on the liar indicator and the least is Narcissistic which is violated by Carter. Then Lee violates the most on the insolent indicator.

So from this research, in this film there are 4 maxims that are violated by the main characters which then cause several impacts on the characterization of the characters in the Rush Hour Movie 1 film. In the end, the cooperative principle is not implemented well with the existence of maxims that are violated by the main characters.

## 2) Suggestion

Based on the research result, the writer would like to give some suggestions. First, the researcher wants this research to be a useful reference for English Literature students who are interested in analyzing the topic of maxim violation and its contribution to characterization on the same topic or other topics that are still related to characterization of the main characters that have different country between them where they have different in culture also. Second, this research can be a reference for readers who want to discuss maxim violation and characterization.

## REFERENCES

- Ambalegin (2022). The Pragmatic Analysis Of Cooperative Principle In Turning Red Movie. *Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature* 10(2) 1487-1495  
<https://doi.org/10.24256/Ideas.V10i2.3179>
- Afiana (2020). The Cooperative Principle Analysis in About Time Movie. *Linguistic English Education and Art (LEEA) Journal*, 4(1), 66-76.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31539/leea.v4i1.1369>
- DiYanni, R. (2001). *Literature Reading Fiction, Poetry, and Drama*.
- Grice, P. (1975). Syntax and Semantics Volume 3: Speech Acts. *The Modern Language Journal*, 60(ue 5/6), 301. <https://doi.org/10.2307/324613>
- Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.
- Moleong. (2017). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Rosdakarya.
- Sudaryanto. (2014). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa (pengantar penelitian wahana kebudayaan secara linguistik*. Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta
- Roekhan. (2002). *Mengenal Kekerasan Simbolik Di Sekolah*. Jurnal, Fakultas Sastra.
- Roekhan. (2013). *Mengenal Kekerasan Simbolik Di Sekolah*. Jurnal, Fakultas

Sastra, Universitas Malang.

Rusminto, Nurlaksana Eko. (2015). *Analisis Wacana: Sebuah Kajian Teoretis dan Praktis*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu

Ulhasanah, L. (2020). *Pemaknaan Stereotip Gender dan Kelas Sosial pada Film “Little Woman.”*

Zaim, M. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa: Pendekatan Struktural*. Sukabina Press.

