

The Violations of Conversational Maxims By The Characters In Fast And Furious 1 Movie

Wahyu Unggul Widodo¹⁾

ABSTRACT

This research discusses violating conversational maxim found in a movie entitled Fast and Furious 1 movie. This research has two main purposes which are finding the types of violating conversational maxim in that movie and explaining why the violations appears. The writer uses the theory of cooperative principle by Grice (1975). The source of this research is Fast and Furious 1 movie. In completing this research, the writer applies data collection method with an uninvolved conservation observation technique and analytical method with sorting determinants technique. The result of this research found that violating conversational maxim occurs when speaker does not fulfil a proper maxim during conversation to make certain meaning and is the discovery of all types of violating maxim purposed by Grice (1975). The analysis found 3 violations maxim of quantity, 9 violations maxim of quality, and 2 violations maxim of relation

Keywords: *Conversational Maxim, Violating Maxim*

Correspondent Authors;

1) Lecturer of Universitas An Nuur, wahyuunggul@unan.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

When two people talk to each other, they need to take turns and share information that helps both of them. If you tell each other what you mean, your talk will be easy to understand and flow well. When people have a good conversation and understand each other well, they have followed the rules of polite speaking. Grice (1975) suggested that communication works best when people follow certain rules. These include being clear, relevant, and truthful. By following these rules, we are more likely to be understood and have successful conversations. The Cooperative

Principle has four rules (called maxims) that help people in a conversation work together. These rules are called the maxims of quantity, quality, manner, and relevance. They tell us how to communicate in a way that is helpful and respectful to others. When we use Cooperative Principle, we help the listener understand what we really mean and our reasons for saying it.

Sometimes people can't follow rules and they break them. If someone doesn't follow the rules for speaking, we say they "violate" them. Violation happens when speakers do not try to follow a certain rule. If speakers break the rules of conversation, then they might not understand each other

very well and the conversation might not work out. When speakers break a rule about how to talk, the listener might not understand the truth of what they said, and only get the basic idea.

Sometimes, people will lie for certain reasons. They think lying is a good way to stay safe and keep away from anything that might make them feel uncomfortable. People often lie because they don't want to look bad in front of others. Sometimes, when people do something wrong, they might have to lie so others don't find out and they don't look bad. People lie for a lot of reasons like keeping secrets, making someone happy or feeling jealous of others.

Brown and Yule (1983, p. 32) give additional explanation regarding the conversational maxims pioneered by Grice (1975, p. 45). Maxim of quantity requires the speakers to be as informative as is required, they should not give too little or too much information. The maxim of quantity says to give enough information, neither too little nor too much. Some speakers think they know how much information their audience can handle or cares about. If you don't tell enough, the person listening to you might not understand what you're talking about. It's important to be clear and specific. However, people who say something more than the hearer needs could make them boring. What this maxim wants is to emphasize that the statement is the clearest, or most

informative, that can be produced in a certain situation.

The second rule is called the maxim of quality. It means that when people speak, they should be honest and only say things that they think are true. They are expected to tell the truth and only talk about things they can prove. Some people talk about things they think are right, but they don't have strong proof. They want others to know that they are just sharing their thoughts.

The third rule is about being relevant. It means that people expect speakers to say something related to what was previously said. But people don't always talk like that all the time; each conversation has a reason for the speakers. These intentions can be either good or bad for both the people speaking and the people listening. Grice (1975, p.45) suggested ways for people to talk nicely to each other, but sometimes they might not follow those ways if it helps them achieve their goal. If someone speaks knowing that the person listening won't understand the real meaning, they are breaking a rule.

When someone speaks and doesn't say enough, the listener can't understand the whole story. They might be doing this on purpose to keep the listener in the dark. The person talking is not telling the whole truth. They are leaving out some important information. For example:

[The setting: a guest wants to be nice and friendly; he smiles to a receptionist and says hello politely. A dog that the guest thinks she is the receptionist's comes and sits beside him. Then the guest asks the receptionist:]

Guest : Does your dog bite?

Receptionist : No

Guest : (bends down to stroke it and gets bitten) Ow! You said your dog does not bite!

Receptionist : That is not my dog.

(Cutting, 2002, p. 40)

The receptionist actually knows that the guest is talking about the dog which is beside the guest and he absolutely knows that the dog does not belong to him, but the receptionist intentionally does not give the guest enough information, for reasons.

If a speaker breaks the rule (maxim) of quality, he or she is not sincere and giving the hearer the wrong information, example:

Husband : How much did that new dress cost, darling?

Wife : (see the tag-50 pounds, but says...) Thirty-five pounds

(Cutting, 2002, p. 40)

When the husband asks about the new dress' costs, his wife lies and says it costs less than it actually did, it means she has been breaking the rule of being honest. The wife also could avoid telling her husband how much the dress cost by changing the subject.

Setting: A husband is the one who earns money, and the economy condition is bad. He sees his wife wears an unusual dress. Then asks :

Husband : How much did that new dress cost, darling?

Wife : I know, let's go out tonight. Now, where would you like to go?

(Cutting, 2002, p. 40)

In a different scenario, when asked: "How much did your new dress cost. ", the wife might have broken a rule of polite communication by giving an unclear or confusing answer.

The Situation: Both the husband-and-wife work to earn money, but times are tough and it's hard to make ends meet. He looks at his wife and sees that she is wearing a weird dress. "Then they ask:"

Husband : How much did that new dress cost, darling?

Wife : A tiny fraction of my salary, though probably a bigger fraction of the salary of the woman that sold it to me.

(Cutting, 2002, p. 40)

In real life people often violate the maxims of Grice's Cooperative Principle for reason. It is portrayed in Fast and Furious 1 movie. It is a sequel of Fast and Furious movies.

In this paper, the writer will discuss the finding of maxim violation that conducted by the character in the movie.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study looked at the words people said in the movie *Fast and Furious 1*. This movie was picked because it is really cool and has important conversations between the people in it.

The data were selected by choosing the conversations that seem to break a rule of conversational Maxims proposed by Grice (1975). The result of the collection then to be inventoried by classifying the violations of maxims into tables. The next step is finding the reason why the speaker or character violates certain maxim. Signs of maxim violation were based on Cooperative Principle suggested by Grice (1975, p. 45).

The criteria of violation of maxims used as distinguished guidelines:

Violate the maxim of quantity,

- If the speaker does not speak directly to the point and talks around it using extra words.
- If the person talking doesn't give enough information.
- If the speaker doesn't talk for very long.
- If someone talks a lot.
- If someone keeps saying the same words over and over again.

Violate the maxim of quality,

- If the person talking says something that isn't true.

- If someone says something sarcastic or uses irony.
- If someone says they didn't do something or it's not true.
- If the person giving information is not telling the truth.

Violate the maxim of relevance,

- If someone talks about something that doesn't relate to what they are supposed to be talking about.
- If the person talking suddenly talks about something else.
- If someone doesn't talk about something on purpose.
- If someone keeps something secret or doesn't tell the truth about something.
- If the speaker blames the wrong thing for causing something.

Violate the maxim of manner,

- If someone talks in a way that's not clear, what they mean might not be easy to understand.
- If the person talking makes things sound bigger or more important than they really are.
- If someone uses informal language that others cannot understand.
- If the person talking isn't speaking loudly enough.

(Grice, 1975, p. 45)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings showed that there was violation of the maxims. It could be the maxims of quality, quantity and relevance. While for the maxim of manner, there were no finding of the violation of this kind of maxim.

Below the detail finding and discussion;

1. 00:43:34,241 --> 00:43:38,453

Brian : I think we should go out sometime.

Mia : **No, I don't date my brother's friends.**

In this conversation Mia was violating maxim of quality. Mia lied to Brian and she also denied what Brian offered. Brian wanted to date her, in fact Mia wanted the same thing, but for the reason, which Mia was the only one who knew about it, she refused Brian offer.

On the other side, there was a possibility that Mia was too shy to accept Brian's offer. She must knew that Brian's offer means date, and for most woman to accept date offer from a man directly was something uncommon. The way Mia refused Brian's offer was by saying *No, I don't date my brother's friends* that mean she lied, and it mean Mia violated the maxim of quality.

2. 00:48:36,463 --> 00:49:05,444

Dominic :Tell me what the hell you're doing down here.

Brian : **Shit. What I'm doing? I owe you a 10-second car. And what this is about, this is about Race Wars. I just went in there, and Hector is gonna be running three Honda Civics with Spoon engines.**

In this conversation Brian was violating maxim of quality and relevance. In this scene Brian broke into Hector's garage, but Vince and Dom have caught him red-handed. Dominic asked Brian the question. First, Brian lied about what was he doing. He was spying as his duty as a cop, but he told Dominic that he was spying what were under Hector hood. In this case, Brian has violated the maxim of quality, he lied and distorted the information.

Brian also violated the maxim of relevance, because his answer for Dominic question was unmatched, he avoided talking about what he was really doing.

3. 00:49:48,661 --> 00:49:49,989

Dominic : You are a cop?

Brian : **(denied, by shake his head)**

In this conversation Brian was violating maxim of quality. He was a cop, he was undercover to spy the hijacking shipments of electronics. He, of course, lied about this, if he did not do that, his mission would completely fail.

Brian lied that he was not a cop by his shaking head gesture, mean he has violated the maxim of quality.

4. 00:52:04,881 --> 00:52:08,085

Tran: Do you see anything wrong here?

Ted : **No.**

Tran: We got no engines, do we?

In this conversation Ted was violating maxim of quantity and quality. He was uninformative and talking too short. In this scene Ted lied to Tran. Tran showed him a car without an engine. He asked Ted who was responsible for supplying the engine, whether Ted knew that there was something wrong, but Ted denied it, he pretended knowing nothing. Ted, here violated the maxim of quality because he lied to Tran.

Ted also violated the maxim of quantity because he was uninformative and talked too short.

5. 01:05:25,647 --> 01:05:36,733

Tanner : I know you've been lying to me. My question is this: Have you been lying to yourself because you can't see past Mia?

Brian : **He won't go back to prison.**

In this conversation Brian was violating maxim of quality and relevance. Brian answered Tanner's question by saying something that was not relevant, that is why, here, Brian violated the maxim of relevance. He tried to change the topic of the conversation.

The irrelevance also indicated that Brian denied the fact that he could not see past Mia, since it was, he has lied to Tanner, and so he also violated the maxim of quality.

6. 01:06:37,720 --> 01:06:43,755

Brian : Nice car. What's the retail on one of those?

Ferrari Driver : More **than you can afford, pal. Ferrari.**

In this conversation Ferrari driver was violating maxim of quality. He did not tell Brian the retail of his Ferrari, otherwise he told Brian that Brian would not be able to buy the car.

The Ferrari driver was not sincere for a certain reason. Perhaps, he wanted to insult Brian or something else.

7. 01:07:46,373 --> 01:08:03,052

Dominic : So, what's wrong, Brian?

Brian : **Nothing, man, I'm fine.**

Dominic : Come on. Obviously something's off.

Brian : Look, I have my good days and bad days just like anybody else.

Dominic : Brian, don't lose that cool of yours. That's your meal ticket.

There was something happened to Brian. Dominic asked him what was happening. Brian lied by saying that he was fine. He had lied to Dominic. That is why, here Brian said to violate the maxim of quality.

8. 01:08:17,154 --> 01:09:16,086

Brian : I need something extra on the side, like you.

Dominic : What do you mean, like me?

Brian : What's that supposed to mean? That's what I mean.

Dominic : What does that mean, like me?

Brian : Don't try....I'm not stupid, all right? I know that there's no way you paid

for all that shit you got under the hood. There's no way you paid for what's under the hood of those cars, by doing tune-ups and selling groceries. Whatever it is you're in on, I want in on it, too.

Dominic : **(Give Brian a piece of paper)**

Brian : Well, what is this?

Dominic : Read it.

Brian : What is this for?

Dominic : It's directions. To Race Wars.

In this scene, Brian wanted to know, what the business Dominic ran, so he could get all the stuff under his hood. Brian believed that it was not only doing tune up or selling groceries. But Dominic did not give Brian anything about what business he ran, otherwise he gave Brian a piece of paper.

Dominic avoided talking about something, he also tried to hide fact and made the conversation unmatched. This made him violated the maxim of relevance.

9. 01:14:05,630 --> 01:14:08,750

Tran: Where's he going?

Domini : **He went to the car wash.**

In this conversation Dominic was violating maxim of quality. Tran asked Dominic where Jesse was going, Jesse was running away after losing a race to Tran. He ran away to save his car. In this case, Dominic knew that Jesse was not going to the car wash, he knew that Jesse ran away. Dominic lied to Tran for a reason. Since it is, Dominic has violated the maxim of quality.

10. 01:16:25,480 --> 01:16:30,557

Brian : Mia, what's going on?

Mia : What?

Brian : You know what I'm talking about.

Mia : **No, I don't.**

In this conversation Mia was violating maxim of quality and quantity. This scene was taken place when Mia upset with Dom, who was obviously going on another robbery. Brian insisted that Mia knew what was going on. But Mia lied by saying that she did not know anything. In this case Mia has violated the maxim of quality.

Mia also talked too short to Brian, *No, I don't*, which it could be categorized as the violation of maxim of quantity.

11. 01:16:38,326 --> 01:16:48,168

Brian : You know about the trucks?

Mia : **No, Brian! What trucks? Jesus Christ. What?**

Brian : Listen to me. Mia, I'm a cop.

In this conversation Mia was violating maxim of quality. This scene was taken place when Mia was forced by Brian to tell him about what was going on. But Mia lied by saying that she did not know anything. In this case Mia has violated the maxim of quality.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

The study showed that even though Grice (1975) suggests people should communicate nicely, sometimes they choose not to on purpose. When people didn't follow the rules, they had their own reasons for doing it. The Fast and Furious 1 Movie characters broke some rules on purpose, and the writer noticed it.

I hope this discovery will help people understand when others break the rules of talking and what they really mean when they speak.

Based on explanation above, it can be concluded that violating maxims are intentionally happen in movie because violating maxim is a way people use in daily conversation. Violating maxims is important to make communication goes smooth when people can understand the meaning deeply of what speakers say, but sometimes it also occurs with certain function, to hide a fact, avoiding someone to ask further questions, etc. Hopefully, this finding would improve the understanding of the violation of maxims and enable people to see what is behind one's utterances.

REFERENCES

- Black, E. (2006). *Pragmatic Stylistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Finch, G. (2000). *Linguistic Terms and Concepts*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole, & J. Morgan (Eds.),
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa*. Yogyakarta.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: Introduction to Pragmatics*.
- Waget, A. (2016). Violations of Grice's Maxim in the Prince and the Pauper Movie. *Sanata Dharma University Journal*
- Fast and Furious 1 (2001) Movie: http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0232500/synopsis?ref_=ttpl_pl_syn Retrieved on January 19th 2019