

Analysis of Violations of the Cooperative Principles in the Film: Extraction 2 (2023)

Bagya Aryanto¹, Adhan Kholis²

¹Universitas Nahdlatul Ulama Yogyakarta

bagyaaryanto0204@student.unu-jogja.ac.id

Article History:

First Received:
27/07/2023

Final Revision:
09/11/2023

Available online:
31/12/2023

Abstract. It would have been much better if both speakers and interlocutors could carry out conversations with each other that meet the rules of language when providing information in a communication that was carried out in real life, or it can be said that the communication carried out was communicative. Each response must be pertinent to the question, not wordy, and contain no lies or ambiguous conversations so that the speaker or interlocutor understands more about what was being discussed. As a result, cooperative principles in discourse are required. This study is connected to linguistic rules in the film Extraction II. This study aimed to (1) determine the type of violation of the cooperative maxims presented in the film Extraction II and (2) characterize the speakers' motivation behind committing the violation. The methodologies and strategies employed in the Extraction II film research were the listening and note-taking methodology for data collection and then the researcher employed a data analysis technique, specifically the equivalent method, to identify the form of violation and motivation of the cooperative principle. In addition, the approach used in this study was qualitative. According to the findings of the research, there were seven violations of the cooperative principle in the film. These infractions included one violation of the maxim of quantity, three maxims of quality, two maxims of relevance, and one maxim of manner. In addition, the violation served six purposes: to convince, plan something, cover something, express annoyance, divert the topic of conversation, and confirm identity.

Keywords: *cooperative principles, pragmatic, maxim violation, film*

INTRODUCTION

Every person utilizes language to convey and execute the results of their feelings and ideas into sound, or to communicate with other humans more easily. "A system of arbitrary and conventional articulated sound symbols used as a means of communication to generate feelings and thoughts" (Dendy et al., 2008). It can be concluded that the primary function of language is to facilitate human communication by ensuring that the other person fully comprehends what is being stated.

"Language is important in humans since it is one of the means through which humans interact with one another" (Toda & Ghozali, 2017). Language is used in communication not just to ensure that the other person understands what is being said, but also to generate successful communication based on linguistic principles. The adoption of the cooperative principle to generate communicative debates is one such rule. "People converse to exchange various types of information" (Jorfi & Dowlatabadi, 2015). Good communication may be defined as communicative and capable of conveying information in such a way that listeners accept what is communicated. "In certain conversations, the speaking partner may not cooperate well. This might end in the speaker losing since the speaking partner does not give the information the speaker requires, causing the discussion to be failed" (Ilma & Dahlan, 2022).

Someone's interaction with another person may have a variety of intents and intentions, such as ridiculing, diverting the focus of the discussion, lying, or reacting to things that are unnecessary and do not result in inquiries from the one enquiring. Speaking in terms of cooperative principles, this is a breach. "The adoption of cooperative principles by speech participants is critical to the effectiveness of the communication process" (Wildan et al., 2020). If there is a violation during communication, the discourse cannot be considered communicative.

"If there is a departure in a discourse, the speaker intends to reach certain connotations, the speaker in question does not cooperate or is not cooperative if the implied relationship does not exist. In conclusion, it may be stated that both the speaker and the listener must adhere to some sort of cooperative concept for the communication process to be successful" (Fatmawati, 2017). In this example, it is evident that the function of the cooperative principle in communication is critical to developing communication that can be described as informative and communicative. Violations of the cooperative principle may be observed in everyday life, literary works, and even films as a source of amusement.

Grice (1975) explains the four maxims in a pragmatic study, namely: the maxim of quantity is a speech act performed by the speech participant by providing sufficient information or not exaggerating other information in an utterance, the maxim of quality is a speech act performed by the speech participant by saying something that is by the facts or truth based on clear and real evidence, the maxim of relevance implies that good cooperation between the speaker and the speech partner is expected in a speech act so that the speech act has a good and relevant contribution, and finally, the maxim of manner implies that in a speech act, the speech participant is required to say something immediately clear and coherent to establish good cooperation in an utterance. Pragmatics also investigates speakers' intentions when reciting a certain linguistic unit in a language. "A pragmatic study is a study of the intent behind the speech of a speaker and addressee who are both context-bound" (Rohmadi, 2014). So, in pragmatics, there will be different context-bound linguistic features, such as social context, place, environment, and even culture, since, as Rohmadi stated, this pragmatic research concerns the intention behind someone's speech. As a result, the function of speech context in interpreting the intent of speech in communication is quite high.

"In everyday life, there are still frequent disparities in understanding between speakers and conversation partners, because the communication or speech that is uttered serves another function, making the meaning of the phrase that should be in the speech ambiguous" (Wulandari et al., 2020). In this situation, it is evident how this pragmatic analysis is used, namely to determine the speaker's objective behind the words stated and to determine if the speaker violates the cooperative principle when carrying out the speech. "Even if a communication does not meet the cooperative principles, it can nevertheless be understood" (Pradani & Sembodo, 2021). Perhaps the listener can still understand what is being said, but this is not always the case due to a violation of the cooperative principle, but more importantly in a conversation, the listener will be able to understand and feel the answers required are what is expected. Violations of the concept of cooperative principle may be discovered in a variety of literary works, including film. This study tries to elaborate on the content using maxims.

"Film is a moving image that is connected by color, sound, and a story," according to the definition of the entertainment business. Films are frequently referred to as "living pictures" (Dewanta, 2020). Everyone can enjoy films according to the genre they like, be it romantic, horror, thriller, and so on. "Film is a living picture or story" (Dendy et al., 2008). As the industrial world is developing, especially in the film industry, the film is not only an image that looks stiff which is only black and white, but now we can enjoy films with very clear quality to give an impression that can make it seem as if the story connoisseurs are immersed in the story.

The relationship between film and language can be examined through every conversation that the characters have, then from these conversations, we can know what they are talking about, whether each language is understandable by listeners or the language used tends to be wordy so that the person being the opponent he talks in the film and even we as film connoisseurs feel we don't understand what is being conveyed. "The fundamental strategy used in movies to accomplish message

delivery is conversation. Therefore, we must pay great attention to the words being made if we want to know the message we want to communicate” (Fahlevi & Ainusyamsi, 2019). It can be concluded that conversations that fulfill the cooperative principle are conversations that make other people understand what is being said, the information provided follows what is needed, and of course, relevant answers so that the conversation runs communicatively. "In this type of communication, the speaker will speak as informative as possible, say something with adequate evidence, carefully consider the context of the conversation, always try to make the speech produced concise, and not ambiguous so as not to mislead the interlocutor" (Fauziah et al., 2018).

A film can be used as a medium that is used to analyze matters related to linguistic conventions through conversations that are carried out by each character in the story either orally or and there are no film genre limitations for analyzing linguistic conventions, meaning that we can use any genre, such as romantic, action, drama, comedy, scientific and horror. “The film was employed as a study tool since it depicts the interactions of individuals in diverse locations and situations” (Sari et al., 2019).

According to the statement above, the writer is interested in investigating breaches of the principle of cooperation inherent in creative work, namely *Extraction II*. This action, drama, and thriller film with a running time of 124 minutes was released on June 9, 2023. The plot revolves around the actions of a mercenary team tasked with saving a woman and her child from criminals. There are violations of the cooperative principle maxims in this action genre film, which may be discovered in the words of the actors who have different purposes.

When delving into an analysis of potential violations of the Cooperative Principles in the film titled "*Extraction 2*," the primary objectives of the research are twofold. Firstly, the investigation aims to discern the extent to which this study adheres to Grice's maxims of Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner in communication. Furthermore, the research seeks to unearth any instances of information overload, misrepresentation, lack of relevance, or ambiguity. Secondly, the research endeavors to understand the practical implications of these potential violations on audience perception and engagement. The ultimate goal is to offer insights that can guide future filmmakers and marketers in creating titles that align more effectively with the Cooperative Principles, fostering clear and engaging communication with the audience.

RESEARCH METHOD

The methodologies and strategies employed in the Extraction II film research were the listening method for data collection, followed by a follow-up technique, the Free Liberal Listening method, and the researcher also used a note-taking method to collect data in this study. "The listening method is a method of listening that is accomplished by listening to a use of language" (Sudaryanto, 1993). To begin investigating, researchers used the listening method on the research object. Then, using the free liberal listening method, researchers only listened to a discussion without being personally involved or having a dialogue in the conversation. Following the listening method, the researcher uses the note-taking method to capture every data displaying violations in the Extraction II film, which will then be gathered and put together so that the necessary data may be nicely structured. and then, the approach used in this study was qualitative.

The researcher then employed a data analysis technique, specifically the equivalent method, to identify the form of violation of the cooperative principle maxims and define the motivation of the form of violation. "The equivalent method is one in which the determining tool is external to the language in question and does not become part of it" (Sudaryanto, 1993). The pragmatic equivalent technique will be utilized in this study to assess the violation of the cooperative principle maxims in Extraction II, with the data findings classified based on the type of violation detected. "From a linguistic standpoint, the pragmatic equivalent method identifies according to the reaction and level of audibility related to the speech partner" (Sudaryanto, 1993).

"Meanwhile, the referential equivalent method is used to explain the aim of violating the cooperative principle's maxims, which indicates that one sort of equivalent method is the deciding instrument in the form of language referents" (Sudaryanto, 1993). Of course, in this instance, the aim of each character to violate the cooperative principle by creating analogies between language and actual reality will be sought. To determine why a character breaks the principle of cooperation, the referential equivalent technique analyses the context, character motivation, and actions performed. In this study, the researcher searches for indications in the speech, character behavior, and situations to gain a better understanding of the character's rationale for violating the cooperative principle. Researchers compare the discovered data to the true goal to be conveyed.

So, this study has two goals. The first is to determine the type of violation of the cooperative maxims presented in the film Extraction II and to characterize the speakers' motivation behind committing the violation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study include an examination of the form and purpose of the violation of the cooperative principle in Extraction II, which lasts 124 minutes and contains seven utterances that violate the cooperative principle in a speech. The following is a table of speech distribution that breaches the cooperative principle:

Table 1. Violation type and amount of data

No	Type of violation	Data
1	Maxim of quantity	1
2	Maxim of quality	3
3	Maxim of relevance	2
4	Maxim of manner	1
Total		7

Based on the findings of the data analysis, it is possible to conclude that the breaches of the maxim of cooperative principle that is most frequently carried out in an utterance are the maxims of quality, with as many as three data points. The violations in the speech that were violated the least were maxim quantity and maxim manner with only one data appearing.

On the maxim of the cooperative principle, every remark violates this maxim because it has a meaning. The following are the intents of these violations:

Table 2. Type of violation intent and amount of data

No	Violation intent	Data
1	Convincing	1
2	Plan something	1
3	Cover something	2
4	Expressed annoyance	1
	Divert the topic of conversation	1
5	Confirm identity	1
Total		7

According to the table above, the infractions that are frequently made are designed to Lie or conceal something with a total of three data. While the few infractions were giving inadequate information and rambling with only one data point apiece.

1. Violation of the maxim of quality

The maxim of quality is a speech act done by the speaker by delivering accurate information, and a violation of this maxim occurs when the speaker offers incorrect information. The following are the utterance's forms and meanings:

a. Convincing

At the time duration of 00:36:41:

Sandro: [in Georgian] Where's Father? You told me he was coming.

Ket: He'll meet us later.

The speech participants were Sandro and Ket. The topic of the story was that Sandro asked his mother about the whereabouts of his father. Ket's purpose in lying was to make Sandro believe and want to go with the rescue team. The place where this story took place was in the car. This speech was direct. Ket lived up to the norms of decency. The type of speech was direct dialogue. It was called a violation because Ket lied about the whereabouts of his father Sandro.

b. Plan something

At the time duration of 00:52:18:

Yaz: We're almost there. Are you all right? Need anything?

Sandro: I'm hungry.

Yaz: Let me see what we got.

The speech participants were Sandro and Yaz. The topic of his story was when Yaz finished making calls with one of his teams, Sandro intended to take Yaz's phone. Sandro's goal in lying in his story was to be able to take Yaz's phone and then use it to call Sandro's uncle, the leader of the criminal group to tell the location of the rescue team. The place where this story took place was inside the plane. This speech was direct. Sandro lived up to the norms of decency. The type of speech was indirect dialogue. It was called a violation because Sandro lied by saying he was hungry to be able to take Yaz's phone.

c. Cover something

At the time duration of 01:32:42:

Mia: Why didn't you stay? Why didn't you stay?

Tyler: Well, they needed me in, um... in Kandahar and...

Mia: We needed you.

Tyler: Because I was deployed...

Mia: Tyler why didn't you stay?

Tyler: Well, I had ordered, and... so I couldn't...

Mia: Bullshit. No, why didn't you stay?

Tyler: I couldn't...

The speech participants were Tyler and Mia. The topic of the story was Mia asked why Tyler wasn't there beside her when her son died. Tyler's purpose in lying was to cover up the one thing he was hiding, Tyler could not see his son die, so he chose to become a volunteer force to fight in Kandahar. The place where this story took place was Tyler's house. This speech was direct. Tyler lived up to the decency norm. The type of speech was direct dialogue. Called breaking because Tyler lied about what happened.

The findings of this study are similar to those of previous studies. Wulandari (2020), titled "*Prinsip Kerja Sama dalam Film Nicky Larson et Le Parfum de Cupidon dan Implikasinya pada Pembelajaran Bahasa Prancis*" and

Toda (2017), titled “*Violations of Maxims Analysis of Cooperative Principle in Maleficent Movie*”. In that, they highlight violations of the quality maxim. The rationale for breaching the Cooperative principle is to try to persuade and conceal anything; the prior study is still relevant to the author's research.

2. Violation of the maxim of quantity

The maxim of quantity is a speech act done by a speaker in which appropriate information is provided while not embellishing material that is unnecessary in a discourse. Meanwhile, a violation of the quantity maxim is supplying partial information or offering information that is not required. The following is the utterance's form and meaning:

a. Covering something with incomplete information

At the time duration of 00:52:37:

Nik: Don't. She could aspirate.

Ket: I know how to take care of my child.

Tyler: [in Georgian] Calm down. She's just trying to help.

Ket: [in Georgian] Don't patronize me.

Tyler: [in Georgian] A doctor will be there when we land. Try to rest.

Nik: Since when do you speak Georgian?

Tyler: Since always.

The speech participants were Nik, Tyler, and Ket. The topic of the story was when Nik suggested that Ket be more careful when taking care of his child Ket, then surprisingly Nik was surprised why Tyler could speak Georgian. Tyler's purpose in hiding this was to cover up something related to his past. The place where this story took place was inside the plane. This speech was direct. Tyler lived up to the decency norm. The type of speech was direct dialogue. Called violating because Tyler did not provide information related to why he can speak Georgian completely.

The finding of this study is similar to those of previous studies. by Wulandari (2020), titled “*Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama dalam Film Nicky Larson et Le Parfum de Cupidon dan Implikasinya pada Pembelajaran Bahasa Prancis*” and Pradani (2021), titled “*The Violation of Conversational Maxims in the Movie Series Divergent*”. Which highlighted the violation of the quantity maxim. The reason for breaching the cooperative principle is to disclose information that the interlocutor does not truly grasp what is being discussed since the information presented is insufficient to comprehend what the speech implies and the data supplied is insufficient. In this scenario, the earlier study is still relevant to the author's current research.

3. Violation of the maxim of relevance

The maxim of relevance is a speech act in which a statement is made that is pertinent to the issue being discussed. The violation occurs when the speaker delivers material that is unrelated to the query. The following are the utterance's forms and meanings:

a. Expressed annoyance

At the time duration of 00:16:51:

Unknown: What happened? Do you fall off a bridge?

Tyler: How about you put my cup down, hop in your car, and fuck off?

Participants in the speech were Tyler and a man whose identity was unknown. The topic of the story was when the man asked about what happened to Tyler. The purpose of this story was to express the annoyance Tyler felt by the man. The place where this story took place was in front of Tyler's house. This speech was direct. Tyler does not live up to the norms of decency. The type of speech was direct dialogue. Called violating because Tyler did not answer the question relevantly.

b. Divert the topic of conversation

At the time duration of 00:49:38:

Sandro: [in Georgian] Where's Father?

Ket: [in Georgian] There isn't time for this. Your sister needs help.

Sandro: [in Georgian] I'm not leaving without him.

Ket: [in Georgian] Come on. Your sister needs help.

Sandro: [in Georgian] I'm not going.

The speech participants were Sandro and Ket. The topic of the story was Sandro asked his mother about his father. Ket's goal in changing the subject was to make sure Sandro would not hinder their escape from the criminals. The place where this story took place was on a road leading to the plane. This speech was direct. Ket lived up to the norms of decency. The type of speech was direct dialogue. It was called violating because Ket tried to divert the topic because he didn't want to answer Sandro's question.

The findings of this study are comparable to those of previous studies. Fatmawati (2017), titled *Violation of Cooperation Principles in the Speech of Samin* and Wildan (2020), titled *"An Analysis on The Violation of Cooperative Principles in The Film Avengers"*. In that, they emphasize violations of key Cooperation maxims. Both conversations in the research contain sentences that do not give the essential responses; hence the concept of cooperation is violated since there is no relation between questions and replies. In this scenario, the earlier study is still relevant to the author's current research.

4. Violation of the maxim of manner

The maxim of manner is a speech act performed by offering clear, orderly speech according to the standards that apply in the context of communication. The violation occurs when the speaker delivers a long-winded, confusing, and ambiguous speech. The following is the utterance's form and meaning:

a. Confirm identity.

At the time duration of 00:16:27:

Tyler: You lost, right?

Unknown: Are you Rake?

Tyler: I asked you first.

Unknown: Yeah, but my answer depends on yours. See, if you are Rake, then you are the myth of Mumbai, the legend that got the journalist out of Congo, that took down the two gangs to save the mayor of Rio, the honor would be all mine but I have to say, mate, you're not living up to the hype.

Participants in the speech were Tyler and a man whose identity was unknown. The topic of the story was the man whose identity was unknown suddenly in front of Tyler's house and asked about Tyler. The purpose of the unknown man was to confirm the identity of Tyler for his prowess and to invite collaborate with Tyler. The place where this story took place was in front of Tyler's house. This speech was direct. Unknown men do not live up to the norms of decency. The type of speech was direct dialogue. Called violating because the man tries to confirm the identity of Tyler's prowess by rambling and ignoring Tyler's questions.

The finding of this study is similar to those of previous studies. Jorfi (2015), titled *"Violating and Flouting of the Four Gricean Cooperative Maxims in Friends the American TV Series"* and Sari (2019), titled *"An Analysis of Maxim Violations in a Movie and Their Impacts on Effective Communication"*. Which exposes violations of the maxim of manner. In each of these cases, the dialogues were given with unnecessary words and words that were not clear. In this scenario, the earlier study is still relevant to the author's current research.

The results of this research analysis are certainly far from perfect, as there are several obstacles and limitations in analyzing content based on various maxims. Some statements are implicitly expressed, requiring further and deeper interpretation. Not all conversations were analyzed; only a few were selected that the researcher deemed representative of various maxims. Therefore, there is a need for the continuation of this research to produce meaningful content analysis results.

CONCLUSION

According to the findings of the research, there are seven violations of the cooperative principle in the Extraction II film. These infractions include one violation of the maxim of quantity, three maxims of quality, two maxims of relevance, and one maxim of manner. and then, the violation serves six purposes: to convince, plan something, cover something, express annoyance, divert the topic of conversation, and try to confirm identity. This study can potentially be used as a reference for future research on breaches of the cooperative principle. It is anticipated that the reader will be able to grasp the sorts of violations of the cooperative principle as well as the speaker's motivation for violating the cooperative principle as a result of this research.

Moreover, hopefully, the results of this research can have a positive impact on readers, especially in terms of understanding the concept of violation.

REFERENCES

- Dendy, S., Sugiyono, & Maryani, Y. (2008). *Kamus Bahasa Indonesia*. Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Dewanta, A. A. N. B. J. (2020). Analisis Semiotika Dalam Film Dua Garis Biru Karya Gina S. Noer. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia*, 9(1), 26–34. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jppbi.v9i1.3123>
- Fahlevi, A. R., & Ainusyamsi, F. Y. (2019). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerjasama Dan Implikatur Percakapan Dalam Film Ibrahim Khalilullah. *Hijai - Journal on Arabic Language and Literature*, 2(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.15575/hijai.v2i2.6533>
- Fatmawati, A. (2017). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama Dalam Tuturan Masyarakat Samin (Violation Of Cooperation Principles In The Speech Of Samin). *Jalabahasa*, 13(1), 50–60. <https://doi.org/10.36567/jalabahasa.v13i1.50>
- Fauziah, M. T., Emzir, E., & Lustyantje, N. (2018). Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama dalam Tuturan Diskusi Kelas Bahasa Indonesia. *JP-BSI (Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia)*, 3(2), 51. <https://doi.org/10.26737/jp-bsi.v3i2.722>
- Grice. (1975). *Syntax and semantics*. Academic press, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Ilma, N., & Dahlan, M. (2022). *Prinsip Kerja Sama dalam Penggunaan Bahasa Makassar di Pelelangan Paotere*. 10(4).
- Jorfi, L., & Dowlatabadi, H. (2015). *Violating and Flouting of the Four Gricean Cooperative Maxims in Friends the American TV Series*. 3.
- Pradani, A. F., & Sembodo, T. J. P. (2021). The Violation of Conversational Maxims in the Movie Series Divergent. *Lexicon*, 7(2), 224. <https://doi.org/10.22146/lexicon.v7i2.66572>
- Rohmadi, M. (2014). *Kajian Pragmatik Percakapan Guru Dan Siswa Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia*.
- Sari, D. F., Nuraini, L., & Muthalib, K. A. (2019). *An Analysis Of Maxim Violations In A Movie And Their Impacts On Effective Communication*.
- Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan aneka teknik analisis bahasa: Pengantar penelitian wahana kebudayaan secara linguistis*. Duta Wacana University Press.
- Toda, M. A. E., & Ghozali, I. (2017). *Violations Of Maxims Analysis Of Cooperative Principle In Maleficent Movie*. <https://doi.org/10.36597/jellt.v1i1.922>
- Wildan, D. N., Rejeki, S., & Taufik, M. (2020). An Analysis On The Violation Of Cooperative Principles In The Film Avengers. *Journal Albion : Journal of English Literature, Language, and Culture*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.33751/albion.v2i1.1796>

Wulandari, N. D., Kusrini, N., & Ikhtiarti, E. (2020). *Pelanggaran Prinsip Kerja Sama dalam Film Nicky Larson et Le Parfum de Cupidon dan Implikasinya pada Pembelajaran Bahasa Prancis*. 3(1).