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ABSTRACT
In communicating, good cooperation between the speaker and the listener is needed. Good cooperation will minimize misunderstandings between the two of them. There is a rule called the cooperative principle. As Yule (2000: 37) asserts Grice (1975) defines the cooperative principle is to make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. However, the speaker can violate the maxim and caused understanding. This study aims to analyze violating maxims and determine the reasons behind the speakers violating the maxims on the “Soul” movie, an animated film produced by Pixar Animation Studios and released by Walt Disney Pictures. The theories used in this study are the theory by Paul Grice, and the theory by Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi. The method used in this study was descriptive qualitative method. The result of this study showed that there are 35 violating utterances. Quantity maxim comes as the most common maxim that violating by the speaker. It occurred 11 times during the conversation. After that, it was followed by relevance maxim and manner maxim that occurred 8 times each, and maxim of quality as the lowest violation because it only occurs 6 times. In addition, the underlying reasons for violating maxims were avoiding the discussion 11 times, and protracting the Answer 9 times, misleading the counterparts 6 times, and finally pleasing the interlocutors 2 times.
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1. INTRODUCTION
One of the important aspect of everyday life is language. Language is important because it is a communication tool used to express feelings, intentions, ideas and thoughts. Without language people will find it difficult to communicate and understand the meaning of the communication carried out. In order to create better communication, good cooperation must form between the speaker and the listener. The speaker should be able to convey the information or purpose of his utterance clearly, factual, relevant, concise, and orderly, so that listeners can receive the message. There is a rule regarding this cooperation between speakers and listeners, which is often called the cooperative principle. As Yule (2000: 37) asserts Grice (1975), the cooperative principle is to make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged. Therefore, Partidge (2006) says that following the cooperative principle will avoid some misunderstanding.

According to Grice (1975), there are four maxims in Cooperative Principle: quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. Those maxims are the suggested principle for the speaker and hearer to show their cooperation by giving the appropriate contributions in their conversation. If these principles are not fulfilled, there will be a maxim violation. Maxim violations can occur when the speaker speaks unclearly, give false information, irrelevant, or not concise, which causes the listener to have difficulty understanding the speaker’s meaning. According to Leech (1983), violation of conversational maxim takes place when the speaker fails to apply absolute maxim in the conversation to cause misunderstanding on their participant.

However, in this paper, the writers focus more on the analysis of maxim violation. In our daily life we often unconsciously violate maxims when communicating. It starts to become a serious problem, it often leads to misunderstanding and failure to achieve good communication between the speaker and the listener. Maxim
violation is not only faced in real life but also in the literary works such as novels, interviews, drama, speeches and even movies. Movies becomes an interesting source of data because it is a literary form that is closer to everyday life. In the movie, there are conversations and contexts in various situations that describe everyday life. The writers are interested in analyzing the maxim violation in “Soul” movie, as there are a lot of maxim violation in the film. The problem of this study are formulated as below: 1) What types of maxims are violated in Soul movie? 2) What reasons behind the speakers violating the maxims?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Cooperative Principle

The success of a conversation can be seen from the successful delivery of the message or the intent of the speaker to the interlocutor or listener. This success would not have been obtained if it were not for good cooperation between the speaker and the listener by applying the cooperative principle. The cooperative principle is a way to convey speech so that it is easily understood by listeners in order to avoid misunderstandings. A philosopher named H. P Grice said make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

The speaker and the listener have to cooperate with the maxims to make the conversation run smoothly. In the cooperative principle Grice divides them into four kinds of maxim:

Maxim of Quantity

At this maxim, the speaker is required to provide information as needed by the listener. According to the Grice (1975), maxim quantity requires speakers to make a contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange), and not to make a contribution more informative than is required.

Maxim of Quality

This maxim is a maxim that requires the speaker to contribute or provide information that is definitely true and in accordance with the facts. Grice (1975) says that in this maxim the speaker is required not to say what is believed to be false and not to say something that say something that lack adequate evidence.

Maxim of Relevance

In order to create good communication, speakers and listeners must make relevant contributions to what is being discussed. As stated by Grice (1975), this Maxim of relevance requires speakers to “be relevant”.

Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner is the maxim which demands the speaker's contribution to contribute or to say in a clear, concise, orderly, and unambiguous. This is supported by the opinion of Grice (1975) who argues that maxim of manner must avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity [verbosity]) and be orderly.

Violating of Maxim

Good cooperation does not always occur in communication. Likewise, with the cooperative principle which is sometimes not considered when communicating. Sometimes participants fail to fulfil the maxims in the conversation and commit maxim violations. Grice (1975) said “To have an interest, given suitable circumstances, in participation in talk exchanges that will be profitable only on the assumption that they are conducted in general accordance with the Cooperative Principle and the maxims”. The violations of maxims are clearly shown in the examples as follows.

Violation of the Quantity Maxim

This maxim requires the speaker to make a contribution as informative as is required.

Context: A (a guest) wants to be nicer and friendlier; he smiles to B (a receptionist) and says hello politely. A dog comes and stands beside him. Then A asks B.

A: “Does your dog bite?”
B: “No”

A: “(bends down to stroke it and gets bitten) Ouch! You said your dog does not bite!”

B: “That is not my dog”

(Cutting, 2000, p. 40)

In the above conversation there has been a violation of the maxim quantity. B violating the maxim by saying "no". Too little information in a situation like this. The situation demands B to give a brief but very informative explanation. The information needed by A from B is “This is not my dog so I don't know whether this dog likes to bite or not” or “It should be better if you don't touch the dog because it's not my pet”. However, B purposely didn't give an informative contribution, even though B knows that A is talking about that dog is next to B and that the dog is not his pet.

Violation of the Quality Maxim

This maxim requires the speaker to contribute or provide information that is definitely true and in accordance with the facts.

Context: A wife bought a new dress which cost 50 pounds. When her husband asked about the new dress’s price, she told the wrong information. She lied to her husband because she did not want her husband to get angry toward the expensive dress since her husband got a low salary from his job.

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

Wife: “(see the tag-50 pounds, but says…) Thirty-five pounds”

(Cutting, 2000, p. 40)

In the conversation above, there was a violation of maxim quality. The wife answered her husband's question by dishonestly or lying, she said “The new dress costs fifty pounds”, which was actually not that much. She deliberately lied to her husband so as not to get angry at her. Thus, the wife violates the maxim of quality.

Violation of the Relevance Maxim

This maxim requires the speakers and the listeners must make relevant contributions to what is being discussed.

Context: A and B have been doing the exam paper in their school. A is curious whether B has already finished the exam paper or not, so A asked B about the exam paper.

A: “Have you finished that exam paper yet?”

B: “It’s been raining a lot lately, hasn’t it?”

(O’Grady, 2005, p. 233)

In the conversation above, there was a violation of maxim of relevance. A wants to know if B has completed the exam or not, but B responds in a way that isn't relevant to asking A about the weather. Question A has been linked with B's exam paper. However, B's response does not contribute to goal A, but B's aim is to distract A from the topic and causing A to misunderstand the conversation. In addition, response B provides the implication that B doesn't want to talk about exam papers because he hasn't finished it. Thus, B's response to A is violating the maxim of relevance.

Violation of the Manner Maxim

This maxim demands the speaker's contribution to contribute or to say in a clear, concise, orderly, and unambiguous way. Context: A (husband) is not the only one who earns money, but the economic condition is bad. He sees B (wife) wearing an unusual dress. The husband asks the wife.

A: “How much did that new dress cost, darling?”
B: “A tiny fraction of my salary, though probably a bigger fraction of the salary of the woman that sold it to me”.

(Cutting, 2000, p. 40)

In this conversation there was a violation of the maxim of manner. B’s response is unclear. It was very difficult for A to understand such vague responses. Thus, B’s response implies that B wants to withhold clear information about the price of the dress. B on purpose violating the maxim of manners to maintain the confidentiality of A, also avoid discussing the dress by using such long and vague comments.

From the previous example of maxim violations, we can know that the violation of maxim violations can occur for a variety of reasons, including covering up the truth or lying, and deliberately distracting the speaker or avoiding discussion. Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011) stated that “Even two reasons for violating the maxims; the first is the speakers tend to violate the maxims with intention to cause misunderstandings on their participant’s part and or to achieve some other reasons, for example to protract answer, please interlocutors, and avoid discussion”.

Misleading the Counterparts

Khosravizadrh and Sadehvandi (2011) argue that in order to detect counterpart's intention before the next move, the speakers tend to mislead the listeners by giving false evidence or information. The provision of false information or evidence is usually done to cover up the truth or to mislead people.

Protracting answer

Khoravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011) stated in their theory that protracting the answer occurs when the speakers employ verbose or short informative contribution. In other words, protracting answer occurs because it gives too informative and wordy answers.

Please interlocutors

Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011) stated that pleasing the interlocutors deals with giving the insincere contribution in order to please the speakers. It can also be said that pleasing the interlocutors is an answer that begs or answers that make people do something.

Avoid discussion

Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011) state: "avoiding discussion occurs when the speakers may encounter an unpleasant situation or topic". In other words, avoiding discussion occurs when someone does not want to discuss any longer and he changes the topic to avoid it or when someone asks too many questions about something.

III. METHODOLOGY

In this study, the writers used a descriptive qualitative research. This research was conducted by describing the data with words and sentences. Sudaryanto (2015) argues that “qualitative methods are research methods that are solely based on existing facts or phenomena that live empirically in the speakers so that what is produced or recorded is in the form of data as is”. In this research, the writers identify the types of maxims violations and the reasons for violating the maxims in the conversation in the Soul movie.

The writers observe the data through watching Soul (2020) movie produced by Pixar Animation Studios and released by Walt Disney Pictures. Then, in the movie conversation, the data that commits the maxim violation is taken and will be used as the object of research. When analyzing the data, the researcher used a pragmatic study as the roof of the analysis. For data collection, the writers used the cooperative principle theory from Grice (1975). Then each maxim violation data will be examined to find out the reason behind the violation using the theory of Khosravizadeh and Sadehvandi (2011).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In “Soul” Movie, there are 35 maxim violations. However, only 5 data will be included as samples. Some of the conversations contained in the movie commit violations of fore than one maxim. There are 11 data indicating violation of maxim of quantity. Furthermore, there are 8 data that support maxim relevance violationsand
violation maxim of manner. Thus, 6 data also indicate a violation of the maxim quality. The data and analysis results are shown below.

Data 1

Joe: “Connie knows what I mean right, Connie?”

**Connie: “I’m twelve”**

(00:02:41 – 00:02:44)

Data 1 shows a violation of the maxim of relevance. This conversation occurred in music class, when Joe as a music teacher told his students about the beginning he liked jazz music. Joe tells the story to motivate Connie and other students, after that he asks Connie if she understands what he means, but she instead answers “I’m twelve” which is a statement that violates the maxim of relevance because it is not related to Joe’s question.

The reason for the violation of maxim of relevance in data 1 is due to misleading the counterparts. Connie answered Joe's question like that simply to show that she didn't understand what Joe was saying. Thus, Connie's utterance is a violation of the maxim of relevance.

Data 2

Joe’s Mom: “So, you’re going to tell them yes, right?”

Customer : “Please, say yes”

**Joe: “Yeah, definitely”**

(00:04:13 – 00:04:17)

In data 2, this shows a violation of maxim quality. The conversation takes place at Joe’s mother’s store. Joe at that time told his mother that he was offered to become a permanent teacher but Joe wanted to refuse because at the same time he was offered to perform with Dorothy William’s band, who is idolized by Joe. However, his mother kept pressing him to accept the offer as a permanent teacher so Joe answered her mother’s question with “Yeah, Definitely”, that was just a lie because he would not accept the offer.

The reasons for violating maxim quality in the above conversations to avoiding the discussion. Joe answered his mother's question with a lie because he wanted to avoid a prolonged discussion with his mother, if he answered honestly that he would not accept the offer, it would end up with a longer discussion. Thus, Joe's lying utterance is violating the maxim of quality by reason of avoiding the discussion.

Data 3

Connie: "Um, I think your cat wants to get out"

**Twenty-two: "Ugh, he thinks he knows everything"**

(00:47:15 – 00:47:19)

This conversation occurs when Joe, who was in the body of a cat tries to stop twenty-two, who was in his body from going out to see Connie. Joe tries to open the door which was locked from outside by Twenty-two but he can't open, because he is inside a cat's body. Connie saw that and said to Twenty-two that she thought was Joe that the cat might want to get out but Twenty-two response was ambiguous and vague.

The reason for violating maxim of manner in data 3 above is because Twenty-two misleading the counterparts. Twenty-two deliberately answered in an ambiguous way so that Connie would ignore the cat or which it was Joe at the moment. Thus the utterance Twenty-two expressed in the above conversation is violating maxim of manner by reason of misleading the counterparts.

Data 4
Joe: “Wait. Are you actually helping me?”

Twenty-two: “Joe. I have been here for who knows how long, and I’ve never seen anything that’s made me want to live. And then you come along. Your life is sad and pathetic. And you’re working so hard to get back to it. Why? I mean this I gotta see! “

(00:29:29 – 00:29:44)

The conversation from data 4 occurs after Joe and Twenty-two run from the chase of Counsellor Jerry, Twenty-two takes Joe into a room where there is a cardboard box that can take them to another part of that place, and Twenty-two convinces Joe that she can help him return to earth. The answer of Twenty-two in this conversation falls into a violation of the maxim of quantity, because it is too long and trivial. She could have avoided the maxim violation by answering the question with a "Yes, I will" or "No, I won’t".

The reason for violating the maxim of quantity on data 4 is because the speaker is protracting the answer. Twenty-two protracting her answer to convince Joe that she has a reason to help him. However, the utterance of Twenty-two falls into violation of the maxim quantity by reason of protracting the answer.

Data 5

Counsellor Jerry: “So let’s get you to the Great Beyond”

Twenty-two: “Umm, wait! We forgot to try…uh break dancer! Yeah, I think that’s gonna be my thing. Popping and locking. Windmills. Settling my disputes with dance. Can we have one more minute to go back and try breakdancing? Please, Jerry? You look really good today, Jerry”

(00:28:34 – 00:28:55)

In data 5, there are two violations, maxim of quality and quantity. This conversation occurs when Joe, who was appointed as a mentor at that time, is required to find a spark of Twenty-two, but after trying all the activities Twenty-two still has not found the spark, then the counsellor comes to them and finds out that Twenty-two still has not found the spark. The utterance from counsellor were answered by Twenty-two, but the answers given were lies and too informative. On her utterance she lied that she and Joe were going to try a breakdancing which they would not, then she put too much extra information into her words, it made her violate the maxim of quality and quantity.

The reason for violating the maxim of quality and quantity on data 5 was that it included pleasing interlocutors. In the conversation on data 5, twenty-two answered the counsellor Jerry with lies and verbose which showed the violated maxim of quality and quality, then in her utterance there was the sentence". Please Jerry?" which can be interpreted as a request. Thus utterance of Twenty-two in data 5 is a violation of the maxim of quality and quantity by reason of pleasing the interlocutor who in the conversation is Jerry.

Data 6

Counselor Jerry: “I have to ask… How the dickens did you do it? Get that Earth pass to change?”

Joe: “Oh… uh I just… let her walk a mile in my shoes, you could say.”

Counselor Jerry: “Well, it worked”

(01:11:25-01:11:33)

On data 6, there is a violation of maxim quality. This conversation occurred after Joe returned from his life on earth to the great before, at that time he was being escorted by the counselor Jerry to go to the great beyond where Joe was supposed to be because he had actually died. On the way to take Joe, Counselor Jerry is curious about how twenty-two get her Earth pass, but Joe answers with a little cover up of the truth about what happened. Joe answers that he let her walk a mile in his shoes. In fact, he and twenty-two went to earth quietly and Twenty-two at that moment entered Joe's body while Joe himself went into the body of a cat. While on earth twenty-two live life as Joe, it can be said that he let her walk a mile in his shoes, where twenty-two live as Joe and because of that she got her Earth pass.
The reason for the violation of maxim quality on data 6 can be said to be a form of misleading the counterparts. Joe deliberately misled Counselor Jerry into not knowing the truth about the reason twenty-two got her Earth pass. So, in data 6, this occurs for maxim quality customers by reason of misleading the counterparts.

Data 7

Counselor Jerry: "Hey Terry, what's that over there? Look immediately!"

Terry: "What? What are you talking about?"

(01:29:30-01:29:33)

On data 7, there is a violation of maxim quality. This conversation happened when Terry was focused on calculating souls that would go to the Great Beyond with his big calculator, suddenly Jerry's counselor came and said, "Hey Terry, what's that over there? Look immediately!", which is a way to mislead Terry to look in another direction other than at his calculator so that Counselor Jerry can mess up his calculations. What the Counselor Jerry said was a lie because there was actually nothing in the direction he pointed.

The reason for this violation of maxim quality is obvious to misleading the interlocutors. Counselor Jerry told the lie so he could change Terry's calculations and free Joe from going to the great beyond and coming back to life on earth. Thus in data 7, there is a violation of maxim quality by reason of misleading the interlocutors.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings, the authors found 35 violations of maxims committed by the speaker. The type of violating maxim that appears in the Soul movie consists of violating the maxim of quality, violating the maxim of manner, violating the maxim of relevance and violating the maxim of quantity. The speakers sometimes violated one maxim on their utterance, and also violated more than one maxim at the same time. Violation maxim of quantity was the highest violation done by the speakers. It occurred 11 times. They were then followed by violation of relevance maxim and violating of manner maxim 8 times each. The last, violation of quality maxim which occurs 6 times is as the lowest. The maxim violation is based on various reasons, there are four reasons that underlie the implementation of breaking the maxim in the film Soul, they violated the maxims in order to protract the answer, avoiding the discussion, pleasing the interlocutors, and misleading the counterparts. The most common reason for maxim violating the Soul movie is avoiding discussion that takes place 11 times. Then followed by protracting the answer 9 times, misleading the counterparts 6 times and the last with the least number is pleasing the interlocutors 2 times.
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