

**AN ANALYSIS OF NON-OBSERVANCE MAXIMS IN *CUSTOMS*
*PROTECTION***

¹Muhammad Fadillah, ²Ernie Diyahkusumaning Ayu Imperiani, S.S., M.Ed.
English Language and Literature
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
¹fadil1612@gmail.com, ²ernie_imperiani@upi.edu

ABSTRACT

The paper investigated non-observance of maxims among Indonesians and foreigners male and female passengers at Indonesian airport when the customs officers were checking the passengers. Specifically, it analyzed the types of non-observance of maxims along with the possible reasons as to why the passengers broke the maxims. This descriptive qualitative research applied the theory of Cooperative Principles by Grice (1975) to identify the maxims in a conversation between passengers and customs officers and Christoffersen's (2005) theory in analyzing the possible reasons for breaking maxims. The data were taken from a transcription video of a reality show entitled "Customs Protection" that were obtained from its Youtube channel. The findings revealed that the passengers broke the Maxim of Quantity, the Maxim of Quality, and the Maxim of Relation. Also, the passengers were flouted more on the Maxims of Quantity in the conversation. Moreover, most of the maxims were broken due to the reason to convince someone. The passengers were likely to flout the maxim of quantity to convince the customs officer with an indicator to avoid the process of customs declaration for each item that the passengers brought from overseas. Even though the phenomena of non-observance maxims might help the passenger to trick, the customs officer did not easily believe the passengers' answer. Hence, all of the passengers have to follow the regulation and the procedure that is valid in Indonesia, which is an obligation for every passenger, especially to pay tax for new items that were brought from overseas.

Keywords: *Cooperative Principle, Customs Protection, Maxims*

INTRODUCTION

In communication, people generally talk with various underlying reasons, such as to gather or share information, to show their expressions, to ask questions, and many more. If two or more people are communicating and engaged in a conversation, both are usually giving feedbacks either in the form of verbal or nonverbal as an act of mutual understanding. In generating a successful communication, the speaker and the hearer are expected to follow some principles so both of them can get the intended meaning.

With regard to the principles in communication, Grice (1975) has proposed a set of rules that are called Cooperative Principle and argued that in a conversation people are assumed to be cooperative in communication by following some principles. The principles are also labeled as maxims which consist of four (4) types of maxims, which are; the maxim of quality (truthful), the maxim of quantity (informative as required, not more or less), maxim of relevance (relevancy), and maxims

of manner (orderly and unambiguous).

In general, Cooperative Principle is a set of rules which makes a conversation effective and efficient in a communication according to the required contribution. As Grice (1975, p. 45) suggests that when a speaker and a hearer have a conversation, they need to be informative to show cooperation and understanding in the conversation, so the goal of the conversation can be effective and efficiently achieved. In addition, to fulfill the effectiveness of conversation, Grice (1975) states that in the maxim of quality the speaker is supposed to be truthful when giving a contribution in conversation, while the maxim of quantity suggests the speaker to be informative as required (not more or less informative). The other two maxims are; maxims of relevance, which advise the speaker to be related to the discussed topic in the conversation and maxim of manner that expects the speaker to avoid obscurity and ambiguous expression. In maxim of

manner, it is also crucial for being brief and order.

However, in real life, some speakers may not obey the principles of maxims. It may be due to make a more precise meaning in the process of giving information or hiding some information. The phenomena can occur in a daily conversation where the speaker decides for being uncooperative or reject to contribute as required. In her study, Herawati (2013) argues that in some particular conditions, when people tend to reject in observing maxims, they are indicated to have another purpose of interaction. If the speaker chooses to be uncooperative intentionally or unintentionally, the speaker is assumed to have another intention or other purpose in interaction. In the phenomena of breaking the maxims, the speaker can choose between to violate, to flout, to infringe, to opt-out, or to suspend the maxims. These terms are also called as non-observance of maxims.

People sometimes fail to observe the maxims in conversation. This is because people also may not directly utter the intention or purpose

of what they mean when they are involved in a conversation. There are some ways to break maxims according to Grice (1975), such as Flouting, Violating, Infringing, Opting-out, and Suspending. Flouting is a condition where the speaker does not follow the maxims without any intention to mislead or to deceive the speaker which usually contradicts with fact between what is being said, and also can be asserted an implicit meaning. Violating is a condition where the speaker fails to observe the maxims by misleading the hearer intentionally, with a purpose by telling the truth but actually untrue or somehow to deceive the hearer. Infringing is a condition where the speaker speaks unclearly as a result of a lack of language knowledge such as a child who still learns to speak or a foreigner which not mastering a language. Besides, some factors like drunkenness, nervousness, excitement, or other factors that make the speaker speak unclearly or not direct to the point are also considered as an infringement. Opting-out is a condition where the

speaker seems to avoid contributing due to particular reason (ethics, rules, privacy, and others) that makes the speaker cannot answer normally instead of giving less information, and it commonly occurs in public life. Suspending is a condition where the speaker rejects the maxim because of inappropriateness that related to a cultural factor or certain events which cause the speaker to speak indirectly, for example by using particular words or expression such as taboo words.

When people break the maxims, they are assumed to have an intention in hiding some information or another purpose in an interaction. According to Christoffersen (2005), there are some possible factors for people to break maxims. These factors are Hiding the truth, Creating jokes, Avoiding certain topics, Averting to hurt someone's feelings, Saving face, Creating fake truth, Convincing someone, and Cheering the hearer.

After considering the confined area of writing, this study will not present the detail of each particular term that is related to the

study. Further explanation regarding the term can be seen in Grice (1975) & Christoffersen (2005).

Some cases of non-observance maxims may also be found in the airport, especially in a conversation between passengers and customs officers in customs checking. Mostly the passengers do not provide direct answers and prefer to go around the bush when the customs officer asks them. The unclear utterance creates an obstacle for customs officers in examining passenger baggage or belonging.

One of the Indonesian TV programs which provide a condition where a passenger is having a conversation with a customs officer in the airport is *Customs Protection*. It is a reality show TV Program in NET TV channel that collaborates with the Directorate General of Customs and Excise Indonesia. The show is presenting an actual event or phenomenon in securing traffic of goods, monitoring export and import activities, customs clearance, and others based on government regulation and laws that apply in Indonesia. Additionally, this TV

program is aired every Saturday and Sunday at 21.30 WIB, but it also can be watched online from its Youtube channel named *86 & Customs Protection NET*.

In this present research, *Customs Protection* is chosen as the data because it is suitable in finding natural data of conversation between passenger and customs officer at the airport. Meanwhile, *Customs Protections* TV program can represent a real condition in an airport even though it can be scripted, but the case that is presented based on data or fact.

In terms of analyzing maxims and non-observance of maxims, many studies have been conducted in analyzing a similar issue with different contexts of TV programs. For example, Alfina (2016) examined maxim violation in *Mata Najwa* talk show in *Selebriti Pengganda Simpati* episode. The study found that all of the maxims were violated in the talk show and followed by various underlying motivations, which are to show some politeness towards others and keep other's self-esteem.

Another study was conducted by Virgin & Utami (2016). They analyzed the dominant violated maxims in one of *Hitam Putih* talk show episodes. The finding shows that in *Hitam Putih*, the guest was broke all of the maxims with a tendency to create jokes or humor. The most violated maxim is maxims of relevance where the speaker did not provide related information regarding the topics that were discussed. This phenomenon occurs since the guest wanted to create a sense of humor.

There is also a study conducted by Asyareh, Al-Sabti, Awwad, Mansoor, & Razali (2019). The study investigated flouting and violating maxim in Gaddafi interview during The Arab Spring. In this study, The Arab leader Gaddafi violated and flouted the maxims by playing words, talking too much, hanging upon the topic, and lying. The main purpose of breaking maxims is to obtain mass support by manipulating people through playing words and create other shades of meaning.

There are several studies that are deal with *Customs Protection*, which are also conducted by several researchers. Atmajaya (2017) investigated the influence of broadcasting *Customs Protection* TV program toward the image of Directorate General of Customs and Excise Indonesia by giving a questionnaire to 105 students at the University of Surakarta who takes Branding subject. He found that the broadcasting of *Customs Protection* has a positive correlation toward the institution since the TV program itself gives an amount of information and presents how the Customs and Excise institution works.

As well as that, Desilvani, Hafiar, & Damayanti (2017) analyzed how drug smuggling case and the image of Indonesian Customs and Excise is framed through *Customs Protection* NET TV. The study uses the theory of Social Constructivism on Reality by Berger and Luckmann, and also Paradigm Constructivism in framing analysis by Robert N. Entman. The result shows that in presenting drug smuggling case *Customs Protection*

NET TV, it presents four elements in defining problems as well as in defining causalities, moral decisions, and emphasizing problem-solving. Additionally, Indonesian Customs and Excise is framed as an institution that provides service and protection for society.

Both of the studies show a similar result that *Customs Protection* is an effective TV program that can provide a piece of information about how Indonesian Customs and Excise protecting the country from illegal and prohibited goods. It also creates a positive image for Indonesian Customs and Excise in the society that is a trustful and reliable institution for solving problems related to customs and excise in Indonesia.

Most of the research has investigated non-observance of maxims using Grice's Cooperative Principles in various objects, such as talk shows, interviews, movies, and many more. Meanwhile, research in investigating non-observance of maxims that occur in a conversation between passenger and customs officers in airport customs checking

is still rarely conducted. Also, *Customs Protection* is still less discussed linguistically. Along with that, this research observes the conversation between passenger and customs officer at the airport by using the theory of Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) in investigating the non-observance of maxims, which is done by passengers. Specifically, it examines the maxims that fail to be observed by passengers and figure out the possible factors that influence the passenger in breaking maxims towards customs officer questions.

METHODOLOGY

This research used a descriptive qualitative method to identify the data. According to Berg (2006), qualitative research is commonly used in observing words, images, and descriptions, while quantitative research tends to have a cope with numbers. Furthermore, O'Reilly (2015) mentions that qualitative research is designed to investigate a phenomenon to have a comprehension regarding a particular issue. Qualitative method was chosen

because the data of this research is non-numerical data, it also helps the researcher in order to gain insight and answer the research problem. Moreover, this research examines the non-observance of maxims, which is done by airport passengers and the possible underlying factors.

The data for this research were in the form of transcription from a video, which was taken from Youtube, specifically from the *86 & Customs Protection NET* channel. Five (5) videos were selected for this research by focusing only on the video that takes place in Indonesian Airport, and the length of the videos itself is varied, ranging from six to eight minutes per video. The video also can consist of one to two cases for each video. The title of taken videos are "Petugas Mengamankan Tas dan Baju yang Dibeli Penumpang di New York", "Pemeriksaan Barang Bawaan di Bandara Soetta Petugas Mengamankan Baju & Minuman Dari Luar Negeri", "Membawa Banyak Pewarna Tubuh Untuk Binaraga Alhasil Penumpang Dikenakan Pajak", "Wanita Ini

Memakai Sepatu Brandednya Agar Tak Dikenai Pajak”, and “Buka Jastip Wanita Ini Malah Dikenakan Pajak”.

The processes of collecting data were obtained by following several steps. First, the videos were watched carefully in order to decide which scenes that are going to be transcribed. After the scenes are selected, the conversation between passengers and the customs officers then transcribed.

The next step involved the categorizing and classifying the maxims found in a form of a table whether it flouts, violates, opts-out, infringes, or suspends the maxim by using Grice's (1975) theory about Cooperative Principle. In addition, the possible factors also investigated based on Christoffersen (2005) regarding the criteria of lying. Lastly, the findings were interpreted to draw main conclusions.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this analysis of non-observance maxims in *Customs Protection*, Grice's (1975) theory about Cooperative Principle and the theory

of Christoffersen (2005) in defining possible intention of breaking the maxim were applied in revealing the violated principle, types of non-observed maxims, and the possible reasons as to why the passengers did not follow the rules. The findings reveal that the passengers break three out of four maxims that are proposed by Grice (1975). In terms of non-observance of maxims, most passengers decided to break the maxims by flouting or violating it rather than to break it with the three other types. Furthermore, the possible reasons why the passengers did not provide direct answers were also identified. As a piece of additional information, the participants are Indonesian and foreigner male and female passengers.

Non-observance Maxims

In terms of non-observance maxims, there are some maxims that were broken by the passengers when answering the customs officers' questions. Three maxims were identified to be broken, which are; Maxims of Quality, Maxim of

Quantity, and Maxim of Relation. non-observance maxims is presented
 The list of occurrences regarding in the following table 1.1.

Table 1.1 Frequencies of Broken Maxims by Passengers

Maxim Types	Occurrences	Percentage	Rank
Quality	9	18,4%	3
Quantity	26	53,1%	1
Relation	14	28,5%	2
Manner	0	0%	-
Total	49	100%	-

From Table 1.1 above, it shows that not all of the broken principles were found in the conversation between the passenger and the customs officer. There are three types of broken maxims occurred, which are; Quality, Quantity, and Relation. From the total of 49 occurrences of broken maxims, Maxim of Quantity becomes the most frequent of broken maxims with 26 occurrences (53,1%) and it is because the passenger either provides more information or less information in their response. The second most frequent broken maxim is Maxim of Relation with 14 occurrences (28,5%) where the passenger commonly did not answer the given question instead of asking another question toward the customs

officer. The third position is Maxim of Quality, the passengers did not observe the Maxim Quality 9 times (18,4%) in the conversation which caused by a failure of providing true information while uttering their response so the principle of truthful cannot be achieved. However, Maxim of Manner was not found or broken in the conversation

Types of Non-observance of Maxims

According to Grice's (1975) theory, there are five types of non-observance of maxims that can be used by the speakers. However, in this study, not all of the types were found. There are only three out of five types were found from the analysis. The occurrences and

percentage of non-observed maxims is shown in Table 1.2 below.

Table 1.2 Frequencies of Non-observance Maxims by Passengers

Non-observed Maxim	Occurrences	Percentage	Rank
Flouting Maxim of Quantity	18	36,7%	1
Flouting Maxim of Quality	2	4,1%	6
Flouting Maxim of Relation	5	10,2%	5
Violating Maxim of Quantity	8	16,3%	3
Violating Maxim of Quality	7	14,3%	4
Infringing Maxim of Relation	9	18,4%	2
Total	49	100%	-

As can be seen in Table 1.2 above, based on 49 pairs that were identified as non-observance of maxims there are three main types of non-observance maxims, such as; Flouting, Violating and Infringing. When the passengers were asked by the customs officer, they decided to flout the maxim of quantity 18 times (36,7%) out of 49 pairs of conversation and followed by infringing the maxim of relation with 9 times (18,4%) occurrences out of 49 pairs of conversation. Furthermore, with a slight difference of occurrence, violating the maxim of quantity occurs 8 times (16,3%) while violating the maxim of quality occurs 7 times (14,3%). Flouting the maxim of quality becomes the least frequent non-observance of maxims

that performed by the passenger with 2 times (4,1%) occurrences among the conversation between the passengers and customs officer.

Flouting Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity suggests the speaker gives the required information, not more or less informative than required. In reality, people sometimes do not follow this principle and can be categorized as breaking the maxim of quantity if they give more or less information. The provided example below is an example of flouting the maxim of quantity.

O1 : Ini baru ya Pak yah?
Is this new, sir?

P1 : Iya, barang murah.
Yes, cheap items.

Generally, the customs officer checks every passenger's baggage that comes from overseas and all new items that were bought from overseas need to be declared so the customs officers can calculate tax based on a regulation that applied in Indonesia for the passenger.

The example shows P1 breaks the maxim of quantity, specifically flouting the maxim of quantity. P1 gives more information rather than required in answering O1's question. In addition, P1 wanted to make the items are less expensive so P1 does not have to pay tax for the items that were bought from overseas.

Besides, the passenger's items were identified as an expensive items since the officer found the price tag was still hanging on the items even though the passenger claimed that the items were on promo. The officer also knew the items were exceed the limit of personal use tax-free regulation, which is 500 USD per person, after saw the price tag. Due to the limit of tax-free for personal use items, the passenger was assumed to have a

particular intention toward the officer through the conversation.

In fact, P1 actually can answer O1's question using yes or no answer and that is enough to fulfill the maxim of quantity. However, P1 decided to add more information for the answer and it considered as flouting to convince someone and particularly in this context to avoid paying tax for the items.

The following example is in line with Alfina's (2016) findings which discovered that the speaker provides more information in the utterance because the speaker attempted to hide something from the hearer.

Flouting Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality expects the speaker to provide truthful information or simply based on fact. Once the people did not provide a shred of truthful evidence in the contribution, it will be assumed as an act of breaking the maxim of quality. This is an example where the speaker flouts the maxim of quality.

O4 : Kalau disini sih 16 jutaan, ya 17 juta lah, karena pembebasannya cuma 500

USD tuh sekitar 7 juta baru selebihnya akan dikenakan pajak.

The price here is around 16 million, or 17 million because the tax-free is 500 USD, it is around 7 million then the rest will be tax charged.

P4 : Katanya kalau lagi dipakai enggak kena.

If I wear it, it will not get charged, they said.

The illustration shows that P4 breaks the maxim of quality by flouting. It can be seen that P4 refused to be cooperative in answering O4's question. P4 indicated to avoid paying tax by claiming that if the items were worn it will not get charged for tax. This is in contrast with the fact that there is no such a rule like that. Every new expensive item that was bought from overseas will be charged with no excuse.

As mentioned before, the regulations for personal use items that were brought by each passenger is only 500 USD or 1000 USD for 1 family. In other words, if the price is over limit it will be charged for tax and the customs officer will help to handle in calculating the tax.

O4 is expecting that P4 can be cooperative that P4 understands about the regulation and pay the tax. Unfortunately, P4 cannot provide the

sufficient information for the utterance, which makes the answer implied as breaking the maxim of quality.

The following example shows that the speaker cannot provide any information or evidence in supporting the utterance which mean it is considered as violating the maxim of quality as Virgin & Utami (2016) stated in their study.

Flouting Maxim of Relation

The maxim of relation is a maxim where the speaker is supposed to contribute a relevant answer in a conversation. An illustration below is an example of how the speaker flouts the maxim of relation.

O1 : Di declare sama komandan kita yah?

It will be declared by our chief, okay?

P1 : Aduh, salah saya. Di email bisa gaknya?

Ugh, my bad. Can I send it by email?

The example above is an illustration of flouting in the maxim of relation where P1 did not provide a related answer regarding the given question by O1. When P1 was asked to meet the customs chief for declaring items P1 refused to contribute in the conversation

because P1 has an intention of avoiding declare process of items with the customs chief.

O1's question is a simple yes or no question, but since P1 wanted to escape from the problem P1 choose to flout the maxim by answering an irrelevant answer by asking the officer if P1 can send the invoice via email.

Flouting is a type non-observance of maxims that is commonly found a conversation and it generally occurs in a situation where the speaker is intended to cause a misunderstanding to achieve certain purposes (Asyareh et al., 2019). The conversation of P1 and O1 above is considered as flouting since P1 wants to achieve particular goal.

Violating Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity suggests the speaker to give required information, not more or less informative than required. In reality, people sometimes do not follow this principle and can be categorized to break the maxim of quantity if they give more or less information. A

conversation below is an instance for violating the maxim of quantity.

O1 : *Tasnya.*

The bag

P1 : 2 biji, 3 biji, murah-murah tapi promo.

2 bags, 3 bags, cheap but it is on promo.

The example above shows the act of violating the maxim of quantity where P1 intentionally wants to mislead O1 with the answer. O1 was asking about how many items that P1 bought from overseas, but P1 talks too much meanwhile O1 knows that the price tag of the bag is still hanging on it.

P1 only has to answer the quantity of the bag to fulfill the principle of quantity and provides true information to avoid violation. Besides, P1 wants to convince O1 that the bag is not expensive because it was on promo even though the price tag exists but P1 cannot prove it.

By violating the maxim of quantity, the speaker is assumed to have an intention in misleading the hearer and it also can be seen when the speaker is being too informative toward the hearer (Alfina, 2019).

Besides, Virgin & Utami (2016) claim that violation of the maxim of relevance is more frequent to occur than others. This is because in Virgin & Utami's (2016) study the speaker is more often to violate the maxims of relevance in order to create a sense of joke or humor. Meanwhile, in this study, the result shows that the violation of maxim quantity is more frequently occur where the speakers many times are found did not provide the necessary information, either more or less information. This is contradicts with what have been said by Virgin & Utami (2016) in terms of violating.

Violating Maxim of Quality

The maxim of quality expects the speaker to provide truthful information or simply based on fact. Once the people did not provide truthful evidence in the contribution, it will be assumed as an act of breaking the maxim of quality. The example below illustrates the violation in maxim of quality.

O2 : Ini udah sering, pak. Kalau cuma sekali, soalnya bapak kan udah rutin ya.

This is frequent, sir. If only once, but you go overseas frequent.

P2 : Saya kalau bawa baju ini baru sekali, pak.

This is my first time for bringing clothes, sir.

The illustration above is an example of the maxim of quality that was violated. In this case, P2 wants to persuade O2 that this is the first time P2 brings many clothes but O2 does not believe it because it is illogical if O2 brought many clothes only for their families as a souvenir from overseas.

P2's utterance is categorized as violating the maxim of quality because the provided information is not based on fact (O2 knows P2 go overseas frequent). Moreover, P2's answer is intended to mislead the hearer.

The example clearly shows that the speaker wants to mislead the hearer by giving false information. The speaker also did not provide an evidence to support the answer (Alfina, 2019) so P2 is violating the maxim of quality.

Infringing Maxim of Relation

The maxim of relation is a maxim where the speaker is supposed to

contribute a relevant answer in their conversation. The following illustration is an example of the infringing maxim of relation.

O2 : Can you speak English?
Can you speak English?
P2 : **Huh?**
Huh?

The example shows that P2 breaks the maxim of relation, specifically infringing maxim of relation. The uttered expression by P2 is not related to the topic that asked by O2. Instead of answering the question, P2 uttered with ambiguous expression like confusion.

P2 does not contribute toward the maxim of relation. This may be caused by the nationality of P2, which is Japan, and P2 does not have a capability of understanding in English or Bahasa Indonesia so it makes P2 cannot answer O2's question. While O2 has utter the question clearly by asking if P2 can speak English so it can help the process of checking easier for O2.

As Grice (1975) mentioned, infringing is one of non-observance maxims that can occurs among

foreigner due lack of knowledge to the language and example of P2 who is originally from Japan represents it.

The Possible Reasons for Breaking the Maxims

According to Christoffersen (2005), there are eight (8) types of possible reasons why people are breaking the maxims. From the findings, there are some reasons as to why the passengers break the maxims; which are, avoiding certain topics, saving face, creating fake truth, and convincing someone.

Interestingly, from forty-nine (49) pairs of conversation, there are nine (9) pairs of non-observed maxims that cannot be revealed in Christoffersen's (2005) categories regarding possible reasons for breaking the maxims. Those numbers of non-observed maxims are Infringing types of non-observance maxims that were classified into others type of possible reasons.

The possible reasons for breaking maxims from the analysis are displayed in table 1.3 below.

Table 1.3 Frequencies of Identified Possible Reason in Breaking Maxims

Possible Reason	Occurrences	Percentage	Rank
Hiding the truth	0	0%	-
Creating jokes	0	0%	-
Avoiding certain topics	8	16,3%	3
Averting to hurt someone's feeling	0	0%	-
Saving face	7	14,3%	4
Creating fake truth	5	10,2%	5
Convincing someone	20	40,8%	1
Cheering the hearer	0	0%	-
Others	9	18,4%	2
Total	49	100%	-

Convincing Someone

The passengers mostly break the maxim for convincing someone. In this case, it is for convincing the customs officer toward their answer or response. In answering the customs officer's question, it was detected that 20 times (40,8%) out of 49 pairs of conversation, the passengers were trying to convince the customs officer. For instance, P2 tries to convince the customs officer that a shopping entrusted goods service is not like other shops that sells many items and has an actual shop. This type of reasoning, by adding some additional information, is possibly used by the passenger who wants to strengthen their answer so the hearer can trust the speaker

(Christoffersen, 2005). The example is provided below.

O5 : Dijual?

For sale?

P5 : **Engga ini jastip, jadi aku cuma ngambil, gak kayak gimana gimana, cuma gak buka toko.**
No, it is a shopping entrusted goods service so I only buy it but do not have a shop.

The example shows that P5 tries to convince O5 how a shopping entrusted goods service works by rejecting the idea of selling items, but actually it is the same just like an act of selling items. Moreover, P5 emphasizes that there are no actual shop to do this service. P5 also persuades O5 to believe what are P5 said about shopping entrusted goods service. This is in line with the idea of Christoffersen (2005) when the speaker adds more details in the

answer to makes the hearer trust the speaker, it is considered as convincing someone.

Avoiding Certain Topics

Some of the passengers' answers were also identified as avoiding certain topics. According to Christoffersen (2005), this type of reason is classified when the speaker tends to answer with a minimal response or also done by giving unrelated answers to change the topic as well. The speaker also either not interested in the topic or intentionally avoid the topic so that the purpose of the speaker can be achieved through interaction. In the case of avoiding certain topics, this type of reason occurred 8 times (16,3%) out of 49 pairs of conversation. The following example is shown below.

O2 : Ngisi kertasnya yang biru tadi?

Do you fill the blue form?

P2 : **Gak tau mbak.**

I don't know.

The example illustrates P2 tries to avoid in talking about the blue form that is usually have to be filled by every passenger who comes from overseas. By answering 'I don't know', it implies that P2 wants to

avoid certain topic from O2. As Christoffersen (2005) explained, if the speaker is giving irrelevant answer or change the topic it can be considered as a reason to avoid a certain topic.

Saving Face

In some pairs of conversation, there are also some passengers' answers that were revealed as saving face where the passengers tried to save their face from embarrassment. This category of reason can be used by the speaker when the speakers have a purpose to cover themselves from awkwardness (Christoffersen, 2005). From the analysis, saving face occurred 7 times (14,3%) out of 49 pairs of conversation. The illustration of saving face is revealed below.

O4 : Mbak nya beli atau dibeliin?

Did someone buy it for you or you buy it?

P4 : **Dibeliin lah, enggak mau dibeliin lah kalau kena pajak mah.**

Someone buy it for me, I don't want it if get charged.

The following example reveals that P4 unconsciously mentioned that the shoes were brought by the passenger, while previously P4 claims the shoes were

brought by someone for the passenger. To save the face, P4 reclaims the answer by saying 'someone buy it for me, I don't want it if get charged'. The passenger's answer is indicated as a reason of saving face because the passenger wants to escape from the embarrassment (Christoffersen, 2005).

Creating Fake Truth

The passengers also were found to create fake truth when answering the customs officers' questions. By creating a fake truth, the speaker creates something that is fake or false to be true based on imaginary truth which the speaker believes and the speaker also persuades the hearer to believe it as a piece of real information. From the analysis, it was found 5 times (10,2%) out of 49 pairs of conversation. The example below presents the illustration of creating fake truth.

O4 : Kata siapa?

Who said so?

P4 : **Katanya asal jangan baru, kan baru punya ini doang.**

As long as it was not new, they said. I only have this one.

The illustration above shows P4 creates something that is false to be true, P4 also persuades O4 to believe it as a true information. This is happened because P4 tries to avoid a further checking for the shoes that P4 brought from overseas. When P4 said 'As long as it was not new, they said. I only have this one' P4 expects O4 to believe the information so P4 can hinder paying tax for the shoes. Christoffersen (2005) claims it is a possible reason to break the maxim by creating a fake truth.

Others

The analysis shows an interesting finding in terms of identifying the possible reasons in breaking the maxims. There are nine (9) out of forty-nine (49) pairs of conversation which included into Infringing types of non-observance maxims that cannot be revealed in Christoffersen's (2005) theory. Those pairs are classified into Others type of possible reasons in Christoffersen's (2005) category due to the types of Infringing which occurs when the speaker does not

have an adequate knowledge on a certain language.

From the analysis, there is a different findings compared to Alfina's (2016), Virgin & Utami's (2016) & Asyareh, et al's (2019) study. When the maxims were broken, this study shows that in particular cases people break the maxims for convincing someone, avoiding certain topics, saving face, or creating fake truth, while Alfina (2016) claims that the speaker tends to break the maxims for the reasons of keeping other's self-esteem and showing politeness. Meanwhile, in Asyareh, et al's (2019) study the speaker break the maxims to create a certain shades of meaning which makes the utterance not conceivable to the hearer so the speaker can gain a support from masses. Last, the findings also shows the possible result is not similar with Virgin & Utami's (2016) study that explains the speaker break the maxims for creating jokes and humor.

CONCLUSION

Based on the mentioned aims of the study, this study examines the non-

observance of maxims and the possible reasons for breaking the maxim. Through the analysis, three out of four Grice's (1975) maxims were violated by the passengers while answering the customs officers' question, they are; Maxim of Quantity with 26 occurrences (53,1%), Maxim of Quality with 9 occurrences (18,4%), and Maxim of Relation with 23 occurrences (28,5%). Also, Flouting and Violating are the types of non-observance maxims that are commonly found in the conversation, specifically on Flouting the maxim of Quantity with 18 times occurrences (36,7%) and Violating the Maxim of Quantity which occurs 8 times (16,3%). Besides, after the possible reason was analyzed using Christoffersen's (2005) theory the passengers were mostly identified to convince someone (the customs officers) with 20 times occurrences (40,8%).

Overall, from the analysis and the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the passengers constantly break the maxim of quantity by flouting it. The

passengers prefer to flout the maxim of quantity when asked by the customs officer. This has happened because the passengers' answer is followed with additional information or the information itself is less informative. Moreover, this present study also reveals that the possible reasons for breaking maxims is to convince someone, specifically in convincing the customs officers. By convincing the customs officers, the passengers expect to avoid the process of customs declaration where the passengers have to inform the customs officers about new items that were brought from overseas and if the item exceeds the valid regulation, the passengers have to pay the tax. In other words, the passengers are trying to trick the customs officers to skip the obligation of paying tax. However, the result does not necessarily shows that all of the passengers at airports disobey the valid regulation in the country by avoiding pay tax, but to reveal the broken maxim that occur and the possible reasons of breaking the maxim.

REFERENCES

- Alfina, E. O. (2016). *The maxim violation on Mata Najwa talk show 'Selebriti Pengganda Simpati'*. Retrieved from: <https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id/index.php/engliterature/article/view/11376/11033>
- Asyareh et al. (2019). Instances of violations and flouting of the maxim by Gaddafi interview during The Arab Spring. *International Journal of English and Education (ISSN: 2278-4012)* vol. 8 issue: 1 January 2019. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/38208615/INSTANCES_OF_VIOLATION_AND_FLOUTING_OF_THE_MAXIM_BY_GADDAFI_INTERVIEW_DURING_THE_ARAB_SPRING
- Atmajaya, A. O. (2017). *Pengaruh terpaan tayangan Customs Protection di NET TV terhadap citra Direktorat Jenderal Bea Cukai*. Retrieved from: <https://eprints.ums.ac.id/id/eprint/58011>
- Berg, Bruce L. (2006). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. 6th ed. Boston: Pearson.
- Christoffersen, D. (2005). *The shameless liar's guide*. Naperville: Sourcebooks Hysteria. Retrieved from: <https://b-ok.cc/book/1012719/1a8202>
- Desilvani et al. (2017). *Citra Dirjen Bea dan Cukai pada kasus penyelundupan narkoba dalam tayangan Customs Protection NET TV*. DOI:

- <https://doi.org/10.24198/ptvf.v1i2.19870>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. L. (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
- Herawati, A. (2013). *The Cooperative Principle: Is Grice's Theory suitable to Indonesian language culture?*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v7i1.417>
- O'Reilly, M. (2015). *Advanced qualitative research*. 1st ed. London: Sage Publications.
- Tupan, A. H. & Natalia, H. (2008). *The multiple violations of conversational maxims in lying done by the characters in some episodes of desperate housewives*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.10.1.63-78>
- Virgin, J. A. & Utami, C. P. (2016). Dominant maxim violations in 'Behind Lawyer Profession' of Hitam Putih talk show. *Ninth International Conference on Applied Linguistics (CONAPLIN 9)*. Atlantis Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10/2991/conaplin-16.2017.40>