PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

FLOUTING GRICE'S COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE IN A POLITICAL INTERVIEW (TRUMP'S INTERVIEW WITH TIME ON 2020)

Taqwa Rashid Juma'a

Instructor of English/ The General Directorate of Education

Al-Najaf Al-Ashraf-Iraq

ABSTRACT

Communication refers to the process of transmitting messages between at least two communicators. Communication involves both linguistic facts like produced sentences and non-linguistic facts including meaning and condition. In order to have a successful conversation, the mentioned elements should work together with the communicators' information. as a matter of fact, people communicate their emotions and feelings because communication reflects an intimate exchange between them. Therefore, many pragmatic theories believe that individuals have advanced expertise that lead them to choose those terms in various circumstances through their conversations. Accordingly, this study aims to apply Grice's Cooperative Principle which represents an important theory in this discipline in a political interview of Donald Trump's Interview with TIME on 2020. The statistical findings mirrors that the four maxims including quantity, relevance, quality and manner maxims are flouted by the president respectively. It is concluded that the main aim behind the flouting of maxims is to attract the intention of the listeners to the significance of the utterances that are not explicitly stated in the words uttered.

INTRODUCTION

As a means of communication, language is employed by people in order to convey their emotions, concepts, thoughts whether directly or implicitly. The contact between two or more individuals take place throughout conversational interactions since conversation makes an interactive communication among people. Thus, there should be some rules to be followed by the interlocutors for having a successful communication and a perfect conversation as well.

Accordingly, different theories especially in the field of pragmatic are argued to provide various norms that are interested with the concept of conversation. In this concern, Grice's theory which is entitled "Cooperative Principle" (CP in short) represents the main theory through which he shows how it is necessary for the interlocutors in a conversation to cooperate with each other. Although speakers can fail to follow the maxims, the intended message is still transmitted to the listener. The failure to observe the maxims refers to another term called 'flouting maxims'. It indicates that the rules set by Grice are generally not followed by speakers as they appear to cheat, deceive, or be humorous and sarcastic. In a chosen political interview, this research aims to analyze multiple cases to illustrate how the speaker is flouted the cooperative maxims.

The Concept of Conversation

Conversation is interpersonal communication between two or more people. The development of conversational skills and etiquette is a significant part of socialisation. Conversation represents a mechanism that is inevitable and permanent which continues without any fixed cognitive map. Any ideals ought to be observed after a successful conversation; often these standards are actually flexible with respect to social or cultural rules. Conversation refers to an atmosphere in which people communicate their goals and intentions, communicating, i.e., "conversationalists," among two or more interlocutors. This setting is not restricted to the immediate context, as the "co-text" is sometimes named. So that conversation reflects what happens between individuals when sharing language together (Mey,2001, pp.134-135).

Furthermore, individuals can believe that the world functions according to a collection of internalized maxims or laws, and the best is done typically to make it operate in that manner. Grice states that by saying something that varies from what they actually mean, individuals do not follow the maxims at all times. Therefore, he reports that "everyday speech often happens in less than ideal conditions, but people can still operate". Conversation is a mutual activity in the Gricean sense, relying on speakers and listeners who have a collection of shared values. Including the "face-work" process, which points out to the work of showing faces to each other, protecting our own face and the face of the others as well. Interlocutors have to consider the face offered by others that varies in various situations, even though they are not sure of the face proposed by others. The "adjacency pair" is another principle used in speech, which indicates that a greeting results in a similar greeting, a farewell results in a farewell, and so on. In addition, a conversation includes a significant amount of "role-playing" in which participants select their roles in any conversation and find out the roles of others for building "a dramatic commitment" as appreciating the faces of others. Latest significant conversation principle, which demonstrates how successful cooperation can be achieved, is "turn taking". To encourage the other party to converse or speak, each speaker must give up his turn (Wardhaugh, 2006, pp.291-297).

Grice's Cooperative Principle Theory (CP)

Generally speaking, in linguistics, the cooperative theory illustrates how people attain successful conversational communication in popular social circumstances, i.e. how listeners and speakers behave cooperatively and embrace each other in a specific way. It is implemented by Paul Grice in his pragmatic theory. Through the years 1913-1988 Herbert Paul Grice is known as the 'pragmatic father' who lectured at Harvard University (Aitchison, 2003, p.104). In his lectures, he discusses the principles of cooperative theory. In addition, Grice was pleased with the idea that the audience delivers the message from what the speaker says to what the speaker means (Thomas, 1995, p.56). In 1989, Grice formulates the Cooperative Principle (CP) as a general principle that governs the conversation. He states that, in a beneficial task, the participants are required to follow the CP. Furthermore, cooperation in conversation is influenced by the "cooperative principles, which is as follows: "make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage, at which it occurs by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged"(Grice, 1989, p.26) . It is proposed that the speaker and listener talk with the ability to deliver and perceive a message so that both participants collaborate to interact effectively (Thomas, 1995, p.63).

Due to Grice's point of view, we would be conversationally cooperative without understanding it as we interact with each other. Even if we are not socially cooperative, such conversational cooperation works. For instance, in anger mood, we can disagree with each other and yet collaborate totally a lot in conversation to fulfill the discussion, this conversational collaboration expresses itself in a number of conversational maxims that we feel we need to follow. At first sight, these maxims seem like laws, whereas they seem to be broken more frequently than norms of grammar or phonology, which is why Grice uses the word "maxim rather than rules" (Grice, 1975, pp.41-58). Since Grice communicates the concepts in the imperative mood, Grice's work has faced some contradictory ideas. In addition, some real readers assume that Grice tried to tell speakers how to conduct themselves in a conversation, which is definitely not the case. In fact, Grice implies that conversationalists believe that a certain set of rules are in place in conversational interaction, unless there is any strong indication of the opposite (Thomas,1995, p.62). Though Grice's work encounters significant restrictions, it is at the core of pragmatic discipline yet and cannot be denied the important role it plays in this sector. It is suggested that we should be cautious in recognizing what "cooperation" means in Grice's CP CP (Hadi, 2013,p.70). Consequently, the cooperative theory (i.e., Gricean maxims), is divided into four conversation maxims. These four maxims define particular logical concepts encountered by individuals who, in search of successful communication, obey the cooperative principle. Applying the Gricean maxims reflects a way of describing the relationship between and what is comprehend by utterances.

The Cooperative Maxims

In any conversation, individuals communicate with the intention of transmitting information in every interaction, and the easier they are to transmit information, the more possible people are to understand and acknowledge what they have to say. In spite of the significance of capacity to communicate efficiently and relay knowledge to others, they sometimes make mistakes. Some of these errors are comparatively small and just make our interaction a bit less productive than it might be, while other errors will mislead the listeners. Fortunately, there are several basic rules that are "Grice's conversation maxims" which will enable the speakers to prevent these communication errors. Thus, a number of conversational maxims set up by linguist Paul Grice to clarify the idea that individuals instinctively adopt to direct their conversations making their communicative efforts successful. There are four main concepts that revolve around the quantity, consistency, and meaning of what people say and the way they say it as well. Although these maxims were intended for the first time to explain how people communicate intuitively, they can be utilized in various contexts to consciously direct the way people interact. As such, you can read about the maxims of conversation in the following article and see what you can do to apply them in reality, so you can make your communication as efficient as possible (Thomas,1995, p. 63). The maxims given are not a collection of guidelines that should be succeed to the letter, but they should be followed to the best of the capacity of the speaker and may also be violated or conflicted creatively. The four maxims according to Grice (1989 p. 27) are shown as follows:

Maxim of Quantity

The current maxim allows the speaker to have the correct amount of data throughout the process of speech. It is composed of two sub-maxims; first, "Make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purposes of exchange)". Second, "Do not make your contribution more informative than is required".

Maxim of Quality

The speaker should provide the correct knowledge by speaking according to this theory. Grice reveals it as a super maxim " try to make your contribution one that is true" in the sense of telling the facts and it contains two sub-maxims; first, "Do not say what you believe to be false". Second, "Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence".

Maxim of Relevance

The maxim of relevance tells the speakers to "be relevant". The speaker should be appropriate to the subject of conversation or the context in which the sentence takes place and to previous utterances during the conversation, in compliance with this principle.

Maxim of Manner

This maxim applies to "how what is said is to be said" According to this theory, to prevent uncertainty and obscurity, the speaker should be transparent and organized when talking. It is composed of the "be perspicuous" super maxim and four other sub maxims; first, "avoid obscurity of expression". Second, "avoid ambiguity". Third, "be brief avoid unnecessary prolixity)". Fourth, "be orderly".

To sum up, Grice points out that his list of maxims aims to have an effective exchange of information rather than manipulating the actions of the addressee. "Other maxims are obviously required, and Grice adds a tenth of "the list maxims: "Be respectful". This open ended list poses many difficulties: one may add a new maxim for any regularity in conversation. The uncertainty of the concept of maxims is another concern. The theory of relevance is used to solve problems that focus on the cognitive factors that make a piece of speech important to a listener and how these factors contribute to the process of interpretation (Surian et al,1996, pp.58-59).

Flouting the Cooperative Principle

A cooperative speaker can deliberately disobey a maxim, as long as (s)he or the context provides the listener with sufficient indications to note it. Grice introduces the term "Floating" to characterize the mechanism in which the non-observation of the maxims produces a conversational implication. The flouting mechanism happens when, in order to establish an inference, a speaker does not obey one or more maxims. It implies that the speaker does not attempt to confuse or deceive the listener to look beyond the semantic level for deeper meaning. If one or more of the maxims are overlooked by a speaker in a conversation, the maxims are flouted. Accordingly, while operating under the CP, the listener can interpret the message and fill in missing details due to the context. It is emphasized that cooperation is the root of flouting (Thomas, 1995, pp.65,69).

Flouting a maxim shows the listener that the CP is not observed by the speaker. The interpretation of flouting can be challenging because the mechanism itself does not intend to include a reason or an explanation for the flouting (Cruse, 2000, p.360). Moreover, three major areas where flouting may arise are identified by Mey (2001, p.76) as; 1) There is cooperation that is taken as a code of conduct that is general, inviolable and indisputable. (2) CP consists of large intercultural discrepancies. (3) It can not be helped to note that some types of social activity are favoured, whereas others are subject to portion. For Brown and Levinson (1987, pp. 220-233), the total process of flouting the four maxims can be as follows:
First, flouting the maxim of quantity can be resulted in: "Understatement, Overstatement, and Tautology".
Second, flouting the maxim of quality can be resulted in: Irony, Metaphor, and Rhetorical questions.
Third, there would be no figure of speech to ignore the concept of relevance, but often the disregard of relevance in any scenario will indicate a comic meaning. Such flouting can take the form of suddenly changing the subject, specially in the case of direct questioning by the speaker.

Fourth, flouting the maim of manner can be resulted in: "Ambiguity, Vaguenes, Ellipsis".

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The current research is a quantitative as well as quantitative study because language is utilized for interpreting the data and there are statistical findings that are shown in percentages to display the time of flouting the maims occurrences. The data of the present research are forms of conversations taken from a political interview in "Donald Trump's Interview with TIME on 2020" citizen. Donald Trump sat down for a report on his re-election bid for an interview with TIME in the Oval Office on June 17. He addressed his Political opponents, his unusual approach to the 2020 campaign and his first-term achievements, as well as his views on Iran, China and Mexico and domestic problems such as abortion and the economy during the 57-minute interview. The transcript of the interview is written and transcribed, then it is read and critically analyzed to get required outcome. The interpretation is according to the process of abiding and violation of Grice's maxims. The norms set up, here, are built upon Grice's analogies by which we are going to analyze the flouting of maxims in the president Trump's interview with TIME on 2020, these maxims are:

1. The characteristics of flouting the maxim of quantity: "Longer than normal, Briefer than normal".
2. The characteristics of flouting the maxim of qualities are: "Briefer than usual, Less relevant, less direct or more vague than usual".
3. The characteristics of flouting the maxim of relrvance are: "Less relevant, Less direct (going round the bush), Having no relation to the context".
4. The characteristics of flouting the maxim of manner are: "More vague/ obscure, Less clear than in normal style."

The table below (Table 1) shows the time of occurrences of flouting each maxim by the president (Donald Trump) and the results are shown in percentages:

Table (1): Trump's Occurrences of Flouting Grice's Maxims

No.	Type of maxims	Occurrences	Percentages
1-	**Maxim of quantity**	13	46.42%
2-	**Maxim of quality**	03	10.71%
3-	**Maxim of Relevance**	10	35.71%
4-	**Maxim of Manner**	02	07.16%
	Total	28	100%

As it is displayed in the table above, there is a clear violations of cooperative principle in general since all maims are flouted in the conversation. The

statistical findings demonstrates that the total number of flouting maxims occurrences represents (28) along the interview by the president. As it is clear in Table (1), the maim of quantity records the highest occurrences of flouting Grice's CP WHICH IS (13) times (46.42%). Then comes the maxim of relevance which is flouted (10) times (35.71%). Next, the maxim of quality is flouted (3) times (10.71%). Finally, the maxim of manner represents the less maxim flouted by Donald Trump through his interview with Time which occurs only (2) times (07.16%).

To begin with the analysis and interpretation of the data, it is obvious that the maxim of quantity which receives the highest results occurs when less or more contributions are made. In this sample interview, when Trump is asked about Iran's uranium program being enriched overnight, because of the lack of knowledge on the part of the addressee, he violates the principle of quantity; that is, the contributions made are less than sufficient. For instance:

TIME:"Do you believe the evidence the intelligence community is — says that shows Iran is launching attacks on oil tankers?[1]
TRUMP: "Well, I don't think too many people don't believe it. I think people say they don't believe it because they don't want to get drawn in. But they don't, they don't, uh, they don't believe it."

In this part of interview, Trump flouts the maxim of quantity when asked about his promise of not being involved in any foreign war. He seems to prolong the answer with many unnecessary information and longer than normal. If he only says "I don't think too many people don't believe it" , the message is obvious and understandable. But , he provides adds more information to create an implicature as well as mislead some audiences for political interest. He also breaks this maxim when asked about his promise of not being involved in any foreign war. He seems to prolong the answer with many unnecessary information.

Concerning the maxim of manner, the answers offered by Trump are not applicable to the questions asked. As far as the theory of manner is concerned, it is known that cases of infringement arise where the addressee fails to provide straightforward and direct answers, despite the fact that the questioner continues to confirm that the replies are not the ones requested. In relation to the addressee's answer, they are not straightforward.

TIME: " Are you considering more military action?"
TRUMP: "I wouldn't say that. I can't say that at all. It would be inappropriate. But they would be making a big mistake if they enriched."
TIME: "Are they calling your bluff on this or how do you see it?"
TRUMP: "Time will tell. Only time will tell."
Often Trump seems to flout two maxims together, especially the quantity and relevant maxims. He seems to be more descriptive, and less important is his contribution to the response.

---

[1] The transcript of the interview is retrieved from: https://time.com/5611476/donald-trump-transcript-time-interview/

TIME: "It does look as if you're getting drawn in rather than pulled out, especially with regard to the tankers. Are you concerned about Iran's attacks as —"
TRUMP: "Well, one of the things that seems to be rather ridiculous — also, Shea, do me a favor. Will you get the information I had yesterday — the people that benefit from the Straits. The companies, countries that benefit from the Straits. Just — I want to show you something. China gets 60% of their oil there. Japan 25% of their oil. So many of the other places get such vast amounts of oil there. We get very little. You know, we have made tremendous progress in the last 2-1/2 years in energy, and when the pipelines get built, we're now an exporter of energy. So we're not in the position that we were in, that we used to be in in the Middle East where we needed — you know we were there — some people would say we were there for the oil."
In regards to the maxim of quality , the following shows the violation of this maxim , where the addressee does not sound truthful.

TIME: "So does that mean that strategically you would go to war over nuclear weapons but not over passage through the Strait of Hormuz?"
TRUMP: "Well, I wouldn't even want to say that, but I would certainly go over nuclear weapons, and I would keep the other a question mark. Shea? Ask them to bring in the documents I saw yesterday."

Again, when the president was asked about the Honk Kong demonstration, Trump notably opts out of the maxim of quantity. In this exchange, the addressee politician appears to be saying too much information in the first item, and therefore violates the quantity limit. The rule of quantity is blatantly flouting over informativeness. This flouting is due to the statement of redundancy or repetition of the tautology, in addition to the violation of the quality cap, the addressee is untruthful as far as his replies about the relationship between America and China are concerned.
TIME: "So just continuing on this idea of America's role on the world stage, what is your message to the demonstrators in Hong Kong right now?"

TRUMP: "Well, look, my message is that they're obviously having a big impact, because it's been pulled back and it will be pulled back further. And I think that they've been very effective in their dealings with China. By the way, I have a very good relationship with China, just that they've treated us unfairly with respect to trade for many years. Since the WTO, we've been treated unfairly. We've helped create China. I give them a lot of credit, but we've helped create China. You look at what's happened over the last period of time, and China wants to make a deal. They actually had a deal with us. We were very close to having a deal, and then they pulled back on three major points that were just unacceptable to me. So I'm very happy now collecting 25% on $250 billion, which is what we're doing. But China wants to make a deal, and I don't blame them, because companies are leaving China by the

hundreds because they don't want to pay the tariffs. So China's going to want to make a deal."

The following demonstrates the violates the maxim of relevance, as well as the maxim of manner; it seems to be less direct than required where the violation of the maxim of manner and relevance are very clear.

TIME: "Have you gotten any messages from Iran?"
TRUMP:"Look — when I first — One of the first meetings I had was with the Pentagon, and we were talking about the Middle East, which I was always against going in. You know people always like to say," "Oh, maybe he was too —" "I wasn't. I was always, I was against going into Iraq. It was a terrible… going into the Middle East was a terrible decision. We're into the Middle East for $7 trillion. Many lives, and if you look at both sides, you know, unbelievable numbers of lives — because I look at both sides, I don't just look at the one side. I look at both sides. It was a terrible decision to go in. It's quicksand. Always has been, always will be. And we're doing just fine. We did ISIS. We're doing fine in terms of Afghanistan. We're down to half — we'll soon be down to about 8,000 soldiers."

Here in this exerpt, Trump's the contribution of the addressee is highly or considerably more informative than required; he obviously and noticeably as that the maxim cannot be fulfilled once he explicates that he would not make any assumptions. He adds more and more than what is the interviewer wants him to answer; he talks about the words of Iranian community rather than the attack on the ship getting closer to their territory.

TIME: "But how do you explain the current attacks against shipping, and as Pompeo laid out, allegedly —"
TRUMP: "Well, so far, it's been very minor. And so far, if you look at the rhetoric now compared to the days when they were signing that agreement, where it was always," "Death to America, death to America, we will destroy America, we will kill America." "I'm not hearing that too much any more, and I don't expect to, by the way. I don't expect to. A lot difference. Rhetorically you understand."

When Trump was asked about "Where will you spend most of your time campaigning" or " the immigration suppression" or "about some political analysts looking at the 2020 election who say that his strategy of focusing on base issues makes sense given his politics "or" separation of the family issue, he really was a bit loquacious". He really broaden the answer and goes far beyond what is required as shown in the appendix. He was too informative because he maybe thinks that the answer needs more details.

The maxim of relevance seems to clearly flouted as the president unexpectedly jumps to an overtly different topic which far from the question he is asked, he jumped from talking about Mexico's related issues to the ISIS's related issues

TIME: "The promise was that Mexico was going to pay for the wall

This isn't over."

TRUMP: "This is a negotiation........that deal is much more lucrative for the United States than NAFTA Here's the ISIS maps. You probably have to look at them together. So, here, I'll show you. That's where I took over. That was halfway through. And this is like now, or something, yep."

Trump always tries to break the maxim of quality if the question is less important than others or it is sharp or radical or seems to be surprising important or it is confidential and hence, he seems to be untruthful as in the following and hence, he seems to be untruthful as in the following:

TIME: "He testified under oath —"

TRUMP: "Excuse me"

TIME: "But why would you try to limit the investigation only —"

TRUMP: "I didn't limit the investigation."

TIME: "You dictated a letter —"

TRUMP: "Excuse me —"

Another case of flouting the maxim of relevance and quantity by avoiding answering certain questions for he feels that they are repeated and he answered them already. Hence, he appears to be less relevant and contributes less to the question or the information required.

TIME: "What would you do if a foreign power launched a propaganda effort to halt a Democratic opponent?"

TRUMP: "Well, I've said, you know what? I've answered it so many different ways — I answered it in Stephanopoulos, I answered the same question on Fox"

As a result, the President (Donald Trump) seems to be flouting the maxims not to confuse the listeners, but to attract the intention of the listeners to the significance of the utterances that are not explicitly stated in the words uttered. The main aim behind the phenomenon of flouting a maxim is, therefore, to effectively convey a meaning by generating an implicature

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the analysis and critical interpretation of Trump's violation of Grice's maxims, the following conclusions are drawn:

1-   A very important conclusion can be drawn is that when Trump is asked about certain questions to the extent that he feels that they are a bit dangerous and confidential, he turns to violet the maxim of relevant and try to beat around the bush and go indirectly or ambiguous.

2-   Another important conclusion is that when he is asked questions or issues related to what is going on inside America or related to him personally and causes no harm for him, he turns to prolong his answer, and hence he breaks the maxims of quantity

3-   Flouting the maxim of quantity is obvious, both the statistical findings and the percentage level which is 13 out of 28 responses which is equal to 46. 42, this means that Trump's, in most cases, is inclined to be more informative and often less informative.

4-   The percentage of occurrences of flouting the maxim of quality is really low. The percentage is 03 out of 28. This means that Trump is hardly

untruthful and aware of not being false and saying things he does not believe in or lack evidence.

5-   One of most essential conclusion or outcome one can draw from this paper or analysis is that the maxim of quantity and the maxim of relevance that are much more flouted than the maxims of quality and manner which is due to the very language of politics. In communicating any piece of knowledge, politics, most often, involves some considerations. That is why it is difficult to clearly grasp the truthfulness, adequacy or inadequacy of any piece of knowledge.

6-   As far as the maxim of relevance, it is seconded the list. The percentage is 10 out of 28. This means that Trump's contribution to the conversation is less relevant and Has no relation to the context.

7-   Regarding the maxim of manner, like the maxim of quality, it also occurs rarely. This is due to the fact that Trump's contribution to the conversation is usually less obscure or indirect.

REFERENCES

Aitchison, J. (2003). Teach Yourself Linguistics. London: Hodder and Stroughton.

Brown, R. & Levinson, S. (1987). Politeness: Some   Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruse, D. A. (2000). Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics And Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grice, H. P.(1975). Logic and Conversation. Syntax and Semantics. Cole, P. and Morgan, J.(Eds). Vol. 3, PP.41-58. New York: Academic Press.

Grice, H. P.(1989). Studies in the way of words Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Hadi, A.(2013). A Critical Appraisal of Grice Co-Operative Principle Open Journal of Modern Linguistics Vol. 3, No. 1, PP. 69 72.

Mey, J. (2001). Pragmatics: An Introduction. 2nd Edition. UK: Blackwell.

Surian, L. , Baron-Cohen, S. and Lely, H. V.(1996). Are Children with Austin Deaf to Gricean Maxims? Vol.1, No.1, PP. 55-71.

Thomas, J.(1995). Meaning Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatic. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics 5th Edition Blackwell Publishing.