



An Analysis of Grice's Cooperative Principles in Some Selected English TV Interviews

Aso Ali Muhammad¹, Hemn Adil Karim²

¹Ministry of Education

²Department of English, College of Education, University of Garmian

Article Info

Received: June, 2019

Revised: June, 2019

Accepted: July, 2019

Keywords

Cooperative Principle,
Interview, observance, non-
observance, non-adherence.

Corresponding Author

hemn.adil@garmian.edu.krd

Abstract

The study is an attempt to investigate Grice's cooperative principles to some selected English TV interviews. It is a process in which the speakers cooperate with each other by maintaining certain rules and regulations in order to continue the conversation. The study aims to show the role of language in communication and the main properties of the assumed meaning that is conveyed through language. In doing so, two types of English TV Interviews are picked to be analyzed on the basis of the cooperative principles which are political and artistic interviews as they are the two areas which easily display the observance and non-observances of the maxims. It is hypothesized that non-adherence to cooperative principle is a strategy widely used by political leaders and artists to achieve their goals. The study has concluded that both politicians and artists violate the principles differently and for different purposes.

Introduction

Grice describes communication as adhering to what he calls the cooperative principle. This means that people do not only seek to accommodate understanding when they communicate, they also expect their conversation partners to do the same. This is not to say that we always behave in such a cooperative manner when we communicate (46). As Crystal points out, "common experience shows that we do not. But we do seem to tacitly recognize their role as a perspective or orientation within actual utterances can be

judged". The point is that we all seem to recognize this principle as a norm against which utterances can be judged (Crystal 49). Grice observed that people display symptoms of such an unspoken understanding in their communicative behavior. Furthermore, he argues that not only do people adhere to such a principle; they should do it as it is rational behavior (Grice 48). He assumes that people communicate for a reason, they have a goal, and to reach that goal they have to take into account the four different maxims of communication that underpin the cooperative principle. In line with

this, he describes the general purpose of people's communication as "a maximally effective exchange of information" (Grice 47). As a result, the general cooperative principle is formulated as "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" (Grice 45).

The idea of a cooperative principle is in turn the base for Grice's concept of implicature. Although this study does not mainly concern with implicature, a brief explanation is necessary to fully understand how the cooperative principle works. Although we do not usually notice it, what we say does often not mean or cover exactly what we want to convey. One of the many examples given by Grice is person B replying "there is a garage around the corner" to person (A)'s statement "I am out of petrol" (Grice 51). Semantically (B)'s statement is incoherent with A's statement, and might thus be seen as irrelevant (although in this case it is immediately clear to most people that it is not). However, because (A) expects (B) to be cooperative, and thus the statement to be relevant, (A) interprets (B)'s statement as implying that the garage has petrol to sell. Implicature, then, relies on the observance of the cooperative principle.

Conversation

Sometimes, we all know how to make a conversation with others; though, few people can explain what is necessary to have a conversation going on wheels. Grice noticed that human language is a creative and flexible system that makes communication, but for the communication to be not only possible but also successful, it should have certain qualities. Paul Grice suggests that in ordinary conversation, speakers and hearers share a Cooperative Principle (hereafter: CP). The CP itself states as follows, "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". It implies that speakers need not supply information that speakers can assume that hearers already have.

Grice in his *Logic and Conversation* also analyzes cooperation as involving four maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Speakers give enough and not too much information to accord the maxim of quantity. They are genuine and sincere, speaking truth or facts to meet the maxim of quality. Utterances are relative to the context of the speech to fill the maxim of relation. Speakers try to present meaning clearly and briefly, avoiding ambiguity to satisfy the maxim of manner. His cooperative principle is based on the assumption that language users tacitly agree to cooperate by making their contributions to the talk as is required by the current stage of the talk or the direction into which it develops (21).

1. Implicature and Inference

An implicature is a type of speaker meaning that goes beyond what is literally said. More specifically, implicatures pertain to separate individual, additional thoughts with their own pragmatic force (Haugh 128-130, Jaszczolt 96). Inference, in contrast, refers to the cognitive processes by which participants figure out (speaker) meaning beyond what is said or encoded. While many scholars treat implicatures as essentially synonymous with non-logical/pragmatic inference, other scholars insist that assimilating implicature to inference constitutes a conceptual and analytical error.

If a speaker wants to do an FTA [face threatening act], and chooses to do it indirectly, he must give hearer some hints and hope that hearer picks up on them and thereby interprets what speaker really means (intends) to say. The basic way to do this is to invite conversational implicatures by violating, in some way, the Gricean Maxims of efficient communication.

To implicate is to say something with certain meanings. If hearer understands a speaker who has implicated principle, then hearer has made a certain inference. But hearer's inferring that speaker has implicated principle cannot be identified with speaker's implicating principle. That we often "invite" hearers to make certain inferences from what we say does not mean that hearers visit implicatures on us by accepting our invitation. To assume that speaker's implicature is somehow constituted by or dependent on

hearer's inference is to make the same mistake that was embodied in the cooperative presumption.

(1) A: Let's stop and get some money for groceries.

B: The bank was flooded yesterday, so it may not be open.

(2) A: Let's stop and have a picnic by the river.

B: The bank was flooded yesterday, so it may not be open.

Because the word bank is highly ambiguous, we cannot simply "decode" (B) utterance to figure out what (B) meant. The fact that (A) had just mentioned money is a good clue that (B) meant "commercial bank" rather than "riverbank" in (1). In (2), the fact that (A) had just mentioned the river is a good clue that (B) meant "riverbank." But neither of these clues in any way determines what (B) meant. In (1), (B) could have been referring to the riverbank. If he were, we would characterize his remark as irrelevant. If (B) engaged in such "non sequiturs" frequently, we would think there was something wrong with him. If we suspected he was deliberately trying to mislead us, we would probably be annoyed.

2. Conversational Implicature

In his article "Logic and Conversation" Grice (44) also coined and introduced a new term in pragmatics study, the verb *implicate* and the related nouns *implicature* (implying) and *implicatum* (what is implied). Grice stated that Grice deliberately chose the word "implicature" of his own coinage to cover any meaning that is implied, i.e., conveyed indirectly or through hints, and understood implicitly without ever being explicitly stated. Therefore, a conversational implicature is something which is implied in conversation, that is, something which is left implicit in actual language use (73). According to Griffiths (134) "conversational implicatures are inferences that depend on the existence of norms for the use of language, such as the wide spread agreement that communicators should aim to tell the truth". He mentions that it is for historical reason that conversational is part of the label. Implicatures arise as much in other speech genres and in

writing as they do in conversation, so they are often just called implicatures. Speakers, writers, addressees assume that everyone engaged in communication knows and accept the communicational norms. This general acceptance is an important starting point for inferences, even if individuals are sometimes unable to meet the standards or occasionally cheat (for instance, telling lies).

Laurence believes that implicature is a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said. What a speaker intends to communicate characteristically far richer than what s/he directly expresses; linguistic meaning radically underdetermines the message conveyed and understood (3).

Yule thought that implicature is an implicit meaning or additional conveyed meaning behind the utterance. In short, implicature is implicit meaning; what the speaker says is not what the speaker means, or what is said is not what is meant. The speaker more often means much more than the words they utter in order for them to be interpreted by the addressee. To interpret the additional meaning, we have to assume that the cooperative principle is in operation (35).

According to Thomas (58) an implicature is produced deliberately by the speaker and may (or may not) be comprehended by the hearer. We can see how this operates.

(3) Anne: We must remember your telephone bill

(hinting that Louisa had talked long enough)

Louisa: Goodbye

Based on the example above, the speaker actually means more than her words "We must remember your telephone bill", she is hinting or indicating indirectly that she wants to finish the telephone conversation.

3. Conventional Implicature

What you said by an utterance can, according to Grice, be understood 'to be closely related to the conventional meaning of the words (the sentence) he has uttered' (Grice 25).

As Gottlob Frege already wrote in his paper 'Der Gedanke' (Frege 19), Grice too

notices that the conventional meaning of an uttered sentence does from time to time both fall short and go beyond what is said. The first holds if the sentence contains, for instance, indexical and/or ambiguous expressions (e.g. 'He is in the grip of a vice'). For an identification of what is said one needs to fix the referents of these expressions, and to eliminate ambiguities. The latter holds if the uttered sentence contains conventional devices which signal that uttered – as Grice puts it – over and above some central speech act performed a further, non-central speech act (Grice 122). A first example is already given in Grice's paper 'The causal theory of perception'. If you utter the sentence:
(4) Sally is poor but she is honest.

She strictly speaking performs two speech acts: (i) you say that Sally is poor and that she is honest; (ii) additionally, you indicate that there is a contrast between poverty and honesty (or that somebody – perhaps she herself – thinks that this is so). According to Grice, it is decisive that the conventional device 'but' in (4) plays a part in figuring out what you meant, or – as Grice puts it – conventionally implicated. This very expression, however, plays no part in determining what you said by (4). In other words, the same is said in (4) and (5):

(5) Sally is poor and she is honest.

The reason for this is that the conventional implicature generated by 'but' (i.e. (ii)) contributes in no way to the truth conditions of the utterance. This becomes immediately obvious since the conventional implicature can be false without what is said being false (as regards the difference between implicatures and presuppositions. Grice terms these implicatures 'conventional' because they result from the conventional meaning of words like 'but' or 'therefore'. In order to see that by (4) it is meant that there is a contrast between (Sally's) poverty and honesty nothing more than knowledge of the linguistic conventions which rule the use of 'but' is needed (Grice 127).

The Cooperative Principle

The cooperative principle is the general principle, as Grice (45) states in the terms: ("Make our conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the

accepted purpose or direction of the exchange in which we engaged"). In interaction people expect that their interaction can run well, and do not occur misunderstanding. So, that is why to get smoothly communication the participation must obey the rules of cooperative principle. Normally information is given as required, truth, stay on topic, and clear. He also argues that in order for a person to interpret what someone else says, some kind of cooperative principle must be assumed to be in operation. Grice suggests that the maxims are in fact not arbitrary conventions, but rather describe rational means for conducting co-operative exchange (Levinson 103).

1. Maxims of Quantity

This maxim states that each participant's contribution to conversation must be no more or less instructive than required (Parker 5).

(6) A: Bill and Martha are leaving tomorrow.

B: I'll miss Martha (Attardo 23).

In this example, speaker B flouts the maxim of quantity (as his response only attends to part of the topic initiated by A). As a result, the deliberate omission can be said to imply that perhaps he is not so fond of Bill.

2. Maxim of Quality

"This maxim states that each participant's contribution should be truthful and based on sufficient evidence" (Parker 6).

6) Tom: I might win the lottery Jean: Yes, and pigs might fly (Attardo 24).

The obviousness of the untruth of Jean's reply gives our cognitive system a huge nudge. Jean is flouting the maxim of quality, so there must be something else going on, and so we start a hunt for likely inferences we can make. Here we quickly settle on the implication that Tom's chances of winning the lottery are about the same as pigs flying. Flouting the maxim of quality is the driving force in irony.

3. Maxim of Manner:

This maxim says that each participant's contribution must be expressed in a reasonable clear fashion (Parker 6).

7) A: Let's get the kids something.

B: OK but not I-C-E C-R-E-A-M [spelling it out](Attardo 537).

Speaker B is going out of their way to be a bit obscure, spelling out the words rather than simply saying them. B is utterly failing to cooperatively follow the maxim of clarity and conciseness. B is being so openly that A can infer that there must be a special reason for being so uncooperative: the likely inference, of course, is that B doesn't want the kids to complain that they're being denied a treat.

4. Maxim of Relevance

"This maxim states that each participant's contribution be relevant to the subject of the conversation" (Parker 6).

8) Jim: Where's the roast beef?

Mary: The dog looks happy (Attardo 26).

Any competent speaker knows that Mary means something like "For answer to your question, the beef has been eaten by the dog". Of course, she doesn't say that we work it out on the basis. First, that what she says is relevant to what she's been asked. If she is mentioning the dog, then the dog must be some kind of answer. This is perhaps the most utterly indispensable and foundational assumption we make about the talk we hear that it's relevant to what has immediately gone before.

Observing the Maxim

Observing the Maxims, Grice says that speakers intend to be cooperative when they talk. In this case the addresser is observing the maxims in a fairly direct way, he may nevertheless rely on the addressee to make his inferences on the assumption that the addresser is following the maxims of conversation. This means the addressees and the addressers assume that both of them follow the conversational maxims. The addressee expresses the addresser's statement on the basis of the CP. One way of being

cooperative is to give as much information as is expected speaker (Levinson 104).

9) Where are the keys?

They are on the table.

Non-observance of Maxims

Grice was well aware, however, that there are very many occasions when people fail to observe the maxims. There are five ways of failing to observe a maxim: namely:

1. Flouting a maxim
2. Infringing a maxim
3. Suspending a maxim
4. Violating a maxim
5. Opting out of a maxim

People may fail to observe a maxim because, for example, they are incapable of speaking clearly, or because they deliberately choose to lie. These possibilities are discussed in order, but the most important category by far, the one which generates an implicature (Thomas 64).

1. Flouting a Maxim

The speaker blatantly fails to follow a maxim in which he has no intention of deceiving or misleading. The speaker wishes to raise the hearer's attention to the implicit meaning which is different from, or in addition to, the expressed meaning. According to Grice, this additional meaning is called "Conversational implicature" and the way by which such implicature is generated is called "flouting a Maxim" (Grice 71).

10) Jim: How was your holiday?

Ben: Really great, flat tires and traffic accident really made my holiday.

From the example above, Ben's utterance flouts the maxim of quality. Ben starts by saying positive utterance "really great" and he added further information "flat tires and traffic accident really made my holiday" which is in contradiction with his first sentence. With this utterance Ben intentionally flouts the maxim and hoped that Jim as the hearer understands the

implicature of his utterance which is Ben actually did not have a great holiday.

2. Infringing a Maxim:

When the speaker has an imperfect knowledge or performance of language, the speaker here infringes the maxims like a young child or a learner of foreign language who has imperfect command of the language. Furthermore; nervousness, darkness, excitement may make impairment of the speaker's performance; in these cases she/he does the infringement (Thomas 74). Sometimes speaker infringes the maxims because she/he is incapable to speak clearly, she/he does not know the culture or he has not enough knowledge of language.

11) Waitress: Would you like to have tea or coffee?

Customer : yes

From the example above the customer does not follow the maxim of relevance. However, the customer does not follow the maxim intentionally probably because the customer is non-English speaker or does not have sufficient knowledge about the language.

3. Suspending a Maxim

Another type of non-observance of a maxim is suspending maxim, which happens when participants in a conversation are not expecting the maxims to be fully fulfilled, since the participants are withholding information that is to them culturally necessary. This would not be seen as uncooperative by other members of that community. Suspending a maxim does not generate an implicature to the members of the community in which this occurs (Thomas 76). An example of the suspending of a maxim can be seen in (12). In this example, the speaker is the daughter of a murdered man and she is talking to an officer of the Navajo Tribal police:

12) 'Last time you were with that FBI man – asking about the one who got killed,' she said, respecting the Navajo taboo of not speaking name of the dead. 'You found out who killed that man?' (Thomas 76).

In this case the woman is not observing the maxim of quantity, since she is speaking in vague words about the man who got killed, despite the fact that she knows him very well. This would create an implicature telling the interlocutor that she does not know the man who got killed, but since they follow the same traditions, which in this case mean not speaking the names of the dead, the people involved are aware that the maxim is being suspended, and therefore no implicature is created (Thomas 76-77).

4. Violating a Maxim

According to Grice the speaker violates a maxim when s/he will be liable to mislead the hearer to have such implicature (Grice 49). People in real life tend to tell lies for different reasons: hide the truth, save face, feel jealous, satisfying the hearer, cheer the hearer, and convincing the hearer. As stated by Grice, many people tend to tell untruth and break the maxims of Grice's cooperative principle when they communicate, they even do multiple violations for lying purposes (Grice 45).

13) Mary: You just stained my dress with red wine!

John: Nobody will notice.

From the example above, John violates the maxim of quantity by saying untrue information. However, John's utterances prevent or at least discourage Mary to find out about the truth or the implicature of his utterance which is that Mary's dress is ruined and everybody will notice that.

5. Opting out of a Maxim

When the speaker opts out from the maxim, s/he seems unwilling to cooperate in the way the maxim requires (Grice 71). Moreover, Thomas said that the "example of opting out occurs frequently in public life, when the speaker cannot, perhaps for legal or ethical reason, reply in the way normally expected. The speaker usually wishes to avoid generating a false implicature or appearing uncooperative". (Thomas 74) Thomas also stated that giving the requested information might hurt a third party or put them in danger.

14) Grace: How bad is his wound?
Doctor: I'm sorry. I can't tell you anything

From the example above, the doctor does not follow the maxim of quantity by not providing enough information to grace. The doctor opted out the maxim due to the procedures of the hospital or for the sake of secret information or something else.

The Analyses of the Interviews

In verbal communication people should use language communicatively, and to talk communicatively there should be cooperation in communication between the addressee and the addresser. That is why cooperativeness of conversations is crucial for maintaining mutual understanding among the participants. In order to be successful in communication there should be some norms that govern the communication. One of the norms that proposed by Grice is Cooperative Principle. In cooperative principle the speaker should put emphasis on four maxims namely maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner. In short, speaker should speak something true, relevant, informative, and clearly. Besides that Cooperative Principle depends not only on the amount of information, accuracy, way and relevance but also on the aspect of tolerance and cultural background of participants of the conversation.

1. Interview

An interview is simply a conversation where questions are asked and answers are given. In common phrasing, the word "interview" refers to a one-on-one conversation between an interviewer and an interviewee. There are mainly two purposes of doing interviews which are for assessment and for information.

2. Types of interview

There are many types of interviews which can be arranged. It depends on the aims of having the interview. Two important types of interviews are defined briefly below:

1. TV. Interview

Halbrooks believes that a TV interview can be as simple as asking questions of people on the street, or it can be as involved as a one-on-one, sit-down discussion with the president.
<https://www.thebalancecareers.com/tv-interview-tips-for-news-media-professionals-2315424>

2. Radio Interview

Radio is often considered the medium which fits most comfortably with academic discussion. A radio interview generally offers a wider scope to discuss your field than a TV interview. Radio interviews can either take place in the studio or over the phone.

<https://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/external/news/dealing/talk/radio>

3. Analyses of Political Interviews

Interview One

The data of the research is transcript of Barack Obama's interview. The interviewer is Robin Robert, a news presenter of ABC News' "Good Morning America," He interviewed Barack Obama related to the issue of same-sex marriage. The interview was in the Cabinet Room of the White House, May 9, 2012.

Analysis

(15) ROBIN ROBERTS: I'm sure it is. One of the hot button issues because of things that have been said by members of your administration, same-sex marriage. In fact, your press secretary yesterday said he would leave it to you to discuss your personal views on that. So Mr. President, are you still opposed to same-sex marriage?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Well-- you know, I have to tell you, as I've said, i have been going through an evolution on this issue. I've always been adamant that-- gay and lesbian-- Americans should be treated fairly and equally. And that's why in addition to everything we've done in this administration, rolling back Don't Ask, Don't Tell-- so that-- you know, outstanding Americans can serve our country.

Whether it's no longer defending the Defense against Marriage Act, which-- tried to federalize-- what is historically been state law.

At a certain point, I've just concluded that-- for me personally, it is important for me to go ahead and affirm that-- I think same-sex couples should be able to get married. Now-- I have to tell you that part of my hesitation on this has also been I didn't want to nationalize the issue. There's a tendency when I weigh in to think suddenly it becomes political and it becomes polarized.

From the dialogue above, the researchers found that Obama flouted maxim of quantity, and maxim of manner because his answer is too much and prolixity. Based on his explanation in the interview, actually he supported to legalize same-sex marriage but because this issue still being controversial, he gave prolix response for hiding his exact opinion.

(16) ROBIN ROBERTS: So if you were the governor of New York or legislator in North Carolina, you would not be opposed? You would vote for legalizing same-sex marriage?
PRESIDENT OBAMA: I would. And-- that's-- part of the-- evolution that I went through. I-- asked myself-- right after that New York vote took place, if I had been a state senator, which I was for a time-- how would I have voted? And I had to admit to myself, "You know what? I think that-- I would have voted yes." It would have been hard for me, knowing-- all the friends and family-- that-- are gays or lesbians, that for me to say to them, you know, "I voted to oppose you having-- the same kind of rights-- and responsibilities-- that I have."

From (16), the researchers can measure the flouting of cooperative principle. The interviewee flouted maxim of manner because his statements is prolixity. He did not express his opinion briefly. Besides that he also flouted maxim of quantity because he gave too much answer.

(17) ROBIN ROBERTS: You're not going to leave Mrs. Obama on Air Force One again, on Mother's Day or anything like that?

PRESIDENT OBAMA: Did you see that?
ROBIN ROBERTS: Yeah, I kind of did. It--
PRESIDENT OBAMA: Oh, it was embarrassing.

In example (17), one can notice that Obama flouted maxim of relation because his information is prolixity and not relevant because the implicature occurred in these dialogues.

(<http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2012/may/11/barack-obama/president-barack-obamas-shift-gay-marriage/> accessed 1/5/ 2018).

Interview Two

The data of the second political interview is a transcript of Donald Trump's interview. The interviewer is Margaret Brennan, a news presenter of CBS NEWS' "Face the nation," He interviewed Donald Trump in relation to the issue of global threats. The interview was in White House, February 3, 2019.

Analysis

(18) MARGARET BRENNAN: Would you shut down the government again?

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Well, we're going to have to see what happens on February 15th

In this dialogue, Brennan wants Trump to answer the question with "yes" or "no" but he doesn't like to answer the question and to be cooperative; therefore, this kind of answer is a clear violation of maxim of relevance.

(19) MARGARET BRENNAN: She offered you over a billion dollars for border security.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Excuse me?
MARGARET BRENNAN: She offered over a billion dollars for border security. She doesn't want the wall.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: She's- she's costing the country hundreds of billions of dollars because what's happening is when you have a porous border, and when you have drugs pouring in, and when you have people dying all over the country because of people like Nancy Pelosi who don't want to give proper border security for political reasons, she's doing a terrible disservice to our country. And on the

15th we have now set the table beautifully because everybody knows what's going on because of the shutdown. People that didn't have any idea- they didn't have a clue as to what was happening, they now know exactly what's happening. They see human trafficking. They see drugs and gangs and criminals pouring in. Now, we catch them because we're doing a great job. But if we had proper border security we wouldn't have to work so hard and we could do an even better job, and I think Nancy Pelosi is doing a terrible disservice to the people of our country. But she can—

In example (19), Trump's answers to Brennan's questions violate both maxim of the quantity and relation. He violates the maxim of quantity since he provided more information than was required to answer the question. In addition, his verbose answer to the question also breaks the relevant maxim because he gave some information as response to Brennan's question which does not include the information about the amount of money Nancy Pelosi offered for border security.

(20) MARGARET BRENNAN: But you- but you also campaigned saying that, you know, President Obama made a big mistake by telegraphing his military moves. You're telegraphing your retreat.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I'm not telegraphing anything. No, no, no. There's a difference. When President Obama pulled out of Iraq in theory we had Iraq. In other words, we had Iraq. We never had Syria because President Obama never wanted to violate the red line in the sand. So we never had Syria. I was the one that actually violated the red line when I hit Syria with 59 Tomahawk missiles, if you remember. But President Obama chose not to do that. When he chose not to do that, he showed tremendous weakness. But we didn't have Syria whereas we had Iraq. So when he did what he did in Iraq, which was a mistake. Being in Iraq was a mistake. Okay. Being in Iraq- it was a big mistake to go- one of the greatest mistakes going into the Middle East that our country has ever made. One of the greatest mistakes that we've ever made—

In this example, one can make out through the conversation that maxim of quality and quantity are not fulfilled since Trump gives more

information than required (violation of quality maxim) to avoid telling the truth (violation of quality maxim).

(21)MARGARET BRENNAN: Cause you have an acting AG until you get Barr confirmed--

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Yes.

MARGARET BRENNAN: An acting defense secretary. An acting chief of staff. An acting interior secretary.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP. It's OK. It's easier to make moves when they're acting.

MARGARET BRENNAN: So you are going to shake up--

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Some, and some not.

Trump violates the quantity maxim in (21) because he provides less information than required by answering with only 'yes', meanwhile the interviewer's question needs more detail. One can also notice the violation of manner maxim due to Trump's obscure and ambiguous information of (some, and some not).

(22) MARGARET BRENNAN: What surprised you about some of the questions that Robert Mueller asked you?

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Well, look the Russia thing is a hoax. I have been tougher on Russia than any president, maybe ever. But than any president.

Here this dialogue, Trump may not say anything clearly related to the question but invite the hearer to seek for an explanation of possible relevance. He should have provided answer which was clear enough to be understood by the interviewer; therefore, his answer appears to be unconnected, insincere, and irrelevant.

(23) MARGARET BRENNAN: Would you make the Mueller report public because you say there's nothing in there? Congress can subpoena it anyway, though.

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Totally up to to the Attorney General.

MARGARET BRENNAN: But what do you want them to do?

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Even the Mueller report said it had nothing to do with the campaign. When you look at some of the people and the events it had nothing to do--

MARGARET BRENNAN: You wouldn't have a problem--

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Excuse me.

MARGARET BRENNAN: --if it became public?

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: Excuse me. That's up to the attorney general. I don't know. It depends. I have no idea what it's going to say.

In (23), Trump is blatantly giving less information than is required by answering the questions so briefly and addressing the problem to the Attorney General (quantity violation) and He also fails to observe maxim of quality by using expressions such as 'it depends' , 'I have no idea" and 'excuse me' just to avoid being cooperative and telling the truth.

(24)MARGARET BRENNAN: North Korea. When and where are you going to meet Kim Jong Un?

PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP: I won't tell you yet, but you'll be finding out probably State of the Union or shortly before. But the meeting is set. He's looking forward to it. I'm looking forward to it. We've made tremendous progress. If you remember, before I became president, it looked like we were going to war with North Korea. Now we have a very good relationship. The hostages are back. Okay, the remains are starting to come back. The remains of our Korean War veterans—

In the above example, the president's answer seems to be uncooperative because he doesn't like to answer the questions of (when and where) clearly, instead, he also violates the maxim of quantity by giving verbose and wordy response to a question which can be answered clearly and in a few words .

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/transcript-president-trump-on-face-the-nation-february-3-2019/>

4. Analyses of Art Interviews

Interview One

The data of the research is transcript of Lady Gaga's interview. The interviewer is Stephen Fry, a news presenter of financial time. He interviewed Lady Gaga related to the works. MAY 28, 2011.

Analysis

(25)Stephen Fry: And these rumors that . . . you said you don't care about the money, and it's pretty clear to people because you plough it back into the show and you will actually change the show as it's going around, so the last one, Monster Ball, as it went round the world, it was changing . . .

Lady Gaga: It went from a theatre tour to an arena tour. The only big things I've purchased are my dad's heart valve and a Rolls Royce for my parents, for their anniversary. And that was only because my dad had a Lady Gaga license plate on our old car and it was making me crazy because he was getting followed everywhere, so I bought him a new car. Other than that, I put everything in the show and I actually went bankrupt after the first extension of the Monster Ball.

In this example; regarding Grice's model. Lady Gaga violates the maxim of relation, since the interviewer asked about that she didn't care about money, she answered him with unrelated answer she talked about her fathers. She violates Grice's maxim of quality, because she says something that is not true and doesn't give the right information.

(26) Stephen Fry: It's about being reborn, is it?

Lady Gaga: In fact, sexuality is just one very small part of it and I think it's so interesting to see the way people latch on to words. You say the word gay in a song and suddenly all the other words float away and the focus goes in just on one word. I'm happy that everyone focused on that word, though. It's an important word to liberate. But the album is about rebirth in every sense. It's about being able to be reborn over and over again until you find the identity inside of yourself that defines you best for who you are, that makes you feel the most like a champion of life.

In this example, Lady Gaga violates the maxim of quantity, since she gives more information than is required; when the interviewer asked "It's about being reborn, is it? " she answered with long paragraph which interviewer does not need these information, they're unnecessary information; so we can also say that she violates the maxim of manner because she is not brief in her reply to the interviewer and she provided unnecessary information.

(27) Stephen Fry: Yes, it isn't the most natural connection until you realize the obvious thing about Michael Bolton, which is he does have a voice of the most extraordinary warmth.

Lady Gaga: Unbelievable. I also sing about artifice and the surreal and magic. That's exactly what my new album is trying to combat and liberate at the same time, is the idea that I live halfway between reality and fantasy at all times because I choose to, and anyone can choose that, and I believe everybody has something so magical about them and why, as a society, are we so afraid of magic? Why is magic synonymous with artifice?

Why is the fantastic synonymous with a lie? If art is a lie, then I will tell that lie every day until its fucking true.

The interviewer speaks about Michael Bolton. But in her reply, Lady Gaga violates the maxim of quality because she does not give the right information when she answers him; she breaks the maxim of relation since she speaks about her music style which does not relate to the conversation.

Interview Two

The following transcript is of Brad Pitt's interview. The interviewer is Larry King, a presenter of CNN on his programme (Larry King Live). He interviewed Brad Pitt related to his works. 4/12/2018

Analysis

(28) Larry King: We now welcome to "Larry King Live," from New Orleans. You were here a year ago. It's good to have you back. But I must ask, Brad, what's the moustache for?

Brad Pitt: It's political, Larry. It's political

In this example, Pitt's answer doesn't relate directly to King's question so it is a clear violation of relevant maxim. In addition, he breaks manner maxim when he doesn't speak obviously about the purpose behind wearing moustache and by using the word 'political', Pitt wants to say that he doesn't like to talk about it.

(29) King: Do you ever feel outnumbered?

Pitt: They're getting heavy

In (29), the answer that Pitt gives in answer to King's question isn't really an answer to the question on a surface level. Therefore, it is a non-cooperative response (violation of relevant

maxim). He also fails to observe quantity maxim by being less informative than is required.

(30) King: By the way, is New Orleans now your home?

Pitt: Well, it's -- we call it a base camp. You know, as you know, we're ...

The breaking of manner maxim can be seen in this example where Pitt violates the maxim by responding with a statement that is ambiguous and rather than giving an answer with yes or no.

(31) King: Wow. I applaud you and everyone associated with it. It's a great, great movie.

Do you think -- do you think having kids -- as you have so many -- keeps you young?

Pitt: Thank you, Larry.

Pitt's failure to answer the second question (do you think having kids keeps you young) can be interpreted as a clear violation of relevant maxim hence, Pitt's answer in (31) is a response of King's applauding to Pitt's movie.

(32) King: People don't mob after you there.

Pitt: No. They've got their own thing going, man. They've got their own thing going here.

In this example, Pitt breaks quality maxim when he doesn't want to tell the truth about people mobbing by saying that people don't gather around him because of his celebrity but they are here and there since they have their own business.

<http://edition.cnn.com/2008/SHOWBIZ/Movies/12/03/pitt.king/>

Conclusions

This study has applied Grice's Cooperative Principles to two English TV interviews. One is political TV interviews which includes Barack Obama's and Donald Trump's TV interview. The other one is artistic interviews which features Lady Gaga's and Brad Pitt's TV interview. After analyzing the interviews, the researchers realized that the interviewees sometimes follow the Grice's four maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner, but they often violate them for different purposes. In the analysis of the political interviews, the researchers noticed that Grice's CPs were more adopted in Obama's interview than Trump's. Maxim of quality and quantity were further fulfilled in the responses of Obama than of Trump's, meanwhile, maxim of manner and relation were correspondingly violated in their

responses. In the study of the artistic interviews, the researchers led to the conclusion that maxim of quantity and quality were more adopted in Brad Pitt's interview than Lady Gaga's. In contrast, maxim of manner and relation were further followed in Lady Gagas' responses. In the analysis of both types, Grice's CPs were more adopted in artistic interviews compared to political interviews, among these maxims, maxims of quantity and manner were generally violated in political interviews since they have secret agenda and they don't want to answer every question sufficiently and clearly while maxims of quality and relation were rather followed in artistic interviews.

References

1. Attardo, S. Linguistic Theories of Humor. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994.
2. Attardo, S. Violation of Conversational Maxims and Cooperation: the case of jokes. Journal of Pragmatics, 1993.
3. Crystal, David. Language and the Internet, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2001.
4. Frege, G . 'Thoughts' in Logical Investigations. Oxford: Blackwell, 1977.
5. Frege, G. Der Gedanke. Eine logische Untersuchung. Beitrgezur Philosophie des deutschen Idealismus. Reprinted in English translation (1918/19).
6. Grice H, P. Logic and conversation, Syntax and semantics. New York: Academic Press 1975.
7. Grice, H. P. Logic and Conversation. Syntax and Semantics vol. 3: Speech Acts, ed. By P. Cole & J. L. Morgan, 41-58. New York: Academic Press, 1975.
8. Grice, H. P. Studies in the Way of Words (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.
9. Grice, H. P. The causal theory of perception. Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society 35 (suppl.) 1961.
10. Grice, H.P. Studies in the Way of Words. London: Harvard University Press, 1975.
11. Griffiths, Patrick. An Introduction to English Semantic and Pragmatics. Edinburgh: Edinburg University Press Ltd. 2006
12. Haugh, Michael. Conversational interaction. In The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics, eds. Keith Allan and Kasia M Jaszczolt Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2012.
13. Haugh, Michael. The intuitive basis of implicature: relevance theoretic implicitness versus Gricean implying. Pragmatics 12:117-134. 2002.
14. Horn, Laurence. Implying and inferring. In The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics, eds. Keith Allan and Kasia M Jaszczolt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
15. Levinson, Stephen. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983.
16. Parker. Frank. Linguistic for non-Linguists, printed in the United States of America. Copyright Pearson Education , Reprinted 2012.
17. Thomas, J. Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. London: Longman. 1995.

Internet Sources

1. <https://www.thebalancecareers.com/tv-interview-tips-for-news-media-professionals-2315424>
 2. <https://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/external/news/dealing/talk/radio>
 3. (<http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2012/may/11/barack-obama/president-barack-obamas-shift-gay-marriage> accessed. 1/5/ 2018).
 4. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/transcript-president-trump-on-face-the-nation-february-3-2019/>
 5. <https://www.ft.com/content/aa5b5ec4-86c8-11e0-9d41-00144feabdc0>
- <http://edition.cnn.com/2008/SHOWBIZ>

