PRAGMATICS: GRICE'S CONVERSATIONAL MAXIMS VIOLATIONS IN THE RESPONSES OF SOME WESTERN POLITICIANS

Asst.Prof.   **Asst.Lect.**
Hamid M.Al-Hamadi(Ph.D.)   Behija J.Muhammed(M.A.)
University of Basra - College of Arts

ABSTRACT

   This paper accounts for the application of Grice's four maxims of conversational implicatures to some political interviews randomly chosen , to serve as objective material of this work. The study is an attempt to find out how much the maxims of quantity , quality , relevance and manner are followed throughout the responses of the politicians con- cerned. Cases of violation are given considerable importance in this paper especially the violation of the maxim of quality which is considered the core of truthfulness of any conver- sation.

   The researchers have used statistics and , to some extent , percentages just to show to what extent the above maxims are violated , especially the maxim of quality. The results have proved the correctness of the hypothesis of this work which states that when the maxim of quality is violated , all other maxims are difficult to adhere to.

1. Introduction:

   Grice's theory of conversational implicatures is considered as one of the basic and most interesting theories in the history of pragmatics (Levinson 97; Davies ; Soames)[•]. It sets forward the mechanism that

---

[•]MLA style-2009 has been adopted for in-text citation and references.

language users should follow in order to understand each other in so many instances when meanings and intentions are not explicitly conveyed (Terkourafi).

What this paper accounts for is to apply Grice's four maxims of conversation (quantity, quality, relevance, and manner) to some political interviews made and shown on TV. Samples of such interviews are randomly chosen by the researchers to serve as objective material for this paper. In these samples of interviews, different famous western politicians respond to different questions addressed by TV programme presenters and sometimes by the audience.

The material has been collected from certain websites which are accessible to millions of internet users. The reasons behind choosing such interviews are twofold. First, they can be attributed to the fact that they serve as authentic material where one can best apply Grice's maxims of conversation (Yule 42). Second, interviews with famous political figures are selected because this study is primarily oriented to examine whether or not such political interactions coincide with Grice's maxims and how implicatures might be drawn to sustain the co-operative principle
(henceforth: CP).

It is important to note, here, that this research paper is to judge who follows these maxims and who does not; it is mainly looked upon in terms of surveying Grice's theory of conversational implicature in the light of those interviews. The study is an attempt to find out how much information (quantity) , truthfulness (quality) , relatedness to the current situation (relevance) , and brevity and clarity (manner) are given throughout the responses of those politicians. The emphasis , laid down here , is on cases of violation of Grice's maxims , especially the maxim of quality , as "when the *quality* maxim is violated , complete adherence to the other maxims is difficult" (Grice 45).

2.Gricean Theory of Conversational Implicature : A Theoretical Background

In the Gricean scheme, utterances make sense no matter whether there are missing or incomplete elements. Interlocutors are able to derive meanings from what is unsaid (implicated) depending on drawing related inferences to the particular utterance. What is implicated is made reasonable by what Grice calls implicatures or conversational implicatures (45). Meaning is inferred from the use of some utterance in context. Grice's theory of implicature is concerned with the ways in which meaning can be communicated not only by what is said, but also by how it is said (Levinson 97). Grice wants to show the inferential paths that lead interlocutors from what is said to what is meant. Its guiding principle is that *" constrains on the use of utterances and the information conveyed by them arise not only from the semantically encoded meaning , but also from the communicative uses to which they are put"* (Soames).

According to the Gricean theory, there are four basic guidelines (maxims) , called the maxims of conversation which model theefficient and effective use of language. These maxims are as follows (Levinson 101- 02; Akmajian et al. 382): maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner. These maxims are said to have a certain significance for logic and semantics, since they extend the principles of deduction and inference (Levinson 101), i.e., they allow conversants to infer from what is said in an utterance when meaning is not directly conveyed. Yule (37) considers "these maxims as unstated assumptions" in conversations. The norms set up here are built upon Grice's analogies which "*are relevant to what he regards as a fundamental question about the CP and its attendant maxims*" (Grice 47).
Grice regards them as universal principles although some researchers , like Abdul-Wahid (278-80) , in his treatment of Arabic , regards them as culture bound ,especially the maxims of quantity and relevance.
 They are as follows (Levinson 101- 02; Akmajian et al. 382):

Maxim of Quantity

Super- maxim: Be informative.

Sub-maxims: 1. Make your contribution as informative as required (for the current purposes of the conversation).

   2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

Maxim of Quality

Super-maxim: Be truthful.

Sub-maxims: 1. Do not say what you believe to be false.

            2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Maxim of Relevance: Be relevant.

Maxim of Manner:

Super- maxim: Be perspicuous.

Sub-maxims: 1. Avoid obscurity of expression.

            2. Avoid unnecessary ambiguity.

            3. Be brief.

            4. Be orderly.

   Grice's conversational maxims jointly express a cooperative principle (Grice 45)*"Make your conversational contribution such as required at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk of exchange in which you are engaged ".*

   Grice proposes these maxims to define conversational implicatures which are the overriding goal of his theory. He (49)suggests,

 A man who, by saying that p has implicated q, may be said
to have conversationally implicated that q, provided that (1) he
 is presumed to be observing the conversational maxims, or at
 least the Cooperative Principle; (2) the supposition that he is
 aware that, or thinks that, q is required in order to make his
saying or making as if to say p, consistent with this presumption;
 and (3) the speaker thinks (and would expect the hearer to think
 that the speaker thinks) that it is within the competence of the
 hearer to work out, or grasp intuitively, that the supposition
             mentioned in (2) is required .

According to Grice (50) , the inference mechanism works as follows:

He has said that p; there is no reason to suppose that he is not
observing the maxims, or at least the Cooperative Principle;
he could not be doing this unless he thought that q; he knows
(and knows that I know that he knows) that I can see that the
supposition that he thinks that q is required; he has done nothing
to stop me from thinking that q; he intends me to think, or is at least
willing to allow me to think, that q; and so he has implicated that q.

To realize that a conversational implicature exists, the addressee depends on the following factors:
1) The conventional meaning of the utterance, as well as any reference that may be used.
2) The CP and its maxims.
3) The context, whether linguistic or otherwise.
4) Background knowledge.
5) The fact that all relevant elements mentioned above are available to both interlocutors (50) .

In order that a proposition q to be considered "conversationally implicated", Soames maintains that
the conclusion -- that the speaker believes or accepts q,
and is inviting his hearers to do the same – must, in
principle, be derivable by an argument of the specified
type from information available to speaker-hearers
about the meaning of the sentence uttered,
the context of utterance, the conversational maxims,
and other background information in the context.

The implicatures interlocutors draw are of two types , according to the speaker's relation to the maxims (Levinson 104). They can either be drawn by observing the maxims or violating them (see Section 3 below). Directly observing the maxims, the speaker may depend upon the hearer to infer what is said by making propositions

assuming that the maxims are being followed. But in the case of violating certain maxims, the speaker obliges the hearer to draw more inferences and if the speaker can be assumed to imply these inferences, then the CP is still operative (Levinson 109; Verschueren 33). For instance, if the speaker's remark seems irrelevant, the hearer will attempt to create a string of inferences that make it relevant or at least cooperative. In this regard, Yule (40) draws the attention to the importance of noting that *" it is speakers who communicate meaning via implicatures and it is listeners who recognize those communicated meanings via inferences."* Thus, the inference made will assume cooperation.

3. Violating Grice's Maxims

Adherence to the cooperative principle and its correlative maxims is a reasonably rational behaviour since it benefits the participants and reflects their communicative competence (Grice 48-49; Verschueren 35). Despite Grice's claims of ideal exchange, once the rules (maxims) he prescribes for conversants are followed and abided by, he suggests that there are cases when these rules may be violated. Grice is very much aware that participants may not necessarily act in keeping his maxims, but, at the same time, argues that any exchange will operate even if these maxims are being violated emphasizing that the maxims enrich coherence and relevance rather than refuting them (Levinson 106). Clearly enough, violating any maxim does not indicate a breakdown of interaction (Levinson 109; Talib). To put it differently, interlocutors try to understand contributions to violated maxims as informative, truthful, relevant, and clear. Once these contributions are broken, interlocutors try to interpret , induce, or search for inferences or conversational implicatures (Leech 12).

Sometimes, the speaker confronts a situation where s/he has to choose between two or more meanings to arrive at a clear interpretation of the message conveyed. In such a case , Grice (49) suggests that , the hearer assumes that the speaker is cooperating and intends the hearer to infer. The speaker's intentions can be determined by the four types of violation of the four maxims. The first violation is

when the speaker is "unostentatiously" and "quietly" subverting the maxim, as it happens in telling lies (violating the maxim of quality). Second, s/he is overtly opting out of a maxim, as in (1) below where B's reply indicates that s/he openly

admits that s/he cannot give the required answer because it is top secret.

1) A: So, how's the search for the new principal and vice-president going? Do you have a short list yet?

   B: I can't tell you anything about it; the proceedings of the committee are confidential.

Third, the speaker is coping with a clash between maxims. To exemplify,

 2) S) Where does C live?

    R) Somewhere in the south of France.

It seems that R's reply does not meet the requirement of S's question.

   Grice (51) argues that if R tries to observe one of the sub-maxims of quantity, to say where C lives, s/he will violate another maxim which is the quality maxim; i.e. R will say what s/he does not know, thereby giving false information. R implicates that s/he does not know exactly where C lives. The clash, here, is between quantity and quality.

     Finally, the speaker may flout the maxim in order to exploit it. In this case, violating the maxim is noticeable to the hearer. For instance, A is writing a letter of recommendation for a student who is a candidate for a philosophy job, and his letter reads as follows:

3) "Dear Sir, Mr. X's command of English is excellent, and his attendance in class has been regular. Yours, truly."

First of all, there is no reason to assume that A is not cooperating , because if he were, he wouldn't have written the letter. On the assumption that he is being cooperative, he would surely give a positive evaluation if he had one to give. Further, A knows that he has to give the required information. There must be a reason he hasn't put

in the letter. Normally, people show reluctance to provide negative assessment, especially in writing. Eventually, his evaluation can be negative. A implicates that his student is no good at philosophy, and he simply doesn't want to explicitly state that (Grice 33, cited in Soames).

Talib argues that *"a breakdown of communication may not occur even if the listener perceives that the speaker has not been very cooperative with regard to a particular utterance, as the listener may have the opportunity to ask for confirmation or elaboration, …"* Being so, the hearer (especially a competent one) can manage to repair any violated communicative fracture already been made.

The following is a survey of the four maxims and the implicatures that are constructed in both cases: observing and breaking the maxims, with examples.

A. Quantity

This maxim is related to the way conversants try to make their contributions as informative as they possibly can, giving sufficient information , no more no less (Leech 11; Levinson 106). It has two dimensions. The first is concerned with providing full information as required, and the second is neither to be more nor less informative. When this maxim is being observed , its effect arises when an additional inference to the utterance is made to make the stated meaning stronger, or most informative within the context of a particular situation (Levinson 106). Considering B's reply in (11) below, one can infer that (Harry only got a fine):

   4) A: How did Harry fare in court the other day?
       B: Oh , he got a fine.
But, if it happens that Harry has got another sentence, e.g. a jail sentence, then B is not providing the full information required, if he already knew this. The addition of (only) to the implicature strengthens the infromativeness of the implicature of the proposition expressed (Levinson 109).

The second dimension of the maxim of quantity is concerned with the way that one tries to make her/ his contribution no more than is needed, otherwise the speaker violates this maxim.

   5) A: How are you today?

      B: Well, my car is not working too good right now and to tell the truth, I don't have very much money. In fact, I don't know how I'm going to pay my bills this month .

The other way of drawing implicatures, that is breaking the maxim of quantity, is made clear in the following conversation (Yule 40):

   6) Charlene: I hope you brought the bread and the cheese.

      Dexter: Ah, I brought the bread.

Upon listening to Dexter's statement, Charlene infers that Dexter has not brought the cheese, because he does not mention it . Has he brought the cheese, he would mention so. Dexter, in this case, wants Charlene to infer that what is not mentioned is not brought.

   The case of flouting the maxim of quantity can be found in tautologies, and emphasis imposed upon them blatantly violates this maxim. The example in (7) that follows might implicate that "it's no concern of ours" for an informative implicature has to be drawn assuming that the speaker is cooperative (Levinson 111).

   7) If he does it, he does it.

B: Quality

   The maxim of quality, according to the Gricean theory, states that conversants try to make their contribution one that is true. It includes two sub-maxims, as referred to above. Both are related to what is stated (said) explicitly. Being one of the four maxims of conversation, this maxim may be observed or violated. The implicature in (8a) arises directly from the assumption that the maxim is being observed by the speaker (adopted from Levinson 105):

   8) John has two Ph.D.s.
        a.   I believe he has, and have adequate evidence that he has.
        b.   John has two Ph.D.s but I don't believe he does.

(9)

Since the overriding goal of the Quality maxim is to make sure that the speaker communicates only what s/he believes to be true, the inference in (8a) clearly meets the standard Quality rule (say what you believe to be true and of which you have adequate evidence) , which contradicts (8b) where what is implicated is not asserted. Quite often, Levinson (105- 06) comments,

in co-operative circumstances, when one asserts
something one implicates that one believes it, when
one asks a question one implicates that one sincerely
desires an answer and, by extension, when one
promises to do x, one implicates that one sincerely
intends to do x, and so on.

He adds that once such utterances are used otherwise, it is likely that there will be a violation of the maxim of quality.

Certain cases of covertly flouting the maxim of Quality (and other maxims) include jokes, fictions, metaphors and ironies (Levinson 109; Wilson). The speaker in each case says what s/he does not literally believe. With regards to lies, the conversant "deceptively" commits herself/ himself to the truth of the proposition expressed; whereas with jokes, fictions, metaphors and ironies, s/he does not. To exemplify, the following two examples illustrate two uses of two figures of speech, namely metaphor and irony , respectively.

9) The leaves danced in the breeze.
10) John Major spoke in his usual forceful fashion.

The speaker in the above two examples does not commit herself /himself to the truth of the propositions stated. Taking Grice's analysis of such cases into consideration , Wilson looks upon these two utterances as deliberate and blatant violations of the maxim of Quality. Faced with such violations, the addressee is meant to search for certain related inferences that the speaker might have intended to convey, and thereby keep the CP sustained. Definitely, different violations result in different implicatures. Thus, (9) could implicate (11), and (10) could implicate (12) (adopted from Wilson) .

11) The leaves moved in the breeze as if they were dancing. (Simile)
12) John Major spoke in his usual unforceful fashion. (Irony)

C: Relevance

A great number of conversational implicatures can be generated by this maxim which accounts for the way interlocutors make relevant contributions to a particular exchange (Levinson 107). For instance:

13) A: Can you tell me the time?
    B: Well, the milkman has come.

Considering (13) above, particularly B's utterance, one can realize that it is not providing a complete answer that A requires; it gives a partial answer. This is arrived at only if one assumes that B's reply is relevant to A's question. The implicature operates as follows - on the assumption of the relevance of B's reply, A's question requires B to give an answer. There is only one way by which one can judge that B is observing the maxim of Relevance and the CP in accordance with the current exchange, and that B is not providing the full information that A expects, but believes that the coming of the milkman can help A to arrive at a partial answer. Therefore, A may implicate that B intends to communicate the time which is "at least after whenever the milkman normally calls" (107). Levinson points out that the way this inference and similar ones are made is important in the coherence of discourse because without such assumptions of relevance, many utterances would be considered irrelevant.

If a speaker intends to be as cooperative as possible, the maxim of Relevance seems to be the most difficult to violate (Talib). Levinson (111) supports this claim by asserting Grice's notion that it is hard to find cases where this maxim is flouted simply because it is difficult to interpret utterances as irrelevant. Nevertheless, the following example, Levinson cites , is a case of violating the maxim of Relevance.

14) A: I do think Mrs. Jenkins is an old windbag, don't you?
    B: Huh, lovely weather for March, isn't it?

Speaking about something irrelevant to A's utterance, B may implicate that " hey, watch out, her nephew is standing right behind you" (Talib) ; he is trying to draw A's attention not to proceed his comments on Mrs. Jenkins.

D: Manner

The last maxim indicates that one's contribution should be clear, direct, orderly and to the point. The speaker should avoid using vague or ambiguous utterances when speaking. Levinson (108) thinks that the most important of the sub-maxims of manner is the one that states that participants "be orderly". Grice (47) states :"*I expect a partner to make it clear what contribution he is making, and to execute his performance with reasonable dispatch.*"

To show how this maxim might be violated, (15) and (16) below illustrate further how the sub-maxim of manner (be brief) is crucial for understanding the difference between the two utterances.

15) Miss Singer produced a series of sounds corresponding closely to the score of an aria from Rigoletto.

16) Miss Singer sang an aria from Rigoletto (Levinson 112). Examining the content of both sentences, one can see that it is more or less the same. The latter expresses it in a direct way. While interpreting the former , the hearer might wonder why the speaker expresses so simple matter in such a complicated way. It is likely that the speaker has certain reasons for avoiding the use of the verb (sing). Stressing singing isn't what Miss Singer is doing. This implies Miss Singer is a bad singer.

4. Application: Politicians Violations of the CP

The norms set up , here , are built upon Grice's analogies which "*are relevant to what he regards as a fundamental question about the CP and its attendant maxims*" (Grice 47). They are as follows:

1. Maxim of Quantity violation characteristics:
  a. Longer than normal.
  b. Briefer than normal.
2. Maxim of quality violation characteristics:
  a. Briefer than usual
  b. Less relevant
  c. Less direct
  d. More vague than usual.
3. Maxim of Relevance violation characteristics:

a. Less relevant
b. Less direct (going round the bush).
c. Having no relation to the context.

4. Maxim of manner violation characteristics:
a. More vague/ obscure.
b. Less clear than in normal style.

Table - 1   Politician A Responses

R e	Maxim of Quantity		Maxim of Quality		Maxim of Relevance		Maxim of Manner	
	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation
1.		+	+		+		+	
2.		+		+		+		+
3.		+		+		+		+
4.		+		+		+	+	
5.		+		+	+			+
6.		+		+	+			+
7.		+	+		+		+	
8.		+		+	+			+
9.		+	+		+		+	
10		+	+		+			+
	0	10	4	6	7	3	4	6

To start with , items (1) through (10) reveal clear violations of the maxim of quantity. These violations occur when less or more contributions are made. In this sample interview, most cases of the violation of the quantity maxim are due to over-informativeness on the part of the addressee ; that is, the contributions made are more than required.

Cases of the violation of the maxim of quality are detected in six items: (2) , (3) , (4) , (5) , (6) , and (8) where the addressee breaks this maxim. These cases seem to state untruthful replies.

The responses in items (2) , (3) , and (4) are not relevant to the questions asked.

As far as the maxim of manner is concerned, it is found that cases of violation occur in (2) , (3) , (5) , (6) , (8) , and (10) where the addressee does not provide clear and direct replies, despite the fact that the questioner keeps on confirming that the replies are not the

(13)

required ones. They are not straightforward in relation to the addressee's reply.

Table – 2   Politician B Responses

Respon se	Maxim of Quantity		Maxim of Quality		Maxim of Relevance		Maxim of Manner	
	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation
1		+		+		+	+	
2		+	+		+		+	
3		+		+	+		+	
4		+		+		+		+
5		+		+	+		+	
6		+		+	+		+	
7	+		+		+		+	
8		+	+		+			+
9	+			+	+		+	
10	+		+		+			+
	3	7	4	6	8	2	7	3

There are a lot of violations as far as the maxim of quantity is concerned. Items (1) through (6) are all over-informative stating more than required. In (6), the addressee implicates that he is going to find out what is in the Thorne, if he really does not know what is there. In (8), the addressee noticeably opts out of the maxim of quantity in order to preserve confidentiality. He explicitly informs the questioner that the maxim cannot be fulfilled; he cannot comment simply because the issue referred to is confidential.

In regards to the maxim of quality , items (1) , (3) , (4) , (5) , (6) , and (9) show violations of this maxim , where the addressee does not sound truthful.

As for the maxim of relevance , items (1) and (4) seem to convey violations of this maxim.

Items (4) , (8) , and (10) seem to convey violations of the maxim of manner.

Table -3   Politician C Responses

Respon	Maxim of Quantity		Maxim of Quality		Maxim of Relevance		Maxim of Manner	
	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation
1		+	+		+			+
2	+		+		+		+	
3		+	+		+		+	
4	+			+		+		+
5		+		+	+		+	
6		+		+		+		+
7		+		+	+			+
8	+		+		+			+
9		+		+	+			+
10	+			+	+		+	
	4	6	4	6	8	2	4	6

When asked about the terrorist threat to the whole world and whether or not it is going to be diminishing, the addressee (politician C) in this exchange appears to be telling too much information in the first item, and hence violates the maxim of quantity. Over-informativeness also occurs in items(1) , (3) , (5) , (6) , (7) , and (9). In (6) the addressee blatantly flouts the maxim of quantity. This flouting is due to the assertion of the tautology (Everyone is a big one). It can be implicated that the addressee used to make electoral challenges which were "all big"; or every candidate is "big" and to manage his electoral campaign as powerfully as he could.

Looking at table-3 above, one can notice that examples of violation of the second maxim are detected in (4) , (5) , (6) , (7) ,(9) , and (10). Asked about the future of the Australian troops and whether he is going to discuss an exit strategy with the other politicians, the addressee , in this sample interview , states that he will not discuss such an issue, because there is another more important issue which has to be discussed , namely , the security situation. In (6), the questioner is to infer that the addressee means that "everyone of the electoral challenges is big, not only this one", he has to assume the following: the addressee wants to be cooperative and is giving true information, though this leads him to flout other maxims, namely the maxim of quantity above. The speaker could not observe the maxim of quantity because of the clash between this maxim and the maxim of quality.

Finally, item (10) indicates that the addressee states explicitly that he does not want to commit himself to some expectations concerning the US withdrawal within a definite period of time. Again in (10) the addressee restates that the maxim cannot be achieved simply because he admits that he would not want to commit himself to the withdrawal of the US troops within a year.

Obscurity arises in item(1) and (4) where the speaker overtly violates the maxim of manner providing no straightforward reply to *"what day would it be"*. Items (6) and (7) ,(8) , and (9) are found to be unclear since they do not provide straightforward replies. Therefore, violations of the maxim of manner can be easily figured out.

Table – 4   Politician D Responses

Respo	Maxim of Quantity		Maxim of Quality		Maxim of Relevance		Maxim of Manner	
	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation
1	+			+	+		+	
2	+			+	+		+	
3		+	+		+		+	
4	+			+	+		+	
5		+		+		+		+
6		+		+	+			+
7		+		+		+		+
8		+		+	+			+
9	+		+		+		+	
10	+		+		+		+	
	5	5	3	7	8	2	6	4

The interview made with politician D contains a number of violations. The maxim of quantity is violated in (3), (5) , (6) , (7) and (8). In (3) the contribution of the addressee is less informative than required; he frankly and noticeably admits that the maxim cannot be fulfilled once he explicates that he would not make any assumptions. Likewise, his contributions in (5) and (6) indicate that he, again, noticeably flouts the maxim of quantity. On the other hand, items (7) and (8) denote that the addressee is over- informative.

The maxim of quality is being violated in seven items; (1) , (2) ,(4) , (5) ,(6) , (7) , and (8). All over these items, the addressee is being untruthful as far as his replies are concerned.

Concerning relevance , two items violate this maxim. They are (5) and (7).

Items (5) , (6) ,(7) , and (8) violate the maxim of manner simply because the speaker's answers are either vague or indirect. In (5) he is vague since he refuses to *"get into the business either of talking about individuals or talking about individual trappings"* , and in the rest he is indirect.

In the following table, cases of violating the maxim of quantity can be found in (2) , (3) , (4) , (6) , (8) , (9) , and (10). The addressee , in all these items , provides more informative replies than required.It is believed that nine items in this interview do not provide truthful contributions. This belief is based on real-life truth which contradicts all exchanges in this sample.

Item (10) violates the maxim of relevance , while eight items are less direct than required where the violation of the maxim of manner is very clear.

Table -5   Politician E Responses

Respons	Maxim of Quantity		Maxim of Quality		Maxim of Relevance		Maxim of Manner	
	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation	Abiding	violation
1	+			+	+			+
2		+		+	+			+
3		+		+	+			+
4		+		+	+			+
5	+			+	+		+	
6		+		+	+			+
7	+		+		+		+	
8		+		+	+			+
9		+		+	+			+
10		+		+		+		+
	3	7	1	9	9	1	2	8

T-Test

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std.Deviation	Std.Error Mean
Pair 1	Abiding	0.3000	50	0.4629	6.547E-02
	Violation	0.7000	50	0.4629	6.547E-02

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences			t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std.Deviation	Std.Error Mean			
Pair Abid.- 1 Viol.	-0.4000	0.9258	-0.1309	-3.055	49	0.004

Results: There are significant differences , because T-value is much less than 0.05 , the norm for measuring humanities or linguistic data . It is , in this case 0.004. T-value, then , shows significant differences. Therefore , Violating the maxim of QUANTITY is very clear , both statistically and on the percentage level which is 35 out of 50 responses which is equal to 70%.

T-Test
QUALITY

Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std.Deviation	Std.Error Mean
Pair Abid.	0.3200	50	0.4712	6.664E-02
1 Viol.	0.6811	50	04712	6.664E-02

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences			t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std.Deviation	Std.Error Mean			
Pair Abid.- 1 Viol.	-0.3600	0.9424	0.1333	-2.701	49	0.009

Results: Again , T-value , here shows significant differences which is so much less than 0.05 , that is 0.009. This shows both statistically and

on the percentage level that violating the maxim of QUALITY is very drastic. The percentage is 68% which shows a very clear violation of this maxim in the responses of the politicians under study. And once the maxim of QUALITY is violated all other maxims follow suit. As Grice (45) puts it " When the quality maxim is violated , complete adherence to the other maxims is difficult".

The violation characteristics of this maxim can be summed up in these points:

a. Briefer than usual , b. Less relevant , c. Less direct , d. More vague than usual.

<div align="center">T-Test</div>
<div align="center">RELEVANCE</div>

Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std.Deviation	Std.Error Mean
Pair Abid.	0.8000	50	0.4041	5.714E-02
1 Viol.	0.2000	50	0.4041	5.714E-02

Word scanner

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences			t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std.Deviation	Std.Error Mean			
Pair Abid.- 1 Viol.	0.6000	0.8081	0.1143	5.250	49	0.000

Results: T-test state that there is no significant difference shown , here , still since the maxim of Quality is violated , then this maxim has no importance.

T-Test

MANNER

Paired Samples Statistics

	Mean	N	Std.Deviation	Std.Error Mean
Pair Abid.	0.4600	50	0.5035	7.120E-02
1 Viol.	0.5400	50	0.5035	7.120E-02

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences			t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std.Deviation	Std.Error Mean			
Pair Abid.- 1 Viol.	-8.00E-02	1.0069	0.1424	-0.562	49	0.577

Results: No significance difference is shown , yet since the maxim of Quality is violated , this result is not important according to Grice.

Conclusion

From the tables and statistics above one can infer that the hypothesis mentioned earlier is correct , because it is supported by high percentages and significant T-value differences. Looking at the number of violations of quantity , one can see that they amount to 35 times , that is 70% , which is very high. Again looking at the results of statistics above , one can see that the T-value shows significant differences , that is the T-value is 0.004 which is very much below the norm which is 0.05.

When one looks at the times of violation of the quality maxim which is very decisive , one can notice 34 times of violation , that is 68% which is again very high. The statistics , again , support the hypothesis very highly, as the T-value is 0.009 which is very much

below the norm . This of course indicates that the T-value shows significant differences.

Up to here one can comfortably state that the hypothesis is correct and highly supported by the percentage and statistics , especially of the Quality maxim , the most decisive maxim.

In regards to the Relevance maxim , there are also certain violations which amount up to a considerable number , which again adds to the support of the hypothesis. The same applies to the maxim of Manner.

Exactly as Marmor (2007) states that any linguistic communication is not easily understood , this understanding is to be achieved by various elements of language and context which lead to a clear apprehending of what someone is saying or asserting. Hence , certain distinctions must be made, namely , the literal meaning of the utterance , the semantic content, and further the communicative content the speaker follows in any exchange , including conversational implicatures.

The most fundamental conclusion one can draw from this work is that the maxim of quantity and more importantly the maxim of quality are much more violated than the maxims of relevance and manner which is due to the very language of politics. Politics , most often , requires certain considerations in communicating any piece of information. That is why truthfulness , sufficiency or insufficiency of any piece of information cannot be readily understood

References

Abdul Wahid,Adnan Abdul Daem. Conversational Maxims and
        Implicature : An Evidence from Arabic for Quantity and
        Relation.Unpublish Ph.D. Thesis , University of Basra ,2000.

Akmajian, Adrian, Richard A. Demer, Ann K. Farmer, and Robert M.
        Harnish. *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and
        Communication* (4th ed.). Cambridge: Mit Press ,1995.

Davies, Bethan. 'Grice's Cooperative Principle: Getting the
        Meaning Across' . 12th Oct.2008
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/linguistics/WPL/WP2000/Davies.pdf>

Grice, P .'Logic and Conversation'. In P.Cole and J. Morgan (eds.),
        Syntax and Semantics, *vol. 3: Speech Acts*. New York:
        Academic Press, 41-58 ,1975.

Leech, Geoffrey N. *Explorations* in *Semantics and Pragmatics*.
        Amsterdam: John Benjamins ,1980.

Levinson, Stephen C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge
        University Press ,1983.

Marmor , Andrei . 'What Does the Law Say ? Semantics and Pragmatics
        in Statutory Language'. 2007. 23rd Jan.2009 <http:// www.
        giuri.unige.it/intro/dipist/filo/testi/analisi_2008/09marmor.pdf>

Partee , B.H.'Semantics and Pragmatics : Entailments , Presuppositions ,
        Conversational and Conventional Implicatures' .2004. 3rd
        Sept.2008 <http://
        people.umass.edu/partee/RGGU_2004/RGGU047.pdf>

Soames, Scott .'Drawing the Line Between Meaning and
        Implicature- and Relating Both to Assertion' .2007. 14th June 2008
        <http://www.ub.es/grc_logos/bw/abstracts/soames.doc>

Talib, Ismail S. 'Grice's Cooperative Principle' .2006. 1st May 2007
        <http://courses.nus.edu.sg/course/ellibst/lsl.html>

Terkourafi , Marina ' Socialising Grice : On Intelocutor's reasons for
Co- operating in Conversation'. 2005. 22nd March 2007 <http: // www.
        linguistics.Unic.edu/mt217/Terkourafi_COPiL_sumission.pdf>

Verschueren , Jef .*Understanding Pragmatics*.London:Arnold ,1999.

Wilson, Deirdre 'Is There a Maxim of Truthfulness?' In *UCL:
        Working Papers in Linguistics*, 7:197-22. 1995. 6th Dec. 2008
<http://www.langsci.ucl.ac.uk/linguistics/WPL/95papers/WILSON.pdf>

Yule, George .*Pragmatics*. London: Oxford University Press (1996).

ملخص

إن هذا البحث يعرض لتطبيق المبادئ الأساسية الأربعة في المحادثة ، التي وضعها العالم اللغوي Grice ، في إجابات بعض السياسيين الغربيين خلال مقابلاتهم التي اختيرت بصورة عشوائية لتكوّن المادة الموضوعية للبحث.

يعدّ البحث محاولة لاستكشاف مقدار الإلتزام بهذه المبادئ (وهي الكم والنوع والعلاقة والوضوح) من خلال إجابات السياسيين المعنيين ، إذ يبين حالات عدم الإلتزام ويعطيها أهمية كبيرة ، وبخاصة مبدأ النوع الذي يعدّ أهم المبادئ في المحادثة والحوار ، ذلك لأنه يعبّر عن الحقيقة في المحادثة.

لقد استعمل الباحثان الإحصاء ، ولحد ما ، النسب المئوية ليوضحا مقدار عدم الإلتزام بهذه المبادئ لا سيّما مبدأ النوع. وقد برهنت النتائج صحة الفرضية التي تنص على صعوبة الإلتزام بأي مبدأ من المبادئ الثلاثة (الكم والعلاقة والوضوح) عندما لا يتم الإلتزام بمبدأ النوع.