

Pragmatic Analysis of ex-President Donald Trump's interviews and its relation with the Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle

Michael Kwarteng 

M.A. in Foreign Language and Literature. Department of Linguistics, Nanjing Tech University, Nanjing- China.

✉ **Corresponding Author:** Michael Kwarteng, E-mail: michaelkwartengpaah@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received: February 11, 2021
Accepted: March 18, 2021
Volume: 3
Issue: 3
DOI: 10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.3.4

KEYWORDS

Cooperative Principle; Grice's Maxims; Conversational Implicature; Speech Act

ABSTRACT

This analytical-descriptive paper investigates the violation and the keeping of Grice's (1975) cooperative principles (CPs) in an interview between some American Journalists and former President Donald Trump. The study involved the observation and analysis of ten Donald Trump's interviews in the context and content of racism, coronavirus, election, politics, leadership and social relation that were randomly selected via YouTube. Its aim was to assess critically the violation and the keeping of Grice's (1975) cooperative principles (CPs) and its maxims, the speech act theory, and also improve upon interlocutor's communication skills. Also, pragmatically, the current study examines the perlocutionary effect of utterances on interlocutors and listeners in general, and further investigates a new way of understanding speakers' non-cooperative and cooperative attitude and their violation of Cooperative Principles and its maxims throughout the communication process. The research sample was solely analyzed through conversational implicature and the consideration of Grice's four propounded maxims under cooperative principle, as well as the speech act theory. According to the results, speakers' uncooperative attitude is mostly influenced by psychological factors like frustration, irritation, nervousness, anxiety, conflict of interest, and other factors such as politeness, cheap praise, lack of adequate information, entertainment, and sometimes deliberate violation. It was also revealed that language users do sometimes cooperate most often than not due to the perlocutionary effect on listeners and themselves. Besides, interlocutors sometimes violate some maxims, because they have least or no idea about the consequences of their responses on their listeners as well as themselves. Also, it was evident that, albeit speakers might not be aware of Grice's maxims and its Cooperative principles yet they habitually conform to it in communication process. The study recommends a deeper way for readers understanding of Paul Grice's CP and its maxims, the speech act theory, and also improve upon their communication skills. In summary, it recommends that communicators, language learners, teachers and linguists are to be mindful about their diction and its consequences on their participants and the society as a whole.

1. Introduction

Linguistics, the scientific study of human language, has many branches, including pragmatics, which specifically deal with meaning in context. This is to say that the context of an utterance cannot be exempted when decoding it. While Semantics focuses only on the meaning of combined words, pragmatics goes beyond to provide sufficient explanations for meaning. The common thing is that both pragmatics and semantics deal with the meaning of utterances but semantics concentrates on the literal meaning of an expression. It does not consider the context in which it is expressed (Cutting, 2002). Pragmatics realizes the importance of context, especially in showing the meaning underlying a particular expression. Thomas (1995) explains that meaning in semantics is the dictionary meanings of words or phrases, while meaning in pragmatics is the speaker's intention.

Since language's primary importance is for effective human communication, speakers' intended meaning is crucial and cannot be overlooked. Aitchison (1995) emphasizes that in a narrow sense, pragmatics investigates how listeners get the intended meaning of their speakers, whereas in a broader sense, it concerns with certain principles that interlocutors consciously or unconsciously adhere to communicating.

Grice, a renowned linguist, in (1975) developed a pragmatic theory called cooperative principle and implicature. He argues that participants follow certain rules and patterns in their conversations about which they may or may not be aware. Consequently, participants are expected to make their utterances informative and relevant. Grice (1975) proposes that conversation is based on a shared principle of cooperation, and his work on the Cooperative Principle (CP) led to the development of pragmatics as a distinct discipline within linguistics. To exchange ideas and information in communication, interlocutors try to adopt a cooperative behavior to convey their intentions and transfer their utterances implicitly. In this regard, Grice (1975) points out that communication acts depend on the Cooperative Principle and that interlocutors try to cooperate in most of the conversational discourse. He thus proposes some principles in order to account for the cooperative behavior of participants in their conversations.

Grice (1975) also considered both cooperative principle and conversational implicature in his article as "Logic and Conversation". According to him, utterance interpretation is not a matter of decoding messages. Instead, involves taking the meaning of the sentences together with contextual information, using inference rules and working out what the speaker means on the basis of the assumption that the utterance conforms to the maxims. An implicature is a piece of information that is conveyed indirectly by an utterance. This implies that an implicature is something that logically follows from what is asserted in an utterance.

Also, J. Austin (1975) has introduced Speech-act theory and further developed by American philosopher J.R. Searle. In pragmatics, a speech act is an utterance defined in terms of a speaker's intention and its effect on a listener. Essentially, it is the action that the speaker hopes to provoke in his or her audience. Speech acts might be requests, warnings, promises, apologies, greetings, or any number of declarations. As one might imagine, speech acts are an essential part of communication. According to speech act theory, there is no clear-cut boundary between speaking and acting. That is, saying is acting and that words are deeds.

From John Austin's point of view, language is used to inform or describe things. It is often used to "do things" and to perform acts. With the deepening of research, Austin realized that every sentence could be used to implement behavior in a certain sense, and it is not only the function of a sentence. Therefore, he introduced a new theory to determine how a speech act is to be interpreted, one must first determine the type of act being performed whether Locutionary Act, Illocutionary Act or Perlocutionary Act.

In a nutshell, it is against the background of Grice's four propounded maxims under cooperative principle and conversational implicatures as well as John Austin's Speech-act theory that these selected interviews of Donald Trump are analyzed to find out the applicability and the usefulness of the theories. This material further aims to analyze the collected data using the maxims, which will help future researchers and language learners know how universal and practical these theories work and unveil the perlocutionary effect of keeping and violating the maxims in conversation process.

1.1 Objectives

This study aims to throw more light on CP maxims and targets to investigate the reasons and consequences behind speakers' cooperative and non-cooperative attitudes of CP in the Speech Act theory's modern contexts and its contribution to pragmatics development.

1.2 Research Questions

1. What are the interpreted reasons for cooperative and non-cooperative attitudes of maxims by interlocutors' during the conversation?
2. What are the possible consequences on interlocutors and listeners when CP maxims are violated or not violated during the process of interview?

2. Literature Review

2.1 The cooperative principle

The Cooperative Principle consists of four categorical maxims: quality, quantity, relation and manner.

A. Maxim of Quality

- Speaker tells the truth or provides adequate evidence for his statement. The maxim of quality has some form of moral tone attached to it. Do not say what you believe to be false.
Do not say anything that for which you lack adequate evidence

B. Maxim of Quantity

- Speaker's contribution must be informative as required.
- Do not make your contribution to the conversation more informative than necessary.

C. Maxim of Relation

Speaker's response must be relevant to the topic under discussion. Avoid padding and circumlocutions.

D. Maxim of Manner

Speaker must speak concisely, clearly and avoids ambiguity or obscurity. They should be very brief and well organized. High sounding and jaw breaking as well as complex words and phrases should be avoided because the essence of communication is that the hearer should be able to understand. A speaker should not use words for self-aggrandizement or to earn cheap praise. Furthermore, the maxim requires politeness (treat your listeners as you would like to be treated).

2.2 The Violation and concordance of the Cooperative Principle

When Grice came up with the Cooperative Principle, he also believes that, people would not obey the principles accurately in reality due to one reason or the other. The violation of the maxim can be defined as the occasions when one or several maxims are absent during communication processes (Jia, 2008). Sometimes, a party would violate the principle while the other would concord. Therefore, speakers often abide to some maxims in order to achieve a certain goal and for that matter they take into account the locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary effect. Also, one party may violate the principle because of some deep reasons rather than telling lies. For example, telling a joke, writing a book or making a movie is peculiar situation in which CP can be violated in order to carry audience away. To better develop the plot of a story or to create a special effect, CP can be violated. Also, speakers violate CP in order to be polite that's why Leech (1983) proposed the Politeness Principle (PP) in order to account for the violations of CP. In this situation, the conversational implicature which is the logic behind any given message, is what the speaker intends to communicate to audience rather than the literal words.

2.3 The Cooperative Principle and Conversational Implicature

Grice in his theory pointed out that, the inadequate attention to the nature and importance of the conditions governing conversation and that whether speakers violate or do not violate the maxims in conversation, there is always an additional meaning that is logically attached to utterances known as implicature that we infer by considering the context.

In other words, an implicature is something a speaker suggests or implies with an utterance, even though it is not literally uttered. Implicatures can aid in communicating more efficiently than by explicitly saying everything we want to communicate.

In 1983, British linguists Stephen C. Levinson [6] and Geoffrey N. Leech [7] respectively turned out PRAGMATICS and PRINCIPLE of PRAGMATICS, in which both praised Grice's theory of conversational implicature as a most important part in pragmatics. Conversational implicature surpasses the syntax and semantics is use to explore the meaning of sentences at first, and it explains the relationship between literal meaning and practical implication of utterance. It consists of two parts: generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature.

Generalized conversational implicatures (GCI) are inferences that refer to the non-explicit meaning that occurs by default in any type of context (Grice, 1975). It is information that is inferred in a prototypical way, as long as there is no particular information that denies or contradicts it. This means that when interlocutors obey some of the principles, their utterances often give some direct information, Example:

Kay: "Do YOU LIKE MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE?"

Roy: "I LIKE SCIENCE." (This answer directly implies Roy doesn't like Mathematics)

On the contrary, a particularized implicature is a conversational implicature that is derivable only in a specific context. This means that one party in interaction disobey the principle on purpose to let the other party explore the meaning of communication. Example:

Boss: "WHERE IS MY CAR KEY? "

Maid: "MADAM IS GONE FOR PARTY." (In this exchange, the Boss will likely derive the implicature "his wife has taken the car" from the maid's statement).

2.4 Features of Conversational Implicature

There are five features in conversational implicature namely; cancellability, non-detachability, non-conventionality, indeterminacy and calculability.

Cancellability (Defeasibility): This is where by speakers add some words in a certain linguistic context or non-linguistic context and the meaning of context changes. In other words, conversational implicature can be canceled by adding some words either by an explicit declaration that the speaker is opting out or, implicitly, by the co-text and context. Example:

Mavis: "DO YOU WANT SOME COFFEE?"

Eva: "COFFEE WOULD KEEP ME AWAKE." (YET I DO WANT TO STAY AWAKE.)

Non-detachability: As we all know, conversational implicature is explored through the Cooperative Principle and context, so it is not only relevant to utterance form, but also relevant to contexts. Non-detachability refers to conversational implicature which depends on the whole context rather than utterance structure. That means, if a certain word or sentence changes, the implicature of the discourse would not change. Thus expressing the same thing in another way usually carries the same implicature. Example:

Boy: "WOULD YOU LIKE TO GO TO THE PARTY TONIGHT?"

Girl 1: "I HAVE SCIENCE EXAM."

Girl 2: "THERE IS A SCIENCE EXAM TOMORROW."

Girl 3: "I have a science exam, don't I?"

Non-conventionality: It's a situation where by the implicature of conversation belongs to particularized implicature rather than generalized implicature. This is because conversational implicatures are achieved by connecting the Cooperative Principle and context rules. And the implicature follows the meaning of utterance. The conversational implicature will change while literal meaning will not change. It relies on the saying of what is said but they are not part of what is said. They are associated with speaker or utterance but not proposition or sentence. Example:

Man: "WOULD YOU LIKE TO INVITE ME UP TO A COFFEE?"

Woman: "OH...I'M AFRAID THE PLACE IS IN A TERRIBLE MESS."

Indeterminacy: This refers to the case that a phrase or a sentence with single meaning will elaborate different implicatures in different contexts. In many cases, the list of possible implicatures of an utterance is open and indeterminate. Example:

Joan: "WHAT DO YOU THINK OF MIKE?"

Jane: "HE IS A BULL."

Calculability: This refers to the hearer exploring conversational implicature according to the literal meanings of utterance and the Cooperative Principle. It is not part of the meaning of the expression, but depending on our prior knowledge of that meaning, context, the assumption of cooperation, and other factors, we can generally work out or calculate the intended implicatures. Example:

Boy: "CAN I KISS YOU?"

Girl: "THERE IS CORONA VIRUS OUTBREAK."

2.5 Speech act theory

Speech-act theory is another sub-field of pragmatics aside from cooperative principle and conversational implicature. This area of study is concerned with the ways in which words can be used not only to present information but also to carry out actions. It is used in linguistics, philosophy, psychology, legal and literary theories, and even artificial intelligence development.

Speech-act theory was introduced in 1975 by Oxford philosopher J.L. Austin in his book "How to Do Things with Words" and further developed by American philosopher J.R. Searle.

According to the renowned linguist, a speech act is an utterance defined in terms of a speaker's intention and its effect on a listener. Essentially, it is the action that the speaker hopes to provoke in his or her audience. Speech acts might be requests, warnings, promises, apologies, greetings, or any number of declarations. As you might imagine, speech acts are very essential part of human communication.

Basically, both Austin and Searle believe that language is not only used to inform or describe things, it is often use to "do things", and to perform acts.

This implies that, there is no clear-cut dichotomy between speaking and acting. In producing an utterance, we are performing an action. This action needs to be performed in accordance with social conventions and institutions. According to the theory, saying is acting, that is, words are deeds and that speakers must be mindful of whatever they utter. Example:

I. I PERMIT YOU TO GO NOW. I PRONOUNCE YOU GUILTY! I AM GLAD TO INFORM YOU OF YOUR PROMOTION. I REGRET THAT I MARRIED YOU. I PRONOUNCE YOU HUSBAND AND WIFE. I SENTENCE YOU TO LIFE IMPRISONMENT. CONGRATULATION!

According to Austin, he categorized speech act into three types to determine which way the theory is to be interpreted, one must first determine the type of act being performed. Locutionary Acts, Illocutionary Acts and Perlocutionary Act.

Locutionary Act: It is the act of making a meaningful utterance. Since communication is believed to be goal directed activity, sometimes a speaker does not explicitly utter his intention but such meaningful utterance will demand certain response from the listener.

Illocutionary Act: It refers to the performance of an act in saying something specific. There is a kind of conventional force associated with the utterance that the listener is supposed to respond to even though is not openly said.

Perlocutionary Act: It refers to the speech act that has an effect on the feelings, thoughts, or actions of either the speaker or the listener. It seeks to change minds. Unlike locutionary acts, perlocutionary acts are external to the performance; they are inspiring, persuading, declaring or deterring. Changing minds is a typical example of a perlocutionary act.

Example:

II. IT'S SO CHILLED IN HERE.

- Locutionary act : the room is too cold.
- Illocutionary act : a request to off the air-conditioner.
- Perlocutionary act : the listener offs the air-conditioner or his refusal.

III. DO YOU HAVE WASHROOM IN THE HOUSE?

- Locutionary act : I want to use the washroom.
- Illocutionary act : a request to show or open the washroom.
- Perlocutionary act : the listener shows the washroom or his refusal.

2.6 Relationship between Cooperative Principle and speech act theory.

Speech act is another important part of conversational implicature. Cooperative principle and speech act explain how people express their ideas and opinions by using language as a tool to establish or maintain relationship with others. Speech act explains the intensions and the consequences of utterances that cooperative principle cannot solve. In simple terms, speech act makes cooperative principle ineffective in certain occasions. However, they all make great contribution to realize communicative intentions.

2.7 Review of Related literature

Having summarized the major studies on cooperative principle and implicature as well as speech act theory, I will now focus on establishing the context for applicability and practicality of the theories. Linguists must recognize that the consideration of the two theories is essential in human communication.

To this effect, after Paul Grice came out with his pragmatic theory of Cooperative Principle and the conversational maxims, a number of studies have been done in order to diagnose its universality, applicability and predictability in respect to different types of spoken and written languages among different situations and cultures.

Devine (1982) conducted two pilot studies; in the first study he assessed the universality of the conversational maxims noted by Grice in 1976 and also examined the process of creating implicatures. By comparing the degree of comprehension of the given implicature instances in English, he tested the ability of the understanding of implicature in L2, among native and non-native speakers of English. The researcher chose 15 L2 language students and 15 American students as his subjects. The L2 students were in advanced English classes at Michigan State University. Their levels were determined by Placement test. This group consisted of ten males and five females with various language backgrounds Such as, Farsi, Japanese, Spanish, and Korean, and

their ages ranged from 18 to 43. The other group was American students, studied in an introductory level course on language at Michigan State University. This group consisted of eight females and seven males who ranged in age from 19 to 28. They were given brief descriptions of 15 situations to read, and all contained an example of Conversational implicature. The researcher devoted three scores to the responses: a) the subjects got the message, b) the subjects didn't get the message, c) it was not possible to determine. The conversational implicatures were based on the three suggested types by Grice (1976) as: flouting and clashing of maxims, and also unstated connection between statements. The results showed that the two groups understood the same, with a little difference; however, in the case of flouting the maxim of Quantity the data were more problematic. Although in different cultures there are different interpretations. This shows that, employing implicature in cross-cultural communication is a potential obstruction to the success of their interaction.

The material is very useful and practical however, it does not deal with the effect speech act has over cooperative principle when the two theories contextually come into contact and that this material sees to address.

In addition, Sobhani, A. & Saghebi, A. (2014) conducted a survey that aimed to investigate new ways of understanding a speaker's non-cooperative attitudes and the violation of Cooperative Principle maxims in real Iranian psychological consulting session. In order to deal with this situation, the researchers used a data base of three recorded conversations between a male psychotherapist and his patients collected from psychological consulting sessions, in Shiraz, Iran. The patients are from both genders and different age-range since the linguistic features generally differ based on age and gender. They are dealing with different behavioral problems because the researcher intended to analyze and interpret distinct cases of CP violation within the same context. The analysis of the conversations focused on the occasions where violations of CP maxims, non-cooperative attitudes or intentional miscommunication occur. The methodology of conversation analysis was adopted to take a close look at certain lines of the conversations since the objective was to bring to light some of the linguistic choices of interlocutors used during psychological consulting from a pragmatic perspective.

After analyzing their language by means of conversational implicature and the occurrences of the violation of Cooperative Principle, it was concluded that the recognition of conversational implicature is essential for understanding the non-cooperative attitudes of the speakers their violation of one or more Cooperative Principle maxims. Moreover, it was clear that the message people intend to convey is not wholly contained within the words they use, but it is also dependent on how hearers interpreting the message taking into account context and implicated meaning. Finally, there were instances when the purpose was to intentionally miscommunicate within this sophisticated social context. The study has a great contribution to the existing knowledge in the area of pragmatics and psychology development however, it did not tackle the context where by CP comes into contact with speech act theory which is the target of this current study.

Furthermore, Sayed Rahman Sial, from Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China in April 2019, conducted a research on Cooperative Principles in Kabul Times Newspaper reports focusing on the destruction and acceptance of Grice's (1975) cooperative principles (CPs) in the current news reports published in Kabul Times and classify which of the four CPs (quality, quantity, manner, and relation) have been dishonored most and which ones the least. For the purpose of analytical-descriptive research, 100 news stories were randomly selected from the newspaper of Kabul Times. The corpus was specifically designated from April/10/2017 to April/10/2018 which was the updated daily news published then. The implementation and defilement of these CPs were coded by two independent raters.

To have a trustable data, the corpus was examined by the two independent raters. In the collection of news columns, care was taken to integrate only news columns with the length of 180-400 words. Also, in the collection of news columns, researchers tried to have almost a standardized number of columns in the groups of sports, economic, social, political, and cultural news. Corpus examination did this descriptive-analytic research study; the results were obtained using this formula: $P_i = (F_i/N_i) \cdot 100$. According to the study, P_i stands for relative frequency, F_i stands for absolute frequency, and N_i stands for the total frequency of the data. Ten news stories which were published then were randomly selected from the 100 news stories and thoroughly analyzed.

The results reported that the largest percentage of maxim was associated with the social news among all four types of news namely, political news, economic news, security news, and sports news. Maximum of quality was dishonored the most among the four types of news, in relations to social news; the results present that the second highest violated maxim was the maxim of quality in the total maxims in the economic news compared to the other four news types. The results of this study can be used by EFL learners and teachers as well as reporters in multimedia. Despite all this usefulness of the research, it did not take into account the presence of speech act theory in contact with the CP in the context of Economic news, Security news, Political news and Sports news.

Moreover, in July 2015, Mako Okanda, Kosuke Asada, Yusuke Moriguchi & Shoji Itakura also conducted a very important research by using a revised Conversational Violations Test to examine Gricean maxim violations in 4- to 6-year-old Japanese

children and adults. Participants' understanding of the following maxims increased with age: 4-year-olds' understanding of maxims was near chance, 5-year-olds understood some maxims and 6-year-olds and adults understood all maxims. Preschoolers acquired the maxim of relation first and had the greatest difficulty understanding the second maxim of quantity. Children and adults differed in their comprehension of the maxim of politeness. The development of the pragmatic understanding of Gricean maxims and implications for the construction of developmental tasks from early childhood to adulthood were analyzed. Finally, it was found that children and adults violated and abide the maxims differently.

3. Method and Data Collection

In order to obtain the desired data for this study, ten selected interviews of ex-president Donald Trump in the context and content of racism, corona virus, election, leadership and social relation, were randomly selected and critically analyzed based on his implicit urges. The research sample which was gotten via YouTube, were solely analyzed by means of conversational implicature and the consideration of Cooperative Principle Maxims as well as the perlocutionary effect.

3.1 Data Analysis and Discussion

Through the use of both pragmatic and conversational analysis, the selected interviews are analyzed based on Cooperative Principle maxims and Implicature. The researcher focuses on unveiling the reasons for interlocutors' cooperative and non-cooperative attitudes and the consequences on interlocutors and listeners during conversation from a pragmatic perspective.

3.2 First data

Data I and II is issues on corona virus that two different journalists had with Donald Trump during the 2019 pandemic when he was the then president of the United States of America.

Data I

Journalist: *"What do you say to Americans who are watching you right now who are scared?"*

Trump: *"I say that you are a terrible reporter that is what I say. I think it's a very nasty question."*

From the above data, it can clearly be deduced that, the ex-president violated the maxim of relevance which requires Speaker's response to relate to the topic under discussion and there should be the avoidance of padding and circumlocutions. To this effect, Mr. Trump as a president could have taken advantage of the question to educate and motivate Americans to restore confidence about the panicking situation but he rather attacked the journalist personally without answering the question.

Also, Mr. Trump violated the manner maxim which demands Speakers to speak directly and specifically to avoid ambiguity or obscurity. Trump was supposed to be very brief and well organized. The ex-president was supposed to take advantage of the question to explain to the citizens, the measures put in place to control the situation so that the American people will have hope in the leadership. He sounded self-aggrandized to earn cheap praise and was not polite enough as a president since the maxim of manner requires speakers to treat listeners as they would like to be treated. In this context, we can say that the logic behind or the conversational implicature could be that, the speaker was confused and desperate because of the pandemic. It could also be that he has not put down any measures to control the pandemic in his country or he doesn't like the journalist. The perlocutionary effect can be that the citizens who are listening with keen interest will lose confidence in the president and find their own solutions that can negatively affect him as a leader in the future.

Data II

Journalist: *"Why do you keep calling this the Chinese virus?"*

Trump: *"Because it comes from China."*

The answer to the above asked question is simple and straightforward but very informative which makes it agreed to some of the maxims. Considering maxim of quality, Trumps answer was true that the virus comes from china and he did not hesitate to say. His answer also responds to the maxim of relation that it relates to the question without any digression or circumlocution. Also, his simple, clear and straightforward provided answer without any ambiguity, concord to the maxim of manner. The conversational implicature from the speaker's response is that, once the first corona virus case was recorded in Wuhan China in early December 2019, the name can be attached to the virus. To this, the perlocutionary effect on listeners across the globe can be that, Donald Trump doesn't like China similar pandemic like Ebola has previously occurred but was not attached to the city or the country of discovery. Even though the president is right, sometimes certain facts should not be directly said to avoid majority hatred. Consequently, this can create enmity between the President himself and some individuals as well as China and America.

3.3 Second data

Data III and IV is about racism that ex-president Donald Trump concerning his thoughts as a renowned politician in the United States of America had with some Journalists.

Data III

Journalist: *"Nineteen days out from the election, you have been labeled a racist, you have been called the success, how do you respond to that?"*

Trump: *"Thank you very much. I'm the least racist person you have ever met."*

In the above data, the Maxim of Quantity is also hampered since Trump deliberately refused to elaborate on the above asked question. He rather said *"thank you"* even that, in the video he wanted to walk out on the lady journalist when he later said *"I'm the least racist person you have ever met"*. Though he was not expected to say anything much under the maxim of quantity to provide more information than necessary but what he said wasn't enough which leads to ambiguity.

In addition, he violated the maxim of quality that he himself was not sure of the answer he uttered if not, the question was simple for him to say *"I am a racist or I am not racist"* due to a particular reason. Through that, he can convince electorates prior to the election to win votes since politicians sometimes take advantage of the media to clear the waves. Rather, Mr. Trump felt irritated and wanted to avoid the interview. The conversational implicature here is that, Donald Trump was reluctant to answer the question because he might be a racist and he doesn't want to talk about it. In this vein, the perlocutionary effect can be that, some electorates will develop the mentality that Donald Trump is racist and that they will vote against him as a presidential candidate which can consequently deny him from becoming a President.

Data IV

Journalist: *"Here is my question; I asked you the last time, I said and some people were shocked if you are racist. You know why I was asking you that. Are you racist?"*

Trump: *"I am the least racist person that you have ever met. I am the least racist person."*

From the interview, we can clearly see that Donald Trump respected the manner of relevance, quantity, and manner since his answer is straightforward and relates to the question without hesitation. However, the maxim of quality cannot be confirmed since what he is saying can be true or false. Again, he was expected to back his answer with some evidence which he did not. The conversational implicature here is that, the president is not racist but the people cannot be sure. With this, the perlocutionary effect will be that some listeners cannot trust the president on the statement since it will be vague to them. However, it was a good decision taken by him as a leader. Though what he said can or cannot be confirmed, it is good to answer in that simplistic manner as a leader in certain context so that the consequence cannot be determined.

3.4 Third data

Data V and VI talks about Donald Trump's encounter with two different journalists on election and politics respectively, concerning his campaign messages as the then president of the United States of America.

Data V

Journalist: *"Mr. President, over the course of the last several days of campaign sir, at the end of the campaign, you repeatedly said that Americans need to fear Democrats. You said they would unleash a wave of violent crime that endangers families everywhere. Why are you pitting Americans against one another sir?"*

Trump: *"Let me just say, very simple; because they are very weak on crime."*

From the above data, it is evident that Trump respected the maxim of quantity, manner and relation knowingly or unknowingly since his answer was very simple but very relevant and informative about the topic. However, the maxim of quality is hampered since his response to the asked question cannot be really confirmed that the Democrats are weak on crime. He was supposed to provide enough evidence to support his castigation against the opposition party. The conversational implicature here is that, the president is doing propaganda towards the election. Consequently, there is the likelihood that some electorates will buy this agenda and vote against the Democrats and others turning deaf ears.

Data VI

Journalist: *"Mr. President, that this Caravan wasn't invasion."*

Trump: *"I consider it to be invasion."*

Journalist: "As you know Mr. President, the Caravan was not an invasion. It's a group of migrants moving from Central America towards the border with the U.S."

Trump: "Thank you for telling me that. I appreciate it."

Journalist: "Why do you characterize it as such?"

Trump: "Because I consider it an invasion. You and I have a different of opinion."

Journalist: "But do you think that you demonized immigrants in this election to try to keep....."

Trump: "Not at all. I want them to come into the country but they have to come in legally. You know they have to come in, Jim, through a process. I want it to be a process and I want people to come in. And we need the people."

Journalist: "You campaign"

Trump: "Wait, wait, wait, you know why we need the people don't you? Because we have hundreds of companies moving in. we need the people. "

Journalist: "They are hundreds of miles away though. They are hundreds and hundreds of miles away. That is not an invasion."

Trump: "Honestly, you know what, I think you should let me run the country. You run CNN. And if you did it well your ratings would be much better."

From the above data, we could see that the interview started smoothly. The interviewer and the president were sharing their opinions about invasion as to their different interpretation of the situation and that the president thanked the journalist for his education. The journalist proceeded by asking the president: "but do you think that you demonized immigrants in this election to try to keep....." and the president replied by saying so many things to the uncompleted question as if he knew what the journalist is going to say. At first, the president respected the maxim of quantity by saying "not at all" then he continued to violate all the four maxims because he provided more information than what was expected from him by violating the quantity maxim. At a point, the journalist tried to come in with another question but Trump said: "Wait, wait,wait". The question being asked by the journalist has to do with the president denying the Caravan to US because of the election. However, the president started talking about hundreds of companies moving into the Country at his regime and that he would love to see more foreigners moving to America through legal means which makes him self-aggrandized and fishy hence violation of manner maxim and quality. The conversational implicature here is that, the journalist was more convinced that the president is scared of the 2020 general election and therefore he wants to demonize immigrants in order to win. Later, the journalist proceeded by saying: "They are hundreds of miles away though. They are hundreds and hundreds of miles away. That is not an invasion." and Trump responded by saying: "Honestly, you know what, I think you should let me run the country. You run CNN. And if you did it well your ratings would be much better." This is typically a cheeky response from the president. It does not relate to the topic, it is not informative enough, it doesn't show respect to the journalist that makes Trump violate the maxim of relation, quantity and manner. The conversational implicature here is that, the president is arrogant and feels irritating when certain factual questions are asked and that whatever he does is nobody's business. The president confidently told the CNN journalist who represents the masses and for that matter electorates that, he should let him run the country. To this, the perlocutionary effect is that, some electorates will develop an idea that, the president hates immigrants. Also, they are not part of the government and that the president does not respect them which can let him lose the election.

3.5 Fourth data.

Data VII and VIII is about leadership that two different journalists had with Donald Trump concerning his priorities, ideas and decisions as the then leader of the United States of America.

Interview VII

Journalist: "Are you ready for some tough question?"

Trump: "You gonna be fair".

Journalist: "I'm gonna be fair".

Trump: "Just be fair".

Journalist: "But you are okay with some tough questions?"

Trump: "No, no".

Journalist: "You don't want some tough questions?"

Trump: "I want you to be fair. You don't ask Biden tough questions".

Journalist: "So we have the pandemic on your watch. We have racial strife, we have luting. Why do you want this job? Why do you want to be president again?"

Trump: "Because we have done a great job and it's not finished yet. And when I finish, this country will be in position like it hasn't being maybe ever. The economy is already rolling back and the other people are going to bring it back certainly the person that we are dealing with are not going to bring it back. They gonna raise taxes".

Journalist: "let me ask you, what you think your... the biggest domestic priority is for you right now?"

Trump: *ultimately, let me, and I will tell you, and it was happening. We created the greatest economy in the history of our country and the other side is coming in.*

Journalist: *"You know that is not true".*

Trump: *"It is totally true. We have the best start market price ever and we are getting close to that price again. The unemployment number for African Americans, for Asian Americans, for Hispanic Americans, virtually every number was the best. And what was happening is things we are coming together....."*

Journalist: *I asked you, what is your priority? I mean not all the good things. What do you have to solve?*

Trump: *"The priority now is to get back to normal. Get back to where we were that the economy ranged and be great with jobs and everybody be happy. And that where we are going and that's what we are heading".*

Journalist: *"And who is our biggest foreign adversary?"*

Trump: *"I would say China. They are our adversary. They are competitor. They are foe in many ways but they are an adversary. I think what happened was a disgraceful. It should never have happened. They should never have allowed this plague to get out of China and go through out of the world 188 countries. It should never have happened".*

From the above data, the journalist violated the relevance maxim right from the beginning by asking Trump "are you ready for some tough questions?" Basically, this is not the right time to ask such question especially when starting an interview. Maybe the journalist intended to make fun but it might sound bias to the interviewee which can provoke him. The conversational implicature here is that, the journalist wants to make fun by pulling the president's legs or she knows him to be impatient so she wants to provoke him. The perlocutionary effect is that, the interviewee can develop the mentality right from the beginning that the journalist doesn't like him which can jeopardize the interview before the end especially when a slight issue pops up. After the president has answered her that he doesn't want tough questions and she must be fair, the journalist proceeded by asking: "Why do you want to be president again?" The president answered her straightforwardly that he wants to finish what he has already started. His answer was very concise and relevant to the question and factual, which concurred all the maxims. The journalist asked again: "let me ask you, what you think your... the biggest domestic priority is for you right now?" when this question was asked Trump violated the maxim of relation by talking about the type of economy he has built and what he has done for African Americans, Asian Americans and Hispanic American instead of saying his priority as a leader. He also violated the maxim of quantity because his information though does not relate, it was also too much for the question. He in addition, violated the maxim of manner since he was required to be straightforward. He adopted circumlocution strategy for cheap praise as a leader. The conversational implicature here is that, Trump wanted to take advantage of the question to tell people the good things he has done as a leader. The perlocutionary effect is that, the average American will be abreast with Trump's achievement, thereby serving as advantage on his behalf.

Finally, the lady journalist asked: "And who is our biggest foreign adversary?" Trump answered this question without hesitation by saying: "I would say China".

Since this answer is relevant, informative, and straightforward, which doesn't break jaws, it concurs with all four maxims. The conversational implicature here is that there is a competition between China and America that the president accepts. The perlocutionary effect will be that, globally there will be the awareness that China is competing with America according to the president which will prompt China to know their world recognition and ginger them to work harder. Besides, there will be much pressure on Americans to be extra careful and work harder to gradually lose global market to China.

Data VIII

Journalist: *"Are you going to include the congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus.....?"*

Trump: *"Do you want to set up the meeting? Are they friends of yours?"*

From the above data, we could realize that sometimes out of frustration or irritation our response to questions may flout some maxims. The President felt so irritated because he was not expecting such question from the journalist. He could have said yes or no and look forward for a follow up question than to divert. Probably, the lady journalist wanted to confirm from him about his decisions on the congress as a leader.

The president violated the maxim of relevance that his response has got nothing to do with the question. Consumers of his utterance will struggle to know why he is pissed off. He violated the maxim of manner in addition. He did not answer straightforwardly and clearly but rather provided jaw broken answer in order to get his hearers surprised. Besides, the manner maxim requires politeness that one should treat his listeners as he would like to be treated but Trump answered a yes or no question with a question "Do you want to set up the meeting?" "Are they friends of yours?"

The conversational implicature here is that, Trump will not include the congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Hispanic caucus. That is to say, if he is ready to include them, the answer is just simple "Yes" that he will feel proud to utter. The perlocutionary effect here is that the congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus will develop the idea that they might not be part of Trump's leadership, which can create enmity between them and the Trump's government.

3.6 Fifth data

Data IX and X is about social relation that two different journalists had with Donald Trump the then President of the United States of America concerning his relationship with Vladimir Putin the Russian President and his opinion about same sex marriage respectively.

Data IX

Journalist: "Everyone is saying always there is bromance between Vladimir Putin and all those stuff. And you know, what is the celebrity nickname for you guys? And I thought of Vlamp. You said; "if he says great things about me, I will say great things about him"

Trump: well look, I don't know. And know nothing about him really. I just think if we get along with Russia is not a bad thing. And you know getting along with other countries, the Democrats is trying to say I like him so much. I don't like him. I don't dislike him. I don't have any feelings one way or the other. It is that kind of matter what he says about me. He says good things or bad things about me. I'm going to make great deals for our country. I'm interested in our country. I'm interested in the success of our country. And right now, I mean you see what is happening. Just generally speaking, and we have a long way to go but they do try and pin me into this. And I am saying to myself, I don't even know him. All of a sudden you know; they make him like he is my best friend. I don't know. What I want is what is right for the country. That is all that matters to me.

The ex-American president provided a solid and well elaborated answer to the asked question concerning his relationship with the Russian president from the data above. His answer respected the maxim of quality since he provided enough evidence to justify the friendship that, he is interested in the success of the country and he wants the best for the American people. His decision as a leader is to get along with other developed countries like Russia is not bad; that is why he has the good relationship with Vladimir Putin and nothing else. In addition, Trump's answer cooperated with maxim of relation in the sense that, his response is in line with the content without any digression. However, he provided a lot of words to defend himself as a politician which made him violate the maxim of quantity. The conversational implicature here is that, Trump shares similar ideology with the Russian president that he thinks it can help America to move forward. Furthermore, the perlocutionary effect here is that listeners across the globe will realized that Trump shares similar ideology with the Russian leadership and wants to move along with them, bringing peace and unity among the two countries.

Interview X

Journalist: *"let's talk about same sex marriage. You said few years ago that you are evolving under the shade. Where are you?"*

Trump: *"I'm traditional marriage. It is changing rapidly".*

Journalist: *"What do you say to a lesbian who is married or a gay man who is married, who says Donald Trump what is the traditional about being married three times?"*

Trump: *"Well, they have a very good point but you know I have got a very hard working person. I got, actually I have a great marriage. I have a great wife now. When I used to think deep my two wives were very good. And I don't blame them but I was working... maybe like you. Twenty two hours a day".*

Journalist: *"I'm not asking you to explain this".*

Trump: *"Yea I know ... I'm just saying....I blame myself because my business was so powerful for me. I don't know that's a good thing or bad thing".*

Journalist: *"So what do you say, it was.... Lesbian or gay man who is married are married and say..."*

Trump: *"I really don't say anything. I'm just check, I'm for traditional marriage".*

From the above interview, the journalist at the beginning wanted to know Donald Trump's stance on same sex marriage whereby he answered: "I'm traditional marriage". Since Trump was not ready to cooperate by showing his stand as a leader, he gave an ambiguous and short answer that was not informative enough, hence violating manner and quantity maxim. The conversational implicature here is that, Trump doesn't support same sex marriage as a leader but because he is a leader of a country, he doesn't want to declare his stand in order to avoid hatred. If he supports the same sex marriage, he will feel proud to declare. Because the answer was vague to the journalist, he proceeded by asking: "What do you say to a lesbian who is married or a gay man who is married, who says Donald Trump, what is the traditional about being married three times?" when this follow up question was asked, Trump again started talking about his past marriages which he said it was not the fault of the women but he was rather ruined by his own busy working schedule. It is clear that, Trump's answer does not relate to the question by violating the

maxim of relation. He also violated the maxim of manner since he did not go straight to the point but revolved around without a stand. The conversational implicature here is that, Trump is against same sex marriage but he was just being mindful of his diction as a politician. When the conversation continued, because Trump was still revolving around the question, the journalist told him directly that: "I'm not asking you to explain this". Afterwards, he asked the question again: "So what do you say, it was.... Lesbian or gay man who is married are married and say..." This time, because the one particular question has been repeated, Trump answered by saying: "I really don't say anything. I'm just check, I'm for traditional marriage". The conversational implicature from this answer is that, Trump insists he is against same sex marriage but he doesn't want to declare as a leader since there are such marriages in his country and if he supports, he will feel proud to declare. The perlocutionary effect can be that since the president insists, he is for traditional marriage and not willing to say anything, the same sex marriage group may develop the idea that, the president is antagonistic to their marriages and they can sabotage Trump's administration and also vote against him during election.

4. Conclusion

The foregoing analyzed data in relation to the cooperative principle and its maxims, unveils that, practical language users like ex-president Trump may or may not be aware of the CP and its maxims yet interlocutors sometimes obey or violate such rules in a communication process. Also, according to the related literature and analyzed data, it is undeniable that, Grice 1975 Cooperative Principle and its conversational implicature cannot be circumvented in linguistics, especially pragmatics. The violation and the concordance of the CP and its maxims could be influenced mostly by psychological factors like frustration, irritation, nervousness, anxiety and conflict of interest as well as other factors such as, politeness, cheap praise, lack of adequate information, entertainment and sometimes deliberate violation. It is also practical that language users do cooperate most often than not due to the perlocutionary effect on listeners and themselves. In addition, interlocutors also sometimes do not cooperate because they lack idea about the consequence of their responses on listeners and themselves. Also, though Grice's CP and its maxims are the center of the pragmatics discipline in linguistics and its importance on the field cannot be denied. However, interlocutors should be aware of when and how to cooperate to the four maxims due to the consequence it may have on listeners and interlocutors in general. This scholarly work serves as a guide and recommendation for further studies, language users and teachers.

Funding: The author of this work solely funded it.

Conflict of Interests: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1]. Cohen B. C. [Cohen Bryan Tyler]. (2020 March 21). *Trump finally loses it in meltdown over basic question from reporter* [video]. Youtube. <https://youtu.be/TLwMCGJspmc>
- [2]. Aitchison, J. (1995). Linguistics. Haodder and Stoughton.
- [3]. Bouton, L.F. (1988). A cross-cultural study of ability to implicatures in English. *World Englishes*, 7,183-96.
- [4]. Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), TESOL (pp. 191-206). Washington DC: TESOL.
- [5]. Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. Routledge.
- [6]. Davis, B. L. (2008). Grice's cooperative principle: meaning and rationality. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 2308-2331.
- [7]. Devine, J. (1982). A question of universality conversational principles and implicatures. In M.A.
- [8]. Grice (2012). Principles. Retrieved from <http://awinlanguage.blogspot.com>
- [9]. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, (pp.41-58). Academic Press.
- [10]. Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press.
- [11]. C-SPAN (2019, July 19). *President Trump on being called a racist* [video]. Youtube. <https://youtu.be/8e7FNv8RSnU>[12]. CNN. (2015, June 28). *Donald Trump on trade, healthcare and more (CNN interview with Jake tapper)* [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/8ft7Np6PFao>
- [13]. South China Morning Post. (2018, November 8). *Donald Trump clashes with media at chaotic midterm election press conference*, [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/au3Zzf33vXw>
- [14]. CTGN America. (2020, March 19). *Is Trump blaming China for COVID-19? You decide*, [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tRLDPy1A8pl>
- [15]. CNN. (2015, December 10). *Donald Trump: I'm the least racist person*, [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XRDmWPAtHiA>
- [16]. 60 Minutes. (2020, October 26). *President Donald Trump: The 60 minutes 2020 election interview*, [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FdAh2HJ98WE&t=14s>
- [17]. Business Insider. (2017, February 17). *Trump's most heated exchanges with Reporters at his longest press conference*, [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/jtI5XK7QP38>
- [18]. CNN. (2017, May 2) *Watch Donald Trump's best interview walkouts*, [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/jSQrVdV7XD4>
- [19]. Kheirabadi, R. & Aghagolzade, F. (2012). Grice's cooperative maxims as linguistic criteria for news selectivity. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2 (3), 547-53.
- [20]. Kolo, Tswana. (2007). *The Use of Grice's Maxim of Cooperative Principle in the Teaching of Writing Competence*
- [21]. Leech. G (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman Group Ltd.
- [22]. Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- [23]. Levinson, S. (1985). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press

-
- [24]. Mey, L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). : Blackwell Publishing
- [25]. Peccei, Jean S. (1999). *Pragmatics*. London: Routledge
- [26]. Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge University Press.
- [27]. Sarami, V. (1993). A linguistic study of Persian contemporary socio-political satire. M.A. Thesis. Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.
- [28]. Sobhani, A. & Saghebi, A. (2014). The Violation of Cooperative Principles and Four Maxims in Iranian Psychological Consultation. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 4, 91-99. doi: [10.4236/ojml.2014.41009](https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2014.41009).
- [29]. Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction :an introduction to pragmatics*. Longman.
- [30]. Yule, G. (1985). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge University Press.