

Floating and Violating of the Cooperative Principles of Gricean Maxims in Political Speeches

Assist Lecturer: Ahmed Abed Nahi

Department of English Language, Faculty of Education, Imam Ja'afar Al-Sadiq University/Najaf

*Corresponding Author: Assist Lecturer: Ahmed Abed Nahi

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20669272>

Article History	Abstract
Original Research Article	<p><i>The application and non-application of the Gricean Cooperative Principle in the context of political discourse are examined in this study. In order to find examples of flouting and violating the principles of Quality, Quantity, Relevance, and Manner, the study specifically examines a selection of interviews with former U.S. President Donald Trump with TIME (2020) and AXIOS on HBO. The data is analyzed using a qualitative and quantitative mixed-methods approach to ascertain how political personalities handle delicate questions and the ensuing perlocutionary consequences on the audience. The results show that the maxims of Quantity and Relevance are most commonly broken, frequently as a tactic to avoid responsibility, reroute the story, or give too much information to obscure the reality. The study comes to the conclusion that non-cooperation is a purposeful rhetorical device employed in political communication to control public opinion and steer clear of confronting difficult facts head-on.</i></p> <p>Keywords: Gricean Maxims, Cooperative Principle, Flouting, Violating, Political Discourse, Political Speeches, Pragmatics, Conversational Implicature, Political Communication, Discourse Analysis, Rhetorical Strategies, Audience Perception.</p>
Received: 12-04-2026	
Accepted: 17-05-2026	
Published: 12-06-2026	
<p>Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.</p> <p>Citation: Assist Lecturer Ahmed Abed Nahi. (2026). <i>Floating and violating of the cooperative principles of Gricean maxims in political speeches</i>. UKR Journal of Education and Literature (UKRJEL), 2(3), 111-117.</p>	

Section One

1. Introduction

A mutual understanding between the speaker and the listener is essential to communication, which is a basic human activity. Philosopher H.P. Grice (1975) created the Cooperative Principle, which states that participants should contribute to the discourse in a way that is true, informative, relevant, and clear in order to promote a successful flow of knowledge. The Gricean Maxims are four distinct categories that comprise this principle: Quality, Quantity, Relevance, and Manner. However, speakers often disregard these maxims in real-world interactions, especially in the high-stakes setting of political interviews. There are two main ways that this failure manifests itself: flouting, in which a speaker overtly violates a maxim in order to create an implicature (an indirect meaning), and violating, in which a speaker discreetly or dishonestly violates a maxim, frequently in order to deceive the listener or escape humiliation.

1.1 Problem of the research

It is rare for political discourse to be simple. Politicians frequently have to respond to challenging inquiries about national problems, personal behavior, and policy. The Cooperative Principle is often compromised for political reasons in these situations. Although conversational implicature in literature and everyday life has been extensively studied, more research is needed to understand how political leaders—Donald Trump in particular—use the disregard for maxims as a defensive and offensive communication tactic. Trump's distinctive and frequently contentious rhetorical style offers a rich dataset for analyzing how the breach of quantity and relevance might be utilized to control a discussion or evade media examination.

1.2 Aims of the Research

This study's main goals are:

1. To determine which Gricean principles Donald Trump most commonly disregarded or broke in his 2020 interviews.
2. To examine the verbal tactics used when a maxim is

violated, such as circumlocution or personal assaults.
3. To ascertain whether these communication decisions may have perlocutionary impacts, or an effect on the audience's perception.

1.3 Importance of the Research
By illustrating how theoretical frameworks like the Cooperative Principle relate to modern political media, this study advances the fields of pragmatics and political linguistics. Citizens and linguistics students can better decipher political speech, spot evasive tactics, and comprehend the workings of "spin" in contemporary governance by knowing how maxims are broken.

Section Two

Literature Review

2. The cooperative principle

Gricean Maxims: (Grice:1974)

- (i) The Quality maxim: Make your contribution one that is true. Don't say what you believe is false, or for which you lack adequate evidence.
- (ii) The Quantity Maxim: make your contribution as is required, but not more, or less, than is required .
- (iii) The Relation (Relevance) maxim: Be relevant, (a participant should not switch the main topic of the conversation).
- (iv) The Manner Maxim: Be clear , brief and orderly, simply a speaker must not utter vague expressions.

2.1 Flouting and Violating Gricean Maxims of Cooperation Principle in Communication

Definition of Flouting and violating Gricean Maxims

According to Cutting (2002) flouting happens when a speaker fails in observing the maxim, but expecting a hearer to recognize the implied meaning. An addressee or a reader depends on his/her information of the utterance and world knowledge not only the literal meaning of the utterance to infer what an addresser wants to convey and these properties were called ostensive- inferential communication by Sperber and Wilson. In flouting Grice's (1975) cooperative signals. figurative uses of language appear such as metaphor. Hyperbole, simile etc.

Whereas the violation of Gricean maxims happens when a listener tries to deceive a speaker or make him/her misunderstand the utterance .Violating Gricean maxims happens when the listener tries to avoid an punishment or an embarrassed situation .

2.2 Flouting Gricean Maxims

(i) Flouting the Maxim of Quality

A wife to her husband who used to arrive late every night

Wow! You're so punctual! Welcome darling.

The husband: Sorry darling! This won't happen again .

Here, the wife intends to make fun of her husband by exploiting the maxim of quality to be sarcastic .

(ii) Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

People sometimes may flout the maxim of quantity for the sake of humor. Jack and Sam are talking on the phone .

Example (1) Jack: please, can you tell me where you are now?

(2.) Sam: Right now, I'm close to my table .

Here, Sam flouts the maxim of quantity as he gives information that is insufficient for Jack and it can be considered as humor .

(iii) Flouting the Maxim of Relevance

*Example(3.):*I'm wondering how did you get that mark in mathematics?

Example (4.): I like to have a sandwich.

B's reply flouts the maxim of relevance to avoid saying the truth of his mark in the exam.

Here, B's answer is not relevant to the A's question, that means, A is bewildered for B's answer .

Example (5) Mother: Oh daughter ...what is the story of that ring on your finger?

Example (6) Daughter: Oh mum, I knew it ... I told my teacher that my mum would be glad to see it .

The daughter would be better if she told her mum from the beginning that her teacher awarded her a ring as a prize. Thus, she flouts the maxim of manner.

2.3 Violation of Gricean Maxims

In violating of Gricean maxims an addressee may violate one or more of them to deceive the addressee or make him misunderstand.

(i) Violation of Quantity Maxim

Example (7)Mother: Did you work well for the exam?

Example (8)Son, who has been sleeping all day long: Yes, I've been working.

This example shows that the boy is not truthful as he violates the Gricean maxim of quality. Thus, the son leaves his mother unsatisfied .

(ii) Violation of the Quantity Maxim

Example (9)Teacher: What's yours father job?

Example (10) Student: My name is Jack, I live in London, my father likes sweets and my mother is a nurse.

In this example, the teacher asked a clear and simple question, but he received from the student a prolonged answer containing many unnecessary details to his question as the student did not tell him clearly about his father's job to avoid the embarrassment or to keep it secret

(iii) Violation of the Relevance Maxim:

Example (11) Sarah: May I borrow your book for a while?

Example (12) Marry: I will go to the gym, then I will meet my friends .

Here, Mary's answer is absolutely not relevant to Sarah's question as Marry is trying to escape from Sara's interrogation.

(iii) Violation of the Manner Maxim

Example (13) boss: Can you tell me why you almost come late?

Example (14.) An employee: I saw an accident on the way . Here, the employee's answer is obscure that leads the boss doesn't get a clear answer.

This part discusses the violation of conversational maxims based on Grice's proposals. It explains the types of violations of the maxims along with examples from Cutting (2002) and Tupan & Natalia (2008). The criteria used in identifying and classifying the violations of conversational maxims were adapted from Tupan and Natalia's work (2008: 68, after Grice, 1975). Subsequent subsections describe and analyse the various ways in which Maxim violations occur.

Maxim	Violating the maxims
Quantity	If the speaker does not to the point but make in circumlocution.
	If the speaker makes an uninformative sentence.
	If the speaker talks too little.
	If the speaker is talking too much information.
	If the speaker repeats many certain words or sentences.
Quality	If the speaker lies or says something that is unbelieved.
	If the speaker does irony or sarcastic statements.
	If the speaker does not want to talk about something.
	If the speaker makes the information distorted.
Relevant	If the speaker gives the unmatched topic in conversation.
	If the speaker changes the topic of conversation suddenly.
	If the speaker avoids talking about anything or something.
	If the speaker hides the fact or something.
	If the speaker makes the wrong causation statement.
Manner	If the speaker uses or makes the ambiguous language.
	If the speaker makes exaggerates the information.
	If the speaker uses slang words.
	If the speaker's voice is not clear or the volume is low.

(Cited from Tupan and Natalia in Grice, 1975, p. 45)

Section Three: Research Method

Data Analysis and Discussion

The present study is a quantitative and a qualitative study also because the language is used to interpret the data and the statistical findings are clear in percentages to show the time of the maims occurrences. (data 1, 2, 3) The present analysis employs the conversational forms extracted from a political interview of “Donald Trump’s Interview with TIME on 2020”. (web source 1)

Datum 1

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 it is clear that the ex-president breached the principle of relevancy, which provides that the Speaker’s response should be relevant to the matter in question, and that padding and circumlocutions should be avoided. Mr.

Trump as president might have used the question as an opportunity to educate and call upon Americans to restore faith in the difficult circumstances, but instead he personally insulted the journalist and did not answer the question. Mr. Trump also breached the norm of etiquette that demands speakers to speak simply and plainly so as to prevent ambiguity or obfuscation. Trump was expected to be brief and well-prepared. It was a question that the ex-president had to utilize to explain to the population the efforts taken to manage the situation so that the American people have faith in the leadership. He was self-aggrandizing for cheap applause, and he wasn't gracious enough as president, in the words of etiquette, that speakers should treat listeners as they would want to be treated.

Or maybe he doesn't like the journalist. Or maybe he didn't take any steps to contain the outbreak in his country. The perlocutionary effect can be that the citizens who are listening, lose their trust to the president and create their own opinions, which may affect the president's leadership in the future.

Data 2

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

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

The solution to the above-mentioned question is clear and simple, yet it is quite enlightening, resulting in agreement with several of the maxims. In terms of the quality maxim, Trump's response was correct in that the infection originates in China, and he did not hesitate to say it. His response likewise adheres to the relational rule of being directly related to the issue without any detour or circumlocution. In addition, his answer was basic, obvious, and plain, according to the ideal of deportment. The speaker's reaction implies that once the first corona virus case was reported in Wuhan, China in early December 2019, the virus's name might be applied to it. The perlocutionary effect on the listeners around the world may be that Donald Trump hates China. Similar pandemics have happened before such as ebola, but were not associated with the city or country of discovery. Even if the president is true, some things should not be expressed outright, lest the people turn against him. So there may be some ill feeling between the President and some people and between China and the United States.

Data 3

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."*

The Maxim of Quantity is also impeded in the above statistics since Trump declined to clarify on the above-mentioned topic. He instead responded "thank you," despite

the fact that he appeared to be about to walk out on the lady journalist in the video when he subsequently remarked, "I'm the least racist person you've ever met." Though he was not expected to speak much since the maxim of quantity dictated that he supplies more information than was required, what he said was insufficient, resulting in uncertainty.

And he broke the quality rule in that he confessed he did not know the answer to the question, if he did not know, then it would have been easy for him to reply: "I am racist or I am not racist" for a certain reason. Politicians sometimes use media to clear the waves and can urge electorates to vote for him before to the election. Mr. Trump, however, was upset and wanted to avoid the interview. The conversational implicature is that Donald Trump did not want to answer the question because he thinks he is a racist and does not want to talk about it. In this respect, the perlocutionary effect could be that some voters believe that Donald Trump is a racist and vote against him as a presidential candidate, and thus stop him from becoming President.

Data (4, 5, 6, 7) are taken taken from the video interview of Donald Trump with Jonathan Swan in AXIOS at HBO Channel. The data was transcribed from oral data to the written data. (web source 2)

Datum 4

J: *Well. I wanted to ask you about that um the U.S troop level in Afghanistan right now is roughly the same as it was when*

T: *Not. You're wrong. Not.*

J: *Mr. President, I'm sorry. We have to do.*

T: *Okay. Are you ready?*

J: *No, no. That would be a different question.*

T: *I will be down in a very short period of time to 8.000 then we're gonna be down to four thousand we're negotiating right now we've been there for 19 years 19 years,*

J: *I know, I know. But if you just let me finish*

T: *We'll be getting out*

(Time: 20:14-20:40)

The context of the data:

Jonathan started a new debate about the US force number in Afghanistan in the recent topic above. That refers to a peace pact between the United States and the Taliban in Afghanistan. It also includes clauses relating to the withdrawal of American and NATO forces from Afghanistan. There was an offer in the previous chat that the question would be sensitive to respond or not. President

Trump then consented to continue the conversation by answering the questions posed to him.

The analysis of this study:

Jonathan continued to discuss the question in the chat, hoping that the dialogue would work well for both of them. Jonathan had not quite finished his explanation when Trump abruptly interrupted him. Jonathan had not yet completed stating his query, so he responded "No." Because Trump was interrupted during his inquiry, here is a courtesy maxim. President Trump responded with a "no," indicating that he would not debate the matter that Jonathan would bring up. Furthermore, Jonathan was audacious and forced because President Trump had already answered the question.

Despite this, Trump ultimately agreed to respond to Jonathan's bold request. At the very least, the author attempted to assess the data to see if President Trump had committed any infractions. Then it was discovered that Trump had broken the relevant type maxims by refusing to mention anything connected to the subject. Besides, Jonathan hasn't completed telling President Trump about the questions he's been asked. Overall, the president responded on the spur of the moment, which resulted in his response not relating to Jonathan's question. Jonathan had asked him a question, and he replied it nonchalantly. Then he was one of the people who violated the rules of relevance since the topic of discussion was unrelated, and he violated the law of quantity because his answers to the subsequent questions were excessive and uninformative.

Finally, it can be said that Trump transgressed the maxims of relevance and quantity. The reasons for the offenses were: 1. President Trump abruptly shifted the subject of the conversation without getting Jonathan's approval to wait for him to finish his inquiry. The second is that President Trump was over-briefed in answering Jonathan's question. Finally, it was thought that Trump wanted to keep the truth secret as he refused to communicate and tried to avoid the suffering of one who would suffer if he did not speak it.

Datum 5

J: You told fox news recently that you couldn't say whether you'd accept the results of the 2020 election. What does that actually look like as the sitting president. I mean it's unprecedented. What would that actually look like?

T: Be Hillary Clinton never accepted

J: She conceded on, she considered

T: Her doesn't accept

J: But that's an important point. She conceded on election right now. She grumbled about it and said all sorts of

T: Grumbles

J: okay

T: She wrote books used the word grumbled fight but she wrote books about it

J: That's fine, but I'm just saying that I get it, I get it.

T: 306 to 223.

J: I'm not disputing you big Hillary Clinton.

(Time: 22:21-22:54)

The data context

Jonathan brought up the topic to discuss the presidential election in 2020. He inquired about Trump's appearance as the sitting president, as this had never happened before. The topic was supposed to respond to Trump in the correct location to Jonathan's inquiry, but he abruptly altered the topic and introduced a new one. In when the talk is unrelated to the subject. Hillary Clinton posed the question, and Trump responded. She is an American politician who served as the 67th Secretary of State from 2009 to 2013, and was also one of President Trump's opponents in the 2016 election. the presidential election of 2016. As a consequence, President Trump defended Hillary Clinton, who has yet to accept her loss in the 2016 presidential election and has spoken of abandoning the present campaign. She then whined about everything.

The data analysis

demonstrates that in this instance President Trump breached the relevance of maxims by altering the subject of his conversation with Jonathan Swan. They never spoke about this before, but President Trump brought up a new matter about Hillary Clinton. Furthermore, President Trump violated the maxims in this case, his statements did not pertain to the issue, and he altered the topic. He broke federal guidelines because he wanted the listener to feel proud of him by sharing his thoughts about Hillary Clinton, who had moaned about the outcome. Then, if so, Jonathan confirmed that in his comment, President Trump said, "I understand it, I get it." The evidence shows that Jonathan gave him a signal that he had breached the cooperative principle.

Datum 6

J: You read your daily talk a week?

T: I read extraordinarily well. Uh uh probably better than anybody that you've interviewed in a long time, uh I read a lot, I spend a lot of time with at meetings uh usually it's once a day or uh at least two or three times a week intelligence because,

J: This was the power

T: Talking about India. You're talking about with the problems with china. Talking about so many different elements of the world. The world is so very angry place. If you look all over the world. We call up I get I see 22 soldiers were killed in India with China fighting over the border it's been raging for many decades and they've been fighting and back and forth. I, I have so many briefings on so many different countries but this one didn't reach my desk. (Time: 18:02-18:47)

The context of the data:

President Trump read his daily speech for a week and this statement proceeded with the problem. He answered cordially to Jonathan's query, but then President Trump, who had gone on far too long to explain how often he reads his daily discourse. What this episode showed, at least, was that Trump answered the question in a few lines.

The analysis of the data:

Because Trump talked too much at the start of the conversation, it may violate quantity maxims. President Trump responded to the question as though he had always done it with his words. Also, have a look at the words "I have exceptional reading skills. Uh, certainly better than anyone you've talked to in a long time." These phrases may explain why President Trump is a decent guy who has meticulously reviewed his daily speech over time and knows it better than anybody else. "I read a lot, I spend a lot of time with at meetings," Jonathan said in "I read a lot, I spend a lot of time with at meetings.

Nonetheless, he went on to express the next response, which was stopped by Jonathan, that "this was the power," in such detail. It does not provide a specific and straightforward response to the interview question. In addition, even though he had to give several explanations, he supplied an adequate answer at the conclusion of his answer in "but this one didn't reach my desk." It's more about being aware of significance. Furthermore, he disobeyed the quantity maxims.

Furthermore, he violated the relevant maxims. See his second response, and President Trump made a causality error when he talked about China's cause and effect.

He shifted the conversation's focus to Jonathan's question about the power in relation to the previous day's chat. Then, in this part, it was revealed that Trump had violated two rules. It is the quantity and relevance maxim.

Datum 7

This datum is taken from a political interview in "Donald Trump's Interview with TIME on 2020" citizen".(web source 3)

TIME:" *Do you believe the evidence the intelligence community is — says that shows Iran is launching attacks on oil tankers?*

TRUMP: "*Well, I don't think too many people don't believe it. I think people say they don't believe it because they don't want to get drawn in. But they don't, they don't, uh, they don't believe it.*"

When pressed about his commitment not to become involved in any foreign wars, Trump defies the quantity principle. He seems to make the answer longer than usual by including a lot of needless material. The message is obvious and understandable even if he only says "I don't think too many people don't believe it." However, he inserts extra material in order to create an implicature and to mislead select audiences for political reasons. When challenged about his commitment not to participate in any foreign wars, he also deviates from this principle. He seemed to go on with a lot of irrelevant material in his response.

In terms of the maxim of deportment, Trump's responses do not apply to the issues posed. In terms of the theory of method, situations of infringement are known to occur when the addressee fails to offer plain and direct responses, despite the fact that the questioner continues to reaffirm that the answers are not those desired. They are not simple in respect to the addressee's response.

TIME: "*So does that mean that strategically you would go to war over nuclear weapons but not over passage through the Strait of Hormuz?*"

TRUMP: "*Well, I wouldn't even want to say that, but I would certainly go over nuclear weapons, and I would keep the other a question mark. Shea? Ask them to bring in the documents I saw yesterday.*"

Trump notably ignores the principle of quantity when asked about the demonstration in Hong Kong. In the first item of this exchange, the addressee politician appears to be providing too much information, and so violating the quantity restriction. The rule of quantity is being shamelessly peddled in favor of informativeness. In addition to the quality cap floating, the addressee is also untruthful in his replies concerning the America-China relationship which is related to the statement of redundancy or repetition of the tautology.

TIME: "*So just continuing on this idea of America's role on the world stage, what is your message to the demonstrators in Hong Kong right now?*"

TRUMP: "*Well, look, my message is that they're obviously having a big impact, because it's been pulled back and it will be pulled back further. And I think that they've been very effective in their dealings with China. By the way, I*

have a very good relationship with China, just that they've treated us unfairly with respect to trade for many years. Since the WTO, we've been treated unfairly. We've helped create China. I give them a lot of credit, but we've helped create China. You look at what's happened over the last period of time, and China wants to make a deal. They actually had a deal with us. We were very close to having a deal, and then they pulled back on three major points that were just unacceptable to me. So, I'm very happy now collecting 25% on \$250 billion, which is what we're doing. But China wants to make a deal, and I don't blame them, because companies are leaving China by the References hundreds because they don't want to pay the tariffs. So, China's going to want to make a deal."

Where the breach of the maxim of manner and relevance are quite evident. This answer violates the principle of relevance as well as the maxim of manner. It seems to be less straightforward than required.

Conclusions

From the examination and critical interpretation of Trump's violation of Grice's maxims, the following conclusions are drawn:

President Trump breached the maxims of quantity because he supplied too much information and he was not to the point or was given the circumlocution of a topic's talk. President Trump breached the maxims of excellence. Because President Trump misrepresented the information. And said something that they believed was false. President Trump breached the maxims of relevancy since he gave material that was not relevant to the subject. President Trump also breached the maxims of manner as President Trump used vague wording to address the inquiry. And President Trump broke the maxims because he wanted the listener to believe every word he uttered in that conversation. In the end, President Trump said he was often uncooperative when he interviewed Jonathan on HBO.

When Trump is confronted with questions that he considers to be potentially hazardous or sensitive, he follows the rule of relevance and tries to avoid directly answering them by going around the bush or using ambiguous language.

Another crucial result is that when he is asked questions or issues about what is going on in America or about him personally that are not harmful to him, he tends to extend his response, therefore violating the quantity maxims.

One of the most crucial implications or outcomes that one can get from this research or analysis, given the language

of politics, is that the maxims of quantity and relevance are much more frequently violated than the maxims of quality and technique. Politics very often involves knowledge. That is why it is hard to understand the accuracy or adequacy or insufficiency of any piece of information.

The maxim of style, like the maxim of quality, comes only infrequently. This is because Trump's contributions to the discourse are often less cryptic or oblique.

The list is consistent with the maxim of relevance. Which means that Trump's input to the discourse is less significant and has no link to the context.

References

Leech, G (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman Group Ltd.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, S. (1985). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, (pp.41-58). Academic Press.

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. Routledge.

Tupan, Anneke H and Helen Natalia. 2008. The Multiple Violation of Conversational Maxims in Lying Done by the Characters in Some Episodes of *Desperate Housewives*. *English Department, Faculty of Letters, Petra Christian University*, 10(01), 63-78. DOI: 10.9744/kata.10.1.63-78/

<https://www.hbo.com/about/>

C-SPAN (2019, July 19). *President Trump on being called a racist* ([video]. Youtube.

[https://youtu.be/8e7FNv8RSnU\[12\]](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>

1.

<http://www.petra.ac.id/~puslit/journals/dir.php?DepartmentID=ING>

2. HBO.com. (2021). About HBO. Retrieved April 27, 2021, from

3. <https://time.com/5611476/donald-trump-transcript-time-interview/>