

Non observance in Joe Biden's speech a pragmatic study

Reem Ibrahim Alattallah

Assistant Professor Dr. Eba' M. Yahya Al-Rassam

reemareema1212rr@gmail.com

Synopsis Politicians use their political interviews to share their opinions on issues facing their countries and other pertinent topics. They use implicature to communicate their objectives to the listener in a variety of indirect and inconsistent ways. Implicature is a component of speaker meaning that, apart from the explicit content, includes a portion of the speaker's intended message in a statement. This study looks at the implied meaning of Joe Biden's speech when he appeared on CBS's "60 minutes" show.

Given the foregoing, the primary goal of the current study is to pinpoint instances of non-observance in Joe Biden's interview with CBS's "60 Minutes" program. In addition to elucidating the purposes of the implicatures that appear in Biden's interview with CBS's "60 Minutes"

The study also makes other hypotheses, among them that: (2) In Joe Biden's speech, the quantity maxim is the one that is most frequently broken or ignored. In accordance with Grice's idea of implicature and the cooperative principle, this study combines qualitative and quantitative approaches (1975). The goal of the descriptive qualitative method is to characterize a language phenomenon in relation to its surrounding context. Since the research findings were expressed as numerical values, percentages, and statistical measures, a quantitative approach was judged required to support this study in order to ensure comprehensive and trustworthy conclusions .

The process of collecting data involves several steps, such as downloading the video, getting the full interview transcript, and identifying statements that might be implicature.

The data analysis produces a number of conclusions, the most common of which are (1) all the maxims were broken or flouted to varying degrees depending on the topic covered during the interview, and (2) Joe Biden most often breaks or flouts the maxim of quantity because he tends to engage in lengthy discourse to provide thorough explanations of his opinions and beliefs.

Key words: Pragmatics, Implicature, Political discourse.

1. Introduction

Both the audience and the speaker must use language proficiently in order to promote efficient communication. This will promote the growth of understanding or acknowledgment of the group's importance. It is often known that prosperous and successful communication happens when all parties can understand the importance

and content of the information being shared as well as the sharing of feelings, ideas, and personal perspectives. When a speaker and listener miscommunicate, there may be reciprocal misinterpretations that have negative effects on both parties. The listener's failure to grasp is the main cause of their inability to fully comprehend the speaker's intended message.

Politicians use implicatures, maybe because they intentionally choose to include implicit components in their spoken exchanges, written statements, and favored ways of communicating with the public. Some politicians use language manipulation to support a particular leadership style in an effort to gain widespread support while maintaining their public persona and without making overt statements. They know that everything they say will be heard by everyone in the community. The aforementioned individuals are cognizant of the fact that gaining public endorsement is a prerequisite for achieving their desired political positions. As such, they often express concepts that are difficult to understand.

2. Theoretical Background & Literature Review

This chapter provides an overview of pragmatics theory in general and the cooperative principle theory in specific. concentrating on the key ideas of this philosophy. Apart from emphasizing the unique characteristics of political discourse, a summary of the most pertinent studies that have been previously published is also deliberated.

2.1 Pragmatics

Because pragmatics is interdisciplinary and has brought philosophy, psychology, and language studies together, it has historically occupied a major place in the study of language. The three most important pragmatics researchers to study the connection between signs and usage were S. Pierce, R. Carnap, and C. Morris (Levinson, 1983). The study of pragmatics as a branch of linguistics focuses on the ways in which context affects meaning. In 1946, British philosopher Charles Morris used the term "pragmatics" to refer to the branch of semiotics that deals with signals.

According to Morris, pragmatics focuses on the different exchanges that take place between people who create or interpret signs (Verschueren, 2003). Osisanwo (2008) asserts that Yule's (1996:3) definition of pragmatics includes a number of different facets of the discipline. According to Yule, pragmatics is the academic study of many features like as the depiction of relative distance, speaker meaning, contextual meaning, the transmission of implicit signals, and the conveyance of extra information beyond explicit utterances. In addition to the message's content, Osisanwo claims that pragmatics also includes the people communicating, their shared perspectives, the context's ability to draw conclusions, the implications of explicit or implicit statements, and the influence of nonverbal cues on meaning interpretation. This gives a more thorough understanding of pragmatics. The original

purpose of pragmatics was to create a language level that stands apart from other levels. According to Adams (1985), it developed progressively throughout the course of the 20th century, going from phonology to syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and finally grammar. Differentiating pragmatics from semantics is the main goal of many definitions of the field.

2.2 Political Discourse

2.2.1 Defining Political Discourse

Van Dijk (2002: 225) asserts that rather than being characterized by a subject or style, "political speech" is basically defined by who speaks to whom, as what, at what occasion, and with what motives. Put another way, political discourse is especially "political" because of its role in the political process. According to Cliton (2004), politics is the struggle between those who want to take and maintain power and those who want to subvert it. A power battle is also raging within the parliament, the cabinet, and the parties. Politics is conducted through speech and writing, and these political acts are likewise carried out through these speech and writing. The acts that political parties, governments, and parliament perform to fulfill their political mandates are the only things that qualify as political activity (Taiwo, 2010). Furthermore, these institutions' members vie with one another for political influence (Beard, 2000:35).

Politicians use language to shape people's perceptions because, as Bayley (2000) puts it, "power can only be wielded in social relations, and language plays a critical function in keeping these linkages." Politicians are also known to occasionally employ fuzziness and euphemisms in their remarks. Its goal is to "make murder seem respectable and falsehoods sound truthful by giving the appearance of solidity to pure wind" (Orwel, 1946:157). Certain scholars claim that there is an unbreakable relationship between language and politics. Politics, for instance, "cannot be done without language, and it is definitely the case that the use of language in the development of social organizations leads to what we call "politics" in a wide sense," according to Chilton and Schaffner (1994, 1997). Additionally, Wilson says that the goal of political discourse analysis is to look at how language or discourse is utilized to attain political effects (Wilson, 2001). Pelinka further states that in order to comprehend the significance of spoken words, language must be seen as a political phenomena that requires ongoing study in cooperation with other fields of language studies like literature and linguistics. Pelinka further points out that politicians typically communicate indirectly and employ cryptic, linguistically complex, veiled phrases. It is true that they speak softly (Pelinka, 2007).

2.2.2 The Role of the Media in Political Discourse

The media is a crucial component to consider while analyzing political language. Because political discourse in the media is so hybrid, there are many methods to

discuss politics, especially when it comes to structural configurations. The forms could shift from tightly structured question-and-answer sessions with direct audience participation to a semi-formal interview with a host who has received interview training (Fetzer, 2013:5). In conducting a political interview, the interviewer and the interviewee usually have competing goals. The primary goal of the interviewer is typically to obtain and deliver as much information as possible. However, politicians often take advantage of this opportunity to improve the public perception of themselves or their party (Li, 2008: 34).

2.3 The Cooperative Principles

It is commonly believed that when people converse with each other, they will act in a cooperative manner. Collaboration in spoken communication is a widely accepted idea, to the point where Grice (1975, cited in Yule, 1996: 37) called it the "cooperative principle." "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the Stage at which it happens, by the recognized purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are participating," is how he interprets the cooperation principle.

In his article "Logic and Conversation," Grice (1975) described communication as follows: "Our discussion exchanges do not generally consist of a chain of disconnected remarks, and would not be rational if they did." Each participant recognizes a common goal or set of goals, or at the very least a mutually agreed direction, in them to some level. They are, at the very least, cooperative activities (Grice [1975] 1989: 26).

Grice's work, according to Bousfield (2008:22), aimed to elucidate the effective communication strategies used by discussion participants. He arrived at the idea that every conversational partner anticipates providing some degree of meaningful cooperation. Grice never meant for the word "cooperation" to suggest that he understood communication perfectly. Rather, Grice was trying to explain how, in spite of the haphazard or even antagonistic nature of much ordinary human communication, most discourse participants are quite capable of making themselves understood and capable of understanding most others in the course of their daily activities (Mey, 2009:152).

2.3.1 The Maxim of Quantity

The Quantity Maxims take into account that speakers should be fairly informative:

- Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange) .
- Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

The maxim of quantity motivates the speaker to make his contribution as informative as possible. The speaker is forced to say exactly what is necessary because it should not be either too much or too little .

2.3.2 The Maxim of Quality

There are two maxims in the quality maxims that represent the expectation that speakers will be truthful and reasonable in their statements.

- Do not say what you believe to be false
- Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence .

This kind of maxim encourages the speaker to give the facts straight and support them with evidence. Grice uses the following example to illustrate this idea: "I want you to offer something meaningful, not anything dishonest. I don't expect you to bring me salt if I need sugar for the cake you're helping me prepare, and I don't expect a rubber trick spoon if I need a spoon" (Grice, 1975).

2.3.3 The Maxim of Relation

One should be relevant, according to the third premise. "Be relevant" In order to accomplish the goal of the maxim relation, the speaker should provide a contribution that is pertinent to the topic of the conversation and stays on topic. Grice provides this maxim link category with an analogy. *"I expect a partner's contribution to be appropriate to the immediate needs at each stage of the transaction; if I'm mixing ingredients for a cake, I don't expect to be handed an amazing book or even an oven towel (though this may be an acceptable contribution later)."* (Grice,1975).

2.3.4 The Maxim of Manner

The Manner Maxims express the demand for clarity in speakers: "Be perspicuous":

- Avoid ambiguity
- Avoid obscurity of expression
- Be brief
- Be orderly (Grice [1975] 1989: 26-27).

This type of maxim encourages the speaker to present their ideas in a clear and understandable way. Consequently, it ought to be comprehensible, organized, and unambiguous. As opposed to the other maxims, the manner maxim emphasizes the manner in which something is said rather than the content of the statement (Bousfield 2008:22). An utterance's comprehension can be greatly influenced by its manner of expression. Furthermore, Grice aimed to underline that the list of sub-maxims for the method category could not be adequate (Bousfield 2008:23).

2.3.5 Observing the Maxims

It is clear from Grice's theory of meaning that comprehending the speaker's intention is essential to comprehending the speaker's meaning (Christie, 2000: 130). Grice's

theory aims to offer a framework for comprehending the indirect act of meaning communication, which explains the relationship between the participants in the discourse and the maxims (Allan and Jaszczolt, 2012: 277). A speaker's obligation to adhere to the maxims and be obedient relies on the nature of the verbal exchange that occurs during a talk.

2.3.6 Non-Observance Maxim

The non-observance of maxims occurs when a speaker is unable to maintain the cooperative principle's tenets when speaking. A dialogue between the speaker and the hearer will not flow naturally if the speaker is unable to follow the maxims. According to Thomas, there are many different reasons why someone can go against a maxim, including deliberate deception or an incapacity to communicate clearly (Thomas, 1995:64). Because speakers are expected to be cooperative by using language in accordance with the maxims, Verschueren contends that a cooperative interlocutor will interpret any blatant disregard for the maxims as a conscious act indicating specific (implicit) meaning (Verschueren, 1999:33).

There are four ways a conversation partner can violate a maxim, according to Paul Grice's article Logic and Conversation. First of all, when someone breaks a maxim, they might do so stealthily and unnoticeably, putting them in a position to trick other people. Second, the individual can express his reluctance to cooperate by choosing not to follow the cooperative principle and maxim. Consequently, the rejection could be obvious. Thirdly, since he cannot uphold the second maxim without violating the first, there may be conflict between the two.

Fourth, a participant is considered to be flouting the dictum when they blatantly disregard it by inviting implicature. As a whole, maxim violation, opting out of a maxim, infringing a maxim, and flouting a maxim are instances of non-observance (Grice, 1975: 30). Subsequently, Thomas Jenny added a fifth category of maxim non-observance to the previous four, which he calls maxim suspension (Thomas, 1995: 64).

2.3.6.1 Flouting

Speaking outside of the maxims is called "flouting of the maxims," and it happens when speakers purposefully violate the maxims to lead their audience to understand the implicit meaning of what they are saying. Politicians often blatantly disregard the adage that they have no intention of misleading or deceiving the audience or the public. Politicians want to highlight the inferred meaning, which could be different from the stated meaning or something different entirely. "Flouting a Maxim" is the technique by which Grice produces this new level, which he names "Conversational implicature" (Grice, 1975, p. 71).

The speaker intentionally violated a maxim in this particular case:

"A: Smith does not seem to have a girlfriend these days.

B: He has been paying many visits to New York lately”.

Occasionally, purposefully breaking the cooperative principle can result in the desired outcome of making the intended message clear. Cutting says it can be difficult to tell which maxim is true and which isn't. The idea that there are flaws in the cooperative model is considered to be a problem. The following example shows how the four maxims intersect: “*A: What did you have to eat?*

B: Oh, something masquerading as a chicken chasseur”

B's response defies the maxims of quantity (by giving insufficient information), manner (by not making it clear what he has to eat), and quality (by not being genuine), even if it is evident that the response is pertinent to the query (Cutting, 2002: 42).

As per Thomas's (1995: 65) assertion, implicature arises when a speaker deliberately deviates from a maxim, not with the aim of misleading the listener, but rather to encourage them to go beyond the literal meaning. Cruse outlines three requirements that must be met for an implicature to occur when a speaker transgresses one or more maxims (Cruse 2000:360).

(A) The violation of the maxims is obvious to the listener.

(B) It is clear to the listener that the speaker wants him to understand that the maxims are being broken.

(C) The speaker shows no indications that he is opting out of the cooperative principle . (Cruse 2000:360)

The listener will understand that a deeper meaning is being given and that the speech is not meant to be understood superficially if all three requirements are met (Cruse 2000:360) .

One essential element of flouting is the interlocutors' collaboration (Levinson 1983:109).

• **flouting the maxim of quantity:**

This adage is usually broken when the speaker uses too few words in a conversation, which results in understatement or overstatement of information according to the situation at hand. Stated differently, the speaker speaks with partially formed words (Leech, 1983: 140 .(

In this instance, the speech is informative in terms of "what is implied" rather than "what is said," and the listener's interpretation of the speech will depend on their capacity to decipher the speaker's reasoning for selecting this specific speech. As an example, consider this from Cutting (2002:37):

"Madeline: How do I look, then?

Jennifer: "I like your shoes."

Jennifer's response doesn't give Madeline all the information she needs to comprehend what was stated. Not that a cute t-shirt and pants look horrible, but since Madeline had inquired about the entire outfit rather than just a part of it, Jennifer thought she would get the reference .

Due to insufficient information, the discourse in the aforementioned situation clearly violates the quantity maxim. Jennifer leaves off part of her comment, so Madeline can deduce the intended meaning.

• **Flouting the maxim of quality:**

In order to avoid punishment from the addressee, the addressor intends to say something false, lie, or deny something. The speaker presents his information fraudulently in order to guarantee that the listener understands the intended meaning of the remark (Levinson, 1983, 110). As an example, consider this from Cutting (2002:37):

"Dominic: why don't you hang out with your buddies?"

Connor: what do you think kind of man I am? I am a good boy taking care of my mom at home"

The aforementioned incident helps Dominic realize that Connor is lying and that he is a bad guy who usually ignores his mother in favor of hanging out with his friends. It's safe to assume that he's just being ironic with himself. In other words. The example above disregarded the quality maxim. According to Cruse (2000), the context of the speech makes it probable to mislead listeners even while it is not true to violate the quality requirement.

There are a number of ways to ignore the quality maxim. Exaggeration is the first strategy. "Hyperbole is typically employed to accentuate something (word) or as a show of tremendous expressiveness or passion," according to Wales (2001: 190). The second method is metaphor. "Words used with metaphor sense cross over sphere of reference onto another on the basis of identical apparent likeness," according to Wales (2001: 250). One element of the metaphorical approach is euphemism. Irony is the third strategy. According to Wales (2001), irony is caustic and often use language that is contradictory. Using humor is the fourth strategy.

Cutting (2002) defined banter as a somewhat aggressive behavior that both expresses and implies a positive emotion. One term used to describe banter is "mock-impoliteness." As rain changes to freezing sleet, Allott explains that the first quality maxim—"Do not express something you judge to be false"—is obviously broken when someone remarks, ironically, "It's fantastic weather for June." The speaker may have conveyed something true—specifically, the contrary of what it first seemed she was saying—to the listener if they believe she is attempting to be cooperative (Grice

employs the traditional meaning of irony in this instance). For example, "It's horrible weather for June."

• **Flouting the maxim of relation:**

The person violates this rule in a way that throws the conversation out of sync and causes the participants to express their topics in different ways. The participant in this case will change the subject by bringing up an irrelevant topic shift during the conversation (Levinson, 1983, 111).

When a speaker changes the topic of a discussion while still assuming that the listener would be aware of the change, they are violating the relational principle. Cutting (2002) claims that by including unrelated remarks, this violates the dictum of relation as an exchanging subject; yet, it still makes the assumption that the audience would comprehend by making connections between the issue at hand and the one that came before it. The chat that follows is an example of this happening:

"A: what do you think of Mark?"

B: his flatmate is a wonderful cook"

As we saw in the last example, B's answer had nothing to do with the question. In response to A's inquiry concerning Mark, B mentions Mark's roommate. But A tries to imply that B isn't genuinely that interested in Mark. This does not necessarily mean, though, that B is not impressed by Mark; it is equally possible that B is unaware of Mark. Since B knows his roommate better than Mark does, he chooses to describe him instead of Mark (Cutting, 2002:39).

• **Flouting the maxim of manner:**

A speaker violates the rule of manners when they utter anything nonsensical. Cutting (2002) states that a speaker violates the rule of manners when his discourse is ambiguous, seems foggy, or tends toward ambiguity. Furthermore, when the speaker uses cryptic language or idioms that make it difficult for the listeners to understand what they are saying. Examples of "flouting the maxim of manner" would be those. Additionally, if the speakers use slang or have a low voice, they will disregard this rule (Levinson, 1983:104).

3. Methodology

3.1 Data collection procedures and the Method of the Research:

In order to analyze the data, this study combines quantitative and qualitative methods. Creswell's (2014) research technique is consistent with the mixed-methods approach to this study, which blends qualitative and quantitative analysis. To characterize a

language phenomenon within its contextual framework, the research used a descriptive-qualitative method. The use of numerical data, percentages, and statistical analysis to illustrate the research findings further supported the need for a quantitative approach to support this study. because it was necessary to carry out this project in order to guarantee a thorough investigation and reliable findings.

3.2 The Model of Analysis:

Data analysis is the next stage after the data collection procedure. In order to identify the many forms of implicatures, the study of the script's debates will make use of Grice's (1975) concept of implicature. The goal is to perform an analysis that will ultimately discover numerous sorts of implicatures, including conversational implicatures, conventional implicatures, scalar implicatures, and maxim violation/flouting. In the topic of philosophy of language, Grice's model—which deals with implicature—is greatly influential. The statement suggests a meaning beyond what the phrase expressly indicates. The two main categories, according to H.P. Grice, are conversational and conventional implicatures.

Particularized and generalized conversational implicature are the two different types of implicature in discourse. In addition, the previously described theory offers a thorough explanation of Grice's conversational maxims and the cooperative principle, which are essential components of the theory's structure. We divide the maxims into four groups and discuss the implications of breaking each one.

3.3 Data Analysis:

Extract 1

SCOTT: "You're not arguing that 8.3% is good news."

BIDEN: "No, I'm not sying it is good news.

But it was 8.2% or ... 8.2% before. I mean, it's not.. you're ac.. we act .. make it sound like all of a sudden, my god, it went to 8.2% It's been-"

Joe Biden indicates a "PCI in this case since in order to understand his utterance completely , the interviewer has to understand the context of the conversation".

When Joe Biden said that the increase wasn't a surprise to the American people, he violated the principle of quality by saying something that is untrue. He is aware that the American people are astonished.

Extract 2

SCOTT: "Is the economy going worse before it gets better?"

BIDEN: "No. I don't think so. We hope we can have what they say, a soft landing, a transition to a place where we don't lose the gains that I ran to make in the first place for middle-class folks, being able to generate good-paying jobs and—expansion. And at the same time.. make sure that we ..we are.. are able to continue to grow."

Biden offered a traditional implicature in his first statement, "I don't think so." "We hope we may have what they call a gentle landing," he says, implying that he is not convinced about it while still hoping for a better outcome .

The second implicature arises from disobeying the rule of quantity, providing more details than are required, discussing at length about the professions, and expressing a desire for a pay raise .

This implicature's goal is to highlight employment and salary advancements rather than talking about the status of the economy as a whole and whether or not things will get better.

Extract 3

SCOTT: "And you would tell the American people that inflation is going to continue to decline?"

BIDEN: "No, I'm telling the American people that we are gonna get control of inflation. And their prescription drug prices are gonna be a hell of lotta lower. Their health care costs are gonna be a lot lower. Their basics costs for everybody, their energy prices are gonna be lower.

Joe Biden violated the principle of quality in this segment of the discussion by making claims without offering proof. Furthermore, he pledged to keep inflation under control even though it is now high. Along with these promises, he assured the American people that their energy and healthcare prices would drop dramatically, despite the nation's dire economic circumstances and high inflation rate. This intervention aims to distract the populace from the country's general economic woes by assuaging their fears and flooding them with promises.

Extract 4

SCOTT: "Mr, president, the price of gasoline is down about 26% from the \$5 high. What can you do to keep that price down while Vladimir Putin is throttling energy supplies?"

BIDEN: "well, there's ..there's a couple things we've done. For example, remember I got some criticism for releasing a million barrels of oil a day from the strategic petroleum reserve. And then along came the industry saying they'd produce another million barrels a day by the spring. So, I think we're in relatively good shape."

Although Biden was helpful in this interaction since he answered the issue in the best possible way without going against any rules, his comments have varied meanings. The word "some" in this part of the text has a scalar implicature, meaning that only some of them condemned him for the decisions he made on this subject .

During his address, the president selected the quantifier "some" from the following list: "all, most, many, some, few." He implies that none of the other words—all, most,

or many—have questioned his decision to spill the oil because the word "some" negates all other words with bigger amounts.

Extract 5

SCOTT: "Schools."

BIDEN: "..to schools, it's .. it's just outrageous. And so the price Ukrainian people are paying for this war is extremely high. But we're gonna stay with them as long as they need our help."

At this point in the conversation, Joe Biden had broken the quality-quantity guideline by giving far more information than was necessary in response to the request. In order to substantiate his assertion that Russia is weaker than most people think and that it cannot threaten Ukraine because the US and its allies are able to help and defend it, Biden gave a comprehensive rebuttal.

Extract 6

SCOTT: "You're already north of \$15 billion in terms of those commitments. How far do you go?"

BIDEN: "As long as it takes."

Biden violated the quantity maxim in his response by providing less details than were required to address the topic and by omitting to indicate the extent of his willingness to assist Ukraine. And it follows that the United States of America's determination on aiding Ukraine in its conflict with Russia extends beyond the points at which this matter terminates.

Extract 7

SCOTT: "As Ukraine succeeds on the battlefield, Vladimir Putin is becoming embarrassed and pushed into a corner. And I wonder, Mr. president, what you would say to him if he is considering using chemical or tactical nuclear weapons."

BIDEN: "Don't. Don't. Don't. You will change the face of the war unlike anything since world war II."

During this part of the conversation, Biden disobeys the rule of politeness by being evasive and failing to say clearly to Putin what he would like to say if he considered using nuclear weapons. The speech in this passage is confusing and susceptible to several interpretations because of its ambiguity. It is believed that there is a concealed warning between the confusing lines since many questions then surface regarding the responses that follow that act.

Extract 8

SCOTT: "And the consequences of that would be what?"

BIDEN: "I'm not going to speculate.."

In this response, Biden violated the rule of quantity by giving less information than the question required (understatement). This is done to demonstrate his unwillingness to divulge any strategies or choices that would be made in the event that Russia were to deploy nuclear weapons against the United States.

3.4 Discussion and Findings:

The results of the maxims that are broken or flouted indicate that there are three maxims of quantity broken, two maxims of manner broken, one maxim of relation broken, and one maxim of quality broken. In addition, there are eleven maxims of quantity broken, five maxims of relevance broken, four maxims of manner broken, and two maxims of quality broken.

The results show that Joe Biden routinely disregarded the rule of quantity, asserting that he usually gave more details than were required to address the topic and that the extra details he added during the conversation were superfluous.

As per Paul Grice, an abundance of information can be deceptive as it might raise irrelevant issues and create an impression of a deliberate intent on the part of the speaker by making listeners. Biden occasionally defied the rule of quantity, though, by understating the question and giving less information than was necessary. In doing so, he suggested that the lack of information had further consequences. Relevance is the second most commonly broken precept, and Biden blatantly broke it when he used unrelated responses to draw conclusions and emphasize his accomplishments .

The second noticed occurrence is flouting the precept of manners, as seen by Biden's evasive responses and unclear statements.

Table (1): Table of flouting maxims:

Maxims	Occurrence	Percentages
Quantity	10	50%
Quality	2	9%
Manner	4	18%
Relevance	5	23%
Total	21	100%

Table (2): Table of violating maxims:

Maxims	Occurrence	Percentages
Quantity	3	43%
Quality	1	14%
Manner	2	29%
Relevance	1	14%
Total	7	100%

4.1 Conclusions

The study has come up with the following conclusions:

The data analysis indicates that, depending on the topic covered in the interview, each of the maxims was broken or disregarded to varying degrees, causing some to be more commonly observed than others. This validates the fourth conjecture.

The most commonly broken maxim is the one about quantity, according to the data analysis and conclusions. When people divulge more or less information than is necessary, this happens. Politicians, such as Joe Biden, frequently disregard or transgress the rule of quantity in order to highlight important topics and gain support from the public. This is consistent with hypothesis number five. Given the information at hand, it is evident that Joe Biden has largely disregarded the quantity maxim by acting contrary to its tenets. There are several indications that he is not adhering to the principle of multiplicity.

Joe Biden routinely breaks the rule of quantity in an attempt to avoid any misunderstanding of what he says. As a result, he frequently speaks at length to give detailed justifications for his opinions and convictions, aware that everyone is listening to everything he says. He must thus proceed with caution in view of this. In an attempt to clear up any confusion, Biden shown a propensity to offer lengthy clarifications when a brief answer would have been plenty for the question at hand.

Defying the precept of relation is the second most common instance of non-observance, indicating that Biden occasionally shifts the topic to make a point or to throw light on various matters for his personal benefit.

4.2 Reference

- Adams, J. K. (1985). *Pragmatics and fiction*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia. J. Benjamins Pub. Co.

- Allan, K. & Jaszczolt, K. (2012). *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allott, N. (2010). *Key Terms in Pragmatics*. London: Continuum.
- Beard, A. (2002). *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Baily, B. (2000). Communicative behavior and conflict. *Discourse and society* 11 (1). 86-108.
- Bousfield, Derek. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics)*. The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in the Study of Religion. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chilton, Paul. (2004). *Analyzing political Discourse : Theory and Practics*. London : Routledge.
- Cruse, D. Alan. (2000). *Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. New York: Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. A.P. *Philosophy of Language*. (Martinich, Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fetzer, A. (2013). Introduction: "The multi-layered and multifaceted nature of political discourse". In Fetzer, A. (Ed.), *The Pragmatics of Political Discourse* (pp. 1-18). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Khosravizadeh, P., & Sadehvandi, N. (2011). Some Instances of Violation and Flouting of the Maxims of Quantity by the Main Characters (Barry and Tim) in *Dinner for Schmucks*. *International Conference on Language, Literature, and Linguistics*, 26, 122-127.
- Leech, G. (2003). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Li, S. (2008). "A performative perspective of Flouting and Politeness in Political Interview". *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 5(2).
- Mey, J. (2009). *Pragmatics: An Introduction (2nd ed)*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Orwell, G. (1946). *Politics and the English Language*. In *inside the whale and other essays* (146-157). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Osisanwo, W. (2008). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics (2nd ed.)*. Lagos: FemolusFetop. 116
- Pelinka, A. (2007). Language as a political category: the viewpoint of political science. *Journal of language & politics* 6. 129-43.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning In Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Routledge.

- Van Dijk, T.A. (2002). "Ideology : Political discourse and cognition". In P.Chilton and Ch. Schaffner (eds.).Politics as Text and Talk.Amsterdam: Benjamins : 33- 57.
- Verschueren, J. (2003). Understanding Pragmatics. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Wales, K. (2001). A Dictionary of Stylistics (2nd ed). England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Wilson, J. (1990). Politically Speaking : the Pragmatic Analysis of Political Language. Oxford : Basil Blackwell.
- Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.