



On Flouting Cooperative Maxims

A Political Catch - 22 Communicative Quest

Prof. Rafi' M. Hussein¹, Dr. Shaalan N. Abdullah²

^{1,2}Dept. of English, Coll. of Arts, Dijlah University, Baghdad, Iraq

rafi.mahmood@duc.edu.iq

shaalan.abdula.@duc.edu.iq

Abstract

This study sheds light on the Cooperative Principle (hereinafter CP), its maxims and the flouting of these maxims in conversational contributions. The concept of cooperation in conversation and talk exchanges is presented by Grice (1975) who theorizes the theorem of the cooperative principle with its maxims: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. Cooperation is supposed to be achieved by these maxims being observed by participants. Sometimes, these maxims are not observed adequately for a variety of reasons. Non-observance modes of maxims include flouting, violating, opting out, infringing, etc. Flouting, the main concern of this study, occurs when participants blatantly fail to observe a maxim which results in generating conversational implicature.

It is then the intentional violating of one of the maxims to imply something indirectly by using sarcasm, irony, or innuendo for rhetorical or persuasive effect.

By investigating the tactics utilized by two politicians and flouting of Grice's C P relevant in political discourse this paper attends to make a touch down on figuring some tactics and outmaneuvers followed to secure acceptance. Specifically, the paper compares the rhetorical styles followed by Trump and Obama in selected speech excerpts. Using the framework of Grice's (1975) conversational maxims—Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner—this study explores how both figures tactically adhere to or deviate from cooperative maxims to persuade, influence, and have public perception.

Flouting the maxims is a micro-level linguistic phenomenon. It saliently contributes to enhance macro-level rhetorical strategies. Understanding both, the micro- and macro-level analysis of political speech helps reveal what is being said, what is being implied, and how power is exercised via linguistic expressions.

Keywords: Cooperative principles, maxims, flouting, non-observance modes, implicatures, micro-macro levels analysis



أجبية خرق مسلمات التواصل الخطابي المتبادل في الخطاب السياسي

أ . رافع محمود حسين^١، د. شعلان نجم عبدالله^٢

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الفنون، جامعة دجلة، بغداد، العراق

rafi.mahmood@duc.edu.iq

shaalan.abdula.@duc.edu.iq

المخلص

تسلط هذه الدراسة الضوء على مبدأ التعاون التواصلية والمشار إليه فيما بعد بالرمز "م.ت"، ومبادئه الأساسية، وتبين اثر الإخلال بهذه المبادئ في المساقات الحوارية وفي مدلولاتها. وقد عرف غرايس (١٩٧٥) مفهوم التعاون التواصلية وتبادل الحديث، مُنظراً لمبدأ التعاون بمبادئه الأربعة: الكمّ المعرفي، وكيف الطرح واسلوبه، والعلاقة الدلالية لمكوناته، والأسلوب المتبع في الطرح. ومفترضاً أن يتحقق مبدأ التعاون عبر التزام المشاركين بهذه المبادئ. غير أن هذه المبادئ قد لا تُراعى بالشكل المطلوب لأسباب متعددة. وبأ نمط مختلفة منها عدم مراعاة المبادئ وخرقها بفعل الإخلال، او الانتهاك، او الانسحاب، او التقصير، وغيرها. ويُعدّ "الإخلال بمسلمات هذه المبادئ" - وهو محور هذه الدراسة - سلوكاً يظهره ويتعمده المتحدث بعدم مراعاته أحد المبادئ بشكل واضح، الأمر الذي يؤدي إلى توليد دلالة حوارية ضمنية متمثلة في الانتهاك المقصود لأحد المبادئ بالإيحاء غير المباشر عن طريق السخرية أو التهكم أو التلميح، لتحقيق تأثير بلاغي أو إقناعي.

ومن خلال دراسة الأساليب التي استخدمها سياسيان، ورصد الإخلال بمبدأ التعاون لدى غرايس في الخطاب السياسي، تسعى هذه الورقة إلى الكشف عن بعض التكتيكات والمناورات التي تُتبع لضمان القبول. وتحديدًا، تُقارن الورقة بين الأساليب البلاغية التي اتبعتها ترامب وأوباما في مقاطع مختارة من خطبتهما. وباستخدام إطار عمل مبادئ غرايس الحوارية في المحادثة (١٩٧٥) في الكم، وكيف، والعلاقة، والأسلوب - تستكشف هذه الدراسة كيفية التزام كلا الشخصيتين أو خروجهما التكتيكي عن مبادئ التعاون بغرض الإقناع، والتأثير، وتشكيل الانطباع العام..

إن الإخلال بالمبادئ الحوارية يُعد ظاهرة لغوية على مستوى التحليل اللغوي الدقيق، ويسهم بوضوح في ارساء استراتيجيات بلاغية على مستوى الخطاب الدلالي الاعم وفهم التحليلين بالمستويين الدقيق والاعم معاً في الخطاب السياسي يساعد على كشف ما يُقال صراحة، وما يُفهم ضمناً، وكيف تُمارس القوة عبر التعبيرات اللغوية.

كلمات المفتاحية: مبدأ التعاون، المبادئ الحوارية، الإخلال، أنماط عدم المراعاة، الدلالات الضمنية، التحليل اللغوي الدقيق والخطاب الحوارية الاعم



1. Introduction

Political discourse often depends on associative meaning of multiple levels beyond literal meaning to attend users' quests. Politicians frequently incorporate implicit modes of expressions to formulate public perception, authority, and assert distinguished identity. Grice's (1975) CP and its conversational maxims, Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner, propose powerful analytical means for exploring tactics political figure implements to shape meaning in political speech. It is the following to these maxims which promotes clarity and cooperation, whereas flouting the maxims overtly can create conversational implicature, "thereby enriching or obscuring meaning to achieve specific rhetorical effects". (Grice, 1975).

Communication is seen as a cooperative act between people. Interlocutors cooperate with each other through the process of communication. According to Grice (1975), communication is the result of interactants' mutual cooperation. Basically, inferring meaning in communicating requires understanding and figuring out the speakers intended invisible meaning through their linguistic choices rather than the overt literal meaning of their utterances.

This study explores the CP, its associated maxims, and the deliberate flouting of these maxims within the context of political discourse. The concept of cooperation in conversation, as first been articulated by Grice (1975), posits that interlocutors generally adhere to mutually approved drive to contribute meaningfully and orderly to the communicative exchange by effectively following the relevant conversational norms. This assumption is vocalized into Grice's "Cooperative Principle", which is implicated through four conversational maxims namely: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. These maxims are supposed to guide language users to be appropriately informative (Quantity), truthful with evidence (Quality), relevant to the topic (Relation). They should express themselves clearly and orderly (Manner)

Frequently, in real-world discourse, especially in the political discourse, strategic deviations from the maxims are broadly involved. Such non-observance manifest in violating, infringing, opting out, or flouting a maxim or else. Of particular interest is flouting, wherein an interlocutor blatantly and intentionally drops a maxim, not to obscure meaning but to imply conversational implicature—a deeper or indirect meaning [using sarcasm, irony, or innuendo] that relies on the audience's inferential capacity (Grice, 1975).

In political discourse, flouting the CP maxim is a rhetorical tactic often used to achieve persuasion, evasions, or populist case. Politicians may flout the Maxim of Quantity by being overly redundant to avoid addressing critical quests, or the Maxim of Quality by using exaggeration or vague expressions to appeal to emotions rather than facts. And, the Maxim of Relation may be flouted through distraction, verbal deviation or



digression, thereby leading attention away from embarrassing issues. These tactics serve not only to inform but to secure public perception, and ideological stances. A favorable persona might also be crafted via flouting any of the maxims.

Moreover, political discourse incorporates ambiguity, irony, and implication devices depending on the strategic flouting of Gricean maxims. As Chilton and Schaffner (1997) proclaim that, “political language is rarely neutral; it is shaped by intentions to persuade, dominate, or mitigate threats to face”. Thus, understanding how political figures flout conversational maxims is vital in providing insights into the pragmatics of persuasion means, ideological framing, and public perception.

According to Grice (quoted in Kempson 6), there is an outlined assumption marking all utterance interpretation. Thus, the interpretation of utterances is considered to be a collaborative project in common social situations led by a cooperative principle in which both communicators are engaged. Thus, hearers and speakers must be cooperative and mutually accept one another to fulfil communication in a particular way. Griffiths, in turn, identifies other communicative norms showing how “the speakers are involved in the reasons when they make possible utterances to convey rather more than is literally encoded in the underlying sentences”. (Griffiths, 2006: 134).

Additionally, the CP describes how people interact with one another. It is intended as a “description of how people normally behave in conversation”. (Peccei, 1999: 27).

Grice (1975: 45) broadly postulates then that: " Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." He also confirms that “the cooperative principle is what people abide by for successful communication”, adding that “Talk exchanges do not normally consist of a succession of disconnected remarks”. They are, to some extent, cooperative; and each participant recognizes in them a common purpose or set of purposes, or at least a mutually accepted direction (Ibid. 47).

Levinson, in the same line, confirms that “there is a set of overarching assumptions that guide the conduct of conversation. These assumptions arise from basic rational considerations and are formulated as guidelines for the efficient and effective use of language in conversation to further cooperative ends (Levinson, 1983: 101).

2.Theoretical Framework

The CP, developed by Grice (1975), theorizes that effective communication sharply relies on speakers’ observation to the four conversational maxims: recognized as in the Quantity of enough information, Quality with adequate evidence, and by being relevant, and orderly. While cooperation is often presumed in conversation, language users,



politicians in particular, may deliberately flout these maxims to generate implicature, create persuasive ambiguity, or achieve rhetorical goals (Chilton & Schaffner, 1997).

2.1. Maxims of the Cooperative Principle (CP)

C P appears as prescription; however, it is intended as a description of how people normally behave in conversation. Some like Jefferies and McIntyre describe Grice's maxims as "encapsulating the assumptions that we prototypically hold when we engage in conversation." (2010:106).

The ' Cooperative Principle ' is formulated as a rule of communication involving maxims, i.e., rules which have to be obeyed by Interlocutors in order to is elaborated in four maxims: quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. Interpersonal interaction would be very difficult and counterproductive if it lacks cooperation. Grice (1975) argues that conversation participants share implicit Knowledge of these maxims; and thus, conversational behavior is governed by them. In Levinson's words, " those maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in maximally efficient rational cooperative way: they should speak sincerely, relevantly and clearly, while providing sufficient information." (Levinson, 1983: 102).

Grice's maxims principles are expressed as follows:

The Maxim of Quantity (Information) which is concerned with the quantity of information to be provided. Under it falls the following sub-maxims:

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

The Maxim of Quality (Truth), in turn, stipulates that one's communicative contributions be what one believes to be true and one should not utter what one lacks evidence for. Under this maxim there are two sub-maxims:

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

Whereas, the Maxim of Relation (Relevance) states that the speaker's communicative contributions should be as relevant as possible to the issue in hand.

However, the Maxim of Manner is simply stated as " be perspicuous". Under this maxim there are a number of sub-maxims :

- a. Avoid obscurity of expression ("Eschew obfuscation")
 - b. Avoid ambiguity.
 - C. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
 - d. Be orderly.
- (Grice, 1975: 45- 46).

It is claimed that if all of the maxims are being observed, there will be no additional set of meaning to be added to the conversation (Thomas, 1995: 64). A clear fulfillment of Grice's maxims may be demonstrated in the following:

- (1.) A. Where are the car Keys?
B. They're on the table in the hall.



It can be realized that (B) has answered clearly (manner) and truthfully (quality) , has given just the right amount of information (quantity), and has directly addressed (A)'s goal in asking the question (relation).

2.1. Non-observance of Grice Maxims

It is assumed that in any conversation or talk exchange, interlocutors are to be informative , truthful, relevant and orderly by abiding to the maxims of the CP. Never the less, interlocutors do not always follow these maxims when they communicate. Rather, they can fail to fulfill the maxims in a variety of ways, some mundane, some inadvertent, but others lead to what most consider as the powerful aspect of Grice's "Cooperative Principle" : conversational implicature (Grice, 1989 : 30).

A conversational implicature is considered to be that part of the utterance meaning which although intended, is not strictly part of what is said ' nor does it follow logically from what is said. It is that part that must be inferred, and that for which contextual information is crucial (Cruse, 2006: 85).

Grice (1975: 49) argues that some may fail to fulfill these maxims in various ways during the exchange of conversation, such as, by violating, opting out, facing a clash and flouting a maxim or more . According to Thomas (1995: 64) adds that some people may fail to observe a maxim because they are incapable of speaking clearly, or because they deliberately choose to lie. The types of non-observance of the maxims are the following:

2.1.1. Violating a maxim

Violating a maxim, according to Grice (1975: 49), is the unostentatious non-observance of a maxim. If a speaker violates a maxim, (s) he deliberately and secretly subverts a maxim and is liable to mislead.

2. 1.2. Opting out a maxim

Being unwilling to cooperate as the norm requires , the speaker opts out a maxim. Thomas (1995: 74) provides examples of opting out a maxim "when the speaker cannot, perhaps for legal or ethical reason, reply in the way normally expected. The speaker usually wishes to avoid generating a false implicature or appearing uncooperative . "

2.1.3. The participant may be faced by a clash. The participant may be unable to observe a maxim without violating another one. Grice exemplifies this by saying that the participant is not able to be as informative as is required without violating the maxim that requires having adequate evidence for what one says (Grice, 1975: 49).

2.1.٤. Infringing a Maxim

According to Thomas (1995: 74) infringing a maxim could occur because the speaker has an imperfect command of language, or imperfect linguistic performance; or being impaired cognitively due to other reasons, as being nervous, excited else.

3.Flouting a maxim



A speaker fails to observe a maxim , not with any intention of deceiving or misleading, but because he wishes to prompt the hearer to infer a meaning which is different from the expressed meaning. A flout occurs when he fails to observe a maxim at the level of what is said , with the deliberate intention of generating an implicature, which is the most important category by far (Grice, 1975: 49).

This type of non-observance of the Gricean maxims will be dealt with in detail in the following section.

In view of that, when speakers appears not to follow the maxims but expect hearers to appreciate the meaning implied, they are flouting the maxims. In case of flouting, The speaker assumes that the hearer knows that their words should not be taken at face value and that they can infer the implicit meaning (Cutting, 2002 : 37).

Mey (1996 : 70) views flouting as a case of verbal communication when" we can make a blatant show of breaking one of the maxims... in order to lead the addressee to look for a covert, implied meaning."

3.1. Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity is flouted when the speaker blatantly gives more or less information than the situation requires. This is simply because (s)he uses insufficient words in conversation. In other words, the speaker gives incomplete words when (s)he is speaking (Leach, 1983: 140) .

Tautologies are considered to be examples of quantity flouting when taken at their face value. For example, "War is war". This utterance is not informative if taken at the level of what is said, but it is informative at the level of what is implicated, and hearer's intention to such utterance depends on the ability to explain the speaker's selection of this particular utterance (Grice, 1989: 34).

Also, the speaker may flout the quantity maxim by giving too little or too much information . For example, in

A. Well, how do I look?

B. Your shoes are nice . . .

(B) does not say that the jeans do not look nice, but he Knows that (A) will understand that implication, because (A) asks about his whole appearance and only gets told about part of it (Cutting, 2002 : 37).

3.2. Flouting the Maxim of Quality

The maximal quality is flouted when the speaker for one reason or another is not truthful . Accordingly, flouting quality might be via :



- A. Exaggeration as in hyperbole, e.g. "I'm starving, I could eat a horse " for being very hungry. (Cutting , 2002 : 37).
- B. Metaphor, as in "My house is a refrigerator in winter " , " Don't be such a wet blanket - we just want to have fun . " Here , the hearers would understand that the house is cold , and the other person is trying to reduce other people's enjoyment . (Ibid : 38) .
- C. Euphemisms as in, "he Kicked the bucket" meaning he died , the implied sense of the words is so well established that the expressions can only mean one thing (Ibid).
- D. Irony which is an "apparently friendly way of being offensive (mock-politeness) (Leech , 1983 : 144)". Thus , the speaker expresses a positive sentiment and implies a negative one. A form of irony , sarcasm , is frequently used to make criticisms. It is normally obvious because of the gap between what is said and what is meant (Cutting , 2002 : 38) .
- E. Banter which is a type of verbal behavior that is considered as an "offensive way of being friendly (mock impoliteness)" (Leech, 1983: 144). It expresses a negative sentiment and implies a positive one (Cutting, 2002: 38).

3.3 Flouting the Maxim of Relation

The participant flouts this maxim in such a way that makes the conversation unmatched. In this case the participant will change the topic by means of irrelevance of the topic of the partner of the conversation (Levinson, 1983: 111). For example, in the following exchange.

A.

So what do you think of Mark ?

B. His flat mate's a wonderful cook.

The speaker (B), by not mentioning Mark in the reply and hence by being irrelevant, the speaker implies that (s)he did it think very much of him (Cutting, 2002:39).

3.4. Flouting the Maxim of Manner

When the speaker uses ambiguous expressions or incomprehensible utterances, or uses slang or his/her voice is not loud enough , (s)he will flout this maxim (Levinson, 1983: 104).

Flouting the manner maxim frequently takes the form of obscurity or ambiguity, as in the following exchange

A. Where are you off to ?

B. I was thinking of going to get some of that

A: OK, but do not be long - dinner's nearly ready.

(B) speaks ambiguous way, saying "funny white stuff" and 'someone' , and avoids saying frankly 'icecream' and 'Michelle'. (Cutting, 2002: 39) .

4. Discourse Analysis of Trump and Obama Using Grice's CP



A comparative discourse analysis of both presidents, Trump's and Obama's, presents a viable example of the way politicians followed to attend their aims, focusing on how each flouts Grice's maxims in ways reflecting their communicative style and political objectives.

Although both are culpable in their conceptional traits it comes to communication, the essences of their theoretical approach is built around a much more parsimonious views. The act of communication is an act whereby one attempts to draw/ persuade/ deflect others' attentions to specific quests. As such, flouting maxims, might be a tactic at micro level to reformulate concept of actions, episodic and anaesthetic memories of some planned trends.

4.1. Trump's Discourse Style

Trump's rhetorical style frequently involves overt flouting of the Maxims of Quality and Manner. In his 2016 presidential public debate, he said that, (2). "Nobody has more respect for women than I do. Nobody."

This unverifiable and hyperbolic claim flouts the Maxim of Quality by lacking verified evident. With his prior contradictory behavior, it creates a performative implicature not of literal indication, but of self-asserted superiority and credibility, helping him to dismiss previous accusations through sheer rhetorical force without engaging in substantiated argument (Grice, 1975).

Besides, Trump's discourse often features repeated utterances and abrupt transitions and winding, reflecting a breach of the Maxim of Manner. As Hart (2020) propounds, "this disorganized style paradoxically builds authenticity among populist audiences, projecting an anti-establishment persona".

The repetition of **nobody** adds a populist flair, amplifying emotional resonance over rational argument. (Lackoff, 2016)

In his public (2016 Presidential Debate) as an example.

(3). "Nobody has more respect for women than I do. Nobody."

In his speech, Trump frequently flouts the Maxim of Manner by using incoherent, disorganized, repetitive, and fragmented style that, serve a strategic purpose. Hart (2020) notes that, such discourse styles cultivate a relatable, "non-elite" persona that appeals to anti-establishment sentiments. His disregard for conventional political rhetoric enables him to maintain an outsider image, even while occupying the highest office, he confirms.



(4) *"I'm not saying my opponent is corrupt, but people are asking questions."* In the example, by flouting the Maxim of Quality and Relation, hinting is made to something without directly claiming it. This tactical rhetorical move often used in politics.

To recapitulate, in his Public Debate, as been shown by excerpts from the 2016 presidential debates below Trump expressively been blunt, hyperbolic and vague

(5) "Nobody has more respect for women than I do. Nobody."

4.1.2 As Micro-level Tactics:

A. Flouting the Maxim of Quality

The statement is extreme and effectively untrue, in the light of prior controversies. Audience, for sure, realized this exaggeration.

He shadowed hyperbole to avoid criticism, yet, the claim ironically invokes skepticism or sarcasm.

B. Flouting the Maxim of Manner

(6) "There's something going on. I mean, people know what's going on."

The statement is vague, and notably ambiguous. The audience effectively forced to bridge the gaps in the claim by their own.

Conspiracy theory is implied without direct accusations, a tactic often referred to as "dog whistle politics" or "plausible deniability".

4.1.3. As a Macro-level Strategy:

By flouting clarity and truth he discarded most general conventions of political discourse

He triggered audience's emotional appeal by acted as neutral persona of populist rhetoric and winding prompts.

By flouting maxims, he directly avoided to quest accountability and evoked audience inference.

4.2. Obama's Discourse Style

Disparately, Obama's discourse style is marked by structured, articulate, and symbolically rich language. In his 2008 victory speech, he said



(7) “This is our moment. This is our time—to put our people back to work and open doors of opportunity...”

In which he cohered to the Maxims of Manner and Relation, but subtly flouts the Maxim of Quantity. Obama’s rhetoric style relies on aspirational tone and abstract generalities rather than policy details. This vagueness invites broad identification, enabling his message to resonate across diverse audiences (Charteris-Black, 2011).

Obama’s style of inclusive language and outstanding rhetoric expose a unified national identity, of unified political vision.

Obama’s eloquence, precision, and strategic ambiguity exposed in his public speech of the (2008 Victory Speech) are purely deducted

(8) “*This is our moment. This is our time—to put our people back to work and open doors of opportunity for our kids; to restore prosperity and promote the cause of peace....*”

His style is sharply contrasts with Trump’s. He closely recognizes the Maxims of Manner and Relation, selecting clarity, coherence, and relevance. Yet, he flouts the Maxim of Quantity by offering extended abstract generalizations without clear policy detail. For instance, the expressions "restore prosperity" and "promote the cause of peace" are suggestive but strategically obscure. As such, his style allows for broader interpretation across various ideological and demographic groups.

Moreover, Obama frequently employs metaphoric language and inclusive pronouns ("our moment... our time") to construct collective identity and appeal to shared values. This rhetorical choice may subtly flout the Maxim of Quality in that it elevates idealism over literal truth, creating a hope-oriented implicature that transcends empirical verification (Charteris-Black, 2011).

As well, Obama frequently incorporates metaphoric expressions and inclusive pronouns such as ("our moment... our time") to enhance collective identity trends and appeal to adopt mutual values. This rhetorical tactics subtly flout the Maxim of Quality by elevating idealism over literal truth, creating a hope-oriented implicature that transcends empirical verification (Charteris-Black, 2011).

At micro and macro levels then , he, to recapitulate, flouts specific maxims

(9) “*If there is anyone out there who still doubts that America is a place where all things are possible... tonight is your answer.*”

4.2.1. As a Micro-level Tactic :



A. Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

By using highly abstract and symbolic rhetoric address he evaded details of why and how questions beyond acceptance of the state quo.

With unifying, exhilarating tone he appeals to emotion rather than reasoning.

Subtle Flouting the Maxim of Relation

(10) “*This is your victory.*”

literally untrue claim for many voters did not elect him.

The claim overlooks the actual division of people to the appear unified.

Expressing all-in inclusive rhetoric, to shape some state of national identity.

4.2.2. As a Macro-level strategy:

He tends to flout maxims poetically to elevate tone, enhance hope, and construct ideological of progress and underpins themes of American exceptionalism.

Strategically, ambiguity used lets diverse audiences react positively.

To recapitulate, Grice’s C P provides a valuable substructure for analyzing the pragmatics of political speech.

At the micro level, linguists focus on linguistic choices, sentence structures, rhetorical devices, etc. Flouting maxims are examined to realize:

How a politician implies conceptions rather than overtly states them.

Why they drop specific information (flouting Quantity).

How they speak vaguely and indirectly (flouting Quality or Manner).

Differently, analysts at the macro level, study discourse themes, ideological structures, or overall strategy. As such flouting maxims is a micro feature which contributes to larger patterns ,e.g. how a politician avoids accountability, attacks opponents, or creates ambiguity. Flouting might, also, reveal strategies of persuasion or manipulation.

Both, Tramp and Obama, negotiate the intricacy of public discourse using Gricean flouting as a persuasion tactic pragmatic strategy in modulating meaning, and for



persuasive appeals. Their approaches, however, reflect divergent ideologies and traditions.

Besides, the rhetoric followed by are diverse. Trump’s flouting of Quality and Manner maxims posits confrontational, emotive quests, asserting populist status. Obama’s, in contrast, shows controlled flouting of Quantity to promote discourse credibility. He counts on symbolic oneness, and ambiguity to device trust and access inclusivity.

Remarkably, Trump’s style shows disruption, populism, and diversion; whereas Obama’s enhances panoramic, symbolic, and aspirational priorities. Such mapping of flouting of maxims reveals comprehensive strategic intents through what they say, and how they say it as well.

Summary Table: A. Gricean Maxims in Trump vs. Obama

Maxim	Trump’s	Effect	Obama ‘s	Effect
Quality	“Nobody has more respect for women...”	Flouts truth; self-promotion, dodging	“Restore prosperity...”	Aspirational abstraction
Quantity	Repetitive generalizations	Avoids details ; emotional	Idealistic broad claims	Encourages inclusivity
Manner	Disorganized, informal speech	maps authenticity	Properally Structure, coherent speech	Enhances credibility
Relation	Occasional topic & conventional shifts	Re-controlling of focus & discourse winding	Logical progression	Reinforces unity

B. Comparative Observations

Maxim	Trump/flouting manner	Obama/ flouting manner
Quality	exaggeration, hyperbole	via idealistic abstraction
Quantity	Overstatements; and lack of justification	obscurity and over-generalization
Manner	disordered, abrupt, colloquial, and dodging	sharply observed organized, articulate metaphorically
Relation	through deflection in debates	Blatantly observed with logical transitions, and contextual consistency
Implicature	Emphasizing dominance, deflects critique, rallies drive	Builds unity, moral authority, and collective vision



5. Conclusion

Political discourse often operates beyond the surface level of literal meaning. Politicians frequently employ implicit strategies to shape public perception, assert authority, and construct identity. H. P. Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle and its conversational maxims—Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner—provide a powerful analytical tool for exploring how political figures manage meaning in public speech. While adherence to these maxims promotes clarity and cooperation, flouting them strategically can generate conversational implicature, thereby enriching or obscuring meaning to achieve specific rhetorical effects (Grice, 1975).

This study tends to provide an overview of the Cooperative Principle, its maxims, and ways of non-observing these maxims concentrating mainly on the “Flouting” of the Gricean maxims.

The comparative discourse analysis of Trump and Obama excerpts offers an example on how each flouts Grice's maxims in ways to reflect their communicative styles to attend their political objectives.

Grice's CP, as such, offers valuable insight into the pragmatic underpinnings of political speech. Thus, in comparing Trump's and Obama's, it becomes clear that flouting conversational maxims is not a failure of communication, but a deliberate rhetorical strategy customized to political context and audience expectations. Exaggeration and informality to pulverize norms and spur support, Obama counts on abstraction and symbolic integration to motivate and persuade. These varying excursive strategies accentuate the capacity of pragmatics in modelling modern political control.

Accordingly, out of this paper it is possible to conclude the following :

1. In any conversational or act of communicating participants should be cooperative, collaborative and abide by the CP and its maxims. .
2. Grice's four maxims, namely quantity, quality, relation and manner for cooperative principle are to be observed by Interlocutors to be duly informative, truthful, relevant and orderly.
3. Failing blatantly to observe these maxims by being flouted, violated, infringed and/or opted partially or completely giving rise to conversational implicature .
4. Flouting of quantity occurs when the speaker presents more or less information than is required , of quality is conducted by means of exaggerations, metaphor, irony and blanking to deflect truth. Being irrelevant to the topic of exchange the the maxim of relation would be flouted, and of manner by using ambiguous expressions that make the utterance incomprehensible.



References

1. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press
2. Blackwell Publishing. Blackwell Reference Online. 30 November 2007 <<http://www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/tesnode?id=g9781405102520-chunk-y478140.510252018>>
3. Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan
4. Chilton, P., & Schaffner, C. (1997). *Discourse and politics*. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 2, pp. 206–230). SAGE.
5. Cruse, Alan. (2006). *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Univ. Press.
6. Cutting, Joan . (2002). *Fragmattes and Discourse: A Resource Boo* . London : Routledge.
7. Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
8. Griffiths, Patrick. (2006). *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press .
9. Hart, P. (2020). *Trump and Us: What he says and why people listen*. Columbia University Press.
10. Jeffries, Lesley & Daniel McIntyre. (2010). *Stylistics*, Cambridge: University Press..
11. Kempson, Ruth. (2002). "Pragmatics: Language and Communication." *The Hand book of Linguistics* Aronoff, Mark and Janie Rees-Miller (eds).
12. Lakoff, G. (2016). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
13. Leech, Geoffaey N. (1985). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
14. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambordage: Cambridge University Press .
15. Mey, J. (1996). *Pragmatics : An Intraduction*. USA: Blackwell Publishing.
16. Obama, B. H. (2008, November 4). *Victory speech*. CNN Politics. <https://www.cnn.com/2008/POLITICS/11/04/obama.transcript/>
17. Peccei, Jean Stillwell. (1999). *Fragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .
18. Thomas, T. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics* Longman.
19. Trump, D. J. (2016, October 9). *Presidential debate transcript*. Commission on Presidential Debates.