

Cooperative Principle in Political Interviews

Jesusa E. Pineda¹, Elmer A. Gumban²

¹College of Arts and Sciences, Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Philippines

²College of Education, Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Philippines

ABSTRACT: This study aimed to determine whether the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, which comprise the cooperative principle, were observed by the five key contenders in the 2022 presidential elections in the Philippines. This study employed descriptive research as its design and pragmatic analysis as its method of investigating the observance of the cooperative principle in political interviews. The transcribed interview responses of the politicians constituted the data of this study. Frequency, percentage, and rank were used to determine which maxims were frequently observed, flouted, infringed, suspended, violated, and opted out. The results reveal that the frequently observed maxim was relevance, while the flouted maxim was quantity. No maxim was infringed, suspended, violated, or opted out by the presidential candidates. This study concludes that the politicians attempted to give pertinent information but needed to provide the exact amount of information during the interviews. This could mean that the information could have been more general or that specific data for comprehensive understanding may have been omitted, purposefully or unintentionally, leading to an incomplete picture.

KEYWORDS: cooperative principle, maxims of conversation, pragmatic analysis

1. INTRODUCTION

The language of politics may be marked by ingenuity or designed to promote improvement or cause destruction. When used positively, political language extols a person. On the contrary, it holds someone responsible for doing something or allows politicians to criticize their opponents harshly or defend themselves when used negatively (Madu & Okpala, 2020). People occasionally fail to express their intentions clearly. Speakers frequently mean considerably more than they tell. Also, speakers can convey the exact opposite of what they say (Lazim, 2020). Beknownst to everyone, politicians can say one thing but mean another. That one thing is called an implication.

Politicians frequently use implicatures because they desire to have specific meanings or desires implied, either entirely or in part, within their written and spoken communications. This action allows them to present themselves in a particular way to their audience (Madu & Okpala, 2020). Politicians avoid making direct statements to keep a straight face. They are aware that the public will hear whatever they say (Dayanthi, 2017). They know that to get the jobs they want in the administration, they must win people over. As a result, they frequently say things that are difficult to understand. Politicians are incredibly skilled at manipulating language. They frequently make claims that do not mean what they say in their literal sense. In the political sphere, they employ language as a weapon.

Since language has many different connotations, it is seen as a potent weapon for interaction in political conversations (Madu & Okpala, 2020). Language is seen as a tool for communicating ideas, initiatives, programs, etc. Making promises, telling the truth or telling lies, and leading others to believe are all battle strategies. Thus, it is true that political language is the cunning and perverse use of words to advance the objectives of the politician (Dylgjeri, 2016). Pujiati et al. (2020) assert that politicians express their opinions about their countries or others in political interviews. The primary function of language is efficient human communication. Hence, a speaker's meaning is of the essence (Kwarteng, 2021).

Several studies looked into conversational implicature in political interviews. However, only a few studies on conversational implicature in interviews with Filipino presidential candidates can be found online. One or more studies might have been conducted, but they have yet to be published.

Hence, this study aims to examine the conversational implicatures in political interviews. Specifically, it seeks to identify the conversational maxims that are frequently observed and those that are flouted, infringed, suspended, violated, or opted out of during these interviews.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The Cooperative Principle states, "Make your conversational contribution as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted

Cooperative Principle in Political Interviews

purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice, 1975, p. 46). Grice's (1975) framework for analyzing the cooperative principle in utterances includes four maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Quantity requires giving the right amount of information. Quality focuses on truthfulness. Relation emphasizes relevance. Manner involves clarity, avoiding obscurity and ambiguity, being brief, and maintaining orderliness.

Conversational implicatures have grown to be one of the main topics of pragmatics. Pragmatics, a subfield of linguistics, studies how language is related to the situations in which it is used (Slotta, 2021). Conversational implicatures are those that speakers imply when they talk, make up an utterance's content, are unconnected to the content of a direct utterance, and are not understood by the grammatical meaning of words (Allot, 2018).

Audiences can reasonably anticipate that rational, cooperative speakers will endeavor to be honest, informative, relevant, and clear in their contributions. In turn, the interpretation of utterances is influenced by these expectations. According to Grice (1975), cooperative rational discourse exchanges are guided by the Cooperative Principle (CP) and conversational maxims. He held that speakers may take advantage of listeners' ability to infer implicatures by conveying implicatures through the use of maxims (Allott, 2018).

Political discourse, a ubiquitous part of daily life, is often mediated through interviews. Hence, a critical linguistic examination of political discourse is warranted (Sumayya, 2012). Political discourse is about being manipulative and hedgy, providing less information regarding the truth.

Some politicians may choose words to put forth specific leadership styles to attract tremendous support. Accordingly, the audience would be left to deal with an utterance and its intention (Madu & Okpala, 2020). Additionally, political discourse is often marked by planned and calculated actions and equivocal communication, making it difficult to recognize the truth. This occurrence is perceptible in political interviews and debates, where speakers utilize varied strategies to promote their cause. Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975), which includes the maxims of quantity, quality, appropriateness, and manner, is a critical framework for examining such discourse.

Politicians leverage various political strategies to influence voters and obtain support for their candidacy (Rosyidah, 2020). Udoh and Ejiaso (2022) looked into President Buhari's interview responses and divulged that strategic use of Grice's maxims helps construct political discourse for targeted goals. Kwarteng (2021) investigated adherence to and violations of Grice's (1975) cooperative principles in interviews between American journalists and former President Donald Trump. The analysis was based on conversational implicature, Grice's four maxims, and speech act theory. It was found that speakers sometimes violated these maxims due to ignorance of their impact on listeners. Despite this, speakers generally conform to Grice's maxims in communication.

Studies based on Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) have examined political interviews, discourse, and debates. These studies have delved into how politicians find their way through conversational maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner to attain their communicative goals. By investigating the political landscape, researchers have obtained more profound insights into how politicians persuade, mislead, and interact with their audiences, emphasizing the pervasive nature of strategic communication and uncooperativeness in the political sphere.

Hamza and Nordin (2024) investigated pragmatic deviations from Grice's cooperative principle and conversational maxims in former U.S. President Donald Trump's 2016 CNN interview with Anderson Cooper. The findings revealed that Trump often deviated from these principles for reasons such as distorting facts to manipulate public opinion, concealing damaging truths, withholding plans, and preserving relationships with U.S. allies. These deviations aimed to present himself as the most qualified presidential candidate.

In a town hall meeting with presidential candidates, President Muhammadu Buhari and his running mate frequently flouted Grice's maxims during an interview with Kadaria. Analyzing eleven out of fifty-three questions qualitatively, the study concluded that all maxims were flouted to achieve objectives such as face-saving, information concealment, and candidate promotion (Ayantayo, 2023).

Research by Lodari et al. (2018) investigated maxim violations by Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, revealing that both violated all maxims, with Trump committing more violations. The most frequently violated maxim was quantity, while the least violated was manner. The study found that these violations were least likely aimed at building a positive political image.

Using quantitative research, Rasool et al. (2022) analyzed how Ishaq Dar and other politicians, in an interview with the BBC in December 2020, demonstrated uncooperativeness and untruthfulness by applying Grice's (1975) four maxims—quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. Their findings revealed that politicians frequently flouted or violated these maxims. Specifically, they often violated the maxim of quantity to convey their political views, regardless of the relevance to the posed questions. This suggests that politicians prepare responses to persuade the audience, irrespective of the interviewer's inquiries. The authors concluded that political talks tend to need to be more cooperative and often untruthful, aiming to gain favor with the public.

Likewise, Dayanthi (2017) found that Trump often flouted the maxim of quantity in a TIME magazine interview, emphasizing the implicit significance of his statements. Similarly, Juma'a (2020) applied Grice's Cooperative Principle to a 2020 interview with Trump, showing he flouted all four maxims to draw attention to the underlying messages.

Rahmi et al. (2018) examined a political conversation on Rosi Talkshow (Kompas TV) to identify which conversational maxims

Cooperative Principle in Political Interviews

are broken and why. The study finds that interviewees break four conversation rules: quality, relation, quantity, and manner. Interviewees talk more than necessary to appear better or gain sympathy from viewers.

In the context of Indonesian political interviews, Gufron et al. (2023) analyzed adherence to Grice's principles, identifying both observance and non-observance of the maxims. Violations were most common, leading to ambiguous information, while compliance with relevance was frequent. Furthermore, Buddharat et al. (2017) examined how politicians exploited Grice's maxims in the 2016 U.S. presidential debates. They found frequent violations of quantity, quality, and relevance maxims, making it challenging to assess truthfulness due to strategic information control.

Considering the Philippine setting, Basa (2023) examined the utterances of guests on 20 selected Philippine talk shows and political interviews, guided by Grice's (1975) cooperative principles, focusing on the four maxims of conversation: quality, quantity, relation, and manner. The study's findings indicate that 80% of the utterances adhered to the maxims of conversation, while the remaining 20% violated one or more maxims. These results suggest that incorporating lessons on Grice's cooperative principles and the features of political discourse into ESL courses could enhance students' communicative competence.

Hence, politicians need to recognize the importance of Grice's cooperative principle, which necessitates contributing relevant and necessary information to advance the agreed-upon topic or flow of discussion (Madu & Okpala, 2020).

When looking into the subtleties of everyday talk, research by Musa and their team in 2022 opened our eyes to how important the setting of a conversation is for grasping what is being said. By diving into 77 everyday chats, they discovered that people often rely on what is implied rather than explicitly stated, guiding them toward fresh topics to explore. In another work, Ariyanti et al. (2020) looked closely at how college teachers respond to students over WhatsApp, mainly focusing on their messages' unsaid yet understood parts. Their detailed study showed that teachers tend to keep things brief and to the point by relying on these unspoken cues to avoid confusion and make the exchange of information quicker and more straightforward. The discoveries of these studies highlight how helpful implicature can make daily conversations flow smoothly.

Handayani et al. (2019) found that most students were sufficiently aware of conversational implicature, adhering to Grice's cooperative principle, which aids in content knowledge acquisition at the university level. Li (2021) revealed that the experimental class using the Conversational Implicature Teaching Strategy showed significantly better conversational implicature inference and listening comprehension than the control class, indicating the effectiveness of this approach. Alharbi (2022) discovered that EFL learners struggled with understanding implicatures, leading to recommendations for incorporating pragmatic aspects into teaching and curricula to improve comprehension. Rouki (2023) found that Greek high school curricula had limited use of implicatures in instructional exercises, emphasizing reliance on literal language and highlighting the need for improved pragmatics instruction to enhance cross-cultural communication skills. Together, these studies highlight the importance of conversational implicature in language comprehension and effective communication.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employed a descriptive research design to determine which conversational maxims are commonly observed in political interviews and which ones are flouted, infringed, suspended, violated, or opted out during these interviews.

The interviews with the five presidential candidates in the latest presidential elections in the Philippines were subjected to pragmatic analysis. Those interviews were chosen based on the following criteria: (1) The presidential candidates were the significant competitors in the latest Philippines' presidential elections; (2) The interviews were readily available on the internet; (3) The presidential candidates' questions concerned society's most pressing issues.

Each utterance in the political interviews was the fundamental unit of analysis of this pragmatic study. A pragmatic analysis is more concerned with what speakers mean through their utterances than what their words might mean (Al-Hindawa & Saffah, 2017). In essence, what the presidential candidates sent forth through their utterances was examined instead of the individual words that comprised their utterances.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Frequently Observed Maxims

Table 1 shows that the maxim of conversation that was regularly observed by the presidential candidates based on their responses was the maxim of relevance. This result indicates that the presidential candidates tried to say things that were pertinent to the discussion.

Cooperative Principle in Political Interviews

Table 1. Frequently Observed Maxims

Maxim	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Rank
Relevance	10	43%	1
Quantity	9	39%	2
Manner	5	22%	3
Quality	0	0%	4
Total	24	100%	

4.2 Flouted, Infringed, Suspended, Violated, and Opted Out Maxims of Conversation

At 43.33% of the total, Quantity is the most commonly flouted maxim, followed by manner at 21.67%. At 18.33% and 16.67%, respectively, quality and relevance have lower percentages of flouted maxims. No further actions (infringed, suspended, violated, or opted out) were taken for any of the maxims.

Table 2. Flouted, Infringed, Suspended, Violated, and Opted Out Maxims of Conversations

Maxim	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Rank
Quantity			
Flouted	26	43.33%	1
Infringed	0	0%	
Suspended	0	0%	
Violated	0	0%	
Opted out	0	0%	
Quality			
Flouted	11	18.33%	3
Infringed	0	0%	
Suspended	0	0%	
Violated	0	0%	
Opted out	0	0%	
Relevance			
Flouted	10	16.67%	4
Infringed	0	0%	
Suspended	0	0%	
Violated	0	0%	
Opted out	0	0%	
Manner			
Flouted	13	21.67%	2
Infringed	0	0%	
Suspended	0	0%	
Violated	0	0%	
Opted out	0	0%	
Total	60	100%	

5. DISCUSSION

This study zeroed in on the conversational implicature in political interviews by espousing that politicians mean more than they say. On this account, it was reckoned gainful to carry a pragmatic analysis by investigating the conversational implicature in political interviews.

The results of this study of political interviews suggest some key points: Politicians prioritized staying relevant to the topic (43%) more than any other discourse maxim, indicating that they may be trying to control the conversation and keep it focused on their agenda. This finding is corroborated by Massanga and Msuya (2017), who found that Tanzanian politicians observed the relevance maxim. The second most common maxim (39%) was quantity, meaning politicians provided sufficient information. This finding aligns with Massanga and Msuya (2017) and Seftika (2015), who observed that politicians adhered to the maxim of quantity. The maxim of manner was less common (22%), indicating that politicians may have preferred expressing their opinions to complete clarity. This contrasts with Seftika's (2015) finding that Barack Obama fulfilled the manner maxim. The most striking

Cooperative Principle in Political Interviews

observation is the complete absence of the qualitative maxim (0%), which raises questions about the veracity of the statements made in these interviews. This is a unique finding not reported in the studies by Massanga and Msuya (2017), Seftika (2015), Juma'a (2020), Madu and Okpala (2020), Aisya and Fitrawati (2019), Nuzulla (2020), and Alam et al. (2022), which focused on the observance of the cooperative principle in political interviews but did not specifically mention the quality maxim. Overall, this study suggests that politicians in these interviews may have been more concerned with staying relevant, controlling the flow of information, and getting their message across than being truthful, clear, and informative.

All the maxims of conversation were flouted in the examined political interviews. No maxim was infringed, suspended, violated, or opted out by the presidential candidates. As regards the flouted maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, the result implies that the presidential candidates did not intentionally provide more or less information than was necessary or expected, give inadequate evidence for their statements, say things that were not relevant to the topic under discussion, and present their responses in a disorderly manner. However, although the presidential candidates did not deliberately mislead their audience by flouting the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner, their failure to observe the cooperative principle brought about conversational implicature. The meanings of their utterances that were not part of what they explicitly said had yet to be determined by their audience.

These results concur with those of the following studies. Massanga and Msuya (2017) found that Tanzanian politicians in television interviews flouted the maxims of quantity and quality, even though they disobeyed the former maxim more (78.94%) than the latter (21%) (p. 88). Juma'a (2020) held that Trump, in "Donald Trump's Interview with TIME on 2020," flouted the maxims of quantity (46.42%), quality (10.71%), relevance (35.71%), and manner (07.16%). Seftika (2015) discovered that the maxims of quantity, manner, and relevance were flouted in Barrack Obama's responses to the interview questions of ABC News anchor Robin Roberts. In the study of Madu and Okpala (2020), the 62 political interviews in the two selected Nigerian newspapers showed that politicians flouted the maxims of manner, quantity, and quality. Aisya and Fitrawati (2019) demonstrated that, with frequencies of 53.96% and 36.50%, politicians disobeyed the maxim of quantity and the maxim of manner the most. Only 4.76% of the time were the maxim of quality and maxim of relevance flouted. Nuzulla (2020) discovered that quantity, relevance, and manner maxims were flouted in "Donald Trump's Interview with TIME in the Oval Office 2020." Alam et al. (2022) divulged that the maxims of manner and relevance were flouted in Pakistan's political talk shows and interviews.

This study provides a critical lens for the public when approaching political interviews. It highlights the need for media literacy and fact-checking because there might be a slipperiness with information in political settings. It also provides valuable insights for communication scholars by providing a framework for analyzing strategic language use in political discourse and its impact on persuasion, image building, and power dynamics. Ultimately, these findings can inform more effective and transparent communication across the political spectrum.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The responses of the five presidential candidates consisted more of flouted than observed maxims of conversation. They failed to follow the maxim of quantity, meaning they did not provide the required information. However, since the maxim of relevance was the most observed, it could be asseverated that they tried to convey relevant information in the context of their interviews.

REFERENCES

- 1) Aisya, N. & Fitrawati, F. (2019). An analysis of flouting of maxim performed by politician guests in Mata Najwa talk show in the episode of Adu Lantang Jelang Penentuan and Babak Akhir Pilpres. *English Language Literature and Online Journal*, 8(4). <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/ell/article/view/106348>
- 2) Alam, M.M., Khan, M.S., & Aman, F. (2022). Application of the cooperative principle to political talk-shows and interviews in Pakistani context. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)*, 13(1). <https://www.tojq.net/index.php/journal/article/view/8774/6233>
- 3) Alharbi, M. A. (2022). Pragmatic awareness of conversational implicatures by L2 undergraduate students in Saudi Arabia. *East Asian Pragmatics*, 7(2), 237–266. <https://doi.org/10.1558/eap.19270>
- 4) Al-Hindawi, F.H. & Saffah, M. (2017). Pragmatics and discourse analysis. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(19). <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/37885/38967>
- 5) Allott, N. (2018). Conversational implicature. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323524978_Conversational_implicature
- 6) Ariyanti, L., Setiawan, S., & Wedawati, M. T. (2020). Exploring Implicature via WhatsApp: The maxim of conversation analysis. *The Asian ESP Journal*, 16(2.2). https://repository.unesa.ac.id/sysop/files/2020-06-30_Jurnal%208%20Slamet.pdf

Cooperative Principle in Political Interviews

- 7) Ayantayo, J. S. (2023). Flouts of the cooperative principal maxims by APC presidential candidates on the candidates. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374118368_the_quint_an_interdisciplinary_quarterly_from_the_north_199_Flouts_of_the_Cooperative_Principle_Maxims_by_APC_Presidential_Candidates_on_The_Candidates/citations
- 8) Basa, R. (2023). A discourse analysis of the “Gricean maxims of conversation” in using English as a second language in Philippine talk shows and political discourses. <https://rpo.ua.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/1.-Summit-2017-Rowela-Basa-1-64.pdf>
- 9) Buddharat, C., Ambele, E., & Boonsuk, Y. (2017). Uncooperativeness in political discourse: Violating Gricean maxims in Presidential Debate 2016. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3272625
- 10) Dayanthi, E. (2017). An analysis of conversational implicature in Time magazine’s interview with Donald Trump. <https://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/bitstream/123456789/34517/2/ERVINA%20DAYANTHI-fah.pdf>
- 11) Dylgjeri, A. (2016.). What is left unsaid; implicatures in political discourse. <https://core.ac.uk/download/143966593.pdf>
- 12) Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lis/study/packs/Grice-Logic.pdf>
- 13) Gufron, M., Junaidi, M., & Nasution, M. (2023). The manifestation of cooperative principles in political interviews: Implications for evaluating communication efficacy. *Linguistics and English Languages Teaching Studies*, 4(2), 46. <https://ejournal.unwmataram.ac.id>
- 14) Hamza, M. & Nordin, N. R. M. (2024). Pragmatic deviation of Grice’s cooperative principle in Trump’s political interview with the CNN news channel. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(3), pp. 883-892, March 2024 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1403.31>
- 15) Handayani, F. R., Sibarani, B., & Sumarsih. (2019). Awareness of conversational implicature of different academic year students of english department of faculty of language and arts state university of medan. *Proceedings of the 4th Annual International Seminar on Transformative Education and Educational Leadership (AISTEEL 2019)*. *Proceedings of the 4th Annual International Seminar on Transformative Education and Educational Leadership (AISTEEL 2019)*, Medan City, Indonesia. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aisteel-19.2019.112>
- 16) Juma'a, T. R. (2020). Flouting Grice’s cooperative principle in a political interview (Trump’s inter-view with Time on 2020). *PalArch’s Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*. <https://archives.palarch.nl/index.php/jae/article/view/6898>
- 17) Kwarteng, M. (2021). Pragmatic Analysis of ex-President Donald Trump’s interviews and its relation with the Grice’s (1975) Cooperative Principle. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(3), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.3.4>
- 18) Lazim, M. J. (2020). Conversational implicatures in the political talk of Sayyed Hassan Nasrallah. *Palarch’s Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 17(6). <https://archives.palarch.nl/index.php/jae/article/view/6677/6466>
- 19) Lodari, Y., Kasmairi, & Sabarudin, S. (2018). Grice’s cooperative principal violation in the second presidential debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. *Journal of English Education and Teaching (JEET)*, 2(3). <https://download.garuda.kemdikbud.go.id/article.php?article=1063381&val=15940&title=GRIES%20COOPERATIVE%20PRINCIPLE%20VIOLATION%20IN%20THE%20SECOND%20PRESIDENTIAL%20DEBATE%20BETWEEN%20HILLARY%20CLINTON%20AND%20DONALD%20TRUMP>
- 20) Madu, B.N. & Okpala, F.N. (2020). Conversational implicatures in political interviews selected from two Nigerian newspapers (Vanguard and Punch). *Sapientia Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Development Studies (SGOJAHDS)*, 3(4). <https://www.sgojahds.com/index.php/SGOJAHDS/article/view/140>
- 21) Massanga, M. & Msuya, E. A. (2017). The observance of Gricean conversational maxims by Tanzanian politicians in T.V. hosted interviews. *English Literature and Language Review*, 3(9). [https://www.arpgweb.com/pdf-files/ellr3\(9\)82-90.pdf](https://www.arpgweb.com/pdf-files/ellr3(9)82-90.pdf)
- 22) Musa, O.R.E., Subaiah, S., & Bahia Afrin Mohammed, S. (2022). Investigating the importance of conversational implicature and violation of maxims in daily conversations. *Arab World English Journal*, 13(2), 109–122. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no2.8>
- 23) Pujiati, T., Al-Rawafi, A., & Suparno, D. (2020). Implicature analysis of Adel Al-Jubeir political interview on Yemen campaign. <https://journal.uinjkt.ac.id/index.php/insaniyat/article/view/15958>

Cooperative Principle in Political Interviews

- 24) Rahmi, S. S., Refnaldi, R., & Wahyuni, D. (2018). Political conversation at Rosi Talkshow. *E-Journal of English Language and Literature*, 7(1). <https://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/ell/article/view/9910>
- 25) Rasool, S., Zahra, T., & Khawar, Z. (2022). An investigation of Grice's cooperative principle in an interview with Ishaq Dar: A pragmatic analysis. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research (KJLR)*, 25(2). <http://kjlir.pk/index.php/kjlir/article/view/322>
- 26) Rosyidah, R. H. (2020). The violation of cooperative principle in conversational of presidential debate Indonesia 2019. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344564169_The_Violation_of_Cooperative_Principle_in_Conversational_of_Presidential_Debate_Indonesia_2019#fullTextFileContent
- 27) Rouki, A. (2023). Exploring implicature awareness and instructional adequacy in greek EFL curriculum: A pragmatic perspective. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 13(5). 635-655. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2023.135038>
- 28) Seftika (2015). Flouts of the maxims in interview between Barrack Obama and Robin Roberts of ABC News "Good Morning America." *Jurnal SMART*, Vol., No. 1. <https://ejournal.umpri.ac.id/index.php/smart/article/view/85>
- 29) Slotta, J. (2021). Pragmatics. <https://www.academia.edu/37607636/Pragmatics>
- 30) Sumayya, S. (2012). Analysis of Pakistani political personality" s conversation. *International Journal of Research in Management*, 2, 67-76.
- 31) Udoh, C. & Ejiaso, V. (2022). A Gricean analysis of President Muhammadu Buhari's channels TV interview <https://www.nigerianjournalsonline.com/index.php/Feschschrifts/article/view/285>



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.