

The Communicative Force of Utterances in US President Joe Biden`s Interview: Context Based Analysis

Prof. Dr. Qasim Obayes Al-Azzawi

English Department, College of Education for Human Sciences, Babylon University, Iraq

E-mail of the corresponding author: dr.qasim_tofel@uobabylon.edu.iq

Ahmed Ali Mohammed Al-Ameel

English Department, College of Education for Human Sciences, Babylon University, Iraq

E-mail of the corresponding author: alamiliahmed@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The language users may vary their use of language and therefore there may be different meanings for one utterance. In presidential speech, communication could be more problematic if certain characters (listeners) violate or flout the cooperative principle. Accordingly, the present study seeks to analyze the pragmatic aspect of communicative force of utterances in six Joe Biden`s interviews in the context and content of coronavirus, politics, racism, leadership and social relation that were randomly selected via YouTube. The study aims at discussing Grice's maxims of conversation, the cooperative principle and how they are sometimes violated or flouted, and direct vs. indirect speech.

As starting point in this study, the researcher should raise the questions: what are the factors that affect interlocutors to flout or violate the principles? What are the possible consequences on interlocutors and listeners when CP maxims are violated or not violated during the process of interview? It hypothesizes that there are some linguistic and non-linguistic factors that participate with Cooperative Principles.

According to the results, speakers' uncooperative attitude is mostly influenced by psychological factors like frustration, irritation, nervousness, anxiety, conflict of interest, and other factors such as politeness, cheap praise, lack of adequate information, entertainment, and sometimes deliberate violation. Also, it was evident that, albeit speakers might not be aware of Grice`s maxims and its Cooperative principles yet they habitually conform to it in communication process.

explanations for meaning. The common thing is that both pragmatics and semantics deal with the meaning of utterances but semantics concentrates on the literal meaning of an expression. It does not consider the context in which it is expressed

1. Introduction

In the scientific study of human language, pragmatics is one of Linguistic branches which specifically deal with meaning in context. While Semantics focuses only on the meaning of combined words, pragmatics goes beyond to provide sufficient

the contextual side of meaning. Accordingly, some sentences can be interpreted literally or figuratively. Context can prompt communicators to engage in one way or another. He (Ibid.) notices that in daily conversations people do not usually say things directly but tend to imply them. He states that implicature may arise from the interaction of the following three factors (Alakrash & Bustan 2020):

- (1) the proposition actually expressed in the utterance.
- (2) the features of the context.
- (3) the assumption that the addresser is obeying the rules of conversation to the best of their ability. Look at the following example:

-A: *Will Sally be at the meeting?*

-B: *Her car broke down.*

Only the answer of the speaker in sentence (b) has the literal meaning, and he is flagrantly violating maxim of relation, but his implied meaning, is depending on context, that Sally will not be at the meeting, (Martina, 2007: 9).

3. Cooperative Principle

Grice, a renowned linguist, in (1975) developed a pragmatic theory called cooperative principle and implicature. He argues that participants follow certain rules and patterns in their conversations about which they may or may not be aware. Consequently, participants are expected to make their utterances informative and relevant. Grice (1975)

(Cutting, 2002) , (Bustan & Alakrash 2020).

Elaf & Hussien (2020) Pragmatics realizes the importance of context, especially in showing the meaning underlying a particular expression. Thomas (1995) explains that meaning in semantics is the dictionary meanings of words or phrases, while meaning in pragmatics is the speaker's intention. Since language's primary importance is for effective human communication, speakers' intended meaning is crucial and cannot be overlooked. Aitchison (1995) emphasizes that in a narrow sense, pragmatics investigates how listeners get the intended meaning of their speakers, whereas in a broader sense, it concerns with certain principles that interlocutors consciously or unconsciously adhere to communicating.

2. Communicative Force of Interaction

According to Grice (1975), conversational implicature plays an important role in our personal interactions. In conversation, communicators usually understand what others are saying even when people do not express their intention straightforwardly. So, conversational implicature is a type of implied meaning, which is inferred on the basis of the conversational meaning of words together with the context, implicature is comparable with illocutionary force in speech act theory in that they are both concerned with

In pragmatics, a speech act is an utterance defined in terms of a speaker's intention and its effect on a listener. Essentially, it is the action that the speaker hopes to provoke in his or her audience. Speech acts might be requests, warnings, promises, apologies, greetings, or any number of declarations. As one might imagine, speech acts are an essential part of communication. According to speech act theory, there is no clear-cut boundary between speaking and acting. That is, saying is acting and that words are deeds. From John Austin's point of view, language is used to inform or describe things. It is often used to "do things" and to perform acts. With the deepening of research, Austin realized that every sentence could be used to implement behavior in a certain sense, and it is not only the function of a sentence. Therefore, he introduced a new theory to determine how a speech act is to be interpreted, one must first determine the type of act being performed whether Locutionary Act, Illocutionary Act or Perlocutionary Act. In a nutshell, it is against the background of Grice's four propounded maxims under cooperative principle and conversational implicatures as well as John Austin's Speech-act theory that these selected interviews of Donald Biden are analyzed to find out the applicability and the usefulness of the theories. This material further aims to analyze the collected data using the maxims, which will help future researchers and

proposes that conversation is based on a shared principle of cooperation, and his work on the Cooperative Principle (CP) led to the development of pragmatics as a distinct discipline within linguistics. To exchange ideas and information in communication, interlocutors try to adopt a cooperative behavior to convey their intentions and transfer their utterances implicitly. In this regard, Grice (1975) points out that communication acts depend on the Cooperative Principle and that interlocutors try to cooperate in most of the conversational discourse. He thus proposes some principles in order to account for the cooperative behavior of participants in their conversations. Grice (1975) also considered both cooperative principle and conversational implicature in his article as "Logic and Conversation". According to him, utterance interpretation is not a matter of decoding messages. Instead, involves taking the meaning of the sentences together with contextual information, using inference rules and working out what the speaker means on the basis of the assumption that the utterance conforms to the maxims. An implicature is a piece of information that is conveyed indirectly by an utterance. This implies that an implicature is something that logically follows from what is asserted in an utterance. Also, J. Austin (1975) has introduced Speech-act theory and further developed by American philosopher J.R. Searle.

listeners as you would like to be treated).

3.2 The Violation and Concordance of the Cooperative Principle

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

language learners know how universal and practical these theories work and unveil the perlocutionary effect of keeping and violating the maxims in conversation process.

3.1 Types of Cooperative Principle

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

A. Maxim of Quality

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

B. Maxim of Quantity

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

C. Maxim of Relation

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

D. Maxim of Manner

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

meaning that occurs by default in any type of context (Grice, 1975). It is information that is inferred in a prototypical way, as long as there is no particular information that denies or contradicts it. This means that when interlocutors obey some of the principles, their utterances often give some direct information, Example: Kay: "DO YOU LIKE MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE?" Roy: "I LIKE SCIENCE." (This answer directly implies Roy doesn't like Mathematics) On the contrary, a particularized implicature is a conversational implicature that is derivable only in a specific context. This means that one party in interaction disobey the principle on purpose to let the other party explore the meaning of communication. Example: Boss: "WHERE IS MY CAR KEY?" Maid: "MADAM IS GONE FOR PARTY." (In this exchange, the Boss will likely derive the implicature "his wife has taken the car" from the maid's statement).

4.1 Features of Conversational Implicature

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

Cancellability (Defeasibility): This is where by speakers add some words in a certain linguistic context or non-linguistic context and the meaning of context changes. In other words,

4. The Cooperative Principle and Conversational Implicature

Grice in his theory pointed out that, the inadequate attention to the nature and importance of the conditions governing conversation and that whether speakers violate or do not violate the maxims in conversation, there is always an additional meaning that is logically attached to utterances known as implicature that we infer by considering the context. In other words, an implicature is something a speaker suggests or implies with an utterance, even though it is not literally uttered. Implicatures can aid in communicating more efficiently than by explicitly saying everything we want to communicate (Alakrash et.al 2020 , Alakrash et.al .

In 1983, British linguists Suephen C. Levinson and Geoffrey N.Leech respectively turned out PRAGMATICS and PRINCIPLE of PRAGMATICS, in which both praised Grice's theory of conversational implicature as a most important part in pragmatics. Conversational implicature surpasses the syntax and semantics is use to explore the meaning of sentences at first, and it explains the relationship between literal meaning and practical implication of utterance. It consists of two parts: generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature. Generalized conversational implicatures (GCI) are inferences that refer to the non-explicit

meaning of utterance. The conversational implicature will change while literal meaning will not change. It relies on the saying of what is said but they are not part of what is said. They are associated with speaker or utterance but not proposition or sentence. Example:

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

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

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

Joan: *"WHAT DO YOU THINK OF MIKE?"*

Jane: *"HE IS A BULL."*

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

Boy: *"CAN I KISS YOU?"*

Girl: *"THERE IS CORONA VIRUS OUTBREAK."*

5. Speech act theory

Speech-act theory is another sub-field of pragmatics aside from cooperative principle and

conversational implicature can be canceled by adding some words either by an explicit declaration that the speaker is opting out or, implicitly, by the co-text and context. Example: Mavis: *"DO YOU WANT SOME COFFEE?"*

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

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

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

Girl 1: *"I HAVE SCIENCE EXAM."*

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

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

Non-conventionality: It's a situation where by the implicature of conversation belongs to particularized implicature rather than generalized implicature. This is because conversational implicatures are achieved by connecting the Cooperative Principle and context rules. And the implicature follows the

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

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

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

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

-ITS SO CHILLED IN HERE.

- Locutionary act : *the room is too cold.*
- Illocutionary act : *a request to off the air-conditioner.*

conversational implicature. This area of study is concerned with the ways in which words can be used not only to present information but also to carry out actions. It is used in linguistics, philosophy, psychology, legal and literary theories, and even artificial intelligence development. Speech-act theory was introduced in 1975 by Oxford philosopher J.L. Austin in his book "How to Do Things with Words" and further developed by American philosopher J.R. Searle.

According to the renowned linguist, a speech act is an utterance defined in terms of a speaker's intention and its effect on a listener. Essentially, it is the action that the speaker hopes to provoke in his or her audience. Speech acts might be requests, warnings, promises, apologies, greetings, or any number of declarations. As you might imagine, speech acts are very essential part of human communication. Basically, both Austin and Searle believe that language is not only used to inform or describe things, it is often use to "do things", and to perform acts. This implies that, there is no clear-cut dichotomy between speaking and acting. In producing an utterance, we are performing an action. This action needs to be performed in accordance with social conventions and institutions. According to the theory, saying is acting, that is, words are deeds and that speakers must be mindful of whatever they utter.

maxims and Implicature. The researcher focuses on unveiling the reasons for interlocutors' cooperative and noncooperative attitudes and the consequences on interlocutors and listeners during conversation from a pragmatic perspective.

Data I

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

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

From the above data, it can clearly be deduced that, the president violated the maxim of relevance which requires Speaker's response to relate to the topic under discussion and there should be the avoidance of padding and circumlocutions. To this effect, Mr. Biden as a president could have taken advantage of the question to educate and motivate Americans to restore confidence about the panicking situation but he rather attacked the Interviewer personally without answering the question. Also, Mr. Biden violated the manner maxim which demands Speakers to speak directly and specifically to avoid ambiguity or obscurity. Biden was supposed to be very brief and well organized. The president was supposed to take advantage of the question to explain to the citizens, the measures put in place to control the situation so that the American people will have hope in the leadership. He sounded

- Perlocutionary act : *the listener offs the air-conditioner or his refusal.*

6. Relationship between Cooperative Principle and speech act theory.

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

7. Data Analysis

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

Through the use of both pragmatic and conversational analysis, the selected interviews are analyzed based on Cooperatiave Principle

implicature from the speaker's response is that, once the first corona virus case was recorded in Wuhan China in early December 2019, the name can be attached to the virus. To this, the perlocutionary effect on listeners across the globe can be that, Joe Biden doesn't like China the Chinese government's refusal to participate in an investigation by the World Health Organization into the origin of the Corona virus was among the reasons that prompted US President Joe Biden to review the origin of the epidemic. Even though the president is right, sometimes certain facts should not be directly said to avoid majority hatred. Consequently, this can create enmity between the President himself and some individuals as well as China and America.

Data III

Interviewer: "Do you think the fight against racism may end with Derek Chauvin's trial?"

Joe Biden: "A jury in Minnesota found former Minneapolis Police Officer Derek Chauvin guilty on all counts in the murder of George Floyd last May". He also said that "It was a murder in the full light of day, and it ripped the blinders off for the whole world to see the systemic racism the Vice President just referred to the systemic racism that is a stain our nation's soul; the knee on the neck of justice for Black Americans; the profound fear and trauma, the pain, the exhaustion that

self-aggrandized to earn cheap praise and was not polite enough as a president since the maxim of manner requires speakers to treat listeners as they would like to be treated. In this context, we can say that the logic behind or the conversational implicature could be that, the speaker was confused and desperate because of the pandemic. It could also be that he has not put down any measures to control the pandemic in his country or he doesn't like the Interviewer. The perlocutionary effect can be that the citizens who are listening with keen interest will lose confidence in the president and find their own solutions that can negatively affect him as a leader in the future.

Data II

Interviewer: "Do you think the origin is Chinese virus?"

Joe Biden: "there was not enough evidence whether the virus was caused by human contact with an infected animal or from a laboratory accident"

The answer to the above asked question is simple and straightforward but very informative which makes it agreed to some of the maxims. Considering maxim of quality, Biden answer was true that the virus comes from china and he did not hesitate to say. His answer also responds to the maxim of relation that it relates to the question without any digression or circumlocution. Also, his simple, clear and straightforward provided answer without any ambiguity, concord to the maxim of manner. The conversational

don't like him. I don't dislike him. I don't have any feelings one way or the other. It is that kind of matter what he says about me. He says good things or bad things about me. I'm going to make great deals for our country. I'm interested in our country. I'm interested in the success of our country. And right now, I mean you see what is happening. Just generally speaking, and we have a long way to go but they do try and pin me into this. And I am saying to myself, I don't even know him. All of a sudden you know; they make him like he is my best friend. I don't know. What I want is what is right for the country. That is all that matters to me.

The American president provided a solid and well elaborated answer to the asked question concerning his relationship with the Russian president from the data above. His answer respected the maxim of quality since he provided enough evidence to justify the friendship that, he is interested in the success of the country and he wants the best for the American people. His decision as a leader is to get along with other developed countries like Russia is not bad; that is why he has the good relationship with Vladimir Putin and nothing else. In addition, Biden's answer cooperated with maxim of relation in the sense that, his response is in line with the content without any digression. However, he provided a lot of words to defend himself as a politician which made him violate the

Black and brown Americans experience every single day."

In the above data, the Maxim of Quantity is also violated since Biden deliberately insisted to elaborate on the above asked question. Though he was not expected to say anything under the maxim of quantity to provide less information than necessary but what he said was much more than what is required. In addition, he didn't violate the maxim of quality that because he was sure of the answer he uttered if not, the question was simple for him to say "yes it does not it doesn't" due to a particular reason. The conversational implicature here is that, Joe Biden wasn't reluctant to answer the question because he might be an anti-racist and he doesn't want to talk little about it. In this vein, the perlocutionary effect can be that, some people will develop the mentality that Biden is not racist and that they will support him as a president anti-racist.

Data IV

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

Joe Biden: well look, I don't know. And know nothing about him really. I just think if we get along with Russia is not a bad thing. And you know getting along with other countries, I

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

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

Interviewer: "You know that is not true".

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

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

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

Interviewer: "And who is our biggest foreign adversary?"

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

maxim of quantity. The conversational implicature here is that, Biden shares similar ideology with the Russian president that he thinks it can help America to move forward. Furthermore, the perlocutionary effect here is that listeners across the globe will realized that Biden shares similar ideology with the Russian leadership and wants to move along with them, bringing peace and unity among the two countries.

Data V

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

Biden: "You gonna be fair".

Interviewer: "I'm gonna be fair".

Biden: "Just be fair".

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

Biden: "No, no".

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

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

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

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

saying his priority as a leader. He also violated the maxim of quantity because his information though does not relate, it was also too much for the question. He in addition, violated the maxim of manner since he was required to be straightforward. He adopted circumlocution strategy for cheap praise as a leader. The conversational implicature here is that, Biden wanted to take advantage of the question to tell people the good things he has done as a leader. The perlocutionary effect is that, the average American will be abreast with Biden's achievement, thereby serving as advantage on his behalf. Finally, the lady Interviewer asked: "And who is our biggest foreign adversary?" Biden answered this question without hesitation by saying: "I would say China". Since this answer is relevant, informative, and straightforward, which doesn't break jaws, it concords with all four maxims. The conversational implicature here is that there is a competition between China and America that the president accepts. The perlocutionary effect will be that, globally there will be the awareness that China is competing with America according to the president which will prompt China to know their world recognition and ginger them to work harder. Besides, there will be much pressure on Americans to be extra careful and work harder to gradually lose global market to China.

Data VI

From the above data, the Interviewer violated the relevance maxim right from the beginning by asking Biden "are you ready for some tough questions?" Basically, this is not the right time to ask such question especially when starting an interview. Maybe the Interviewer intended to make fun but it might sound bias to the interviewee which can provoke him. The conversational implicature here is that, the Interviewer wants to make fun by pulling the president's legs or she knows him to be impatient so she wants to provoke him. The perlocutionary effect is that, the interviewee can develop the mentality right from the beginning that the Interviewer doesn't like him which can jeopardize the interview before the end especially when a slight issue pops up. After the president has answered her that he doesn't want tough questions and she must be fair, the Interviewer proceeded by asking: "Why do you want to be president?" Biden answered her straightforwardly that he wants to finish what he has already started. His answer was very concise and relevant to the question and factual, which concorded all the maxims. The Interviewer asked again: "let me ask you, what you think your... the biggest domestic priority is for you right now?" when this question was asked Biden violated the maxim of relation by talking about the type of economy he has built and what he has done for African Americans, Asian Americans and Hispanic American instead of

above. His answer respected the maxim of quality since he provided enough evidence to justify that he was able to purchase enough vaccine, he is interested in the success of the country and he wants the best for the American people. His decision as a leader is to get along with other developed countries well over 600 million doses to take care of more than 300 million Americans. In addition, Biden's answer cooperated with maxim of relation in the sense that, his response is in line with the content without any digression. However, he provided a lot of words to defend himself as a politician which made him violate the maxim of quantity. The conversational implicature here is that, Biden doesn't share similar ideology with the Republican men who say they won't get the vaccine and people are talkin' about whether help America to move forward. Furthermore, the perlocutionary effect here is that listeners across the globe will realized that Biden is giving medical instructions by saying that you have to take vaccine when it's available number one. Number two, stay socially distanced. Number three, wear a mask when you're out in public. And we'll get by this and we'll get by it much quicker than we otherwise.

Conclusion

The foregoing analyzed data in relation to the cooperative principle and its maxims, unveils that, practical language users like president Joe Biden

Interviewer: "So you've set out your goals for the country. 100 million vaccine doses by next week, 100 million out the door. Every American eligible for the vaccine by -- adult American by May 1st. Something close to normal on July 4th. But tell everyone, when is everything going to be normal for Americans?"

Joe Biden: Well, first of all, I won't even be able to meet the July 4th deadline unless people listen, wear masks, wash their hands and socially distance because not everyone by July 4th will have been vaccinated. There's enough vaccine I -- we-- we've been able to purchase enough vaccine, George, with a lotta -- a lotta heavy liftin' for over six hundred -- well over 600 million doses to take care of more than 300 million Americans, some of 'em single dose. But I hope that what I'm reading about 30% of Republican men say they won't get the vaccine and people are talkin' about whether they ne-- I mean, you have to-- one, when-- when it's available to, get the vaccine, number one. Number two, stay socially distanced. Number three, wear a mask when you're out in public. And we'll get by this and we'll get by it much quicker than we otherwise (Bustan & Alakrash 2020) .

The American president provided a solid and well elaborated answer to the asked question 100 million vaccine doses from the data

Alakrash, H. M., & Bustan, E. S. (2020). Politeness Strategies Employed by Arab EFL And Malaysian ESL Students in Making Request. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(6), 10-20.

Alakrash, H., Edam, B., Bustan, E., Armnazi, M., Enayat, A., & Bustan, T. (2021). Developing English Language Skills and Confidence Using Local Culture-Based Materials in EFL Curriculum. *LINGUISTICA ANTVERPIENSIA*, 548-564.

Alakrash, HM, Razak, NA, & Bustan, ES (2020). The Effectiveness Of Employing Telegram Application In Teaching Vocabulary: A Quasai Experimental Study. Multicultural Education, 6(1).

Allan, K. and Jaszczolt, K. (2012). *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bouton, L.F. (1988). *A cross-cultural study of ability to implicatures in English*. *World Englishes*, 7, 183-96.

Bustan, E. S., & Alakrash, H. M. (2020). Gender Analysis Amongst Male and Female Malaysian Travelling Bloggers. *International Journal of*

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

References

Aitchison, J. (1995). *Linguistics*. Haodder and Stoughton.

- Generation Communication and Networking, 13(2), 26-38.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power*. 2nd edition. London: Longman.
- Grice (2012). *Principles*. Retrieved from <http://awinlanguage.blogspot.com>
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, (pp.41-58). Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press.
- Huang, Y. (2007), *Pragmatics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kheirabadi, R. & Aghagolzade, F. (2012). *Grice's cooperative maxims as linguistic criteria for news selectivity*. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2 (3), 547-53.
- Kolo, Tswana. (2007). *The Use of Grice's Maxim of Cooperative Principle in the Teaching of Writing Competence*
- Leech. G (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman Group Ltd.
- Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 10(6), 1-9.
- Bustan, E., & Alakrash, H. M. (2020). An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Performed by Donald Trump Tweets Addressing the Middle East Countries. *Global journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 1, 66-74.
- Clarke & J. Handscombe (Eds.), *TESOL* (pp. 191-206). Washington DC: TESOL.
- Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cummings, L. (2010). *The Pragmatics Encyclopedia*. New York: Routledge
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. Routledge.
- Davis, B. L. (2008). *Grice's cooperative principle: meaning and rationality*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 2308-2331.
- Devine, J. (1982). *A question of universality conversational principles and implicatures*. In M.A.
- Elaf, B., & Hussien, A. (2020). Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Tweets Addressing the Middle Eastern Countries. *International Journal of Future*

- introduction to
pragmatics. Longman.
- Yule, G.(1985).The Study of
Language. Cambridge
University Press.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*.
Cambridge University
Press.
- Levinson, S. (1985). *Pragmatics*.
Cambridge University
Press
- Martin, R. (2007) ‘*Rhetoric of political
speeches*’. In Wodak,
R. and N. Koller
(eds.), *The Handbook
of Communication in
the Public Sphere*,
243-269. Berlin:
Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mey, L. (2001).*Pragmatics: An
Introduction* (2nd ed.).
: Blackwell Publishing
- Peccei, Jean S. (1999). *Pragmatics*.
London: Routledge
- Richards,J.(2006).*Communicative
Language Teaching
Today*. Cambridge
University Press.
- Senft, G. (2014).*Understanding
Pragmatics*.
Routledge: Taylor &
Francis Group.
- Sobhani, A. & Saghebi, A. (2014). *The
Violation of
Cooperative Principles
and Four Maxims in
Iranian Psychological
Consultation*. Open
Journal of Modern
Linguistics, 4, 91-99.
doi:
10.4236/ojml.2014.41
009.
- Thomas, J.(1995). *Meaning in
interaction :an*