

FLOUTING GRICE'S MAXIM OF CONCISION BY MALE AND FEMALE IN A SELECTED POLITICAL INTERVIEWS

Asst. Prof. Dr. Bushra Ni'ma Rashid

The University of Baghdad/ College of Education/ Ibn Rushd for Human Sciences/ The Department of English

ABSTRACT

Grice's theory of Co-operative Principle (CP) as well as conversational implicature are very significant in the analysis of many types of texts. Flouting Grice's maxims has a great effect on the flow of conversation. The problem of this study lies in the fact that flouting Grice's maxims sometimes cause gap in the information especially for the addressee. Moreover, flouting makes conversations more interesting. This study is an attempt to investigate the flouting of Grice maxims by males and females in interviews, especially flouting the maxims of quantity and manner. It is hypothesized that males use the strategy of flouting more than females do in conversations. It is also hypothesized that women, sometimes and in some cases, tend to be brief in their speech.

An analysis is conducted to selected pieces of speech from two interviews. The researcher has adopted Grice's model, she also limits herself to selected speeches from two interviews (Muir's interview with Clinton and Spiegel's interview with Merkel). Moreover, numbers and statistics are used in order to find out which maxim is flouted more (quantity or manner). The results of the analysis have revealed that the total number of flouting is (34) times, (18) times by Muir and Clinton and (16) times by Spiegel and Merkel. The researcher has used APA (American Psychological Association) style in her research.

Key words: *The Co-operative Principle, Flouting, Concision, conversations, Grice's model*

1. INTRODUCTION

Grice's theory of Co-operative Principle is considered as one of the most important theories in pragmatics. It has also been widely used in the analysis of many types of texts in English.

In less than a decade after its first publication in 1975, Herbert Paul Grice's paper *Logic and conversation* becomes one of the classic studies in pragmatics. There are two important reasons for the study's success and being widely used in the analysis of texts: (i) it can be considered as the first attempt to shed light on the intuitive difference between what is expressed literally in a sentence and what is only suggested by an utterance of the same string of words, (ii) the components of the notional and inferential framework that Grice set up to characterize various kinds of utterance content are intuitively appealing (cf. Haberland & Mey 2002).

The current study consists of three parts. The first one is an introduction. The second part is a theoretical background about the study. It includes an introduction about communication in general, Grice's co-operative principle, conversational implicature, the characteristics of conversational implicature, and the flouting of the Grice's maxims. The third part contains the analysis of selected speeches from two interviews and the results. The study ends with conclusions and references.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Generally, in any human interaction people not only interact with each other, but they also have an "impulse" or a motive to cooperate with each other. When the great linguist Grice has used the word "cooperation", he does not mean by this word that participants in any conversation are cooperative and helpful with each other, but rather, the Cooperative Principle (CP) aims to explain why people are sometimes unhelpful, or less nice, or even rude. The Cooperative Principle clarifies the ways in which a speaker understands that what the hearer means is rather different from what he/she says. (Chapman, 2011, p. 74).

2.1 Language and Communication

Brown and Yule (1983, p.26) define language *"as an instrument or a vehicle of communication in a context by a S/writer to express meanings and achieve intentions and that language should be related to meaning interpretation"*. This definition implies that language plays a very important role in communication of meaning and intention. Moreover, language is very significant for the transmission of information between the speaker and the hearer

So, communication is achieved through language. Thus, Crystal (1985, p.72) defines communication as *"communication is a fundamental notion in the study of behavior, which acts as a frame of reference for linguistic studies"*. In spite of the fact that sometimes gestures are used in order to express feelings, but it is hard to express complex thoughts and ideas without the use of language.

2.2 Grice's Cooperative Principle

In taking part in an interaction, Grice has supposed that interlocutors notice the following principle: *"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"*(Grice, 1989, p.26).

Marquez (2000, p.6) demonstrates that one of the most important contributions to the study of pragmatics has been that of *"Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) and his maxims of conversation which were formulated on the assumption that the main purpose of conversation is the effective exchange of information"*. CP assumes speakers in interactions attempt to cooperate for the sake of ensuring the maximum efficiency for the transmission of information. There are four significant maxims concerning CP. These maxims can be summarized as follows:

A. The maxim of quality

Try to make your contribution one that is true

1. Do not say what you believe is false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

B. The maxim of quantity

1. Make your contribution as informative as is required.
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

- C. The maxim of relevance
 - 1. Make your contribution relevant.
- D. The maxim of manner
 - Be perspicuous, and specifically.
 - 1. Avoid ambiguity
 - 2. Avoid obscurity
 - 3. Be brief
 - 4. Be orderly

(Saeed, 2016, p.211)

Since the researcher is concerned with the brevity in political interviews, she limits herself to just two of these maxims which are: the maxim of quantity and the maxim of manner.

An example of the observance of the principle and maxims will be in the following exchange:

A: *What's the capital of Venezuela?*

B: *Caracas.*

In this conversation, B has obviously told the truth (quality), has provided no more and no less information than was required (quantity), has fulfilled A's request for information (relation) and has done so in a clear and brief manner (manner) (Flowerdew, 2010, p.96).

It is absolutely true that, sometimes, the co-operative principle does not seem to be working. Yule (1996, p. 145) states that "*However, this general description of the normal expectations we have in conversations helps to explain a number of regular characteristics in the way people things*". For instance, a number of common expressions like: *well, to make a long story short and I won't bore you with all the details*, seem to be indicators of an awareness of the quantity maxim. When the speaker utters any of these expressions he/she flouts the maxim of quantity. The speaker may want to hide something by being less informative.

Some awareness of the significance of the quality maxim seems to lie behind the way people begin some conversational contributions with the expressions like: *As far as I know... , Now, correct me if I'm wrong, but... and I am not absolutely sure but* Moreover, people take care to indicate that what they want to convey is "something they think and feel (not know), is possible or likely (not certain), may or could (not must) happen"(ibid, p. 145). Hence, Yule (ibid) makes a distinction between saying *John is ill* and *I think that John may be ill*. In the former it is very obvious that John is ill while in the second example, it is not clear whether he is ill or not.

2.3 Conversational Implicature

Grice's theory of conversation, specifically, his view that conversation is governed by a set of norms, points to the importance of investigating the social regularities which arise through and are reflected in communicative interaction (Schmitt, 2010, p.75).

Grice describes and explains the type of implicature that depends not on the conventional meaning of words used, but on principles and regularities concerning how people use language in general. However, while knowledge of language is sufficient to know 'what is said?' and what is conventionally implicated. This requires to be enhanced by knowledge about language use before a complete understanding of what has been conveyed by a specific utterance. 'What is said' sustains into a hearer's understanding of what is implicated in this way, but is not enough on its own (Chapman, 2011, p.73).

The hearer also wants to suppose that the speaker follows the general principles of language use and to take into account different aspects of the context of utterance. Grice calls this type of implicature 'conversational implicature' which is, unlike the conventional implicature, depends on the aspects of the context in which it occurs. Grice has not said much about the specific characteristics of conversation, the term for him was an appropriate way in which people use language to interact with each other (ibid, p.74).

For instance:

Carol: Are you coming to the party tonight?

Lara: I've got an exam tomorrow.

On the face of it, Lara's statement is not an answer to Carol's question. Lara does not say 'Yes' or 'No'. However, Carol will directly interpret the statement as meaning 'No' or 'probably not'. How can people account for this ability to grasp one meaning from a sentence which, in a literal sense, means something else? It seems to depend, at least partially, on the assumption that Lara is being 'relevant' and 'informative'. So, Carol can work out that 'exam tomorrow' conventionally means 'study tonight', and 'study tonight' prohibits 'party tonight'. Thus, Lara's answer is not simply a statement of tomorrow's activities, it involves an *implicature* (an additional conveyed meaning) concerning tonight's activities (Yule, 1996a, p. 145-146).

Yule (1996b, p.50) adds that if a speaker's remark looks irrelevant, the hearer will try to create a number of inferences in order to make that remark relevant. Yule (ibid.) points out to the importance of doing so "*it is speaker who communicate meaning via implicatures and it is listeners who recognize those communicated meanings via inference*". Thus, the inference made will assume cooperation.

2.4 Characteristics of Conversational Implicature

There are four important characteristics of conversational Implicature:

1. Calculability

Calculability means that hearers "must be able to figure out how an implicature can be derived" (Geurts, 2012, p.18). This means that hearers must be able to calculate the intended meaning in accordance with the conventional meaning of the words together with the contextual information. For example:

A: Can I get some petrol somewhere around here?

B: There is a garage around the corner.

The way A can calculate B's response by depending on Grice's CP is by supposing that B is cooperative and wouldn't respond with irrelevant information to A's question. Moreover, A arrives to the point that if the garage is opened of course, then s/he can get the petrol s/he needs from it (Grice, 1975: 39-40).

2. **Defeasibility or cancelability:** cancelability examines the possibility of a CI to be cancelled because of additional information introduced afterwards. That is, one may implicate something then cancel it. For instance, Cruse (2000: 350) presents the following example for the clarification of this characteristic:

A: Did the Minister attend the meeting and sign the agreement?

B (1): The Minister attended the meeting.

B (2): The Minister attended the meeting; a statement will be issued later with regard to the agreement.

According to Grice, cited in (Geurts, 2010: 18-19), a CI can be cancelled either explicitly or implicitly. If it is explicitly reported, then the speaker may use explicit word(s) indicating the cancelling of the implicature such as "but, but not ... "as in:

- *There is a garage around the corner, but it's closed.*

Whereas if the implicature is implicitly conveyed, then the cancellability of the implicature will be achieved through the context; as in:

- *X is meeting a woman this evening – his sister, in fact.*

Anyway, by adding new information after stating the first one, the context will absolutely change and this will come up with the characteristic of context dependence. In addition, and as Cruse (2000: 350) further adds, the characteristic of defeasibility/cancellability "adds nothing that is not covered by the criterion of context dependence". Therefore, the feature of cancellability is rather questionable (Fadhil, 2016).

3. **Context-dependent:** The third characteristics which allows language users to differentiate between CI from the conventional ones is that the interpretation of CI is context dependent. Cruse (ibid.: 349) adds further details on this characteristic by saying that an utterance can be interpreted in different ways if it is placed in different contexts. The utterance "I've cleared the table" has two different CI in the following different contexts:

(1) A: Have you cleared the table and washed the dishes?

B: I've cleared the table.

(2) A: Am I in time for supper?

B: I've cleared the table.

In the first example, **B**'s response gives the implicature of clearing the table and not washing the dishes as requested. While **B**'s response in the second example implies the implicature of **A** being late for supper. Here, there will be two different interpretations because there are two different contexts.

4. Non-detachability: when utterances have the same propositional content and still occur in the same context, they will "give rise to the same conversational implicature" (ibid.). This gives rise to the concept of non-detachability. Geurts (2010: 18) says that an implicature must be dependent on the content of the speaker's utterance more than on the form. For example, if such a question as "Have you cleared the table and washed the dishes?" is asked, there will be the following replies:

A. I've cleared the table.

B. I've taken all the things off the table.

The same implicature will arise which is that of only clearing the table.

2.5 Flouting the Grice's Maxims

Flowerdew (2013,p.97) states that "a flout is when someone deliberately and ostentatiously contravenes a maxim. This may be considered a major violation". In some cases, speakers are supposed by the hearers to be noticing a maxim, this is a case of standard implicature. In other cases, speakers are supposed not to be noticing the maxims and this is called a flout. In flouting the maxim of quantity, Grice presents an instance of someone writing a recommendation who only writes a couple of lines. In ordinary circumstance, more than a couple of lines would be needed for a recommendation. So, when the writer only writes a couple of lines, he is trying to infer that the person whom he is writing a recommendation is not qualified enough.

Moreover, when speakers flout the maxim of quality, they do so on the basis of irony, metaphor, meiosis (understatement), and hyperbole, in these cases, speakers say something and infer something else in certain contexts. Therefore, speakers are not being truthful with the hearers. For instance, when someone, says 'Great shot' in tennis, when the players clearly miss the ball, this is an irony. Other examples might involve metaphor, for instance, 'you are a pain in the neck', means that the person addressed is a source of annoyance or source of grief and 'he is a pillar of strength' which means someone who gives support or help during difficult times.

Other examples which contain understatement as for example, 'I was a little bit lucky' after winning a big prize, and hyperbole, as for example 'I paid a fortune' (for something that was a little bit expensive). All the examples mentioned above, are not the literal truth. In flouting the maxim of relation, for instance, in a tea party A says 'Mrs A is an old bag'. After a few minutes the topic changes entirely to 'the weather has been quite delightful this summer'. So, B implicates that A's statement is not preferred to be discussed by rejecting to give a relevant answer (ibid, 98).

Finally, in flouting the maxims of manner, speaker intentionally try to be vague to achieve some purposes. For example, when one parent says to another 'Let's go to that place we talked about yesterday'

to avoid naming the place in front of the children. In flouting the maxim of manner, speakers tend to be ambiguous in the speech to avoid the third parties grasping what they are saying (ibid, 99).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introductory Remarks

This part of the study includes an analysis of pieces of speeches in two political interviews. The first one is between Hillary Clinton and ABC News Anchor David Muir. In this interview, David Muir speaks with Hillary Clinton the night of the California Primary, On Tuesday, June 7, 2016, ABC News' Anchor of "World News Tonight" David Muir has interviewed Hillary Clinton. The full transcript of the interview is adopted from the website: <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/transcript-hillary-clintons-interview-abc-news-anchor-david/story?id=39676932>

The second interview is Spiegel's interview with Angela Merkel. *'In Everything I Do, I Aim to Strengthen Democracy'* Angela Merkel is running for a fourth term in office. Der Spiegel speaks with the chancellor about the addiction of power, the influence on politics of Germany's automobile industry and her attempts to win back voters on the right. The interview has happened on September 01, 2017. The full transcript of the interview is adopted from: <https://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/angela-merkel-in-everything-i-do-i-aim-to-strengthen-democracy-a-1165680.html>. Both the interviews are found in the appendix.

3.2 Data Analysis

The researcher analyses selected speeches from two political interviews. The strategy that is adopted in selecting the material to be analyzed is that of choosing six pairs of speeches from Muir's interview with Clinton and six pairs of speeches from Spiegel's interview with Angela Merkel.

The analysis is presented in the form of tables. Each table consists of four columns. Starting from left to right, the first one shows the numbers, the second column contains the selected text to be analyzed, the third one shows the type of maxim that is flouted in the selected text, and Finally, the fourth one contains the explanations for why the selected texts has been flouted.

3.2.1 The Analysis of Muir's Interview with Hillary Clinton

N.	Text	The maxim Flouted	Reasons for flouting
1.	<p>MUIR: ¹And then joining this president as secretary of state. Eight years ago to the day, you conceded.</p> <p>CLINTON: ^{1 2}That's right.</p>	<p>¹Manner</p> <p>¹Quantity</p>	<p>Muir does not give information for why Clinton conceded from the secretary of state.</p> <p>Clinton does not provide Muir with full information. She just says 'that's right'. She flouts the maxim</p>

		² Manner	of quantity by being less informative than required. Clinton flouts the maxim of manner by being too brief, she does not mention why she has been elected for senate eight years ago. She is ambiguous in her answer.
2.	<p>MUIR: In that speech about 18 million cracks in the glass ceiling, you said the light shining through, filling us with ¹the knowledge that the knowledge that the path will be a little easier next time.</p> <p>CLINTON: ^{1 2}Right.</p>	<p>¹Quantity (less informative than required)</p> <p>¹Quantity</p> <p>²Manner</p>	<p>Muir flouts the maxim of quantity. He says 'the path will be easier', however, he does not mention why the path will be easier next time and which path exactly.</p> <p>Clinton's answer to Muir's question that the path will be easier next time with 'right' does not tell the audience anything about why the path will be easier. Is the political contest, in general, that will be easier for her, or is it her election for presidency that will be easy. Clinton is too brief in her answer.</p>
3.	<p>MUIR: ¹We remember eight years ago that meeting with presumptive nominee Barack Obama. He had just beaten you. I believe you were at Senator <u>Diane Feinstein</u>'s house.</p> <p>CLINTON: ^{1 2}That's right.</p>	<p>¹Quantity</p> <p>¹Manner</p> <p>²Quantity (less informative)</p>	<p>Muir flouts the maxim of quantity. Muir does not give any details about how the presumptive nominee Barak Obama has beaten Clinton eight years ago. He is too brief in his speech because he does not want to embarrass Clinton and make her explain the incident again.</p> <p>Clinton, too briefly, answers Muir by saying 'that's right'. She does not tell him why the presumptive has beaten her and why she has been at Senator Diane Feinstein's house at that time.</p>

		than required)	
4.	<p>MUIR: ¹ ²Have you heard from him yet?</p> <p>CLINTON: ¹ ²We've continually talked throughout this process and I-</p>	<p>¹Manner</p> <p>²Quantity (less informative than required)</p> <p>¹Manner</p> <p>²Quantity (less informative than required)</p>	<p>Muir asks Clinton Whether Senator Barak Obama has called her recently or not, but he is too brief.</p> <p>He does not mention why Senator Barak Obama has to call Clinton.</p> <p>Clinton does not answer Muir's question directly. She does not answer him with 'yes' or 'no', she just says that they continually talk with each other. She is too brief.</p> <p>Clinton does not tell Muir about what she and Senator Obama have talked about exactly through the process.</p>
5.	<p>MUIR: ¹Is Bernie Sanders? Would he be vice president?</p> <p>CLINTON: ¹We're gonna be looking at everybody who has something to contribute.</p>	<p>¹Quantity (less informative than required)</p> <p>¹Quantity</p>	<p>Muir flouts the maxim of quantity. He says that it is possible that Bernie Sanders will be the president, but he does not mention why he is one of the nominees to be president.</p> <p>Clinton does not answer Muir's question whether Bernie will be the vice president since she is one of the nominees for presidency, she does not want to praise Bernie Sanders by saying that he is qualified to be the president. She does not answer Muir with 'yes' or 'no' and she even does not mention Bernie's name.</p>

6.	<p>MUIR: ¹²He did bring up the emails, though, again tonight. He’s going to in this general election, you know that.</p> <p>CLINTON: Uh-huh.</p>	<p>¹Quantity ²Manner</p> <p>¹Manner (too brief)</p>	<p>Muir is less informative and too brief in this speech. He does not explain what is the issue of e-mail in which Trump attacks her.</p> <p>Clinton does not answer Muir because she does not want to bring up the issue of e-mail and explain it (that she has used her personal e-mail when she has worked as secretary of United States to carry out the States works). She fears that explaining this topic may affect her campaign.</p>
----	--	--	---

Table (1) The Analysis of Selected Speeches from Muir's Interview with Clinton

In table (1), the researcher analyses selected speeches from Muir's interview with Clinton. Muir has flouted the maxim of quantity (5) times and maxim of manner (3) times, while Clinton has flouted the maxim of quality (5) times and maxim of manner (5) times, too. The total flouting by both Muir and Clinton is (18) times.

3.2.2The Anaylsis of Spiegel's Interview with Angela Merkel

N.	Text	The maxim flouted	Reasons for flouting
1.	<p>SPIEGEL: Ms. Chancellor, we would like to speak with you about power, but also about the nepotism engendered by power. ¹Most politicians are aware that influence and power can sometimes be like a drug. Have you become addicted?</p> <p>Merkel: ¹I hope not. ²No.</p>	<p>¹Quantity (less informative than required)</p> <p>¹Quantity (less informative than required)</p>	<p>Spiegel does not mention why influence and power can become like a drug. Spiegel also does not mention why would Merkel become addicted to power?</p> <p>Merkel does not mention why she is unlike the other politicians in that she is not addicted to power and influence in spite of the fact that she has been the chancellor of Germany for a long period of time.</p>

		² Manner	Merkel too briefly answers Spiegel's question.
2.	<p>SPIEGEL: ¹Is it really a valid argument to say that your predecessor did the same thing?</p> <p>Merkel: ^{1 2}Yes, it is common practice.</p>	<p>¹Quantity (less informative than required)</p> <p>¹Quantity</p> <p>²Manner</p>	<p>Spiegel does not exactly what Merkel's predecessor does.</p> <p>Merkel is less informative and too brief. She does not mention why it is a common practice for her predecessor to take part in discussions in televised debates.</p>
3.	<p>SPIEGEL: If Mr. Wilhelm had worked for a Social Democratic chancellor, do you think he would have been hired by BR?</p> <p>Merkel: ^{1 2}That is something you have to ask BR.</p>	<p>¹Quantity (less informative than required)</p> <p>¹Quantity</p> <p>²Manner</p>	<p>Spiegel does not mention why Mr. Wilhelm will be hired by BR (Public Broadcaster), if he works for Social Democratic chancellor.</p> <p>Merkel intentionally flouts the maxim of quantity. She does not answer Spiegel's question about whether Mr. Wilhelm has been hired by BR (Public Broadcaster) after leaving chancellor.</p> <p>Merkel is too brief. The reason is that, maybe she does not know that he will be hired by (BR) and says to Spiegel that this is something that he must ask BR (Public Broadcaster)</p>

<p>4.</p>	<p>SPIEGEL: If we were to translate that for regular people, what you mean is: If you form a coalition with the Green party after the Sept. 24 parliamentary elections, the combustible engine will quickly be passé, ¹but if you form a government with the business-friendly Free Democrats, it will take a bit longer.</p> <p>Merkel: ¹I am not talking about coalitions. I am talking about the CDU campaign platform.</p>	<p>¹Quantity</p> <p>¹Manner</p>	<p>Spiegel is less informative. He does not mention why it will take longer to form a government with the business-friendly Democratic.</p> <p>Merkel avoids talking about the coalition with the green party. Instead, she shifts the topic to CDU (Christian Democratic Union) in Germany and she talks about their campaign's platform.</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p>SPIEGEL: ¹Do you believe there was ever a moment when you left too much room for the AfD on the right wing of the political spectrum?</p> <p>Merkel: ¹No. ²If you take a look at our domestic security policies, for example, you will see that we have done everything necessary within the framework of our values.</p>	<p>¹Quantity</p> <p>¹Manner</p> <p>²Quantity</p>	<p>Spiegel does not mention why Merkel would left too much room for the AfD(right-wing populist party Alternative for Germany)</p> <p>Merkel, too briefly, answers Spiegel because she does not want to talk</p> <p>Merkel does mention what she has done exactly within the framework of her values.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p>SPIEGEL: ¹Do you see it as a compliment when people say that you are the best Social Democratic chancellor that Germany has ever had?</p> <p>Merkel: ¹If I listen to the SPD's chancellor candidate, it doesn't seem as though I have earned that title. But seriously: Voters have no use for such categorizations. They rightly expect us to do</p>	<p>¹Quantity (less informative than required)</p> <p>¹Quantity</p>	<p>He does not mention why the German people have considered Merkel as the best chancellor that Germany has ever had.</p> <p>Merkel does not mention why she has not listened to SPD (Social Democratic Party) chancellor candidate and why</p>

	our work as best as we possibly can. And that is what I am doing.		if she has done so, she will not earn the title that she the best chancellor that German has ever had is. Merkel also mentions why voters have no use of such matters because she thinks they only thing that is important for the people is that they must do their work as good as possible.
--	---	--	--

Table (2) The Analysis of Selected Speeches from Spiegel's Interview with Merkel

In table (2), the researcher analyses selected speeches from Spiegel's interview with Merkel. Spiegel has flouted the maxim of quantity (6) times, but he does not flout maxim of manner. Merkel has flouted the maxim of quantity (5) times and the maxim of manner (5) times. The total floutings which have occurred by Spiegel and Merkel is (16) times.

3.3 Results of the Analysis

The results of the analysis of the selected speeches from the two interviews are illustrated in tables and since the researcher wants to find out whether males use flouting more than females, she counts Muir's and Spiegel's flouting first and then Clinton's and Merkel's flouting. Table (3) shows how many times both Muir and Spiegel have flouted the maxims of quantity and manner and the percentages. Table (4) shows how many times both Clinton and Merkel have flouted the maxims of quantity and manner and the percentages.

Number	Maxim Type	Muir and Spiegel – Total Usage	Percentage
1	Quantity	11	%78
2	Manner	3	%21

Table (3) Maxim flouting in Muir's and Spiegel's speeches

From table (3), it is clear that Maxim of quantity is more flouted than the maxim of manner. Maxim of quantity is flouted (11) times with a percentage of about (78%) while maxim of manner is flouted just (3) times, with a percentage (21%).

Number	Maxim Type	Clinton and Merkel – Total Usage	Percentage
1	Quantity	10	%50
2	Manner	10	%50

Table (4)
flouting in Clinton's and Merkel's speeches

Maxim

Table (4) shows that the maxim of quantity is flouted (10) times with a percentage of about (50%) just as maxim of manner which is also flouted (10) times.

CONCLUSIONS

From the analysis and the results, the researcher concludes that in interviews between males and females, females flout Grice maxims more than males and this does not verify the researcher's first hypothesis that males use flouting more than females in interviews. The flouting of the maxims do not occur with same numbers and percentages between the two maxims, each maxim is flouted with different numbers and percentages. Clinton and Merkel flout the maxim of quantity and manner more than Muir and Spiegel and this verifies the researcher's second hypothesis that women tend to be brief in some cases. Women tend to be brief in some cases for some reason as when they do not know anything about the topic under discussion or maybe they intentionally want to hide something.

APPENDIX

Muir's Interview with Clinton

DAVID MUIR: Madam Secretary, thank you.

HILLARY CLINTON: Thank you, David.

MUIR: I'll get you through this so you can make some history tonight.

CLINTON: Thank you.

MUIR: You're about to walk out onto that stage as the first female presumptive nominee for a major party for president. And I'm curious, personally, what this moment means to you.

CLINTON: Well, I think it's gonna take some real time to absorb and reflect on what it means to me personally, what it means to our country, but just as I look at this night and feel the joy and the sense of both possibility and responsibility, it means a great deal to have the faith and trust of so many people who share the view and vision I have for our country and I'm going to do everything I can not to let them down.

MUIR: This country has watched you as first lady, then elected to the senate, then a bruising campaign for president eight years ago.

CLINTON: Right.

MUIR: And then joining this president as secretary of state. Eight years ago to the day, you conceded.

CLINTON: That's right.

MUIR: But now you're back.

CLINTON: Right.

MUIR: As the nominee.

CLINTON: Right.

MUIR: What is that moment for you?

CLINTON: Well, I didn't really believe back in 2008 that I would ever try this again, I was very happy being in the Senate, I had given that '08 campaign all that I had, and so, when I conceded and went to work immediately for then-Senator Obama, that's where I saw my future in the Senate. And I would not have imagined being asked to be Secretary of State, it was a great honor to serve with President Obama in his cabinet. But then the more that I traveled the world, the more that I really regretted the dysfunction and the gridlock and the failure of our own country to live up to our potential and solve our problems in the kind of way that Americans do better than anybody else. I began thinking about running again.

MUIR: You have talked so often about the unfinished business, not only in this country but around the world when it comes to women's rights. Is having the first female American President part of that unfinished business?

CLINTON: It is David, it is of course symbolic but the symbols mean something and symbols often can spark hope and action in people particularly young people and I think it will be a real milestone with my nomination for our country, but it will also send a signal around the world. I care deeply about women's rights. I have been an outspoken advocate for them for many years and as secretary of state I carried that message around the world because empowering women, providing for women's rights, their full participation in society, politics, the economy is not only a matter of individuals being able to chart their own futures. It's good for democracy and it's good for peace and prosperity.

MUIR: You conceded to then-Senator Barack Obama eight years ago tonight.

CLINTON: Right.

MUIR: In that speech about 18 million cracks in the glass ceiling, you said the light shining through, filling us with the knowledge that the path will be a little easier next time.

CLINTON: Right.

MUIR: Was it easier?

CLINTON: It was. In --

MUIR: It was?

CLINTON: It was. Of course, every political contest is hard, that's part of the DNA in America. We make it really tough to run for and hold the highest and hardest job in our country. But I was somewhat reassured and delighted to see that a lot of the challenges that we confronted back in '08 seemed to have diminished -- I'm not gonna say disappeared -- but diminished. There was a greater acceptance by people that a woman could be president, could be commander in chief.

And I didn't really feel like I had to make that case. But instead, I had to present my qualifications, my experience, you know, what I wanna do with my agenda for our country.

MUIR: We remember eight years ago that meeting with presumptive nominee Barack Obama. He had just beaten you. I believe you were at Senator [Diane Feinstein](#)'s house.

CLINTON: *That's right.*

MUIR: Do you think it's time for a meeting with Senator Sanders?

CLINTON: Well I'm certainly reaching out. Our campaigns are talking to one another. I wanna unify the party and I look forward to talking with him personally, because I think his campaign has been a really dynamic and exciting experience for the millions of Americans, particularly young people, who supported him. And I want them to know that I'm going to be working on a lot of the same issues that Senator Sanders and I spoke about, that we both care about, and that we have so much more in common than we do with the Republican presumptive nominee, Donald Trump.

MUIR: Give me an example. Can you give me one thing that he has said on the campaign trail that resonates with you particularly?

CLINTON: I think his absolute commitment to universal health care coverage is something that I have believed in and fought for for 25 years, we have slightly different approaches toward how we're going to get there but we made it a major part of this campaign and I'm very happy that we did. I think the stress on income inequality is something that every American should take seriously, we have got to figure out how we're going to provide more economic opportunity -- good jobs with rising incomes -- and I'm excited to work with Senator Sanders in doing that.

MUIR: But back to that meeting with then-Senator Barack Obama, as it was described to me, there were two chairs.

CLINTON: *That's right.*

MUIR: Two glasses of water, you were alone in the room.

CLINTON: Actually, two glasses of wine too.

MUIR: Oh, yeah. That helps.

CLINTON: Diane had to pour us both some, you know, California wine.

MUIR: *Have you heard from him yet?*

CLINTON: *We've continually talked throughout this process and I-*

MUIR: But since the math added up for you, have you heard from the President?

CLINTON: We were supposed to talk tonight but we haven't yet connected. We'll probably will do it later tonight.

MUIR: Has he signaled to you that he's ready to fight the fight for you?

CLINTON: Well I think he has signaled that he's ready to fight the fight against Donald Trump and he's ready to fight the fight for the progress that we have made under his presidency and since I happen to agree that we have to maintain that progress, I think we're gonna be fighting side by side.

MUIR: You bring up Donald Trump, he said just moments ago on national television that on the Democratic side of the system was rigged and he invited Bernie Sanders supporters to join him. Does that concern you?

CLINTON: No. (laughs) it really doesn't concern me. This is just more of his rhetoric to try to muddy the waters about what he stands for. Anyone who supported Bernie Sanders who thinks we should raise the minimum wage, who thinks that we should have universal health care coverage, who thinks that the wealthy have not paid their fair share, and I could go on and on, would certainly not find that Donald Trump's views are in line with theirs.

MUIR: Just today House Speaker Paul Ryan was asked about Donald Trump in his comments on the judge born in Indiana of Mexican heritage and Speaker Ryan said 'Claiming a person can't do their job because of race is the textbook definition of a racist comment.' Do you think that Donald Trump is a racist?

CLINTON: Well, I don't know what's in his heart, but I know that that comment about the very accomplished federal judge who was born in Indiana to parents from Mexico was a racist attack and I think that has been made clear by the many, many voices speaking out against it and many from the Republican side because clearly this was shocking to people and it went against everything we believe in: that this is a meritocracy. People should be able to rise as hard, high as their hard work, their ambition, their talent will take them.

MUIR: You've said in recent days that electing Donald Trump commander-in-chief would be an historic mistake and you said it would undo much of the work that Republicans and Democrats alike have done over many decades. You spent years as a Senator, you reveled in the legislative process. Have you heard from some of your former Republican colleagues about Donald Trump?

CLINTON: Well, I've heard that, what they say publicly. We haven't had any personal conversations. But I have a --

MUIR: You haven't talked to any of your-

CLINTON: No, but I have a long history of working with them and I know them well enough to believe that a number are quite concerned. Take the issue of nuclear weapons: the cavalier casual way that Donald Trump talks about nuclear weapons is not only frightening but it goes counter to more than 70 years of bipartisan, presidential leadership of Republicans and Democrats who believed that we have to prevent other countries from getting nuclear weapons and we have to do what we can to decrease the number of nuclear weapons in the world.

MUIR: The last 24 hours, Senator Tester, a key Democratic leader, was asked about the idea of a Clinton-Warren ticket. Elizabeth Warren, of course. He answered, 'Is the country ready for two women? I don't know.'

CLINTON: Well, I'm not gonna get into vice presidential choices but I have the highest regard for Senator Warren.

MUIR: Let's put her name aside though. Do you think the country would be ready for two women?

CLINTON: I think at some point. Maybe this time, maybe in the future. But we're gonna be looking for the most qualified person to become president should something happen to me, if I'm fortunate enough to be the president.

MUIR: [Is Bernie Sanders? Would he be vice president?](#)

CLINTON: [We're gonna be looking at everybody who has something to contribute.](#)

MUIR: How short is the short list, Secretary?

CLINTON: Well we don't have a short list yet. We're just beginning to gather up information and think about this.

MUIR: So let me ask you, you have said that Donald Trump does not have the right temperament to be president. He said of you that you lack judgment. He points to your emails. The last time we sat down, you apologized. You've said it was a mistake. But Trump says, FBI investigation aside, that what Hillary

Clinton is guilty of is quote, 'stupidity and bad judgment.' And he asks, 'how can a person with this kind of judgment become the president?'

CLINTON: Well, again, I'm not responding to any of the personal attacks that come from Donald Trump, because he can say whatever he wants about me, and I have more votes than he does as we sit here today. More Americans have voted for me. Obviously they have believed that I would be the best choice for President and Commander in Chief and that's what this election will be about.

MUIR: He did bring up the emails, though, again tonight. He's going to in this general election, you know that.

CLINTON: Uh-huh.

MUIR: Can you assure the American people, and the Bernie Sanders supporters who you now have to court, that there isn't anything coming from this FBI investigation that's going to change the course of your campaign?

CLINTON: Absolutely.

MUIR: You're confident?

CLINTON: Absolutely, yes.

MUIR: I wanna ask you something personal. It takes us back to our last interview. You told me in September that you still hear your mother's voice.

CLINTON: Uh-huh. Right, I do. I do.

MUIR: What would you say to you as you walk on the stage tonight?

CLINTON: Well, she would be really excited and proud. She would be like I am, overwhelmed by this historic moment. She taught me so much in my life, including how to stand up to bullies, which apparently is going to be very much in demand in the upcoming campaign.

And, she would just give me that unconditional love and support that came to me as a child and kept going until the very last day of her life with me.

MUIR: Do you think that she could have predicted this moment? Not you -- your mother.

CLINTON: I don't know. After 2008 I, I doubt it. I think that she was very supportive of me, but I'm not sure she would have predicted that, number one I would do it again. But number two, that it would turn out differently.

MUIR: Donald Trump has talked about the allegation against your husband, the former president. You have not responded. And I'm curious what will be off limits for you. Donald Trump's marriages, his personal life, will that be off limits to you in your campaign?

CLINTON: I think you've seen what kind of campaign I'm running against him. I'm running on, based on the issues. I'm running about what he has said, what his experience lacks in order to be qualified for president, raising the issues that I think most voters care about. And that's what I intend to do throughout this campaign.

MUIR: Has the former president seen the speech tonight?

CLINTON: Yes he has. Absolutely.

MUIR: Does he approve?

CLINTON: He's always got good advice. And he's been helping all through this campaign. I'm so grateful to him and my daughter.

MUIR: He once famously said you get two for the price of one. Is it --

CLINTON: That's true.

MUIR: -- true this time?

CLINTON: I think that having Bill Clinton in the circle of people advising about the economy, particularly coming up with creative ideas about how to help those parts of our country that are the most distressed, feeling the most left out and left behind, parts of the country that honestly, David, I don't think are gonna vote for me whether it's coal country and parts of Appalachia or--

MUIR: Why won't they vote for you?

CLINTON: Well, I think that, you know they just have a different political philosophy, I understand that, but I'm going to do everything I can to be the best president I can be for all America. The struggling, the striving, the successful among us, but I'm going to pay particular attention to how we can help and this is where Bill has so much understanding, how we can help provide a better future for places that are not realizing the benefits of our progressive economy and the opportunities that are out there for people.

MUIR: Are you ready for that debate stage against Donald Trump?

CLINTON: I am so looking forward to it.

MUIR: You are?

CLINTON: Absolutely, I really am. I think it'll be a singular moment in American history because I think I'll have a chance to make clear why I believe that he is not qualified and temperamentally unfit to be president.

MUIR: Let me ask you about the young people I've met on the campaign trail, in particular the Bernie Sanders supporters who told me that for their whole lifetime, you have been in a position of power. Would you make the case to them that this is still making history even though their whole lives they have seen Hillary Clinton with enormous influence and power?

CLINTON: Absolutely, well of course it's historic. There's no doubt about that but what I want the young people who supported Sen. Sanders to know is that my history of working to even the odds, to create opportunities for people, particularly young people, to bring economic and social justice and political opportunities to people started long before I was ever on the national scene and I'm going to bring all of that work and my passion for these issues to the White House and I'm going to fight as hard as I can to make sure they have the futures that they deserve here in America.

MUIR: You told me looking out through that window at all those supporters out there that eight years ago you could not have imagined returning, but this time [winning.]

CLINTON: Yes right. That's right.

MUIR: Is it sinking in?

CLINTON: It's a really overwhelming feeling of both gratitude, excitement, and a sense of great responsibility. And I wanna do the very best job I can to fulfill the trust and faith that people have in me.

MUIR: Well thank you for inviting us to witness history.

CLINTON: Thank you. Thank you very much.

MUIR: Thank you Madam Secretary.

CLINTON: Good to talk to you.

MUIR: You too.

END OF TRANSCRIPT.

Transcript of Spiegel's interview with Merkel

SPIEGEL: Ms. Chancellor, we would like to speak with you about power, but also about the nepotism engendered by power. Most politicians are aware that influence and power can sometimes be like a drug. Have you become addicted?

Merkel: I hope not. No.

SPIEGEL: Late former Chancellor Helmut Kohl proved unable to relinquish power and missed his opportunity for a dignified retirement. His fourth term in office wasn't good for the country or the Christian Democratic Union (CDU). Are you nevertheless stumbling into the same trap as Kohl?

Merkel: Until November of last year, I thought extensively about whether I should run again. In no way did I view the decision as self-evident, and concluded that, to the degree it is possible to determine such a thing, I have the necessary strength and that I am still curious - about people and about how life and the country are changing, and about the challenges that politics present. I think that is decisive, that you don't think you already know everything.

SPIEGEL: Do you have strategies for preventing hubris and for keeping yourself from getting addicted to power?

Merkel: (laughs) I read critical articles in the press.

SPIEGEL: Oh really?

Merkel: As chancellor, I am - as it should be - constantly under the microscope from both the public and the media. It is also important to me that my staff tells me openly how they see things. And an additional good indicator is the mood in my own electoral district. When I am there, which happens frequently, no one is particularly excited or impressed anymore to meet the chancellor. People there tell me immediately what is going well and what isn't.

SPIEGEL: On Sunday, the first and only televised debate between you and your center-left Social Democratic (SPD) challenger Martin Schulz will take place. The broadcasters had wanted to include a studio audience to liven things up a bit, and they wanted more latitude for the moderators. If you are so dedicated to freedom of the press, why did you reject all of those innovations?

Merkel: This TV debate is important to me, which is why I expressed my willingness to participate in such a debate in the first place. It presents an opportunity for millions of viewers to see for themselves the kinds of politics Martin Schulz and I are offering for the next four years. It is standard that the formal modalities of the show are discussed with the broadcasters. Since the debates in 2009 and 2013, there has been a well-tested structure for the show, one that will once again be applied this year. It allows Martin Schulz and myself to hold a discussion with each other and I am looking forward to it.

SPIEGEL: Nikolaus Brender, the former editor-in-chief of public broadcaster ZDF, says that the pressure applied on the broadcasters was excessive and that this year's format is essentially the result of blackmail

Merkel: I have great respect for press freedoms. At the same time, however, a politician also has the freedom to decide whether he or she will accept an invitation to appear on a show or not. We have reached agreement on a proven format and I hope that it will be interesting for the voters.

SPIEGEL: The campaign would have been much livelier if there were more than one televised debate. Why were you against that?

Merkel: Because the campaign in the media takes place in many different formats, such as in citizens forums or town-hall shows. And because we don't have a presidential system in Germany, people vote for parties instead of specific candidates. From the perspective of smaller parties, even one single televised debate is a detested anomaly, because only the lead candidates from the conservatives and the SPD take part.

SPIEGEL: Your concern for the smaller parties is touching.

Merkel: The plurality of our campaign formats, including the televised debates, reflect that we in Germany don't directly vote for a person like in the United States or in France, but for parties. We have a different system.

SPIEGEL: Is it okay for government employees, such as your spokesman Steffen Seibert and aide Eva Christiansen, to lead the negotiations with the broadcasters? Shouldn't your political party be responsible for doing so?

Merkel: Because we wanted to cleanly separate work done on behalf of the government from that done for the CDU, we decided for the duration of the campaign to adopt the model of a clearly denoted and approved second job for three Chancellery employees. The goal is transparency. As such, I welcome the intention of Germany's Supreme Audit Institution to take another look at everything. At the same time, though, it is essential for the government spokesman to take part in discussions pertaining to interview formats and television debates. It was no different when Gerhard Schröder was chancellor. His spokesman also took part in discussions ahead of the televised debates in 2002 and 2005.

SPIEGEL: Is it really a valid argument to say that your predecessor did the same thing?

Merkel: Yes, it is common practice.

SPIEGEL: Why do you rely on German military planes to travel to your campaign appearances?

Merkel: I also take advantage of the ability to fly with helicopters belonging to the federal police force, and both privileges are consistent with rules that have been in place for decades. A chancellor must be accessible at all times and be in a position to execute their duties as best they can. I must have the ability to immediately return to Berlin if necessary. There are also security considerations. Of course, the party must bear the costs of these flights in accordance with the rules, and the Budget Committee in German parliament is also aware of these things. Everything is transparent. In 2005, when I was the challenger to Chancellor Schröder, who was able to take advantage of military aircraft, I used a plane belonging to a private company and didn't take advantage of the legally guaranteed ability as party chair to likewise use military aircraft.

SPIEGEL: Still, using such aircraft is an extreme advantage enjoyed by incumbent chancellors.

Merkel: I don't agree. I am always on duty, even when I am at party events or on vacation. I don't complain about it, on the contrary. You could also say that it is a competitive advantage for a challenger to be able to focus exclusively on campaign appearances. It all evens out.

SPIEGEL: You think so?

Merkel: Time management for candidates without government functions is different than it is for me. No matter where I am, I always have to have my duties as chancellor in mind.

SPIEGEL: The world is your stage while your challenger has to make due with visiting factories and market squares.

Merkel: I am quite enjoying this campaign, but I still have to take care of the duties associated with my office, which I also very much enjoy.

SPIEGEL: Your former government spokesman Ulrich Wilhelm became chairman of the public broadcaster BR shortly after leaving the Chancellery. Your media advisor Eva Christiansen was a longtime member of a ZDF advisory board. Your spokesman Steffen Seibert came from ZDF and has a guaranteed right of return. Everyone talks about the critical distance that state broadcasters allegedly maintain from the state. Does it really exist?

Merkel: There are many examples of politicians moving into business and of people moving between journalism and politics. Former SPIEGEL journalists, for example, have advised German foreign ministers - something that should actually fill you with pleasure because it shows the degree of respect we have for quality journalism. Guaranteed rights of return also exist in public service, it's nothing special.

SPIEGEL: [If Mr. Wilhelm had worked for a Social Democratic chancellor, do you think he would have been hired by BR?](#)

Merkel: That is something you have to ask BR.

SPIEGEL: Let's continue on the subject of nepotism for just a moment. Matthias Wissmann, with whom you once served in Helmut Kohl's cabinet, is president of the German Association of the Automotive Industry. Eckart von Klaeden, who used to serve in the Chancellery as a state minister, is now Daimler's chief lobbyist. Your former head of strategic planning in CDU party headquarters, Joachim Koschnicke, became head lobbyist for Opel for a time and is now once again managing your campaign. Another top party official, Michael Jansen, is now a lobbyist for VW ...

Merkel: ... and don't forget: Thomas Steg, former deputy government spokesman and a member of the SPD, is also working for VW.

SPIEGEL: Correct. Are you surprised that the German automobile industry has the feeling that it exerts significant control over German politics?

Merkel: If it really does have such a feeling, it is mistaken. We are back to where we just were a few minutes ago: Should someone who used to work in politics be allowed to move to private industry? I think they should. At the German post office and at Deutsche Telekom, such exchanges have a long tradition. If, for example, certain environmental regulations for the automotive industry are being introduced, expert exchange with the industry is helpful. It's not the contacts that are decisive, rather it is decisive what politicians ultimately do with the information provided by the industry and with the requests they make before then taking independent action. From the introduction of the catalytic converter onwards, we have repeatedly made political decisions that have demanded quite a bit from the automobile industry.

SPIEGEL: At the so-called "diesel summit" in early August, it was decided that companies would only have to carry out software updates, the cheapest solution for the automobile industry. It won't be sufficient to bring down nitrogen oxide emissions. Why does the German government always let the automobile industry off the hook so quickly?

Merkel: I don't think it does. It is more about enforcing our own ideas regarding how the automobile industry must regain the trust that they have destroyed.

SPIEGEL: The automobile industry systematically cheated German politicians. They developed computer systems to produce fictitious emissions test results. When the deception was discovered, the diesel summit was convened, which only decided to impose software updates - even as everyone at the table knew that it wouldn't be sufficient. How are Germans supposed to conclude that politicians are standing up to the automobile industry?

Merkel: Your version of events is extremely truncated. We made it clear from the beginning that the software update was just a first step, no more, but also no less. It is undeniable that this software optimization has had an effect, because it eliminated what you correctly refer to as cheating - namely

that the emissions systems were controlled by the software in a way that meant they only worked properly in a very narrow range of temperatures and under extremely specific driving conditions. Following the update, the full capability of the exhaust system will always be deployed, and not just partially.

SPIEGEL: Do you trust them? Do you think they will suddenly be honest?

Merkel: I am just as disgusted with this deception as you are, with this cheating of customers. Starting on September 1, new regulations will finally be in effect calling for emissions tests to be performed under real driving conditions. We also need premiums for the trading-in of old diesel vehicles for new ones. At an additional summit this fall, we will examine whether the measures taken by the automobile industry have had the desired effect and whether additional measures will have to be taken. In addition, I have invited representatives from those municipalities most affected by nitrogen oxide emissions to come to the Chancellery on Sept. 4 to discuss how best to use the fund established jointly by the automobile industry and the German government to change traffic patterns in our cities and to improve infrastructure for electric vehicles. Everything we do must ultimately be aimed at regaining the trust of drivers, at ensuring that strict emissions regulations are being observed and at ensuring that our automobile industry offers models that are suitable to our climate standards and our future.

SPIEGEL: Are you in favor of retrofitting hardware in the automobiles affected?

Merkel: Hardware updates are expensive and extremely technically complex. As such, we must consider very carefully whether such a retrofitting requirement for engines would really bring the results that we need because doing so would eliminate significant scope for the automobile industry to invest in new and more modern technologies. I think we should consider all other options first.

SPIEGEL: Once again, you are of the same opinion as the automobile industry.

Merkel: That's not the point. I look at what is best for the future of the vitally important German automobile industry, because it provides 800,000 people in Germany with good jobs. I look at what is good for the people who currently own a diesel vehicle and are concerned about their resale values. And I look at what is good for climate protection and for reducing nitrogen oxide emissions. Sometimes I reach conclusions that the automobile industry likes, and sometimes I don't. The government must carefully weigh all sides, because I don't want the automobile industry to regress from where it is today. That wouldn't be good for our country. I am interested in ensuring that a strong branch of our economy remains strong and innovative.

SPIEGEL: In the U.S., customers that were cheated have received up to \$16,000 in damages. Why hasn't the German government required companies in the country to make similar payments?

Merkel: Our warranty and liability laws are fundamentally different than they are in the United States. The goal of the measures we have taken is to make sure carmakers make the necessary repairs to the vehicles. Emissions systems have to work as they were envisioned when the car models were approved.

That is why we required companies to carry out recalls. That must take place without additional costs to the customers.

SPIEGEL: You have said that the end of the combustible engine is in sight, but you declined to offer any kind of a timeline. Isn't that enough to completely confuse drivers?

Merkel: No. At the Paris climate conference, we resolved that the 21st century would be the century of decarbonization. We adopted national goals to be reached by 2050: We want to cut CO2 emissions by 80 to 95 percent. This century, we will reach a point when the vast majority of cars will emit no CO2 at all, but we have to be open about the technology that gets us there: electromobility, synthetic fuels or hydrogen fuel cells could ultimately end up being decisive. The transformation is already underway when it comes to hybrid automobiles and purely electric vehicles. We must continue energetically down that path. We will continue to need combustible engines as a bridge technology for decades to come. The focus shouldn't be on bans, but on the next stages of innovative development.

SPIEGEL: If we were to translate that for regular people, what you mean is: If you form a coalition with the Green party after the Sept. 24 parliamentary elections, the combustible engine will quickly be passé, but if you form a government with the business-friendly Free Democrats, it will take a bit longer.

Merkel: I am not talking about coalitions. I am talking about the CDU campaign platform.

SPIEGEL: Ms. Merkel, in the U.S., the president shows disdain for the judiciary and for the media - and, more broadly, for democratic values. Is democracy losing momentum around the world?

Merkel: I hope not. For my part, in everything I do, I aim to strengthen democracy in Germany and beyond. The United States is also a strong democracy. As we are seeing in Poland, for example, and also in Hungary, it is important that we have counterweights in democratic systems, and I believe they are still strong in America.

SPIEGEL: When Barack Obama was here in November, he referred to you as a guarantor of democracy and also as a defender of Western values. But since you have been chancellor, voter turnout has been historically low. How can you explain that?

Merkel: Happily, recent state elections have seen higher turnout than in previous elections. When people have the impression that an important decision must be made, they go out and vote. And voter turnout in general elections tends to be much higher than in state elections.

SPIEGEL: Ever since you have been chancellor, turnout has stalled. Some say that you have lulled democratic debate to sleep. Do such accusations bother you?

Merkel: To be more precise, turnout in 1998 was 82.2 percent, in 2002 it was 79.1 percent, in 2005 it was 77.7 percent, in 2009 it was 70.8 percent and then it climbed again in 2013 to 71.5 percent. I am

predicting that turnout will rise once again this year. For me, a campaign is the opportunity to present my party's ideas about our country's future. In interviews and at campaign appearances, I speak exhaustively about these ideas, about the challenges facing us and about the political solutions we propose. Campaigning is more than just attacking and insulting one's opponent. People see how quickly the world is changing and that we are facing huge problems and uncertainties. And now they are deciding which parties and which politicians they would like to work with in shaping the future.

SPIEGEL: Helmut Kohl and Franz Josef Strauß, the late governor of Bavaria, didn't agree on much, but they were united in the belief that German conservatives could not allow a party that was to the right of them on the political spectrum to win seats in German parliament. Now, it looks as though the right-wing populist party Alternative for Germany (AfD) is going to do exactly that. Were you unable or unwilling to prevent that from happening?

Merkel: I am fighting to ensure that the CDU is as strong as possible. We had huge problems to confront: first coming to terms with the euro crisis and then, in 2015, the admission of the many refugees who came to us. We would now like to use good arguments to win back voters who may have turned away from us during those years. That is what I am trying to do at the many appearances I am making these days. But in the euro crisis and in refugee policy, to name two examples, I took necessary decisions in accordance with our country's interests - and in accordance with the values that we have invoked in so many speeches and which now had to be lived out concretely.

SPIEGEL: The CDU always said that immigration has to be carefully controlled. Is the rise of the AfD not an inevitable consequence of your policies?

Merkel: In the summer of 2015, we were faced with an extremely difficult humanitarian situation. I am convinced that our reaction was reasonable and correct. But because the CDU stands for orderly and controlled immigration, we have begun addressing the causes of flight and combatting migrant smuggling - and we have taken corresponding measures in the form of the EU-Turkey deal.

SPIEGEL: Do you believe there was ever a moment when you left too much room for the AfD on the right wing of the political spectrum?

Merkel: No. If you take a look at our domestic security policies, for example, you will see that we have done everything necessary within the framework of our values.

SPIEGEL: Do you see it as a compliment when people say that you are the best Social Democratic chancellor that Germany has ever had?

Merkel: If I listen to the SPD's chancellor candidate, it doesn't seem as though I have earned that title. But seriously: Voters have no use for such categorizations. They rightly expect us to do our work as best as we possibly can. And that is what I am doing.

SPIEGEL: Ms. Chancellor, we thank you for this interview

REFERENCES

- Brown, G. and George Y. (1983). **Discourse Analysis**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chapman, S. (2011). **Pragmatics**. United Kingdom: Macmillan Publishers Limited.
- Cruse, A. (2000). **Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics**. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, D. (1985). **A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics**, (2nd ed). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fadhil, S.M.(2016). **Flouting of Grice's Conversational Maxims by Women in Some Selected Plays: A Pragmatic Study**. University of Baghdad: Department of English.
- Flowerdew, J. (2013). **Discourse in English Language Education**. London: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Geurts, B. (2010). **Quantity Implicatures**. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grice, P. (1975). **Logic and Conversation**. In Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics*, volume 3. New York: Academic Press, pp. 41-58.
- (1989). **Logic and Conversation**. In Grice, H. P. *Studies in the Way of Words* (pp.22-40). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Haberland, H. and J. L. Mey (2002). **Editorial: Linguistics and pragmatics, 25 years after**. *Journal of Pragmatics*, volume 34, pp. 1671-1682.
- Marquez, R.R. (2000). **Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A Contrastive Analysis of Requests and Apologies**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Saeed, J.I. (2016). **Semantics**. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.
- Schmitt, N. (2010). **An Introduction to Applied Linguistics**. London: University of Nottingham.
- Yule, G. (1996). **The Study of Language (2nd ed)**. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). **Pragmatics**. London: Oxford University Press.

INTERNET RESOURCES

<https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/transcript-hillary-clintons-interview-abc-news-anchor-david/story?id=39676932>

<https://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/angela-merkel-in-everything-i-do-i-aim-to-strengthen-democracy-a-1165680.html>