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This study aimed to investigate the flouting of Grice’s maxims in TV Talk Show “Capital Talk.” on Geo TV. The data was in the form of an interview. The researcher watched the talk show (Capital Talk) and selected an episode of April 11, 2016, as the sample of this research. Characters in this interview were Hamid Mir (host of TV talk show Capital Talk) and Imran Khan (Chairman of PTI) as a guest. Methods used in analyzing the data in this study were qualitative and descriptive methods. These methods were grounded on the theory of Conversational Maxims or Cooperative Principle proposed by Grice (2013). From the analysis conducted, the researcher investigated the characteristics and structure of language used by Hamid Mir (host) and Imran Khan (guest). The researcher investigated the flouting of Grice’s maxims. In the end, the result shows that the language used by Imran Khan is more political, the four maxims which have been investigating by the researcher were flouted 41 times in Imran Khan’s (guest) conversation during an interview with Hamid Mir (host). The maxim of quantity is flouted 18 times, the maxim of quality is flouted two times, the maxim of manner is flouted 11 times, and the maxim of relation is flouted ten times. In the end, the researcher also concluded that qualitative maxim was mostly dominated maxims flouted in this research.

Introduction

This study is about “An Investigation of the Flouting of Grice’s Maxims in TV Talk Show: Capital Talk.” The researcher describes the introduction of this study that what is this research on, and why the
researcher needs to research on this topic, and how this research was being conducted, its background, the objectives of the study, research questions for the study on which the whole research is based. In this study, the researcher also explored the research methodology that how the data was collected and which tools were used to collect and analyze data. It throws light the nature of research.Often in conversations, much is said than what is meant. Sometimes the utterances are greatly different from what is, understood of them, this is because those utterances hold meaning which is implied in the context. In a particular speech act of political talk shows, speech acts are the small units to be analyzed in the conversational interactions. These include greeting each other, apologizing, introducing, summoning or commanding (Trudgill, 2003). In this research, it is to be encoded, observed and analyzed how the speakers indulge in speech acts and to which extent they observe, violate or flout the cooperative principles.

So in political talk shows sometimes much more is conveyed than what is said. The speakers take a truthful, ironic or polite stance while performing their social goals. According to Leech (1983) there are four degrees of politeness which are considered as the illocutionary function: 1. Competitive: it includes the acts of ordering, demanding, begging or asking. In these situations, usually negative politeness is required to show good manners, 2. Convivial: it involves acts of offering thanking and congratulating and it requires positive politeness. Collaborative: it involves acts of reporting, announcing and constructing. Here politeness is considered to some extent irrelevant. Conflictive: it involves acts of threatening accusing and cursing. Politeness is irrelevant here because this is designed to cause offense and crime (Leech, 1983, p. 105) as cited in (Fraser, 1990).

Normally people are expected to say what they mean to say. However, sometimes the speakers want to hint what they want to mean in their speech. In different societies, indirectness is a kind of strategy used in conversations (Trudgill, 2003). Now, this indirectness of saying something can be because of negative or positive politeness, which may have different effects on the listeners and speakers in political talk shows. When in conversation something is not said clearly, but it can be deduced or inferred based on cooperative principles than this may be called as conversational implicature. In implicatures the context affects greatly, the meaning of what we say to others. It is actually a strand from the field of pragmatics. Therefore, in political talk shows on television, the contexts greatly affect
the utterances of the speakers, who are politicians, journalists, or from other well-known fields. In that, much more is implied than what is said. It is unfortunate that Grice’s cooperative principles, which are meant for smooth flow of information, are not observed in some talk shows. However, the fact is that the speakers in talk shows coming from different lifestyles make attempt to violate and even flout the maxims. In order to understand all this a background of operational key terms such as Grice’s principles of cooperation, Grice’s maxims, violation, and flouting of maxims, speech acts, and theory of politeness is to be elaborated in chapter two literature review.

For the successful and smooth conversation, it is assumed that the speakers engaged in a conversation cooperate with each other. This is actually the cooperative principle. This is further elaborated in four maxims, i.e. maxim of relevance, quality, quantity, and manner. It is in terms of following or disobeying the maxims that the hearer comes to know about the implied meaning of utterances. If a speaker intentionally disobeys any maxim of Grice, while in the context there is enough information for the hearer to notice than this type of conversation is filled with flouting of maxims. This flouting helps to give information to the hearers in an indirect way. Maurer’s (2004) gives an example on page 3, which is “what an amazing baseball player John is!” This can be a positive comment about John for which his abilities are appreciated and hence the maxim of quality would be said to have obeyed. However, there can be another meaning of this statement. If the speaker intends to convey ironic remark about John in that way the maxim of quality would be said to have disobeyed (Meurers, 2004). So, ironic comments are usually put to convey something negative in an indirect manner. This study finds those indirect comments in a setting of political talk shows in order to; deeply analyze the purpose and functions of those indirect comments.

Pakistani political talk shows are full of data, which can be further analyzed in terms of gender differences in speech. The destiny of our nation is in the hands of our politicians. People elect politicians so that they may represent the, make their voices heard and solve their problems in assemblies. These politicians and political leaders present themselves in talk shows as the representative of the common people. High hopes are put on them. However, it is seen that sometimes the talk shows on TV are no better than battlegrounds. Politicians and other speakers in such talk shows are expected to come to solutions for the interest of the common person.
Now the political discourse of the TV talk shows is supposed to be very direct blunt and straight forward. However, sometimes it is expected that the speakers might, in order to defend their point, or in not giving a clear statement may flout Grice’s maxims. The politicians who are well aware of this ability of influential speech are supposed to flout the maxims. It might be for two reasons. They would say something, indirectly to taunt or satirize the other party. They would do it give ambiguous statements while defending themselves against criticism on the policies of their own parties. Thus, valuable data can be gathered from political talk shows.

There are many purposes for the politicians for flouting the maxims. The flouting of maxims serves the purpose of saying something negative in a less overt way. While doing so the speaker has not much to explain. The speaker in a precise and brief statement is able to convey much more than it is said. These flouting can also serve the purpose of expressing anger without having one’s self to explain what is indirectly said.

**Background of the Study**

Pragmatics is a study about the narrator meaning and how more is communicated than said, and expression.(Yule, The Study of Language , 2014). Grundy (2000) states: “Pragmatics is related to explain how we produce and comprehend unremarkable conversation, but actually moderately extraordinary uses of language.” Pragmatics is an organized way of describing the language used in circumstance. It is looking for to explain arrangements of meaning which cannot be found in the core intellect of words or structures, as described by semantics. Pragmatics is the study clarifies to us how to produce words and understand what individuals say in daily conversation while maybe they use ignorant language.(Raharja, 2015) From the definitions above, it can be concluded that pragmatics is a field linguistics study, which does not only explain about language but also explains how to produce and understands the language used in our real life.(Raharja, 2015).

One of the most elementary statements we must mark for fruitful communication to take place is that both individuals in a conversation are cooperating. This is called the cooperative principle(Miriam A. Locher & Richard J. Watts, 2005). Media is playing an important role in the formation of public opinion. Viewers see and get only the surface meanings form the political TV talk shows. Nobody ever bothered to go into its depth.
Language needs a thorough probe and analysis if one wants to derive the exact meaning, interpretation, intention, and implications of the speakers. This research will be helpful in evaluating media discourse and it will make linguists, scholars and general readers to observe the intricacies and sophistication level of speech, in order to understand it thoroughly and properly.

Since flouting is an important aspect of the sophisticated use of speech, so, exploring the speech of the two genders for the purpose of analysis of flouting is of great value. There have been so many studies in accordance with Grice’s Maxim on various comic talk shows but in Pakistani political talk shows, there has been no such study found. Therefore, this attempt is unique to find flouting of maxims in political talks shows. Much of the rationale of this study is gathered from the researches based on the Grice’s maxims. However, the opposing views of Grice’s studies have also been included and evaluated. The studies related to politeness and irony and the relevance theory have also been explored to find common underpinnings.

Grice (1975) recommended a general cooperative principle, and four maxims identifying how to be cooperative. (Shuwei, Y., & Lumpur, K, 2014). It is widely known, he emphasized, that societies follow these rules for proficient communication. Cooperative Principle contributes to what is required by the conventional determination of the conversation. (Shuwei, Y., & Lumpur, K, 2014). They are:

- **Maxim of Quality**: Make your contribution true; so do not convey what you believe false or unjustified.
- **Maxim of Quantity**: Be as informative as required.
- **Maxim of Relation**: Be relevant. Stay on the topic
- **Maxim of Manner**: Be perspicuous; so avoid incomprehensibility and ambiguity, and strive for brevity and order. (Szczepanski, 2015).

These maxims play a dynamic role to associate the conventional organization of speech as unblemished, accurate, descriptive and appropriate. In the talk show television program, the conversational Maxim is essential to reach the communicative and community objective, because occasionally in the actual conversation the narrators do not constantly apply the concept of Cooperative principle.
The conversation between Hamid Mir as the host and Imran Khan Leader of PIT, as the guest, becomes central to this research. The Hamid Mir’s Show in the episode of April 11, 2016, entitled “Capital Talk” was chosen as a specific research object.

The presenting role of media in Pakistan has become more shimmery and flashy in the information domain of predictable news and present circumstances around the world. Media includes Broadcasting, print, and TV is communicating headlines and hidden stories that are a part of our motherland and the world. The tenacity of these talk shows is to debate and find out of manners of the problems in the up-to-date news and headlines being advertised on numerous news channels. The discussion commonly clear is on legislations, socio-economic apprehensions, social problems, and other traditional, entertainment advancement and programs. Like confusion of advertisements currently, there is a cluster of talk shows expression on different channels nowadays and formerly. TV channels provide another strategy for dramas, cooking shows and range of morning shows, which is associated with entertainment charge that is fundamentally providing entertainment and information of innovation in the society. Media is a vulnerable door to public awareness on diverse matters present in our society nowadays.

*Capital Talk* is an important Geo News program which is a one-hour discussion on current happenings hosted by Hamid Mir (host) “Capital Talk” looks at the contests, disputes, and apprehensions facing Pakistan on an everyday basis.

**Significance of the study**

This study investigates the characteristics and structure of the language used by Hamid Mir as a host and Imran Khan as a guest in talk show “Capital Talk.” This study also finds out the flouting of Grice’s Maxims in their conversation. Flouting is a sophisticated and advanced use of language. However, the political talk shows are full of flouting and flout based utterances. This shows that politicians are supposed to be well aware of the use of language. Flouting is such a device that can help political speakers to perform various functions. For instance they can say something ambiguous in order to avoid telling the truth hence violate the maxim of quality. On the other hand, he or she may utter that ambiguous statement in
a way as to give rise to implicature. These implicatures are basically the target of the study.

Language can be used in various intellectual ways to serve one’s purpose. Whether the political speakers share the same linguistic or extra-linguistic purpose with the listeners or not, is an important aspect of this study. Their flouting would tell a lot about their purpose of speech, which then is reflective of their true purpose of serving their nation. This is not to say that the flouting of maxims can clearly tell about the patriotic outlook of certain speakers but in fact, the analyses of those flouting may reveal about their purpose and motive of speech. Speech is such a tool through which one can analyze one’s thinking and mindset. For this discourse, analysis is done on major scale. There are many studies on various politicians’ speeches at different times of their political careers.

The purpose of selecting mainly the politicians as participants for this study is that these are the ruling and managing authority. They have huge responsibilities on their shoulders. Their motivation and their thinking can greatly influence the youth and their careful or careless speeches can affect the policies of any country. Pakistani politicians are to be aware of their responsibilities. They should have common purpose, sincerity in serving their nation and most of all it all should be reflective through their speeches especially on TV. As political talk shows are a platform for the politicians to perform many functions their on-air speech on TV should be careful and calculated. It is interesting to note the gaps if any in these expectations from the politicians and their speeches.

**The objectives of the study**

The Objectives of this research are as follows:

1. To observe the flouting of Grice’s Maxims in TV Talk Show: “Capital Talk.”
2. To find out most dominated flouted Maxims in the conversation between Hamid Mir as a host and Imran Khan Chairman of PTI as a guest.
3. To explore out the reason for the flouting of Maxims in TV Talkshow: ‘Capital Talk.’
4. To examine out the characteristics and structure of the language used by the host (Hamid Mir) and guest (Imran Khan).
Research Questions

The research questions are filtered after the literature review and grounded study by the following:

Q.1. Which of Grice’s cooperative Maxims are more frequently followed and flouted in the conversation in Geo TV talk show: ‘Capital Talk’ hosted by Hamid Mir.

Q.2. How are the Maxims are flouted in Hamid Mir and Imran Khan Conversation in ‘Capital Talk’.

Q.3. Why the Grice’s cooperative Maxims are flouted in Geo TV Talkshow: ‘Capital Talk.’

Q.4. What are the characteristics of the language used by Hamid Mir and Imran Khan in the Talk Show?

The implication of the Study

This research will help the readers to understand about Grice’s Maxim. They may learn about the flouting of Maxims through this research and the significances that may occur. Besides, readers know the feasible reasons why the Maxims are flouted. The researcher hopes that this research can give readers encouragements as their further research in this field.

However, this research is helpful to increase our understanding of the flouting of four Maxims in TV talk show: ‘Capital Talk.’ This research also can be advantageous to both the reader and the writer. Moreover, this research can be used as a reference to increasing students’ interest in learning how to analyses talks shows’ conversation. The results of this research are aimed to guide for students who are interested in conducting further researches on Conversational analysis and flouting of Grécian (1975) Maxims in Discourse Analysis and Pragmatics.

Delimitation of Present Study

This study concerns with pragmatics analysis. The researcher has delimitied her topic by analyzing only the one-day episode of Geo TV talk show: “Capital Talk.” Since the researcher only analyzed the conversation of main characters, which contains the flouted Maxims. Therefore, owing to times and budget constraints, the study is delimited through the purposive
sample by Hamid Mir’s (host) and Imran Khan’s (guest) who are selected for the purpose.

**Literature Review**

After pragmatics became a part of linguistics, the study of successful and effective communication were sort out by Grice (1975) on the bases on some principles that are supposed to govern all verbal human interactions. Why do people become uncooperative, and when do they become so, more frequently are of important concern for Grice’s pragmatic theories. In real-world, the study of Pragmatics deals with real-life conversations required in various everyday situations. “Pragmatics is the study of speaker’s meaning; it studies the communicated meaning by the speaker, which is interpreted by the listeners” (Yule, Pragmatics, 1996) as cited in (Boulkroune, 2010).

The Pragmatics deals with the speakers’ implied meaning instead of the literal meaning of their utterances (Yule, Pragmatics, 1996). It is the search for the “invisible” meaning or the meaning understood by the hearers, which may be opposed to the literal meaning of the utterances. The understanding of the meaning of utterances is based on many expected assumptions. The study of Pragmatics focuses on the meaning of utterances on the basis of intended meaning by the speaker (Levinson, 1983) as cited in (Boulkroune, 2010). While this view takes into account the speaker’s intentions, the view of Aitchison (2003) focuses both the use of language by the speakers to achieve their aims and the ability of the hearers to understand the meanings of speaker’s utterances (Aitchison, 2003).

The study of Pragmatics is highly dependent on the context. Where the conversation is taking place, why is it taking place and what is the time of conversation are important key points to be discussed. It deals with the generation on implicature, so it involves the hearer’s ability to grasp the meanings form the unsaid words. The relationship of the speakers and hearers also plays a vital role in generation of implicature. Boulkroune (2010) found in her study that the most flouted maxim was of quality. She figured out the causes of this flouting in her analyses chapter. It was observed that the flouting was due “to strengthen opinion, to be sarcastic, and for cultural reasons” (Boulkroune, 2010, p. 29). In order to strengthen their opinions, the students of her study exaggerated to have more impact on their utterances. The participants in her study flouted the maxim of relevance to change the conversation topic, to give additional information, and to avoid talking about something. In her study the participants never
gave too much information. Hence the maxim of quality was never violated. It means that the participants did not want to waste time. They had economy of time in their minds.

Purwanto (2008) studied the flouting of conversational maxims in the Titanic movie. He observed the types, reasons, and consequences of flouting. She observed non-verbal clues like; expression, body language, touching and voice that greatly affect the conversation taking place in the real-life situations. He puts detailed description of non-verbal clues to interpret this movie, in linguistic terms. She studied the postures and gestures, faces and eyes, voice and intonation; the loudness and softness, touch, clothing, types of distances; intimate, personal, social and public, time, power and status and finally the environment in detail (Purwanto, 2008). In this particular study, however, these non-verbal clues were not that significant for the following reasons. Firstly in the movie, there were incidents over a period of time, whereas the talk shows are hardly meant for less than one hour. The participants of the talk shows are not intimate or even acquainted with each other, so their non-verbal clues did not affect this study.

Whenever a speaker is unable to observe the maxim blatantly while having no intention to mislead or cheat the hearer, the utterance is said to be a flouting of a maxim. Grice attempted to explain the process of conversation in which a person tries to understand the difference between the expressed and implied meaning or to what is said and what was meant to be said in a speech (Tamalia, 2013). Implicature is actually the difference between “the- said and the meant- the implicated and the unsaid”, and it means saying little and meaning more. Implicature is the additional meaning. (Ward, 2005, p. 1)

Generally, in all conversations, people are not cooperative (Lumsden, 2008). He further claims that Grice’s principles can be applied to narrower kind of conversation, that which is of concern to linguistic or formal cooperation. The extra-linguistic goal determines linguistic cooperation. While distinguishing among types of cooperation, it does not leave out the concerns about the speakers who are not cooperative. Moreover, when there is conflict of interest, in such situations principle of cooperation need to be qualified.

In order to interpret the meaning of an utterance, the assumption is made that the speaker is cooperating. This has been criticized by many
authors. Here Grice’s position is that he does not make us attentive towards implicatures in which maxim is flouted, which is a special situation in which to create a particular effect the speaker blatantly fails to fulfill the maxim. Grice’s example is to be quoted in this context. A, who was betrayed by his friend, X says, “X is a fine friend”. This violation of the maxim of quality that expects us to speak the truth creates another effect of exploitation. Moreover, Grice mentioned case of clash of maxims, in which the speaker is unable to fulfill one maxim in order to fulfill the other. Grice also mentioned non-cooperation in case of violating maxims in which there are hidden, the intentions of misleading the audience.

On Grecian grounds, communicative acts carry a presumption that they will meet certain standards. Grice set out such standards in the conversational maxims. Utterances should be truthful, informative, perspicuous, and relevant and so on. In relevance theory, similar work is done by the presumption of optimal relevance. Many reasoning tasks are pragmatically odd from this point of view. Some work that has focused on the effects of utterance interpretation has understated its potential influence.

Relevance theory is broad-spectrum speculation of comprehension that characterizes pertinence as a property of inputs to intellectual procedures. Review that the importance of a piece of information is a positive capacity of the intellectual impacts accomplished by preparing it and a negative capacity of the exertion needed to process it. Because of ostensive-inferential correspondence, articulations make an assumption of ideal significance: the listener is qualified for accepting that expression is at any rate sufficiently pertinent to be worth handling, and likewise, is the most applicable one perfect with the speaker's capacities and inclinations. This implies that the listener is advocated in taking after a way of minimum exertion in inferring the unequivocal significance and ramifications of an expression, halting when an understanding has come to that fulfills his desires of pertinence. This is the pertinence theoretic cognizance system.

The Cooperative Principle and conversational maxims can be seen as Grice's response to an inquiry he postured for himself: assuming that individuals are balanced operators, in what capacity ought to one anticipate that they will carry on in discussion and different circumstances in which they have the objective of imparting. His guess is that they would chip in, to some degree, and their open conduct would be represented by specific tenets or standards:
Sperber and Wilson say that Grice’s analysis of meaning could be used as the starting point for a theory of meaning or “as the point of departure for an inferential model of communication” (Sperber & Wilson, 1986, p. 21). Taking it the second way, and exploring the role of inference, reasons, and reasoning in Grice’s account of the way speaker’s meaning is arrived at, the intimate links between Grice’s work on meaning and his work on conversation and implicature become clear.

There is undoubtedly Grice’s work on language use and significance constitutes and even a more effective and intriguing commitment to reasoning and phonetics when it is not seen as containing two completely unmistakable speculations. It is at any rate doubtful that the "Hypothesis of Conversation" is a segment of the "Hypothesis of Meaning". What's more, regardless of the possibility that this elucidation is opposed, it is verifiable that the hypotheses are commonly lighting up and steady, and they are of more philosophical, semantic and chronicled interest if the enticement is opposed to talking about them in separation from one another.

A key to Grice’s work on meaning is that the intentions behind speakers’ utterances play a causal role in hearers’ inferring speaker’s meaning. In terms of Grice’s taxonomy of reasons, this means that personal, or justificatory- illustrative cases are the type of motive hearers have for their corresponding responses to what speakers communicate. On currently standard assumptions about actions, speakers’ intentions also rationalize and cause their utterances, given the meaning they intend to convey. Understanding discourse constitutes as interpretation, whether it is cognizant or not, and whether it engages heuristics or not. An implicit commitment to this view on Grice’s part is indicated by parallels between Grice’s discussion of calculability and his view that reasoning can take place quickly and implicitly.

Conversational Maxims are often deliberately violated by speakers for another purpose, namely to comply with the principles of politeness. In addition, the fact showed that the social degree in the community might influence the speakers in violating or obeying the Cooperative Principles & Politeness Principles (Azhari, 2011).
Flouting of Maxims

A flout occurs when a speaker overtly chooses not to observe one or more maxims with the deliberate intention of creating an implicature. (Szczechanski, 2015). Flouting Maxims can be comprehended as the speaker’s endeavor to state what he implies by defying at least one Maxim in his utterance. It resembles “whenever a Maxim is flouted, there must be an implicature to save the utterance from essentially giving off an impression of being a broken commitment to a conversation.” (Grundy, 2013).

TV Talk Shows

Talk shows can be observed as a specific kind of face-to-face conversation. Haarman (2001) said: According to the type of talk show, the focus for talks may be simply chatting (agreeable talk ostensibly for its own sake) typical of the evening celebrity talk show, or an issue or theme fluctuating from political and social problems and present-day happenings to topics relating more firmly to the private domain, like jealousy or unfaithfulness. (Thornborrow, 2007).

The television talk show is a live medium. Even if, today many programs are prerecorded, they are recorded in such a way to field the effect of liveness. The liveness of broadcasting is a pervasive effect of the medium. (Hutchby, 2005).

“Talk shows are available nearly every hour during weekdays, and most are broadcast live, although recorded segments are sometimes inserted.” (Carnel, 2012).

In addition, they can be classified according to their content, e.g. issue-oriented talk show, trash talk show, celebrity talk show or current affairs talk show. (Carnel, 2012).

TV talk show, as an extraordinary conversational from communicated from side to side mass media, has caught much attention of linguists. In a TV talk show, the collaboration of the hosts and the guests is an important factor in determining whether the program can be successful or not. (Wei Zho, & Wenfeng Zhai, 2016).

Research Model for Present Study

So the theoretical framework for this research is Grice’s (1975) cooperative principles its maxims of relevance theory and grounded
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theory. The researcher used Hafiz Ahmad Bilal’s research “Probing into the Dialogue of the President of Pakistan: Application of Grice’s Maxims” published on 25 August 2013, as a research model of this research. This study tries to show how political personalities try to defend themselves by collectively using words when appearing in media, in order to promote their ideologies to the public. The mass media analyzes certain issues through the collaboration of the public and tries to expose the grimes of the powerful elites (Bilal, H. A., & Naeem, S., 2013).

Type of Research and Research Method

This study was conducted by using qualitative descriptive approach. Hancock (2007) said that Qualitative research is concerned with developing explanations of social phenomena. (Hancock, B., Ockleford, E., & Windridge, K., 2007). Descriptive research is research type which observes a situation, condition, and issue. The research is entitled as “An Investigation of the flouting of Grice’s Maxims in TV Talk Show: ‘Capital Talk’” on Geo TV. It seeks to understand and find out the flouting of Maxims in Hamid Mir’s conversation as a host and Imran Khan’s conversation as a guest through observation. It also investigates the most dominant flouted Maxims in this research data.

Research Design

This research is conducted in the following steps:

Firstly, the researcher searched video of TV Talkshow Capital Talk hosted by Hamid Mir on Geo TV on the internet. Secondly, the researcher watched the talk show (Capital Talk) and selected an episode of April 11, 2016, as the sample of this research, because it was an interview between two characters, Hamid Mir as a host of show and Imran Khan Chairman of PTI as a guest of talk show. Thirdly, the researcher downloaded this data from the internet. Fourthly, the researcher watched and listen to TV Show (Capital Talk 11, April 2016 episode) from VCD for several times to wrote down the utterances in Urdu form. Fifthly, the researcher transcribed (in Roman Urdu) the selective conversation (in which flouting of Maxims occur) of both (host and guest) to get the script through “note-taking” technique. Finally, the researcher translated the conversation into English, analyzed the data to find out the flouting of Maxims in their conversation through observation, and “grounded theory” (2013).
Data and Source of Data

Data is a material object of the research. The source of data refers to the subject from which the data is obtained. This study is concerned about to investigation of flouting of Maxims in Hamid Mir’s Talkshow (Capital Talk). It means that the data of this research was in the form of video recording (taken from the internet) and transcription of the conversation (in the appendix) between Hamid Mir as a host and Imran Khan as a guest talk show ‘Capital Talk.’. The sources of data were taken from Hamid Mir’s Talkshow ‘Capital Talk’ on Geo TV in the episode of April 11, 2016. It was recording a video conversation about 43 minutes and 51 seconds. The data was all the utterances by the main characters of the show ‘Capital Talk.’

The technique of Collecting Data

In this research, the researcher used “Note-Taking” as a technique by observing the conversation during the Talk Show (recorded video) to find out the flouting of Maxim in the conversation. The research played a role as an observer. This research was included in library research because the researcher tried to collect some references about Grice cooperative principles (1975) and its Maxims in a Pragmatic subject by reading some books from the library.

Instruments of the Research

This research is about to investigation of the flouting of Grice’s Maxims in TV Talk show ‘Capital Talk’. Therefore, the source of data was in the form of a video recording of the talk show (Capital Talk) episode 11 April 2016. The data is analyzed through different tables and charts. In addition, in doing the research, the researcher was also aided by some electronic devices such as a TV, and the internet. The researcher, especially to collect and analyze the data, needed these instruments.

Demographics of this Research

The demographics of this research was the home of researcher where the researcher collected data as references by watching and recording the video and then wrote the script of both speakers in TV Talk Show ‘Capital Talk’ on Geo TV hosted by Hamid Mir to investigate the flouting of Grice’s Maxims in the conversation among host and guest.
The population of the Research

The population as an aggregate or totality of all the objects, subjects or members that conform to a set of specifications.(Rudhumbu, 2014). In this research, the population was the TV Talk Show Capital Talk hosted by Hamid Mir on Geo TV.

Sample of the Research

Hamid Mir on Geo TV, only one-day episode of TV Talkshow Capital Talk, hosted the sample of this research. There were two characters Hamid Mir (host) and Imran Khan (guest). The researcher investigated the flouting of most dominated Maxims among their conversation.

Qualitative data analysis requires dialect between ideas and data; people cannot analyze data without ideas, but the idea must be shaped and tested by the data that are analyzed(Chanjuan Liu & Xindai Zhang, 2015). There are some steps during analyzed and identified the data, namely:
- Watched and listen to the video Hamid Mir’s talk show (Capital Talk).
- Identified the utterances used by the speakers. Make some notes of the identified data related to the Cooperative principle.
- Analyzed the flouting of Maxims in the transcribed conversation.

Data Analysis and Discussion

Data Analysis is divided into three parts with sub-headings for clarity.

Firstly, Characteristics of the language used by Hamid Mir (host) and Imran Khan (guest) in TV talk show: “Capital Talk” one-day episode of 11 April 2016.

Secondly, the structure of language in the conversation between Hamid Mir as a host and Imran Khan as a guest.

Thirdly, the flouting of Grice’s Maxims in the interview conducted Hamid Mir (interviewer) and Imran Khan (interviewee).

In the end, the researcher observed most dominated Maxims, which is being flouted in this research and also gave the reason why the flouting of Maxims occurred in this research.

The framework of Grace’s cooperative principle (1975) used by Hafiz Ahmad Bilal research “Probing into the Dialogue of the President of Pakistan: Application of Grice’s Maxims” to find out the flouting of Grice’s Maxims in the data which is observed by the researcher in this research.
Even though, the data used in this research were in the form of spoken and secondary data. The TV Talk Show ‘Capital Talk’ in the episode of April 11, 2016, was used as the data source. It is recording a video conversation about 43 minutes and 51 seconds.

The language used by Hamid Mir as a host and Imran Khan as a guest is a political language. The interview, which was used as data for this research, has a political background of Imran Khan’s speech. Hamid Mir (host) asked political questions to the Imran Khan in the interview TV talk show: “Capital Talk” 11 April 2016.

All the questions asked by Hamid Mir as a host were political questions and Imran Khan (guest) gave all the answers politically as a chairperson of PTI. The conversation between Hamid Mir (guest) and Imran Khan (guest) based on political matters such as “Money Laundering offshore, companies, Corruption, Democracy, Dictatorship, Elections, Politicians, political parties” and so on.

In this interview, which was used as data for this research, the researcher observed that the chairperson of PTI Imran Khan (whose was guest in TV talk show: Capital Talk. Organized by Hamid Mir (host) on Geo TV channel) Coded two religious examples in his conversation while answering Hamid Mir (host)’s questions.

The first example used by Imran Khan is with reference to the Quran. Chairperson of PTI said: “Quran main hai k agar maabaapbhigalat kar rahy hon tou unkobhi manna karo.” (Urdu).

The context used in this line was that Imran Khan (guest) talked about Prime Minster’s government system of Pakistan that Prime Minster run this system on corruption based which is wrong. Allah said in Quran if your parents do something wrong so you should forbid them that’s why Imran Khan said our party forbade PM don’t do something wrong in this pure land of Pakistan and its public.

The manner in which something is expressed in words is called choices of words. It is the style of expressing yourself. In this research, the researcher observed the style of both people who are used as a population of this research first was Hamid Mir as a host and second was Imran Khan as a guest.
The words used by Hamid Mir as a host were mostly questions from Imran Khan (guest). But these selections of words are very polite and neutral in nature. On the other hand, Imran Khan, the other participants of this research used political language.

Results
In this research, the researcher used the 23 datum from the whole interview’s conversation, which is 43 minutes and 56-second video taken from YouTube as a research sample for this research. After analysis data now the researcher has shown the results in charts. For this purpose, the researcher used different charts.

Table 1: The Flouting of Maxims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Manner</th>
<th>Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Datum 1</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 3</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 4</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 6</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 8</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 9</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 10</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 11</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 12</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 13</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 14</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datum 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In datum 1, the researcher observed all four the Maxim are flouted by the guest. In datum 2, only one Maxim is flouted which is the Maxim of quality. In datum 3, the Maxim of manner, and the Maxim of quantity are flouted. In datum 4, the Maxims of relation, manner and quantity are flouted. In datum 5, only Maxim of manner is flouted. In datum 6, the Maxims of quantity and manner are flouted. In datum 7, the Maxim of relation is flouted. In datum 8, three Maxims are flouted (manner, relation, and quantity). In datum 9, the Maxims of quantity and relation are flouted. In datum 10, Maxims of quantity and manner are flouted. In datum 11, only the Maxim of quantity is flouted. In datum 12, the Maxims of quantity, manner, and relation are flouted. In datum 13, the Maxims of quantity and manner are flouted. In datum 14, the Maxims of quantity and manner are flouted. In datum 15, only the Maxim of relation is flouted. In datum 16, only the Maxim of quantity is flouted. In datum 17, only the Maxim of quantity flouted, in datum 18, also the Maxim of quantity is flouted. In datum 19, also the Maxim of quantity flouted. In datum 20, the Maxims of quantity and relation are flouted. In datum 21, the Maxims of quantity and relation are flouted, in datum 22; the Maxims of relation and manner are flouted. In the last datum 23, the Maxim of quantity is flouted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Grice’s Maxims</th>
<th>Number of Flouting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Quantity</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Quality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Manner</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Relation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Maxims flouted</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These all results show that the Maxim of quantity is mostly flouted in whole datum 18 times. The Maxim of quality flouted in whole data is only 2 times. The Maxim of Manner is flouted 10 times and the Maxim of relation is flouted 11 times in this study. The result shows that the Maxim of quantity is approximately most dominated Maxim, which is flouted in this research.

**Figure 1: Flouting of Maxims**

This chart shows the result of analysis the Maxim of quantity is flouted 18 times. The Maxim of quality flouted in only two times. The Maxim of Manner is flouted 10 times, and the Maxim of the relation is flouted 11 times in this study. In this chart, the result shows that the Maxim of quantity is approximately most dominated Maxim, which is flouted in the research.

**Figure 2: Flouting of Maxims**
Table 2. Flouting of Maxim’s Result in Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Maxims</th>
<th>Results in Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Quantity</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Quality</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Manner</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxim of Relation</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This bar chart and table show the result in a percentage. The Maxim of quantity is flouted 58%. The Maxim of quality flouted 6%. The Maxim of manner is flouted 35%, and the Maxim of relation is flouted 32%. Therefore, the researcher investigated that the Maxim of quantity is most frequently flouted in this research.

Conclusion

Grice’s Maxims (1975) obviously have its importance, however, flouting in itself is art if it is intentional often flouting happens consciously and sometimes unconsciously and therefore it conveys meanings different from the reality or produces a pragmatics effect that may be negative like sarcasm or irony. Therefore, when narrator flouted a Maxim intentionally, he aims at exposing some thought.

After analyzing the qualitative data by applying the Grice’s Maxims (1975) and grounded theory (2012) the researcher has observed that the flouting of Maxims has been made in this research intentionally as well as intentionally but always purposeful thought behind it. It conveys meaning entirely different from the reality in either observing or flouting maxims there is a particular intention in Imran Khan’s (guest) conversation.

The main objective of this research was to investigate the most dominated maxim followed and flouted in the conversation of characters in TV Talk show (Capital Talk) hosted by Hamid Mir on Geo TV. The data that was collected for this research showed that the Maxim of Quantity was the most dominated Maxim, flouted many times by the guest (Imran Khan) in this research. The result shows that Imran Khan (guest) flouted all
Maxim 41 times. The Maxim of Quantity 18 times, the Maxim of quality two times, the Maxim of manner 11 times and the Maxim of relation ten times.

The other main objective of this research was to investigate the reason behind flouting of maxims in TV Talk show (Capital Talk). The result shows that in the conversation with the guest (Imran Khan) a mostly unnecessary thing, that shows the Maxim of quantity, flouted. The guest (Imran Khan) essentially gave irrelevant answers to the question asked by the host (Hamid Mir) which shows that the Maxim of the relation is flouted in this conversation. In guest’s (Imran Khan) conversation, two confusing utterances are caused the flouting of the maxim of quality. The reason behind the maxim of manner is that the conversation of the guest (Imran Khan) was not organized and brief. He was trying to justifying his political party, showing his authority, comparison with other countries, showing his sympathy, and criticism on other political parties.

The researcher also investigated the objectives of this research related to characteristics and the structure of the language in the conversation of the participants on the TV Talk show (Capital Talk). The result shows that the language used by the host (Hamid Mir) was very simple, clear and brief. On the other hand, the language used by the guest (Imran Khan) was complex, confusing and in detail. The context of this interview, which is used as data for this research, has a political background of the guest’s (Imran Khan) speech. Therefore, the researcher investigated that the structure of language used by guest (Imran Khan) and host (Hamid Mir) is political. The researcher investigated that there were two religious examples coded by the guest (Imran Khan) for trying to satisfy the questions artistically asked by the host (Hamid Mir). The researcher also investigated that there is irony found in the guest’s (Imran Khan) utterances. Because the guest (Imran Khan) was trying to criticize the Prime Minister and comparing him the current system of Pakistan with other countries’ PMs. The researcher also investigated the expressions of the participants in the interview hosted by Hamid Mir on Geo TV Talk Show (Capital Talk). The result shows that the guest (Imran Khan) was mostly used sympathy expressions and words to express his personality. He was trying to prove that he has kind-hearted and has pain in his heart for others.

Finally, it is concluded that the findings of this research show that this research is helpful to increase the researcher’s understanding of the
flouting of Maxims in a TV talk show (Capital Talk). Besides, the researcher knows the feasible reasons why the Maxims are flouted in TV Talk show (Capital Talk).

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings obtained from the results the researcher hopes that this research can give readers encouragements as their further research in this field. The following recommendations are offered as possible ways to improve this study.

This research is qualitative by nature the future researchers will make it quantitative as well as by comparing two maxims’ analysis.

The data of this research is taken from an only one-day episode of the TV talk show (Capital Talk) hosted by Hamid Mir on Geo TV, but the future researchers can investigate the flouting of maxims by comprising between two TV Talk shows hosted by different channels.

This research has pragmatics context, but the future researchers can analyze this interview (one-day episode of Capital Talk) on another various setting like Discourse Analysis, and Critical Discourse Analysis, Stylistics as well as semantics too.

The researcher is analyzing the data by applying Grice’s Maxims (1975) to find out the flouting of maxims but the future researchers can analyze by applying the politeness theory to investigate the politeness strategies in TV Talk shows.

This research is based on secondary data, but the future researchers can collect data by a primary source such as daily life conversation occurring in the natural environment.

The researcher also suggests that future researchers can investigate the flouting of maxims in play, novels, and movies by applying Grice’s Maxims (1975).
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