

Conversational Implicature on Selected Episodes of *JkLive* Talk Show on Citizen Television, Kenya

Margaret Anyango Opiyo*, Loise Wamaitha Mwai

Department of Literature, Linguistics and Foreign Languages. Kenyatta University

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8100048>

Received: 19 September 2024; Accepted: 30 September 2024; Published: 30 October 2024

ABSTRACT

The study involved an analysis of Conversational Implicature on sampled episodes of the *JKLive* talk show of Citizen TV in Kenya. The research objective was to determine the observance of cooperative principle maxims on selected episodes of the *JKLive* talk show. The study used a descriptive research design in which judgmental sampling was employed in selecting the episodes in the talk show that were more relevant to the study. A sample size of two episodes which had a runtime of one hour each, were used for conversational data and then subjected to analysis. Data was collected through audio and video recording based on naturalistic observation of the talk show. The data was then transcribed orthographically to identify the language features required for the study. Data analysis was guided by the theory of Conversational Implicature by Grice (1975), which he termed as an indirect speech whereby, what is meant by an utterance may go beyond what is communicated. As a theory, Conversational Implicature advocates that, in order to simplify the use of language, rules are needed to govern how we bring out information and at what stage, for effective communication to occur. This theory was used to account for observance or violation of cooperative principle maxims, in line with the objective of the study. Prevalence of violations of cooperative principle maxims were observed, particularly instances of quality, quantity, manner and relevance maxims being disregarded in political discourse, and instances of quantity and relevance maxims also being disregarded in economic discourse. Addressing violations of these maxims can improve clarity and coherence, with the host playing a crucial role in moderating discussions to foster mutual understanding, prevent conflicts, and promote constructive exchanges, ultimately enhancing the viewer experience.

Keywords: Conversational Implicature, JKLive, Maxims and Media.

INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of communication is to understand information, as such, misunderstandings or confusions arise when one fails to express the ideas/ intentions clearly. Media language is important as it provides an easy accessible source of language data for research and teaching purposes, it also reflects and shape both language use and attitude in a speech community. As such, this study investigates the observance of cooperative principle maxims on *JKLive* talk show of citizen TV Kenya, to understand how the application or violation of cooperative principle maxims aids in understanding or misunderstandings during the talk show, and how these violations can influence the overall objective of the show. The study focused on how participants of *JKLive* talk show adhered to the cooperative principle maxims.

Background to the study

Media Socially plays a significant role in shaping language usage and attitudes within different speech communities (Akello, 2021). Consequently, media outlets are considered important social institutions as they serve as key conveyors of our culture, influencing both political and social spheres (Hutchby,1996). Due to these reasons and more, the study of media discourse is crucial, as it unveils insights about society and contributes to its overall character.

In recent studies, there has been a focus on media studies or language use on media by various linguistic researchers, be it on television, radio stations, Facebook and Twitter (Izza et al., 2019; Rui & Ting, 2014). In broadcast media like television and radio, the objective or task of the media personalities is to ensure that people get the information about what is taking place around them, be it in their countries or globally. Thus, they are expected to use language in a way that provides maximum understanding with minimum risk of confusion. Grice (1975) came up with the theory of conversational implicature, to help in governing the interlocutors on how to create a sense of understanding of various interpretations of what is being communicated, unless the conversation is aimed at achieving a different goal from what is spoken. Grice's maxims bridge between what is said and what is meant.

When we have a conversation, we say a lot of things, and according to Grice (1975), we adhere to principle of cooperation. Therefore, there is a need to make it clear so that everyone in a conversation can follow. Interlocutors of a talk show are expected to talk in a way that benefits the conversation without confusion. There are sets of conventions that we are subconsciously aware of, and one should follow if meaningful conversation is intended. Grice came up with the cooperative principle maxims that need to be adhered to, in order to have effective communication. These are the maxim of quality which advocates for being truthful, the maxim of quantity which advocates for giving enough information as required, not less or more, the maxim of manner which advocates for being clear, avoiding ambiguity and obscurity of information, and the maxim of relevance which advocates for being relevant to the discussion at hand. Violation of these maxims sometimes might lead to misunderstandings. When dealing with broadcast media, journalists are expected to be cautious of these principles in order to minimize misunderstandings or misinterpretations during talk shows.

JKLive show has a decade-long history that dates back to the early 2010s as a current affairs program, premiering every Wednesday at 9 pm on Citizen TV Kenya. The show is hosted by Jeff Koinange, who is a renowned Kenyan Journalist. The show typically invites different personalities to discuss issues of national importance and/or public interest that characterize current affairs. It has a huge viewership due to the show's diversity (Media Action, 2018). It has a space for everyone and has a way of bringing out unique stories from these individuals. The analysis was based on this talk show because of the high probability of flouting the maxims underpinning conversational implicature, this is because in talk shows, the conversation between all participants occurs naturally (not scripted), although the hosts regulate certain aspects of the conversation to encourage objectivity, civility, and observance of time slot, while at the same time allowing the participants to spontaneously communicate (Irawan et al., 2019).

Statement of the Problem

The adherence to cooperative principle maxims has a comparatively broader implication in shaping the trajectory and outcomes of national discourse. In this regard, the media has a duty to disseminate diverse information and knowledge, thus it is expected to abide by an ethical code of conduct to serve its purpose. The language use on media talk shows should provide maximum understanding with minimum risk of confusion. For a long time, Kenya's media built public confidence as the most trusted source of information. However, it has since earned itself the tag '*Githeri media*', a pejorative slur that signifies growing public loss of faith in media as a credible source of information, and *JKLive* show is not an exception. Observance of the cooperative principle maxims in television talk shows can go a long way in attaining the educative value of broadcast media. However, discourse analysis studies have not adequately examined how conversational implicature manifests in Kenyan talk shows. Posing a knowledge gap that this study aims to close by providing insights on how to achieve a balanced perspective on conversational implicature, and to promote a more nuanced and informed discourse within the media landscape.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies on Conversational Implicature

Laila (2020) investigated the application of cooperative principle maxims during the 2019 Indonesian presidential debate between two candidates held in Malaysia. The study examined the debate through the lens of conversational violations, focusing on the types of cooperative principle maxims utilized and those

frequently breached. The study aimed to characterize the observed phenomena. The findings indicated that the presidential candidates did not infringe upon the maxim of quantity or the maxim of quality. However, violations were observed in both the maxim of relevance and the maxim of manner. This study gave an insight on the use of this theory for the current study.

Akello et al. (2021) investigated cooperative principle maxims that Facebook users violate whenever they are involved in political discussions in Kenya. The research used a qualitative design because its goal was to give an understanding of a phenomenon occurring naturally. This study utilized the official Facebook pages of Rt. Hon Raila Odinga and Hon William Ruto as its sources of data. Purposive sampling was adopted to identify eighty-seven comments to form data. The findings noted that Facebook users violate all cooperative principle maxims whenever they give their political views. This study however did not look at the violation in talk shows which the current study sought to investigate using the *JKLive* show which presented a research gap.

Mayora (2010) explored implicatures in interviews published in the East African Standard, a Kenyan Newspaper, when responding to 'yes' and 'no' questions. The study used Grice's theory of conversational implicature which postulated interviewees in a conversation consider the context of the conversation to respond to an interviewer. The Standard Newspapers interview excerpts between January and May 2010 were purposively sampled for this study. The study established the interviewees avoided directly giving 'yes' or 'no' answers, though the answers given were sufficient for the interviewer to interpret the answer as either 'no' or 'yes'. The study, therefore, established there were violations of cooperative principle maxims in the standard newspaper. This study was done in print media and was done in a controlled environment. The current study on conversational implicature selected *JKLive* talk show on Citizen TV Kenya in which conversation proceeded under a fairly uncontrolled environment.

Theoretical Framework

Grice (1975) used the term "implicate" to account for what a speaker implies which is different from what is literally said. That is to say, what is meant by an utterance might actually be different from what is said. Implicatures serve various functions, ranging from maintaining politeness, creating a sense of humor, saving face, expressing caution (self-protection), emphasizing information, absolving oneself from responsibility and entertaining audiences (Lazim, 2020).

Yule (1996) defined the term implicature as saying something that means much more than what is actually communicated or spoken. As such, it is the communicator's utterance choice which that violates cooperative principles maxims to bring out the intended meaning, that can only be inferred by the listener based on the consideration of the context. Grice's theory believes that in all language communication activities, there is a mutual understanding between the interlocutors to achieve a specific goal. Grice's conversational principles which he termed cooperative principle maxims, helps in guiding conversations. There are four cooperative principle maxims namely: the maxim of quantity, quality, manner, and relevance. These maxims serve as guideline for interlocutors, to ensure that their contributions are relevant and helpful. Grice acknowledges that people do not always follow these cooperative principle maxims during conversations and thus, Conversational Implicatures arise when these maxims are violated or flouted. Communication moves smoothly only when the hearer shares the same knowledge with the speaker. The cooperative principle maxims advocate for the following:

Maxim of quality; The maxim emphasizes that contributions should be truthful and not contributing to a false belief.

Example of violation: when one says 'I know for sure that the doctor killed Lucy', when they are uncertain and have no evidence to back up this claim, then this maxim is violated by potentially misleading the listener.

Maxim of quantity; It states that speakers should provide just the right amount of information. Not too much or too little.

Example: War is war.

Here, the maxim of quantity is violated by giving less information than is required but with the hope that the listener can infer the meaning. For example, in war, there can be destructions, displacements or even death.

Maxim of **Relevance**: the interlocutors are expected to be relevant to the ongoing conversation.

Example; A) How did she perform?

B) Her shoes looked wonderful.... This could mean that the person in question may have not performed well, but since the speaker did not intend to hurt their feelings, he chose to violate this maxim by answering what he was not asked, as a way of expressing politeness.

Maxim of **manner**: This maxim emphasize that one should avoid ambiguity and obscurity of information.

Example of violation: X) Where do you work? Y) Well, I passed by the market to buy some fruits before going to the office. The weather was great today and I did not have much work to do at the office today considering that I work next to the city hall.

There are two types of Implicatures; **Generalized Implicature**: These are implicatures that result from the common meaning of specific words or phrases (Grice 1975). When someone says, "Some students came late," it implies that not all students arrived in time. **Particularized Implicature**: These implicatures are context-specific and are influenced by things such as the speaker's intentions, the listener's prior knowledge, and the shared context (Grice 1975). They are not exclusively based on the grammatical meaning of the words used.

The theory of conversational implicature can be used to examine talk shows just like other conversational contexts. The purpose of talk shows is to entertain, inform, and engage the audience through talks between a presenter and guests. Using the concept of conversational implicature to analyze these discussions might assist in finding underlying meanings, intents, and implications beyond the stated content of the dialogue. Conversations on talk shows frequently contain implicit messages that go beyond the participants' stated utterances. Implicatures can be determined by studying the context, tone, and nonverbal clues. Body language, hesitations, or evasive answers, for example, may indicate concealed knowledge or emotional reactions that are not clearly communicated.

Talk show participants may use indirect communication to express messages or opinions without overtly articulating them. Conversational implicature aids in deciphering these indirect communications and their intended meaning. Hosts and guests may utilize sarcasm, irony, or references to convey themselves, or create an effect and also the audience participation and interpretation in which talk programs rely significantly on. Viewers frequently extrapolate and take conclusions from the discussions they see (Allot, 2018). Conversational implicature explains how viewers may infer new information or meanings from the discussions by using shared background knowledge and assumptions. Therefore, this theory was helpful in analyzing the objective of the study.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research design

The study used descriptive qualitative research design in which content analysis was employed. Content analysis helped the researcher to identify trends, comprehend contextual factors, and get insight into the communication dynamics of Implicature.

Sampling Procedures and Sample Size.

The study employed Purposive sampling to choose two episodes from *JKLive* talk show of Citizen TV Kenya.

This sampling technique aided in minimizing the repetition of topics and facilitated the researcher's engagement in more meaningful discussions pertinent to the study. The *JKLive* episodes recorded in 2023 were

chosen for the study. The researcher aimed to work with a sample size of two episodes of *JKLive* talk show which lasted for 60 minutes each.

Data collection methods

Qualitative data was collected by listening to and observing *JKLive* episodes hosted on the official YouTube channel of Citizen TV. Recording was used as the main method of data collection, fixed on digital audio and video recording. This data helped the researcher establish the extent to which participants in the *JKLive* talk show adhered to the cooperative principle maxims.

Ethical Considerations

Royal Media Service's *JKLive* show is in the public domain. Thus, permission to access the videos was not necessary. However, as guided by the Kenyatta University research policy, the researcher obtained a letter of introduction from the university which helped in applying for the research permit from the National Commission for Science, Technology, and Innovation (NACOSTI). In order to protect the privacy and confidentiality of participants or interviewees of the *JKLive* talk show, pseudonyms have been used i.e. H representing Host, P1 representing the first speaker/ participant of each episode, P2 representing the second speaker during turn allocation, P3 representing the third participant and P4 representing the fourth participant. The YouTube link for the selected episodes are provided under references.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The objective of the study was to determine the observance of cooperative principle maxims in selected episodes of *JKLive* show on Citizen TV Kenya. The concepts of conversational implicature was applied in the current study to examine the adherence to or deviation from these cooperative principle maxims in the context of the *JKLive* show. The finding showed violations of cooperative principle maxims by various participants or talk show guests with some leading to misunderstandings and breakdown in communication, while others could be inferred. Every maxim is analyzed as follows using the two episodes chosen for the study. (i) The Economic discourse; **Dreams and Expectations**. (ii) The political discourse; **Which way Kenya**.

Maxim of Quantity

The maxim of quantity is concerned with providing an adequate but not excessive amount of information. Adhering to the maxim of quantity helps in maintaining clarity and efficiency in communication. By providing just the right amount of information, participants can avoid confusion and misunderstandings that might arise from providing too little or too much information. This maxim was violated to a great extent by participants in the political talk show *Which Way Kenya?* (The brackets shown in the conversations indicates overlap during the conversational exchange) For example, the maxim was violated by P2 as demonstrated in example 4.1.1 below.

Example 4.1.1 Political discourse. Topic: Which way Kenya?

H: *I'm going to get to the signatures in a moment but first senator [] uuh let me ask you P2, nine lives lost, all that destruction today, was it necessary?*

P2: *First of all, I want to send my heartfelt condolences to the families who lost their loved ones, today morning, they woke up knowing that they are going to nurture their children to become engineers, doctors, but sad enough they are sleeping with corpses. It is quite a sad day.*

P2: *Second, I want to celebrate the teachers of this country who woke up in the morning today, went to school, risked their lives to protect our children who were in school.*

H: *But you saw in Kangemi what happened. Was that necessary?*

P2: *Yah, I saw [] and we saw teachers who were even rescuing the children []*

H: *Yah, because they had no choice, you know exactly what happened...*

P2: *And that is why I feel very bad when my colleague degrades teachers*

When asked whether lives lost were necessary, P2 began by sending condolences to the families who lost their loved ones and then went ahead to celebrate teachers, saying that is why he feels very bad when P1 degrades teachers. P2 consciously violates this maxim in order to mislead the audience because of his political position. The motive was to express caution (self-protection), knowing that the teachers were tear-gassed by the government which he (P2) was apparently part and parcel of and whose action, he had an obligation to defend. This is debunked by P1 who clarifies by saying: *"This government, where he is the secretary general, where now, illegally, he sits in the cabinet, is the one that gave the orders to shoot"...* This is consistent with the findings of numerous media studies (Helmie & Lestary., 2019; Laila.,2020 & Rahmi & Wahyui 2018) which established that this violation mainly occurs as a face- saving strategy.

In contrast, the maxim of quantity was observed by most participants in the economic talk show. Titled: Dreams and expectations. The first participant, when asked about his view of the budget, proceeded to address the question directly as apparent in example 4.1.2.

Example 4.1.2 Economy Topic: Dreams and Expectations

H. *Kenyan across the board are talking about the budget and what it means; dreams and expectations. Let me start with you P1, of boda-boda association, I know you have close to 300,000 members here in Nairobi alone right? What's your view on this budget bro?*

P1: *This Budget is just another one. I mean, we don't know where to start. Because already even before this budget is read tomorrow, going backwards, we have already seriously been affected. Because the daily amount that I used for operation is around Ksh.400 everyday then. But today, a bodaboda rider in town here, and it even gets worse to those who are operating in the outskirts. It goes up to Ksh700, Ksh 800, and to even Ksh 1000, if you are going to operate from 6am to 6pm in the evening. Because the price at the pump is completely out of reach for the small man. ...They say 16% VAT is going to be levied on fuel. That one means we are going to buy it at around Ksh.200 per liter. It is completely unacceptable."*

Observing the quantity maxim aids in achieving mutual understanding between the speaker and the listener. It ensures that the speaker provides sufficient information for the listener to comprehend the intended message without overwhelming them with irrelevant details. The observance of this maxim was also observed in the response of P2 – a Content Creator - when asked about the meaning of content and what he does as a content creator:

Example 4.1.3 Economy Topic: Dreams and Expectations

H: *When you say content creator, for people who don't understand, what do you do?*

P2: *Basically, I think just to explain in simple terms, a content creator is anyone who films or records anything just to post it on social media, and does that to earn a living.*

P2 provides a clear and concise explanation that defines a content creator as someone who films or records content for social media to earn a living. This response meets the requirement to be as informative as necessary for the conversation, ensuring that the audience understands the basic concept without unnecessary elaboration.

The explanation avoids overwhelming the listener with superfluous information about content creation, such as specific platforms or types of content. By focusing on the essential elements—filming, recording, posting, and earning a living. P2 adheres to the second part of the maxim by not providing more information than required. Clarity and Brevity: P2's statement is direct and to the point, allowing for easy comprehension. This aligns with the principle of being brief while still delivering all necessary information, which is a key aspect of the maxim of quantity. In summary, P2's response effectively balances informativeness and conciseness, adhering to Grice's maxim of quantity by providing just enough detail to convey the meaning of "content creator."

By providing an appropriate amount of information, speakers can maintain the focus of the conversation, avoiding digressions that may lead the discussion astray. However, P3 – a small grocery trader (popularly known as Mama Mboga), when asked what she operated out of and what she does, provided more information than was necessary to answer the question:

Example 4.1.4 Economy Topic: Dreams and Expectations

H: P3. Named after my mother. What do you operate out of? And what do you do?

P3: I operate in Wakulima Market as Mama Mboga, and business has not been good. Because, before Covid, I was making 600/- and I am still making 600/- today, but cost of living has gone up. It is hurting me. Life has become hard. We are affected and everything is not okay. My plea is, what is taking us backwards as a country is demonstrations. There is nothing demonstrations brings us as Mama Mboga. It is hurting our business. And, my second plea is to Hon. Raila to accept defeat, and President Ruto to accept victory, and run the country the way it should be run. That is my plea as Mama Mboga. Every time all those protests are happening, it is hurting Mama Mboga, stock is rotting, and there is tension among customers. Overall, I would like to appeal to well-wishers and NGOs, because all these things, it is not because this government has brought it. It has been there before, then Covid happened, and the government got into other priorities. So I would like to appeal to well-wishers to intervene.”

P3 violates the maxim of quantity by providing excessive detail and context that may not be necessary for the listener to understand her main points. This level of detail may overwhelm the listener rather than focusing on the core issue of financial hardship due to rising costs and stagnant income.

Long Explanations: P3 elaborates on the impact of demonstrations on her business, discussing how they lead to stock rotting and customer tension. While these points are relevant, the extensive explanation detracts from her main plea for peace and stability in governance, which could have been conveyed more succinctly. She makes two distinct pleas—one regarding the impact of protests and another directed at political leaders—yet spends considerable time on each without clearly delineating their significance or urgency. This could confuse listeners about what action is most pressing or what she truly wants to communicate. Overall, while P3's narrative is heartfelt and informative, it strays from the principle of being concise and focused, which ultimately dilutes her message. The violation of this maxim was pretty much in the political show under the study as compared to the economic discourse.

Manner Maxim

The maxim of manner guides on effective and cooperative communication. This particular maxim focuses on how the information is presented, emphasizing the form of delivery rather than the content itself. The essence of the maxim of manner can be summarized as advocating for speakers to be orderly in their communication, aiming for clarity and brevity. Manner maxim was frequently violated by both participants in the political talk show.

In the example 4.1.1 earlier presented, the manner maxim was violated in the same discourse whereby P2, when asked whether the loss of nine lives was necessary, instead of going straight to respond to the question, first of all began by sending condolences and appreciating the teachers who rescued pupils, without necessarily answering the question. Similarly, P1's response, particularly his use of insults like "stupid fellows," and his derogatory equation of P2 to a boy, violates the politeness aspect of the manner maxim, and may be seen as aggressive or inflammatory as implied in the example 4.2.1 below.

Example 4.2.1 Politics Topic: Which Way Kenya?

P2: Today morning, I was surprised and... go to P1's twitter handle, he was recording a video celebrating that businesses are not working. So, while his electorate, the people who voted for him are in Maasai land waiting for tourists, P1 is in Nairobi destroying the very highway that is taking the tourists to his people. P1 is

celebrating and dancing on the very grave of his people who are waiting for economic liberation. And therefore H, we want [].

H: *Let him respond*

P1: *This is why I said, next time don't bring me to debate a boy who doesn't understand what leadership is all about. H, I was in Narok, walking in the streets of Narok peacefully, and no one not even a single person was hurt. I walked across all the streets in Narok, talking to the people, and I was joined by hundreds of people who came in. The police came in and escorted me out of the town –*

H: *So what was wrong? How come it was peaceful in Narok?*

P1: *It was peaceful because this illegitimate regime of this fellow, you know? And that is why I keep on saying, you know, the guy who is currently occupying the office of the president, he is surrounded by stupid fellows like him.*

The participants in example 4.2.1 potentially, strategically violated this maxim to sway public opinion, discredit the opponent, or deflect criticism. P2's accusation against P1 could be an attempt to undermine his credibility or paint him in a negative light, especially since there was a political rivalry or disagreement between them. Similarly, P1's response potentially aimed to discredit the current government or its representatives, to bolster his own image or political agenda. In addition, P1 may have intentionally violated manner maxim to maintain ambiguity or deniability. P1's vague reference to "*the guy who is currently occupying the office of the president*" could be a strategic attempt to avoid directly implicating specific individuals or making concrete accusations that could be legally or politically risky. The conclusion drawn from this conversation converges with the findings of Helmie and Lestary (2019), in demonstrating violations of manner maxim, reflecting competitive and conflicting motives. It also aligns with Rahmi and Wahyuni (2018) by illustrating that the violations of conversational maxims are driven by reasons such as saving-face and protracting answers, which reflects a common motive observed in political discourse.

The manner maxim was also violated by the third participant in economic discourse by responding in an ambiguous manner, prompting the host to seek clarification. This is reflected in Example 4.2.3:

Example 4.2.3 Economy Topic: Dreams and Expectations.

H: *Tell me. 600/- a day you make. And the daily expenses?*

P3: *Haa. It is bad. It is bad.*

H: *Tell me. Break it down.*

P3: *Flour is 200/-. Host, we are living in debt.*

H: *Flour is 200/-. Then? Sugar?*

P3: *That's 180/- H: Correct. Ehe?*

P3: *A kilogram of cooking oil is 220/-*

The exemplified conversation is in line with Helmie and Lestary (2019) by demonstrating violations of cooperative principle maxims, particularly in terms of clarity. When the host inquires about the daily expenses, P3's initial response of "It is bad. It is bad" lacks specificity and fails to provide the necessary information regarding the breakdown of expenses. This violation of the manner maxim results in ambiguity and leaves the host and audience unclear about the exact nature of the respondent's financial situation. Additionally, P3's subsequent breakdown of expenses lacks comprehensive detail, with only flour, sugar, and cooking oil mentioned. This incomplete breakdown further violates the quantity maxim, as it fails to provide a thorough accounting of all daily expenses. As a result, the conversation suffers from lack of clarity and specificity, hence hindering effective communication and understanding between the participants.

Quality Maxim

According to Grice's Principle maxims, speakers should strive to be truthful and provide accurate information. This principle assumes that participants in a conversation are being honest and sincere. If someone knowingly provides false or misleading information, they are violating the quality maxim. Conversely, if they lack evidence for their claims or state something they believe to be untrue, they are also violating the quality maxim. In the present study, the quality maxim was violated by both participants in political discourse. When P1 called the government illegitimate, the host asked him to clarify why, but he asks the host not to take him back there. This is reflected in Example 4.3.1:

Example 4.3.1 Politics Topic: Which way Kenya?

P1: *Let me first start by saying this, brick wall to brick wall leads us into a collision. The position taken up by this administration is one which should get every Kenyan worried. This is not about Azimio anymore, Raila Odinga did not go to the streets today. Kenyans are tired and that is why they went to the streets to demonstrate peacefully but they were provoked by goons hired by this illegitimate regime.*

H: *Why do you call it illegitimate?*

P1: *I call it illegitimate...*

H: *He won the elections*

P1: *That is a subject for discussion*

H: *But why?*

P1: *Because even if we went to the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court ignored basic things. Please Jeff, don't take me there because you know what happened.*

H: *Why don't you admit that you did lose the election?*

P1: *I would never admit to that.*

H: *And you were at the Bomas of Kenya?*

P1: *Yes I was, and you aren't taking me back to that debate of Bomas of Kenya because we are here for a different debate. We are here because of all the ill of this illegitimate government.*

H: *You can never call this ill []*

P1: *I will never call it legitimate `...`and soon we will prove that it is illegitimate government the moment we hit 15million signatures, then I would []*

In the foregoing example, P1 repeatedly refers to the government as "illegitimate" throughout the conversation without providing concrete evidence or legal basis for such claims. Without substantiation, these assertions indicate violations of the Maxim of Quality. Similarly, P1's statement in line 14, "I will never call it legitimate," suggests a fixed stance without considering evidence or differing perspectives, potentially disregarding the pursuit of truth as required by the maxim of quality. This may be explained by the fact that P1 potentially had strong political beliefs or affiliations that led him to perceive the government as illegitimate, regardless of objective evidence. In such cases, maintaining the narrative of government illegitimacy serves his political agenda, even if it means disregarding factual accuracy. Further, emotional investment in the issue at hand possibly clouded P1's judgment, leading to a disregard for factual accuracy. Since P1 was against the perceived injustices or grievances caused by the government, his disappointment might have influenced him to prioritize expressing his emotions over presenting objective facts.

The maxim of quality was also violated by P2 when he said “*Today, Eastmatt in Kitengela, the economic hub of Maasais, was vandalized. Tomorrow morning as we wake up, 162 Maasais do not have jobs.*” This claim was challenged by P1 as inaccurate, forcing P2 to qualify that he was being figurative in his language use, while it is evident that the motive was to mislead the viewers’. Example:

Example 4.3.2 Politics Topic: Which way Kenya?

P1: “*Maasais don’t work in Eastmatt. Maasais are busy taking care of their cows, not becoming shopkeepers... compare apples to apples, don’t come in and compare bananas to apples.*”

P2: “*This is a figurative example...*”

P1: “*It is not a figurative example. Be factual. We are not here for fiction.*”

Though the violation of this maxim was minimal in the economic discourse, there were still instances of violation by P3, even in example 4.2.3 where she gives inaccurate prices of commodities at that particular time in which prices were higher than what she stated. The violation might have been targeted at persuading the viewers to give government time.

Relation Maxim

The maxim of relation pertains to the relevance of the contribution made in a conversation. It suggests that speakers should make their contributions relevant to the ongoing conversation, focusing on providing information that contributes to the topic at hand. In other words, speakers are expected to make their statements logically related to the current discussion and avoid introducing irrelevant information. This maxim was violated in the both political discourse and Economic discourse as well. P2 in political discourse for example, when asked in example 4.1.1 whether the lives lost were necessary, he digresses from the topic and starts talking about the teachers. P3’s answer in example 4.1.4 above also deviates from the topic at hand which clearly could be seen as either misinterpretation of the question or a violation consciously done to absolve herself from responsibility. There were several other instances of violation of this maxim witnessed in both discourses.

Ultimately, most of these violations pose significant challenges to effective communication and comprehension within the political and economic spheres. The cooperative principle maxims articulated by Grice (1975) posits that participants in a conversation typically strive to cooperate in order to achieve mutual understanding. This is achieved through adherence to the cooperative principle maxims. By straying from the established norms of cooperative dialogue, participants risked impeding the exchange of meaningful information and fostering misunderstanding. Even though violation of these Maxims can complicate viewers understanding and internalization of information they can also enhance conversational dynamics, prompting deeper engagement and discussion. To note is that not all violations led to the breakdown during these discussions, some fostered deeper engagements.

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The objective of the study was to determine the observance of cooperative principle maxims in selected episodes of *JKLive show* on Citizen TV Kenya. Grice's four conversational maxims were utilized as guidelines for interactions, with the study aiming to assess compliance or deviation from these maxims. Results indicated greater incidences of violations than observance.

The maxim of quantity, which emphasizes providing an adequate yet not excessive amount of information, was investigated within the political talk show “Which Way Kenya?” Instances of this maxim being violated were noted, particularly when participants offered either too much or too little information, resulting in confusion or misunderstandings. Conversely, in an economic talk show titled “Dreams and Expectations,” adherence to the maxim of quantity was generally observed, with participants providing suitable and pertinent information to maintain mutual understanding and clarity.

The manner maxim, which focuses on the delivery style in communication, was frequently breached in political discourse. Participants often veered away from addressing questions directly, resorting to ambiguous language, inflammatory remarks, or off-topic discussions. Similar violations were observed in economic discourse, where some participants responded ambiguously, lacking clarity and specificity, thereby impeding effective communication.

The quality maxim, advocating for truthfulness and accuracy in communication, was also violated in political discourse. Participants made claims without evidence or engaged in sweeping generalizations lacking factual accuracy. Economic discourse similarly saw violations, with some participants making unsupported assertions, undermining the integrity of the dialogue. This maxim was highly violated in the Political discourse as compared to Economic discourse.

The relation maxim, concerning the relevance of contributions to the ongoing conversation, was ignored in political discourse and minimally in Economic discourse, particularly when participants introduced irrelevant topics or pursued disconnected discussions. This disruption in the logical flow of conversation posed challenges to effective communication and understanding within both political and economic contexts. The researcher has noted that there were several instances where violations did not hamper the communication. The interlocutors had mutual understanding as well as the viewers', with an exception of violation of the maxim of quantity since its violation doesn't necessarily imply an alternative meaning or something that can be inferred.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study highlights the importance of adhering to Grice's maxims for successful communication within political and Economic discourse on the *JKLive* talk show. By addressing violations and challenges associated with each maxim, participants can enhance the clarity, coherence, and effectiveness of their communication, ultimately fostering greater understanding and engagement among participants and viewers alike. The host's role as a moderator is crucial in ensuring that the conversation remains coherent, relevant, and respectful. From the tweets under the episodes that were investigated, the viewers were able to note some of the violations while giving individualized understanding of the violations. Adhering to these maxims could bring back the faith that so many have lost in broadcast media, hence the host need to advocate for them on every talk show.

REFERENCES

1. Akello, W. O., Matinde, R., & Oluoch, S. (2021). Violation of cooperative principles among Facebookers in a Kenyan political discourse. *Research Journal in African Languages*.
2. Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics,3, Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). Brill. Academic Press.
3. Helmie, J. Lestary, N.G (2019). An analysis of flouting maxims in conversation speaking of the main character in the movie home alone 2 “lost in New York” by John Hughes. *Journal of English Pedology*, 7 (01), 1-11. <https://jurnal.unsur.ac.id/jeopallt>
4. Hutchby, I. (2006). *Media talk: Conversational analysis and the study of broadcasting*. Glasgow: Open University Press
5. Irawan, A., K. I., Beratha, N. L. S., & Sukarini, N. W. (2019). Reasons for flouting maxim in talk show. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 25(2), 158-165
6. Izza, A. F., Mujiyanto, J., & Yuliasri, I. (2019). The comparison of conversational structures between ZachSang and The Radio 1 Breakfast Shows. *English Education Journal*, 9(3), 421-427.
7. Laila, N.A. (2020). Cooperative principles in the 2019 Indonesian presidential debate: Grice's Maxims Analysis. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 4(1), 14–22. doi: 10.14744/alrj.2019.85057
8. Mayora, J. (2010). An analysis of Implicatures in interviews in the Kenyan print media (unpublished master's thesis) University of Nairobi, Kenya.
9. Rahmi, S.S, Refnaldi, &, Wahyuni, D. (2018). The violation of conversational maxims found in political conversation at Rosi Talk show. *E-Journal of English Language and Literature* 7 (1), 177-183. <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jell>
10. Rui, K. & Ting, S. (2014). An analysis of conversation structure in Ellen Show. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 9(2), 37-42. DOI: 10.3968/5577

11. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
12. You-Tube Link: <https://youtu.be/vOPD-UPnAXc?si=qfFBj-5KHEU69nbm>.
13. You Tube link: <https://youtu.be/VRoVchY4KgU?si=LxCugYqAZ7HSau3a>.