Sapientia Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Development Studies (SGOJAHDS), Vol.3 No.4 December, 2020; p.g. 95 – 108; ISSN: 2695-2319 (Print); ISSN: 2695-2327 (Online)

CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN POLITICAL INTERVIEWS SELECTED FROM TWO NIGERIAN NEWSPAPERS (*VANGUARD* AND *PUNCH*)

BRIDGET NGOZI MADU
Department of English
Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Nigeria.

&
FAVOUR NKEM OKPALA
Department of English
Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Nigeria.
Email: madubridget@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigated conversational implicature in political interviews in two selected Nigerian newspapers (The Punch and the Vanguard). The interviews were analysed using Grice Theory of Cooperative Principle and Goffman Face Theory. Grice suggested four conversational maxims (maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner). Conversational implicature is the use of converstational maxims to imply meaning during conversation; and cooperative principle is the cooperation between speakers in using the maxims. Findings show that politicians did not adhere to the conversational maxims; they responded to questions employing different forms of linguistic strategies, which include flouting, violation, infringement, circumlocution, hedging, equivocation, bridging, and word play. The non-observance of the maxims by the politicians were meant to persuade and convince the viewers and gain social and political credibility, achieving politeness, suppressing and avoiding any face-threatening situations, as well as building the speakers positive image and that of their parties. The researchers therefore recommend that interviewers should try to establish and create a casual, relaxing, and non-threatening environment for politicians during interviews. They should maintain a neutral ground and be objective when interviewing politicians; since getting desired information from the politicians depends a lot on the preparation, organization, and composure of the interviewer.

Keywords: Conversational Implicature, Political Interviews, Linguistic Strategies, Newspapers, Nigeria.

Introduction

Background of the study

Language is a human system of communication; it is a conventional symbol, spoken or written by which human beings as members of speech community communicate. It is the general channel for conveying the common facts and feelings of day-to-day life. It is a means of thought or concept which offers obvious and vivid meaning of human expression for the aim of human interaction in any speech community; if there should certainly be interaction, language must be in use. It is conceptualized that language and politics are linked (Baym, 2007).

Politics and language interact and are in the end based mostly upon one another. Language, consequently, is viewed as the means for communicating ideas, projects, programs, but not exclusively that. It is also a fighting means, to persuade, to make the other believe or not, to promise, to tell the truth, or to tell lies. Language is the means by which politics or political discourse and ideas are shared. Politicians all over the world embellish their very own language in a particular way to offer extra impact and force to their message in order to accomplish their goal of earning more votes (Baym, 2007).

In political interview, the candidate is asked about his or her policy stances, and is then compelled by the interviewer to defend all those positions in the face of opposition (Baym, 2007). Deluca and Peeples (2002) argue that televised political discourse - as seen in political interviews - does not indicate rational debate, but preferably, emphasizes image, emotion, and style. Political language is utilized quite purposely and intentionally either to praise or blame. It can be creative, constructive or destructive, may likely be because it is the weapon through which one attacks the opponents or defends oneself from the opponents, it may be used positively or negatively. It is obvious that political discourse is about being manipulative and hedgy, providing less information regarding the truth of things.

A politician may in fact hide himself behind these skills so as not to connect himself to any kind of commitment. Based on Wodak (2007), different pragmatic devices such as insinuation, allusions, word play, presuppositions and implicatures may be assessed in their diverse functions in political discourse.

An implicature is something that one means, implies, or suggests different from what that person is saying. Implicatures can be part of sentence meaning. According to Yule (1996) implicature is an additional conveyed meaning. It is something more than just what the words mean. Conversational implicatures are briefly described as propositions or assumptions not encoded. Politicians use implicatures, probably because they choose to be implied, totally or incompletely in what is truly said, in their spoken messages and the manner they are likely to express them to the audience. In political interviews, language is seen as a strong device for interaction as it contains several shades of meaning.

Some politicians may manipulate with their choice of words in order to advance certain leadership style with the intention of attracting massive support. Politicians in political interviews may fail to realize the cooperative principles (guidelines); they may communicate one thing while saying another. In other words, their utterances may implicate different speech act than the surface structures. Consequent upon this, the audience would be left to grapple between what is said and what is intended actually. This is the reason for this study: Investigating the meanings that are implicit in language of politicians during an interview situation, as published in two selected Nigerian newspapers.

Aim and objectives of the Study

The study made use of Grice (1975) four maxims of conversation and Goffman (1967) Face Theory to study the conversation in selected newspaper political interviews in order to;

a. Observe different linguistic strategies adopted by politicians which flout the conversational principle known as maxims;

b. Show how the violation of this cooperative principle in political interviews yield conversational implicatures;
c. Examine the pragmatic concepts and how they convey and infer conversational implicatures.

Theoretical Framework

This study adopted two theories: Gricean Theory of Conversational Implicature and Goffman Face Theory.

Gricean Theory of Conversational Implicature: Grice (1975) coined the term 'Implicature' in the series of William James Lectures he delivered at Harvard University in 1969. These lectures were partly published in 1975, entitled as "Logic and Conversation." The basic purpose behind devising the concept of implicature was to explain how speakers mean more than what they actually say in a conversational exchange. The theory of conversational implicatures by Grice (1975), observes that in conversations *what is meant* often goes beyond *what is said* and that this additional meaning is inferred and predictable.

Goffman Face Theory: The concept of 'face' in the study of linguistic interaction derives from the work of Goffman (1967), who observed that face had to do with the 'positive social value' that we like to maintain in social interactions. During any one encounter, the interactants will each have a certain face and will produce utterances that take into consideration each other's face. Linguistic studies of face focus on the way in which we use language to acknowledge the fact that people have face-needs, Goffman wrote about face in conjunction with how people interact in daily life. He claims that everyone is concerned, to some extent, with how others perceive them. We act socially, striving to maintain the identity we create for others to see. This identity, or public self-image, is what we project when we interact socially. To lose face is to publicly suffer a diminished self-image. Maintaining face is accomplished by taking a line while interacting socially. There are two types of face needs - positive face needs and negative face needs. Brown and Levinson (1987) suggested that there are two distinct types of face: 'positive' and 'negative'. Our positive face reflects our desire to be accepted and liked by others, while our negative face reflects our wish to have the freedom to do what we want and to have independence. Positive face needs to look good, be likeable (culturally derived norms to be a desirable human being); negative face needs to be free, have an open schedule, freedom from imposition by others.

A face-threatening act (FTA) is an act which challenges the face wants of an interlocutor. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), Face-threatening Acts may threaten either the speaker's face or the hearer's face, and they may threaten either positive face or negative face. It is an act that infringe on the hearers need to maintain his or her self esteem and be respected. In political interview, the face factor is usually challenged by politicians; although political interview is usually between two people or two groups. The interview is presumed to be watched or listened to by millions of people. As a result of this, the politicians must save and defend three categories of face; their own personal face, the face of the party which they represent, as well as the face of their supporters. In view of this, politicians in their use of language give rise to conversational implicature.

Literature review

Li (2008) in the perspective of performance examines how politicians in political interviews rely on linguistic strategies to grapple with the conflict between being uncooperative and being polite as used by spokesperson for China's Foreign Ministry, concerning North Korea nuclear problems. The spokesperson did not just answer the questions as commonly expected, but rather flout frequently by using hedges to avoid a precise expression of his opinion and attitude, thereby protecting China's face in the future. These non-observances were intended to influence the viewers and gain social and political integrity, achieving politeness, imposing and suppressing/avoiding any face-threatening, and building the speakers positive images and the images of their parties. Kamalu and Agangan (2011) evaluated the speech by President Goodluck Jonathan's announcement of his candidacy for his party's presidential primaries. The authors observed that rhetorical and metaphorical devices were used by politicians. He also discovered there were conscious deployments of diverse rhetorical strategies by the President to state an alternative ideology for the nation of Nigeria. Sandova (2010) analyzed the speaker's involvement in political interviews. She analyzed the linguistic means, which is used to provide a higher level of involvement in political interviews. She explains although the genre of political interview as a formal discourse is seen to have a low included, detached method, politicians apply linguistic means for them to display taking part with their propositions for the purpose of convincing and persuading the audience. Her study revealed that politicians try to make use of phrases like "I think" and "I mean" that denote the subjectivity of the politicians and increase the degree of their participation in the interview. Politicians, she said, often claim humility and service to the people as their motive for wanting power in order to justify the confidence of the populace as well as portraying themselves as down to earth, having listening ears and worth listening to because of their humility.

It is in furtherance of the above researches that this present research attempts to investigate other features like: The different discourse strategies adopted by politicians which flout the conversational principle known as maxims and how the violation of those cooperative principle in political interviews yield conversational implicature.

Method

Design of the Study

This research is solely based on written materials, it is a library work in which the materials used are mainly books, periodicals, and the data extracted were selected from political interviews organized by the print media and published in serial editions. This study is designed to investigate the implicature in the use of language by politicians during interviews through the intervening variables like context and face factor which normally affect language use in interview conditions.

Area of Study

The area to be covered in this study is principally the political interviews selected from different newspapers conducted between the years 2017 to 2019 concerning the Nigerian presidential election of March 2019. Although some interviews will be selected from other elections between these years but the focus is principally on 2019 election. This was the period of intense political activities, ranging from House of Representatives, governorship, and then to presidential election.

Population of Study

The population of this study comprised of two Nigerian Newspapers that featured political interviews of some politicians between 2017 and 2019. The interviews centered on different levels of elections, but principally focused on presidential election of March 2019. The politicians in the various interviews were representing the various political parties.

Sampling Techniques

This study made use of non-probability sampling technique to select the samples. Considering the large number of the media outfits within the print media in Nigeria, the researchers deliberately selected the political interviews from the following newspapers: Punch newspaper and Vanguard newspaper. The popular newspapers in Anambra State of Nigeria are *Punch, National Light, Sun, Vangard, Guardian,* and *National Outlook*. From these newspapers, *Punch* and *Vanguard* newspapers were selected through simple random sampling (ballot box).

Data Collection

The data for this study was a secondary data which were collected through documentary sources. The data were already available; the interviews were already conducted and documented by some persons, and then published in the newspapers. The data is however considered reliable, suitable and adequate for the purpose of the study, since the source is authentic. The researchers were confident of authenticity of the source, because of the fact that reporters and journalists were presumed to be objective and unbiased in reporting, according to norms guiding the profession. Therefore the researchers selected different interviews from two different newspapers which are of immense value and relevance to provide the desired facts and information for the success of this research.

Data Analysis

The method that was used by the researchers in analyzing the data is Descriptive Method. Descriptive research is aimed at casting light on current issues or problems through a process of data collection that enables them to describe the situation more completely than was possible without employing this method. Using this method, the researchers studied and analyze the data with the purpose of summarizing and organizing them in such a way that they will answer the research questions. This analysis was guided by the two theoretical frameworks as proposed by Grice (1975) and Goffman (1967), namely**:** Grice Theory of Conversational Implicature and Goffman Face Theory. The researchers applied the two frameworks to analyze the textual data. Following research ethical principle of anonymity and confidentiality, the names of both the politicians interviewed and those of the journalists were concealed.

RESULT

Preamble

All together, a total number of sixty two (62) political interviews were found in the newspapers within the period of study. However, only examples of them are presented in the tables below. They are arranged in line with the study objectives. (NB: J=Journalist; P=Politician).

Table 1:
OBJECTIVE 1: To observe different linguistic strategies adopted by politicians which flout the conversational principal known as maxims.

Passages from Newspapers	Examples from interviews	Linguistic strategies	How it flouts the maxims
Vanguard October 20, 2018	J- But he was very close to Buhari, whom you say is a man of integrity. Then he also must be a man of integrity. P. Who is a man of integrity? How did that closeness help the electoral fortunes of Gen. Buhari for the 12 years that he was close to him?	Word play	Politicians make use of communicative strategies through the use of metaphor, irony, rhetorical device allusion, or repetitions to achieve certain effects. They use this communication strategy to lay emphasis, exaggerate an idea or some information. Here the politician made use of rhetorical question to disagree with the journalist for saying that the man is a man of integrity. The response may be relevant to the matter on ground but it lacks the maxims of manner, quantity and quality.
Punch September 22,2018	J- You talked so glowingly about your plans to sell the candidacy of Mr. President in your part of the country. There was an appointment made by the President recently for the position of the Director-General of the Department of State Services. Do you think the people of the South-South are happy about it? P- If you remember, in 2015, we started with just one senator and today, by the special grace of God and the democratic will of our people, we have seven senators from the South-South geopolitical zone in the APC. It is a phenomenal growth; it goes to show you that the people of the South-South are gravitating towards Mr. President and the APC. I can assure you that in 2019, the results will show you clearly that the people of the South-South have identified with the APC.	Equivocation	This is adopted when the speaker wishes to avoid a direct answer to a question but is unwilling to resort to telling a lie, he is in a state of dilemma under the current circumstance. If he says "Yes" that the people are happy, he may not be speaking the mind of about 90% of his people, thus creating an air of irresponsibility and disloyalty to his people and if he says "No" that may affect the re-election campaign and the chances of APC come 2019 election. He has violated the maxims of quality and quantity which says you must say what the truth is and must not say more or less than expected.
Punch September 22,2018	J- There were reports from local and international observers that while the first round of voting during the Osun governorship election went well, the supplementary election was everything but transparent. It was learnt that your party was involved in	Hedging	Speakers use this strategy to soften what is said. Hedges are an important part of polite conversation. They make what is said less direct. So that statements don't seem to rely simply on personal opinion. The politician avoided personal involvement which may likely incur some undesired public feedback like argument which may lead to violence.

	vote-buying and intimidation of voters. How do you respond considering that your party claims to have integrity? P- First, I wasn't in Osun during the elections and I can't vote in Osun, but from what I read, international observers commended the conduct of the supplementary elections. I read what two groups of international observers who commended the process said, describing the elections as free and fair		
October 20,2018	J- Those ones are specifically excluded from service. What you are saying is not in the law. P- What is in the law? I said I do not want to argue on the points now.	Evasion	Politicians during political interviews make use of this strategy in order to avoid answering questions directly, like when they have no other option than to react verbally to a face threatening issues, he is not willing to answer the question and thereby failed to observe the maxims of quality, quantity and manner.

Table 2:

OBJECTIVES 2: To show how the violation of these cooperative principles in political interviews yield conversational implicatures.

Passages from Newspapers	Examples from interviews	Violation of cooperative principle (cooperation between speakers in using the maxims)	Conversational implicature
Punch 19 January 2019	J- Isn't the complaint by some soldiers that they don't have weapons evidence that funds are also being diverted under this government? P- No. Why? J- But all this was in the public domain when the promises were being made. P- Who said we were aware?	Flouting of maxims of quantity and manner.	When a politician in interview situation blatantly breaks a maxim in order to make or compel the hearers to seek the implied or the deep meaning of the utterance. The responses above violate Grice cooperative principle, the politician by his reply violates the maxims of quantity which says you must make your contribution as informative as possible and the maxims of manner which says you must be orderly. He leaves the hearer with no option than to imply that funds are also being diverted under the government
Punch 22 September, 2018	J- The opposition Peoples Democratic Party however said your party set the cost of the forms for those aspiring for the office of President so high to give undue advantage to President Muhammadu Buhari. How do you respond? P- My response is this – I'm sure that anybody who cannot afford a nomination form of N45m does not have the capacity to run for a nationwide election… Anybody who doesn't have N45m to procure the nomination forms has no business contesting the presidency.	Violation of maxims of quality and manner. (Flouting is unintentional while violation is intentional.)	This claim lacks adequate proof of commonness in the world. The implicature produced by this statement is that they are playing money politics in which the party would not want to risk the chances of the incumbent president being challenged by another aspirant and to give undue advantage to the Muhammadu Buhari. The politician by not giving to the truthfulness of the matter, has violated the maxims of quality and manner.
Punch September 22,2018	J- A recent report by the Economist Magazine and the HSBC, both London based entities, predicted a marginal loss by your party to the opposition PDP in 2019. Doesn't this prediction worry you? P- I also read the submission of a very influential American institution some years ago.	Opting out of maxims	Converser opts out in the talk exchange when he or she unwillingly shows refusal to observe the conversational maxims accordingly. The politician here seems not to want to answer the question. He opts out of the maxim of quality probably to preserve or save the face of his party.

	They told us that Nigeria was going to disintegrate in 2015; I also read that. You see the Economist and the other institution are not part of the Nigerian nation. Go and ask the man in Bakassi and the man in Borno and the man in Sokoto, please leave the men in London, they do not know us and they will never know us.		

Table 3:
OBJECTIVE 3: To Examine the pragmatic concepts and how they convey and infer conversational implicatures.

Passage from Newspaper	Example from interviews	Pragmatic concepts	Conversational implicature
Punch July 21,2018	J- But it is illegal and criminal to pay people for their votes. P- Yes, it is criminal but the reality of the situation is this – a man has needs for food and has a permanent voter card and someone says you can sell your vote for N5,000. Because of Fayose's desire to remain in power, he started distributing his own. So, should the other set of politicians now wait and allow him to buy up all the electorate and win the election on that basis?	Context: When analyzing a conversation, the discourse analyst has to take account of the context in which a piece of discourse occurs, and in order to interpret these elements in a piece of discourse, it is necessary to know (at least) who the speaker and hearer are, the time and place of the production of the discourse. and the relationship between the speaker and the utterance. No conversational contribution at all can be understood properly unless it is situated within the environment in which it was meant to be understood	If the component terms of the context of the utterance would be considered, the interpretation of the response would be that it is talking the 2018 governorship election of Ekiti State, and that the politician is in the opposition party who were involved in vote buying.
Punch April 15.2018	J- How will you rate President Buhari's chances in 2019 in view of the insecurity situation, unemployment or the perceived poor management of the economy?	Face: Linguistic studies of face focus on the way in which we use language to acknowledge the fact	From the linguistic environment provided by the reply by the politician, He acknowledges that there is the problem of unemployment, but he refuses to affirm that it may affect the chances of president Buhari in 2019. Since the

	P- There has always been unemployment in Nigeria. Go and look at the statistics. What was the country's poverty rating in 2014? Go and check. Nigeria was rated the third poorest country in the world. Even as the Minister of Sports and Youth Development, I knew that the rate of youth unemployment was about 34 per cent at that time. So, why are we talking as if this government created these problems? Why are we talking as if unemployment started when President Buhari came to power? Unemployment has been one of the biggest issues countries are facing.	that people have face 'needs, Goffman wrote about face in conjunction with how people interact in daily life. He claims that everyone is concerned, to some extent, with how others perceive them.	question is a face threatening one, and there could be negative consequences if he should he speak against the president and by extension his party. He swiftly shifted the blame to the previous government.
Vanguard September 16,2018	J- However, is it true that the President is planning to reverse then Acting President Yemi Osinbajo's sack of the DSS DG, Mallam Lawal Daura? P- I don't talk about speculations and I don't talk about unfounded speculations. So nothing like that happened? You know that I don't speak for myself but that I speak for the President. The President has not communicated anything in that direction to me. So, as far as I am concerned, it is still a speculation.	Presupposition: Presuppositions are the assumptions shared by speaker and hearer, which form the background of their ongoing discourse, that is, the background belief relating to an utterance. A presupposition must be mutually known or assumed by the speaker and addressee for the utterance to be considered appropriate in context. In political interviews, presupposition involves a shared knowledge of the journalist and the politician. The interpretation of a presupposition is context dependent	From this exchange, the journalist assumed that the politician is aware that the then Acting President Yemi Osibanjo sacked the DSS DG, Mallam Lawal Daura and then presumed that the politician may be away that the President is planning to reverse the sack, without having to explain or begin to enquire from the politician, and that again he (the politician) may have some information on the issue (may be because of his position in his party or in the government, the response of the politician is in affirmation to the presupposition of the journalist which shows that they have background knowledge of the matter of discourse.

Discussion

The present work has investigated the Conversational implicature in political interviews; it aimed at appraising the observance of Gricean maxims by politicians during interview. The

study adopted Grice (1975) cooperative principle in finding out politicians' observance of the Gricean maxims, thereby producing conversational implicatures. Some political interviews were selected from Punch and Vanguard newspaper. The interviews were analyzed using Grice theory of cooperative principle and Goffman Face Theory (1967). Some findings were made from this study:

Firstly, the linguistic strategies adopted by politicians are: wordplay, hedges, interruption, equivocation, circumlocution, bridging and evasion. They used the strategies to flout or violate the maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, or manner in one way or the other. The indirectness and the vagueness of their speeches were used to soften or mitigate hazards inherent in their political interviews. These non-observances were meant to persuade the viewers and gain social and political credibility, achieving politeness, imposing and suppressing/avoid any face-threatening, and building the speakers positive images and that of their parties (see also Sandova, 2010).

Secondly, the violation of the cooperative principles through the use these linguistic strategies in political interviews yielded conversational implicature. The non-observance of the maxims can assume the form of – flouting, violation, infringement, opting out and suspending. Non observance of the maxims happens most frequently in situations when the information necessary to answer the question is not available or even if available cannot be provided by the politician under the current circumstances in the interview. The reason may be that he wants to avoid face threat to himself, to his party or to the people he represents.

Thirdly, there were some concepts that play vital roles in interpreting, conveying and inferring conversational implicature. Context: This is the linguistic and non linguistic environments of an utterance. When analyzing a conversation, the discourse analyst has to take account of the context in which a piece of discourse occurs. In order to interpret these elements in a piece of discourse, it is necessary to know (at least) who the speaker and hearer are, the time and place of the production of the discourse and the relationship between the speaker and the utterance. No conversational contribution at all can be understood properly unless it is situated within the environment in which it was meant to be understood. Context is the conditions in which something exists or occurs. Linguistically, this is the part of a discourse that surrounds a language unit and helps to determine its interpretation. People will know how to interpret what someone says from the situation they are in. Presuppositions: These are the assumptions shared by speaker and hearer, which form the background of their ongoing discourse, that is, the background belief relating to an utterance. A presupposition must be mutually known or assumed by the speaker and addressee for the utterance to be considered appropriate in context. It will generally remain a necessary assumption whether the utterance is placed in the form of an assertion, denial, or question. Presuppositions include all sorts of assumptions that the speaker makes in uttering a sentence. For example, it is also a presupposition of the utterance that when the language used in the communication at that point is English language, the hearer or hearers understand English. In the utterances, everyone presuppose certain knowledge or understanding whenever we try to communicate with someone. To say that an assumption is wrong or right depends on the position and belief of the interlocutors. In political interviews, presupposition involves a shared knowledge of the journalist and the politician. The interpretation of a presupposition is context dependent.

Face: Face is the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. It is an image self delineated in terms of approved social attributes. The positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. To lose face is to publicly suffer a diminished self-image. Maintaining face is accomplished by taking a line while interacting socially (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In political interview, the face factor is usually challenged by politicians, though political interview is usually between two people or two groups. The interview is presumed to be watched or listen to by millions of people. As a result of this, the politicians must save and defend three categories of face: their own personal face, the face of the party which they represent, as well as the face of their supporters. Context, presupposition and face, all form the basis by which one can interpret meanings in interactions when they correlate with each other in function. So the three pragmatic concepts were adequate for conveying and inferring conversational implicatures in political interviews.

Conclusion

It is apparent that political discourse revolves around being manipulative and hedgy, giving less information about the truth of things. Therefore, it is well enough to say that political language is the tricky and twisted use of language in achieving the politician's goals and interests. In political interviews, language is perceived as a strong device for interaction as it carries different shades of meaning. Politicians manipulate with their choice of words in order to advance certain leadership style with the intention of attracting massive support. Politicians in political interviews fail to observe the cooperative maxims, they communicate one thing while saying another, in order words, their utterances implicate different speech act than the surface structures. Consequent upon this, the audience is left to grapple between what is said and what is meant actually.

The language of political campaign embodied in propaganda and rhetoric, is persuasive. Politicians adopt these linguistic devices to cajole the electorate to vote for them and their parties by presenting themselves as the only capable persons for the job. Politicians use language in a unique way during political interviews to give extra effect and force to their message. This is aimed at achieving their main objectives of discrediting their opponents and winning more votes. This paper reveals that politicians spare nothing in trying to outsmart their opponents, even if it means resorting to the use of utterances that could be defamatory, abusive and sometimes vulgar. Through the use of some linguistic strategies which flout the maxims of cooperation, they communicate information by means of implicature that is, allowing the audience or the readers to give various interpretations to the meanings and to interpret an utterance. There is need to consider context in which the utterance is made and face factor which also go a long way in the interpretation of an utterance made. This process of interpreting an utterance accounts for the complexity of political interviews over other ordinary daily conversations. Conversational implicature does not occur just to make conversation and meaning difficult, but because politicians strategically use language in a certain way to influence a person, or group of persons, position and attitude towards a subject. Again, In political interview, the face factor is usually challenged by politicians, though political interview is usually between two people or two groups. The interview is presumed to be watched or listen to by millions of people. As a result of this, the politicians save and defend three categories of face; their own personal face, the face of the party which they

represent as well as the face of their supporters. In view of this, politicians in their use of language give rise to conversational implicature.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and discussions, the researchers therefore recommend that:

(a) The interviewers/journalists and by extension, the media house should help matters by trying to establish and create a casual, relaxed and non-threatening environment for the politicians during interviews. They must maintain a neutral ground and be more objective when trying to enquire from the politicians because a good journalist while interviewing public figures like politician need to maintain the good atmosphere monitoring everything that is said. Whatever result that comes out of the process depends on the preparation, organization, composure of the journalist. The role of a journalist is not confined to merely reporting the news and events. He is also responsible for interpreting and commenting on the news and events. They must do their job as required by code of conduct guiding their profession.

(b) They should not put words into the mouth of the politicians; that is, they should shed more light than is shed by the politicians or force them to say more than they intends to.

(c) The journalist should avoid luring the politicians into making damaging statement that will likely create some consequences because, the mass media has the power to mar or make a person or a nation as millions of people depend on them to gain information, both locally and internationally. Such an attitude may make the politicians use whatever opportunity they have to use the media promote themselves or demote and damage the face of their opponent or the opposition party.

(d) The media must consider public welfare, the unity of the nation and the impact their report will make on the public.

(e) The public or the audience are encouraged to appreciate conversational implicature in political interviews by understanding the pragmatic concepts such as context, presupposition and face as they help one in interpretation of an utterance.

(f) More studies need to be carried out in the area of conversational implicature in political interviews, especially in Nigeria.

References

Baym, G. (2007). Crafting new communicative models in the televisual sphere: Political interviews on The Daily Show. *The Communication Review*, 10(2), 93–115.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals of language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DeLuca, K. M., & Peeples, J. (2002). From public sphere to public screen: Democracy, activism, and the violence of Seattle. *Critical Studies in Media Communication,* 19, 125–151.

Goffman, E. (1967). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Grice, P .*'Logic and Conversation'*. In P.Cole and J. Morgan (1975) *Syntax and Semantics,* New York, Academic Press.

Kamalu, I. & Agangan, R. (2011). *A critical discourse analysis of Goodluck Jonathan''s declaration of interest in the PDP Presidential Primaries*. Available: http://www.language-and-society.org/journal/1-1/2_kamalu_agangan.pdf. Accessed: 20/4/2020.

Li, S. (2008). A performative perspective of flouting and politeness in political interview. *Journal of Theoretical Linguistics.* 5 (2), 2-8.

Sandová, J. k. (2010). *Speaker's involvement in political interviews*. Unpublished MA thesis, Masarykova University, Brno, Czech Republic.

Wodak, R. (2007). *Pragmatics and critical discourse analysis: A cross-disciplinary inquiry.* London: M. Dascal.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. London: Oxford University Press.