

GRICEAN PRAGMATICS IN BBC DISCOURSE ON THE ISRAEL-PALESTINE CONFLICT

Salman Khan¹, Muhammad Mustafa², Saira Banu³

¹PhD Scholar, Faculty of Arts & Humanities, Department of English, University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan.

¹salmankhan@gmail.com

Keywords

Grice's Maxims, Pragmatics, Media Discourse, Israel-Palestine Conflict, BBC, Qualitative Analysis

Article History

Received: 10 October 2025

Accepted: 15 December 2025

Published: 31 December 2025

Copyright @Author

Corresponding Author: *

Salman Khan

Abstract

This study analyzes the application of Grice's Cooperative Principles in two BBC video discussions on the Israel-Palestine conflict. Using a qualitative exploratory research design, it examines how participants adhered to or violated the maxims of Quality, Quantity, Relation, and Manner. Data were collected from secondary sources through purposive sampling. The findings indicate that while speakers generally complied with Grice's maxims, the maxim of Quality was violated twice and flouted once, as some responses lacked factual accuracy. In contrast, the maxims of Quantity, Relation, and Manner were consistently observed, resulting in informative, relevant, and clear discourse. These findings contribute to media discourse analysis by illustrating how pragmatic strategies shape mediated narratives. The study also highlights the need for further research on real-time media discourse surrounding the Israel-Palestine conflict to enable audiences to critically evaluate news framing.

INTRODUCTION

The Israel-Palestine conflict has been in limelight for many years. The new development made it more prominent in the eyes of the world. This issue has also got many implications for the world. Bearing in mind the implication of this conflict for many international aspects and human rights, it has been under wide media coverage for the past couple of years. It has also given rise to multiple opinions by people and the propagation of narratives in favour and against this conflict. There are many platforms on which this discussion is going on, and the British Broadcasting Channel (BBC), is one of them. But the language used in the discussions by different speakers on the BBC regarding this conflict has not been that much under the eyes of researchers. So, there is a need to delve deeply and analyse the ways language use in the discussions on this media platform influences people's opinions and shape their narratives.

This study aims to analyse the two discussion videos of the British Broadcasting Channel (BBC), regarding this very conflict to see the ways Grice's Cooperative Principles are followed, flouted or breached by the participants to shape and communicate their narratives on this conflict. By analyzing the use of Grice's Cooperative Principles, this study aims to uncover different ways in which language is employed by the participants, in order to develop arguments and shape the credibility in the context of this sensitive issue. Moreover, by looking into these BBC's discussion videos regarding the Israel-Palestine conflict, the motive of the research study is to explore many ways in which language can be used by different parties to build understandings and develop different perspectives. By deeply analyzing different strategies used in the discussions regarding this conflict, this study aims to contribute to the deeper understanding of the ways language is

used in multiple online discussions involving different political rifts, and its role in influencing and shaping the views of people regarding the Israel-Palestine conflict.

1.1. Statement of the Problem

In the current corpus of research studies, there is a thorough lack of studies regarding the recent conflict of Israel and Palestine. This gap has caused obstruction in the deeper understanding of this very conflict by people, and the ways different parties are developing different arguments and propagating different narratives regarding this sensitive issue. By keeping this very notion in mind, it is inevitable to close this gap to help people in a better understanding of this issue. So, this research study aims to see the ways participants have adhered to, flouted or breached Grice's Cooperative Principles in developing different narratives regarding the Israel-Palestine conflict.

1.2. Research Objectives

The current study aims:

- 1) To identify the maxims that are followed and violated by the speakers in the discussion videos at BBC, regarding Israel and Palestine conflict
- 2) To analyse the ways in which the participants in the discussion videos use language, to adhere to or deviate from Grice's Cooperative Principles to promulgate their narratives

1.3. Research Questions

This study aims at answering the following questions:

1. What are the maxims that are followed and violated by the participants in the discussion videos at BBC, regarding Israel and Palestine conflict?
2. How do the speakers in the selected videos use language to adhere to, flout or deviate from the Grice's Cooperative Principles to propagate their point of views?

1.4. Significance of Study

This study holds significant importance, as in the current literature, there is a thorough lack of studies on this very current issue of Israel and Palestine. It is going to shed light on the ways participants in the discussions follow, flout or breach Cooperative

Principles on the BBC's platform to influence and shape public opinions and propagate power narratives. After flipping through this research, people would be able to better understand the ways participants at discussion forums like BBC make use of language in the context of political and international conflicts having different implications for the world.

1.5. Delimitation

This research study only focuses on the analysis of the BBC's discussion videos regarding Israel-Palestine conflict by considering the Grice's Cooperative Principles. Moreover, instead of exploring these videos comprehensively in multiple directions, the study only aims to analyse the adherence to, flouting and violation of Grice's Cooperative Principles by the speakers to propagate their narratives. Additionally, the research primarily focuses on the text of the videos not semiotic features.

However, there is a lot of space for other researchers to analyse these videos in terms of critical discourse analysis and multimodel analysis, to see the ways language and paralinguistic aspects can be used to construct power relations and indoctrinate the narratives of the privileged groups and people.

2. Review of the Existing Literature

Some research works are available through which analysis of the very topic has been carried out by different researchers from different perspectives. The literature review section of this research study will focus on the existing research pertaining to the topic being discussed, in addition to the research studies that have employed the theoretical lens being used in this study.

To begin with, Hamdan and Rababah (2014) conducted a contrastive critical discourse analysis of Netanyahu and Abbas's speeches regarding the Israel-Gaza war to the United Nation's assembly. The researchers explored the concept of "self" and "other" in that context. By using Van Dijk "Ideological square theory," the research tried to unearth the dichotomy between the group polarization of 'us' and 'them.' Their research found out that both the parties presented altogether

different narratives and agenda on the same conflict. They also presented the concept of "self" as strong and demonstrated "other" as the threat.

Another important study was conducted by Raza, Hakimi and Malik (2023). In this research study, the researchers talked about Israel-Palestine conflict and social media by carrying out critical discourse analysis of the opinion article about Haaretz front page. The researchers used Halliday's SFG based transitivity analysis, in addition to critical ideological analysis. This study stressed the ways social media users use online platforms to portray their solidarity and make the world aware of humanitarian crisis in Palestine. The research study found that different syntactic structures and discursive strategies play an important role in the portrayal of identities and ideologies. Besides, these strategies are very crucial in propagating the power abuse and hegemonic structures of socio-political realities. The research emphasized the role of online platforms like social media, in shaping public opinions and promoting political policies on the global issues.

Moreover, Loewenthal, Miaari and Abraham (2022) conducted research on the ways civilian attitudes respond to the state's violence. They carried out this study by analyzing the efficacy of state policies regarding the collective punishment to eradicate civilians support for the miscreants. The research study considered the Palestinian public opinion data, surveys and fatalities data to explore the interplay between the exposure of Palestinians to the Israeli policies and their support for the militant factions. The researchers analyzed the difference in public opinions, in the gap between conflict in Gaza strip and West Bank during the time frame of intense punishment, and the gap in the ease of punishment in both the areas. They concluded that the deaths of Palestinians were directly associated to their direct support for militants' factions. The researchers also found that the Israeli security policies had little substantial long-lasting impact on the Palestinians support for militant factions.

Additionally, another important study was carried out by Junglu and Zakareveciute (2019) under the theme of multimodal frame analysis of the Israel-Gaza conflict in 2014. They carried out the quantitative content analysis of the online coverage

of Israel-Gaza conflict to show the importance of images in conveying certain narratives and ideologies. The sample coded for this research study was based on 219 pictures and 150 texts. Their research study suggested that the textual and visual frames were interrelated in conveying thematic patterns. They found that during this whole conflict, the images played role in intensifying the framing strategy, while the textual modes almost retained their original ways of framing any conflict or event. Textual coverage of this conflict was more inclined towards the de-escalation efforts, but the images remained in graphics state.

Furthermore, Ayer et.al. (2017) conducted research targeting the psychological aspects of Israel-Palestine conflict. The researchers conducted systematic review to synthesize research on the psychological impacts of this very conflict. Their research study unearthed that the exposure to such type of conflicts not only influence the ways Israelis and Palestinians act, think and feel, but also reshape their behaviour towards different ethnic and religious group. Besides, it also affects their opinions and support towards war and peace. They found that Palestinians were exposed to more psychological consequences because of such conflicts. The research concluded that there is a need for more longitudinal studies to determine the clear psychological impacts on Palestinians and Israelis in the context of conflicts.

Adding to the same literature, a comparative study of the coverage of Israel-Palestine conflict of 2008/09 by Al-Jazeera English and British Broadcasting Channel (BBC), was conducted by Zghoul (2022). The researcher conducted content analysis of different thematic and textual sources of AJE and BBC, while also considering the interviews conducted by the journalists of both the channels, respectively. The findings demonstrated that BBC was more inclined towards the broadcasting of the Israeli narrative including their framing, themes, historical contextualization, protests, world reactions and sources regarding this conflict. While on the other hand, AJE equally broadcast the sources and narratives of both Israel and Palestine. It became evident from the research findings that Israeli assaults and military developments were absent in the BBC's broadcast, but all the key developments

were given equal reporting chances on the AJE. However, the interviews from the journalists showed that there should be objectivity in reporting the factors related to the conflict, but the findings also brought forth that those journalists were having different points of views regarding the interpretation of the developments. Overall, the research concluded that BBC undermined the Palestinian narrative, while AJE objectively reported all the events by staying in compliance with moral grounds in coverage.

Besides, Alshqar (2024) carried out research on the role of language in framing the Israeli-Palestine conflict on Twitter, by taking into consideration May 2021, Gaza violence. Alshqar's study took into account the American media outlets CNN, Fox News, and the British media outlets BBC and the Guardian, to analyse the nuance media portrayal of the violence in Gaza in May, 2021. The research incorporated qualitative methodology, in addition to Critical Discourse Analysis, with its pivotal tools Argumentation and The Discourse Historical Approach (DAH), to unmask the power dynamics in the 176 tweets taken for this study. His research primarily focused on the ways ideologies could influence the Twitter narratives regarding this very conflict. In addition, the research study analysed the linguistic choices used by all these channels to see the ways they influence media discourses. The research concluded that there was a great divergence in the reporting of the conflict by CNN and Fox News, when they were juxtaposed with BBC and the Guardian. It means that American media was more inclined towards the Israeli narrative. It also concluded that there were disparities in the media coverage of both the countries.

Last but not least, Manor and Crilley (2018) carried out research study on the visual framing of Israeli-Palestine conflict of 2014, on Twitter by the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs (IMFA). They said that social media serves as one of the fundamental means for framing ideologies and changing people's perceptions, and it becomes more beneficial in the times of war. The researchers took 795 tweets by the IMFA, during the conflict for their analysis. They observed that 14 different linguistic frames were

used by the IMFA to legitimize their policies in the eyes of their people, and to influence their perceptions regarding this conflict. Additionally, they also utilized images to make their policies resonating and credible. The research study also highlighted the function of visual images in augmenting certain frames. They concluded that images played part in orchestrating shared identity in the context of Israel-Gaza conflict.

2.1. Studies on the Theoretical Framework

The theoretical lens that is employed in the current research study has been used by many researchers to analyse the language used to propagate power dynamics and narratives in the media discussions. To start with, Jorfi and Dowlatabadi (2015) carried out the analysis of Grice's Cooperative principles in Friends, which is an American TV series. The research study focused on the instances where flouting and violation of Grice's maxims occurred in the series. The researchers took different excerpts of this TV series for their analysis in the given research study. Their research study demonstrated that the maxim of relevance was the most violated one, while the maxim of quality was flouted the most.

Finally, Xue and Hei, (2017) conducted research which was based on the analysis of Grice's maxims in the humour by taking a Chinese sitcom Home with kids, as a case study. The main purpose of this research was to analyse the observance and flouting of the maxims. They used flouting, opting out, infringing, suspending and violations, as framework for this research study. The study aimed to analyse whether non-compliance of the maxims contributes to the humorous effect in the series or not. The study had considered 96 episodes of the series to observe a maxim that plays an important role in creating a humorous effect. The researchers concluded that flouting and violating were used by the characters to create humorous effects.

In conclusion, from the above comprehensive citation of past research, it can be deduced that a lot of space is available to analyse the language use in the media discussions regarding this recent conflict between Israel and Palestine, to better understand the tactics employed by the media platforms

particularly BBC, to shape and influence the perceptions and narratives of people.

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Research Design

The current research study is qualitative-exploratory in nature. The two selected videos serve as the main source of data for this study. The research executes a close observation of the videos, in addition to the transcripts to identify the alignment, violation or flouting of the Grice's Cooperative Principles by the participants. The main motive of the research study is to provide insights into the ways language can be employed to influence or develop arguments and their credibility.

3.2. Methods of Data Collection

3.2.1. Sample

The purposive sampling technique has been employed by the researcher to carry out this study. As a sample for this study, the researcher has selected two videos regarding the Israel-Palestine conflict taken from YouTube channel which is operated by the British Broadcasting Channel (BBC).

3.2.2. Tools and Techniques for Data Collection

The researcher has employed a secondary data collection tool to collect the data. The only source of data collection for the researcher is the YouTube channel operated by the British Broadcasting Channel (BBC). The researcher has utilized the data gathered from this source to analyse it and answer the research questions to reach a logical conclusion.

3.3. Theoretical Framework

The current research study has utilised Grice's Cooperative Principles to reach the research objectives. Paul Grice (1989) introduced a set of principles which should be followed by people in order to carry out any conversation. These principles are called Cooperative Principles or Grice's maxims. Cooperative Principles can be defined as, "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" (Grice, 1975: p. 48). The

Cooperative Principles are divided into four different super sections which are as under:

- 1) Maxim of Quality (Make your contribution true, do not say anything for which you lack evidence, and do not say the thing which you believe is not true).
- 2) Maxim of Quantity (Make your contribution as informative as required and do not make your contribution more informative than required).
- 3) Maxim of Relation (Be relevant).
- 4) Maxim of Manner (Be clear, avoid ambiguity, be brief and avoid obscurity of expressions).

Moreover, Grice (1975) also refers to the concept of flouting of maxims. This is a condition when a speaker deliberately violates a maxim to create an implicature.

This research study will consider the above devised framework, to analyse the data taken for this study and to reach the objectives outlined in this research.

3.4. Method of Data Analysis

The given research study has incorporated qualitative-content analysis to analyse the data, as it is completely non-numerical data. It is mainly used to analyse written documents, interviews and other types of textual data. According to Elo and Kyngas (2008), qualitative-content analysis is a research method that is used to draw valid and logical inferences from the given data to provide new insights and help understand the meanings of communication with a specific concern for context, intentions and consequences. It provides a way to explore multiple themes and patterns from the given data, to properly analyse and understand it.

4. Discussion and Analysis

Language is a tool that is not only used for communication, but it is also used to influence public perceptions and to disseminate personal narratives regarding any ongoing conflict. Therefore, it is mandatory to delve deeply and analyse the ways in which language has been utilised to propagate point of views and to shape public perceptions. This research study analyses the two videos taken for the research, which are based on discussions regarding the recent conflict of Israel and Palestine. The study

will first deal with the analysis of Grice's cooperative principles in the first video, subsequently, the analysis of the same concept in the second video broadcast on the British Broadcasting Channel (BBC).

4.1. Analysis of the First Video (Duration: 25.09 Minutes)

The video is with the title "Why are Israel and Gaza at war." Basically, the duration of the video is of twenty-five minutes and nine seconds. The video involves the host and one participant. This video has been investigated by bearing in mind the Cooperative Principles of Paul Grice (1975).

4.1.1. Maxim of Quality

Basically, maxim of quality refers to the idea that a person should be truthful as much as possible and will not provide information that is counterfeit or lacks evidence. In the first video, the examples of the maxim of quality can be traced out. One of the main examples is as under, when the host asked the following question to the participant:

Let us get some analysis on where we're at at this situation, we've been talking a lot about the Rafa Crossing, if you can explain why it's so important and if it is likely that Israel will allow people out. (Host, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>)

When the host asked the participant, he provided the information with precise facts and figures. The answer was also backed up by evidence. The participant talked about the importance of Rafa crossing, and said that it is one of the two crossings, and this one is the crossing between Egypt and Israel. This can be seen from his response, when he says, "Rafa Crossing, which is one of the two Crossings, there's one obviously into Israel, this one is into Egypt" (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube <https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>). So, it can be easily inferred that in this question, the speaker adhered to the maxims of quality by providing the information in response to the question.

Furthermore, in the second question asked by the host to the participant, he again adhered to the maxim of quality by providing the historical context and truthful information about the treaty between Israel and Egypt. Moreover, the speaker also provided information about the role of Egypt in mediating between Hamas and Fatah. He also critically analysed the current situation and deduced that Egypt is unlikely to wage war against Israel. The speaker demonstrated security threats persistent in the region to the travelers who want to cross from Palestine into Egypt. This can be seen in the following statements made by the speaker:

I think you could say it's safe to travel to Egypt, I mean none of the Arab states around Gaza and Israel are likely to get actively involved in a war. Lebanon may be drawn into it by Hezbollah as we've just been saying, but Egypt has had the longest peace treaty back to 1978 with Israel. It is very much controlling the borders around Gaza, and with Hamas, it tried to play a mediating role. It's trying to bring the two factions the two main Palestinian factions Hamas and Fatah, in the occupied West Bank together at various points. (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>)

On the other hand, the speaker can also be seen violating maxim of quality by making general statement about Arab and Muslim world, that protests will erupt there in solidarity with Palestinians without any tangible evidence. He says, "I think that's really too early to bear any throughout you will have as you'll see across the Arab World across the Muslim World, major protests in support of the Palestinians" (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>)

Additionally, when the host asked the participant about the political and military wings of Hamas, which were at war with Israel, after it killed 1400 Israelis and injuring many others. The speaker responded with accurate information in which he clearly demarcated between the political and military wing of Hamas. Moreover, he said that Israel killed the members of Hamas involved in the assault, not its leader. He showcased that military wing of Hamas was very hardcore and not willing to negotiate with

Israel, but the political wing was willing to talk with Israel and reach a truce on two state solution. This can be easily inferred from the given statement of the speaker, "I mean they haven't killed the actual leader of Hamas, they've killed some senior members who they say were directly involved in the assault on Israel." (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>)

Likewise, You have in Gaza essentially a military leadership which is much much more hardcore. You have Muhammad de, he is the leader there, Yahya Sina is the political leader in Gaza and the administrative leader. These are people who have shown no sign of any quarter with Israel and still believe that military solution is the only way to go. They still believe that they can as they obviously try to do in this assault to cause so much pain so much hurt to Israel that Israel will either bow and leave and that's a greatest hope or will be pressured into compromise. (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>)

In addition, the speaker violated maxim of quality when he was asked about the Palestinian State that it is a state or it was never a state. He says that Palestine is not a state and it is not formally recognized by the United Nations. Moreover, the speaker goes on saying that Palestine in the modern age does not exist as a country. However, it did exist earlier under the rule of different empires like British Empire, and Ottoman Empire. Subsequently, in the Arab-Israel war, he says that the Arab tried to snatch the whole area but lost in its aims. But if the past is unearthed, it comes out that Palestine did exist as an independent state, and it was also proved when Palestinians gave asylum to the Jews suffering from the holocaust in Germany. His baseless statements can be seen in the following lines, Palestine as a state, I mean it as an entity in the Middle East. it's existed for a very very long time but it's existed under a whole series of Empires under the Roman empire, under the Ottoman Empire from the 16th century until the first world war, then it was a mandate under Britain up until 1947 when Britain withdrew and, then of course, there was the League of Nations decision to divide what was Palestine into

Israel and into Arab and then there was a war with Arab states trying to take over the whole area. They lost, so there hasn't been a Palestine as a country in modern times, but as a name absolutely. (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube.

<https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>)

Last but not the least, when the speaker was asked to comment on if the ongoing war of Israel is with Hamas or Palestinians, the speaker said that it is a war with Hamas. He also asserted that Israel is allowing people to migrate and trying its best to avoid any damage to the Palestinians. He mentioned about Hamas winning of elections in 2006 and ousting the existing rule of Fatah. They also seized Gaza's territory by force. The speaker's use of the statements justified his claims, and made him adherent to the maxim of quality, as can be seen in the following statements,

It's being described as at war with Hamas that's how Israel describes it, that's how we're describing it essentially, because I mean Hamas controls Gaza, no doubt about that there was an election, but it goes way back to 2006, but they won they then seized the whole of Gaza by force from Fatah and they forced them out in 2007. So there hasn't really been any way of gauging how much the people of Gaza want Hamas to be in control. So, Israel certainly doesn't want to look, as if they are waging war on the Palestinians of Gaza. They want to confine it to Hamas and that's why, Israel is saying that they're doing everything they can to try and protect Palestinians by telling them to leave. So, they can then have a clear run at Hamas. (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube.

<https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>)

However, the speaker completely downplayed the Palestinians perception by using the words, "it as almost a niche distinction," (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War", [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>), which is a clear nullification of the opposition narrative. So, it can be inferred that by saying such words, the speaker breached maxim of quality.

4.1.2. Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity refers to the concept that in a conversation, a person's contribution should be as much as informative and required. It asserts that the contribution of a person should not be more informative than required. It is considered one of the important maxims in the Cooperative Principles given by Paul Grice. With reference to the video, the participants' responses were highly informative and even equipped with background information. This can be observed in the following example, when he was asked, "At this situation, we've be talking a lot about the Rafa Crossing, if you can explain why it's so important and if it is likely that Israel will allow people out" (Host, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War", [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>).

In response to this question, the speaker talked about Rafa crossing and its significance in very much comprehensive detail including this very statement, which is as under,

I mean to a degree we're in a sort of holding pattern, here I mean the big story of course is when and if Israel will launch its offensive from the north down in the south at the Rafa Crossing, which is one of the two Crossings, there's one obviously into Israel, this one is into Egypt, where the anticipation is at the moment, and this morning, we had reports that there was going to be a temporary truce to allow a very we're talking very small number of Palestinian Americans across into Egypt. (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>)

Furthermore, the participant was also seen staying in compliance with the maxim of quantity, when he was asked about the fact that why Israel and Gaza are at war with each other. He explained his stance by considering both the perspectives and said that Israel is not at war with Gaza, but it is at war with Hamas, and Israel is trying to the best of its abilities to avoid any sort of harm to civilians. As he adhered to the maxim of quantity, it can be inferred that this conversation between the host and the speaker is adhering to the Gricean maxim of quantity in this context. The following statement of the speaker can also validate this claim,

So there hasn't really been any way of gauging how much the people of Gaza want Hamas to be in control. So, Israel certainly doesn't want to look as if they are waging war on the Palestinians of Gaza. They want to confine it to Hamas and that's why Israel is saying that they're doing everything they can to try and protect Palestinians by telling them to leave, so they can then have a clear run at Hamas. (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>)

So, considering the previous statements, it can be inferred that this conversation between the host and the speaker is adhering to the Gricean maxim of quantity in this context.

4.1.3. Maxim of Relation

It is one of the four conversational maxims given by Paul Grice. Basically, it is a concept that a participant in conversation shall be as relevant as he can and should omit irrelevant information. According to Grice (1975), "I expect a partner's contribution to be appropriate to immediate needs at each stage of the transaction" (Grice, 1975, 47). It means that the contribution should be relevant to the question that is asked. Moreover, Leech (1983) defined this very concept in a way that an utterance is relevant to the context, if it is contributing to the conversational goals of hearer or speaker (Leech, 1983, 24). In the video, the speaker was also found adhering to the maxim of relation, as his responses were quite relevant to the questions that were asked to him by the host. For example, when the speaker was asked about the status of Palestine as a country, he provided detailed information relevant to the context, along with the historical figures. However, his response was more inclined towards the no existence of any Palestinian state. But, Grice maxims of relation, or even all his maxims do not deal with neutrality. They do not deal with the fact that the speaker should be neutral in the conversation. They only deal with the adherence or violation of the maxims in any communication. In this case, the speaker is relevant to the question and provides comprehensive account to the question. However, he is not neutral in his statements. This can be observed in one of the following statements,

It's not formally a country now. There are some countries around the world you recognize as a State, but it's not been formally recognized by the UN. It has a non-member Observer status at the UN since 2012. We talk about President Abbas, so I mean that gives a sense of a head of a state but it's still very much in embryo and the whole issue of a peace process was to set up a viable Palestinian state that doesn't exist. The difficulty over that was Palestinians never believe that what they were being offered was anything close to what they had lost.....It wasn't that the Fatah and the PLO rejected the idea of a two-state solution, but the idea that Israel should exist, and they weren't satisfied with what with what they were being offered. (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video].

YouTube.

<https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>
On the other hand, when the speaker was asked about the political wing and military wing of Hamas, while focusing particularly on the latter one, again he answered comprehensively while being relevant to the question. This also shows that he is adhering to the maxim of relation in the ongoing conversation in the video regarding the Israel and Gaza conflict. For instance, his response was,

You have in Gaza essentially military leadership which is much more hardcore. You have Muhammad de, he is the leader there, Yahya Sina is the political leader in Gaza, and the administrative leader, and these are people who have shown no sign of any quarter with Israel and still believe that military solution is the only way to go. They still believe that they can as they obviously try to do in this assault to cause so much pain so much hurt to Israel that Israel will either bow and leave, and that's a greatest hope or will be pressured into compromise. (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube.
<https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>)
So, it can be deduced that the speaker in the discussion also adhered to the maxim of relation, as given by Paul Grice (1975).

4.1.4. Maxim of Manner

This is the fourth maxim given under the heading of Cooperative Principles. Basically, it deals with the

idea that participants in a conversation should avoid obscure and ambiguous statements. They should also focus to be brief and orderly in their responses. In the video, the speaker did not breach maxim of manner, as his response to the question, when asked about Hamas, that Israel is at war with it, and it has also killed one of the top brace members of it. Moreover, the host also asked him about the demarcation between the military and political wing of Hamas. In his response, he categorically drew differentiation between both the wings of Hamas, along with their approaches and goals. He described the military wing as the hardcore wing of Hamas, which is not willing to strike any deal unlike the political wing of it. For instance,
I mean they haven't killed the actual leader of Hamas, they've killed some senior uh members who they say were directly involved in the assault on Israel. So you have leadership outside a political leadership in Exile. Essentially, Ismael Hania is the leader, he moves between Qatar and several other countries. Qatar though is his real host country and they have shown more readiness as you'd expect from a political leadership to have negotiation have talks to some degree to move a little bit away from a founding charge of Hamas, which says that it is working towards the total destruction of Israel. (Speaker, 2023, "Why are Israel and Gaza at War," [Video]. YouTube.
<https://youtu.be/Nh74H8Pyb8A?feature=shared>)

4.2. Analysis of the Second Video (18.2 Minutes)

The second video is of the title "What is happening in the Israel and Gaza Strip." This video also discussed the recent conflict of Israel and Gaza. The duration of the video is eighteen minutes and two seconds. It is also taken from the YouTube channel of British Broadcasting Channel (BBC). The video involved two speakers and the host of the programme. The research study has analysed the video by taking into consideration the Cooperative Principles given by Paul Grice (1975).

4.2.1. Maxim of Quality

As discussed earlier, this maxim of quality deals with truthfulness. It asserts that participants in a

conversation shall be truthful and should talk about the things which they can validate or back up with the help of tangible evidence. With reference to the second video, both the speakers are talking about the Gaza and Israel conflict and try to persuade the audience by using hardcore vocabulary and references. This comes under psycholinguistics that involves the analysis of language use and inferences to be drawn to persuade and convince the audience about the speaker's own point of view. This thing can be clearly seen when speaker 1 was asked about the reasons behind US support for Israel. The speaker 1 provided all the information including the historical facts and the ties of US and Israel. He said that US has provided almost 4 billion dollars to Israel for buying weapons. Secondly, the US is supporting Israel since it sees Israel as the only functioning democracy in the Middle East. Moreover, at the same time, he also recognized the Palestinian perspective in this regard. The speaker further said that the US is now in 100 percent support of Israel. For instance,

The Siege on Gaza grows but a wider context of that is the US has essentially given a huge financial support to Israel. It has given almost 4 billion dollars, most of that goes in military hardware most of which comes from US companies. It vetoes motions resolutions at the UN Security Council, which criticize Israel. Now the US itself as government's change essentially has stayed pretty much the same position, it sees itself and it tries to present itself as an even-handed mediator in the conflict and essentially adhering to the idea that a two-state solution is what is needed. Under President Trump, it changed slightly but with President Biden, it's gone back to that but from the Palestinian perspective.....I think most American citizens see Israel as the only functioning democracy similar to the US in the Middle East. (Speaker 1, 2023, "What is Happening at Israel and Gaza Strip," [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/9scGFj7zp5w?feature=shared>)

On the other hand, in the discussion, when the speaker 2 was asked by the host, "What will it take for Hamas to stop trying to annihilate the whole of Israel. What compromise would be enough? How can peace be achieved without Mutual

understanding and respect for both sides" (Host, 2023, "What is Happening at Israel and Gaza Strip," [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/9scGFj7zp5w?feature=shared>).

In response to the question, it was observed that speaker 2 flouted maxim of quality to some scale, as he provided subjective interpretation and nuances without considering the historical figures and facts. Moreover, he claimed that Hamas will not consider any Israeli proposal without providing sufficient context and evidence. Besides, the speaker 2 did not consider the responsibilities and actions of Israel in this very context of the recent conflict. To be very conclusive, the tone used by the speaker 2 in his response to the question was quite pessimistic, which clearly demonstrated his mental processes and inability to justify his stance with tangible and validated facts and figures. For example, it can be seen in the following statement given by the speaker 2, I don't think it can, and I think that's why there has been this intractable conflict now for decades and decades, and I think Gaza is important because until some sort of compromise as you say can be reached with Hamas in Gaza, you are never going to have peace in the Middle East, and I think at some points over the last decades, when there continues to be this talk from western countries.....they have not really suggested that they were ready to accept the existence of Israel. (Speaker 2, 2023, "What is Happening at Israel and Gaza Strip," [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/9scGFj7zp5w?feature=shared>)

So from the above given statements and analysis, it can be inferred that mostly both the speakers adhered to the maxim of quality. However, one time in the discussion, the speaker 2 was seen flouting the maxim of quality, as also mentioned for validating the claim in the above analysis.

4.2.2. Maxim of Quantity

This maxim mainly relies on the information that is required from the speaker, or listener in the conversation. Basically, in any conversation, information plays an important role. So, the need is that both the speaker and the listener in any conversation should provide considerable amount of information. By doing so, it becomes easier for the

participants to understand the context and meanings of utterances properly. Likewise in the video under discussion, both speakers were seen providing information as required to the host and the audience. For instance, when speaker 1 was asked about the reason many organizations, particularly media organizations like BBC, Sky news and ITV, not calling Hamas a terrorist organization, the speaker 1 responded to this question in a comprehensive manner with a lot of information embedded into it. He talked about the reasons for not labeling any organization as terrorist to avoid subjectivity and maintain objectivity. Moreover, he also talked about professionalism in broadcasting and not taking any participant's side. His response was quite concise and informative. So, in this way, he was found strictly in compliance with the maxim of quantity. The above analysis can be validated from one of the chunks from the speaker 1 response, I think there are a number of reasons when you are broadcasting to a world audience, you want your perceptions the way that you are dealing with the story not to look as if you are taking any particular side, and calling a group a terrorist group will always look that way and people will always be demanding for this cause or that cause that it's called terrorist or that is not called terrorist.....I mean I think the way that is often found around that by organizations like the BBC is to speak of Acts of Terror or to have the voices of people who are denouncing it as terrorism but not itself using that term. (Speaker 1, 2023, "What is Happening at Israel and Gaza Strip," [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/9scGFj7zp5w?feature=shared>)

On the other hand, speaker 2 can also be seen adhering to the maxim of quantity by providing balanced information in response to the question. When the host asked him a question about the impact of Israel's blockade of aid on Gaza. He provided the answer by considering the nature of current ongoing conflict and the past events, in addition to the impact of this blockade on the young people of the war stricken area. Interestingly in his response, the speaker 2 also showcased the lack of engagement between Israelis and Gazans, and their inability to comprehend the perspectives of the either side in this regard. By doing so, the speaker 2

also stayed in compliance with the Grice's maxim of quantity. For example, his statement is valid enough to justify the adherence to the maxim of quantity, which is as below,

I think that it is important that about half of Gaza's population is under 18. It's a very very young population and there are many people in Gaza who have never left, you know, so they've never met an Israeli. So, there's no interaction between the two sides, no understanding of the other point of the other side's perspective, and I think that is what is really difficult to overcome. (Speaker 2, 2023, "What is Happening at Israel and Gaza Strip," [Video]. YouTube.

<https://youtu.be/9scGFj7zp5w?feature=shared>)

4.2.3. Maxim of Relation

It is one of the maxims under the umbrella of Cooperative Principle. It says that the participants' contribution in a conversation should be as relevant as it can be. In simple, the responses should be in line with the previous statements, or the overall essence of the topic being discussed. Both the speakers in the video were found in adherence to the maxim of relation. For example, when the host asked speaker 1 about the Israel blockade of medicines and other medical aid into Gaza, he responded in quite relevant manner to the question. He provided his response while referring to the international organizations and human rights institutes. The speaker 1 highlighted the grave impacts of the blockade on Gaza by citing the conditions people are facing there, like no water, no electricity and many other things. He also highlighted the impact of Israeli attacks on Gaza and their recurring patterns of military operation. This can be seen when the speaker 1 said,

I mean this sense that a Siege of Gaza this denial of food, this denial of water, and remember it's already under blockade and has been under blockade for 17 years. There's already huge, I mean the water situation is dire in in Gaza, the electricity situation, all of these are already sufficiently bad for Gaza to have been described, you know as one of the poorest places in the world. One of the places where the conditions of life are pretty much at their worst. So, what is really happening with Israel is it's just

tightening that squeeze rather than bringing a siege from nowhere. (Speaker 1, 2023, "What is Happening at Israel and Gaza Strip," [Video]. YouTube.

<https://youtu.be/9scGFj7zp5w?feature=shared>) Additionally, speaker 2 was also found in compliance with the maxim of relation, when he was asked about the reason behind the US and Europe support for the Ukraine, but not for Palestine. So, he responded by considering his own observation on war in Gaza and his coverage of events in the past. The speaker 2 talked about the fact that US provided Israel with a lot of aid, and so does the entire Europe. But interestingly, at the same time, all these countries are paying for reconstruction in Gaza. It can be seen in the statement,

The United States provides a lot of the military support to Israel that causes so much of the destruction in Gaza, and at the same time, you know a lot of the EU Britain, France etc, offer a lot of support to Israel in dealing with Hamas in Gaza. But then, it is also those same countries who support Israel, who are then having to pay time and time again for the reconstruction in Gaza. (Speaker 2, 2023, "What is Happening at Israel and Gaza Strip," [Video].

YouTube.

<https://youtu.be/9scGFj7zp5w?feature=shared>)

4.2.4. Maxim of Manner

This is one of the maxims given by Grice (1975). It asserts that the speaker or the recipients responses in a particular conversation should not be ambiguous. They should have considerable clarity, so that the audience can easily understand the core meanings and draw inferences from the utterances.

For example, the speakers in the video discussion were found in adherence to this very maxim of manner. When speaker 1 was asked about the reason Israel being dependent on foreign military aid despite relatively rich country than Palestine. So, he provided a very clear and unambiguous response to the question. The speaker directly addressed the question and provided the reasons behind the military aid for Israel. He also highlighted the importance of this aid to protect Israel not only from Palestine, but also from the potential threats of Iran. Moreover, the speaker also asserted that there is a

criticism in the US about provision of 3.8 billion dollars to Israel, but he said they could turn out to be well spent ever. This comprehensive, unambiguous and crystal-clear response to the question proves his adherence to the maxim of manner in the ongoing conversation. This can be seen as follows,

Well, I mean it's not simply against the Palestinians. I mean the military support that's given to Israel is meant to defend it against all potential threats. I mean from an Israeli perspective, we've heard from the prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu for years and years, but he sees Iran as the major threat. (Speaker 1, 2023, "What is Happening at Israel and Gaza Strip," [Video]. YouTube.

<https://youtu.be/9scGFj7zp5w?feature=shared>)

Also in the given statement,

There's lots of criticism inside the US that why are we sending almost \$4 billion to a country that's that's rich, when we have huge problems in the US that need to be addressed. But that you know several billion dollars of that could surely be more usefully spent in the US. (Speaker 1, 2023, "What is Happening at Israel and Gaza Strip," [Video]. YouTube.

<https://youtu.be/9scGFj7zp5w?feature=shared>)

Similarly, the speaker 2 also adhered to the maxim of manner by providing clear and unambiguous response, when he was asked by the host to talk about the potential impact of the blockade of aid on Gaza by Israel. He provided instances of UNICEF that Israel is not going to pay heed to international law and other organizations in this regard. He also highlighted the conditions of people in Gaza these days, with no basic life facilities. The speaker also gave instance of his own experience in Gaza in 2013, to validate his stance regarding the potential impact of this aid blockade on the lives of people in Gaza. This can be seen in the following excerpt from his direct response to the question,

I don't think it's going to listen to UNICEF. I think it feels that it will have the backing of its public to do everything it wants. I mean okay you go to the blockade, which as the other person says has been in place in some form from Israel and Egypt to the South for 17 years and certainly, when I was there and the last time, I was kind of regularly going into

Gaza was in 2013. It was bad, at period, there were periods when I was living there where virtually half the food you were getting to come into Gaza was coming through tunnels.(Speaker 2, 2023, "What is Happening at Israel and Gaza Strip", [Video]. YouTube.

<https://youtu.be/9scGFj7zp5w?feature=shared>)

4.3. Findings of the Research

The current research study after the thorough analysis of both the videos taken for the research study found that in the context of Israel and Palestine conflict, BBC analysts mostly adhered to the Cooperative Principles given by Paul Grice (1975). However, it was also observed that the speakers in both the videos to some extent two times violated and one time flouted the maxim of quality. They failed to provide truthful information in response to the questions asked by the host. On the other hand, maxim of quantity, maxim of relation and maxim of manner were found strictly followed in both the videos.

5. Conclusion

The research study examined the application of the Cooperative Principles in the context of the conflict between Palestine and Israel. The research questions were aimed at the analysis to see the ways participants were following, flouting or breaching Grice's maxims, when talking about this very conflict in the discussions at the British Broadcasting Channel (BBC). The research concluded that the speakers in the discussion were strictly in compliance with the cooperative principles. However, two times in the discussions, it was noticed that the speakers breached the maxim of quality. While one time, they partially flouted the maxim of quality. Besides, this research study further warrants more research to be conducted in the same context to provide more real time information about the recent conflict between Israel and Palestine. By doing so, people would be able to get comprehensive insights into the ways language equipped by facts and figures, and other tactics can be used to shape or reshape their perception regarding the conflict.

Acknowledgements

I would like to tender my sincere gratitude to my colleagues for their support throughout writing this research paper. Their expertise and insights helped me form a critical analysis in validating arguments and data analysis in this research article. Besides, this study was carried out without any external support and funding from any government or private organization. Also, there are no conflicts of interest that could have affected the findings of the study or the process of writing this research paper.

5.1. REFERENCES

Ayer, L., Venkatesh, B., Stewart, R., Mandel, D., Stein, B., & Schoenbaum, M. (217). Psychological aspects of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 18(3), 322-338.

Alashqar, M. (224). The Role of Language in Framing the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict on Twitter: The Escalation of Violence in Gaza in May 221 as a Case Study (Doctoral dissertation, Ghent University).

Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>.

Glottopedia.(2014,July13).Maxim of relevance. In Glottopedia.https://www.glottopedia.org/index.php/Maxim_of_relevance glottopedia.org.

Glottopedia. (2014, July 13). Maxim of manner. In Glottopedia. https://www.glottopedia.org/index.php/Maxim_of_manner glottopedia.org.

Hadi, A. (2013). A critical appraisal of Grice's Cooperative Principle. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 3(1), 69-72. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2013.31008>.

Hossain, M. M. (2021). The application of Grice maxims in conversation: A pragmatic study. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(10), 32-40. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.10.4> Al-Kindi Publishers+1.

Jorfi, L., & Dowlatabadi, H. (215). Violating and flouting of the four Gricean cooperative maxims in Friends the American TV series. *International Review of Social Science*, 3(8), 364-371.

Jungblut, M., & Zakareviciute, I. (219). Do pictures tell a different story? A multimodal frame analysis of the 214 Israel-Gaza conflict. *Journalism Practice*, 13(2), 206-228.

Loewenthal, A., Miaari, S. H., & Abrahams, A. (2023). How civilian attitudes respond to the state's violence: Lessons from the Israel-Gaza conflict. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 40(4), 441-463.

Manor, I., & Crilley, R. (218). Visually framing the Gaza War of 214: The Israel ministry of foreign affairs on Twitter. *Media, War & Conflict*, 11(4), 369-391.

Politz, D. (2023, March 24). The practical guide to qualitative content analysis. *Delve*. <https://delvetool.com/blog/guide-qualitative-content-analysis> Delve.

Rababah, A. G., & Hamdan, J. M. (219). A Contrastive Critical Discourse Analysis of Netanyahu's and Abbas's Speeches on the Gaza War (214). *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 10(1), 178.

Raza, A., Hakimi, A. H., & Malik, S. (2023). Israel-Palestine and social media: SFG based Critical Discourse Analysis of Opinion Article about Haaretz Front Page. *Journal of Arts and Linguistics Studies*, 1(3), 237-262.

Shatz, I. (2021, October 8). Grice's maxims of conversation: The principles of effective communication. *Effectiviology*. <https://effectiviology.com/principles-of-effective-communication/>.

Xue, Z., & Hei, K. C. (217). Grice's maxims in humour: The case of "Home with kids". *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 6(1), 49-58.

Zghoul, L. (222). Al-Jazeera English and BBC News coverage of the Gaza War 2008-9: A comparative examination (Doctoral dissertation, Cardiff University).

