

Non-observance of Conversational Maxims in the Exchanges of Department Press Briefings

Dr. Suhayla H. Majeed¹, LuqmanAbdulrahmanAbdulla²

¹Professor, Department of English, College of Languages/ Salahaddin University, Kurdistan-Region/Iraq¹

²M.A. Student, Department of English, College of Basic Education, Salahaddin University, Kurdistan-Region/Iraq²

Corresponding Author:Dr. Suhayla H. Majeed

Abstract:The present paper attempts to provide answers to the questions: Why, how and when does not U.S. Department of State in their Department Press Briefings observe Cooperative Principle. The adopted model used in this study is Grice's (1975) Theory the Cooperative Principle. The study analyses the exchanges of U.S. Department States' Press Briefings released in 2017, presented by the spokesperson Ms. Heather Nauert, which focuses on Iraq Issues. As the exchanges of the Department Press Briefings indicate the policy and political issues of Unites States of America towards all the countries of the world, the study hypothesized non-observance of the exchanges now and then happen is something justifiable. As the texts analyzed are doable has allowed the study to have some achievements. Three types of non-observance of the exchanges have been found, (a) flouting, (b) opting out and (c) violation. Flouting has occurred more frequently than the others. Non-observance of the exchanges happened in those exchanges however if they were observed, the interests of America in the world might have been at risk and danger. Therefore, one of the achievements has expounded that non-observance of the Department Press Briefings befall is to keep the interests of the U.S. safe in the world.

Keywords:Department Press Briefings, Flouting, Opting out, Violation.

Date of Submission: 01-06-2018

Date of acceptance: 18-06-2018

I. INTRODUCTION

In normal conversation, people are by nature cooperative when they exchange talks. It seems that this phenomenon motivated the famous philosopher and linguist Paul Grice (1975) to propose Cooperative Principle; later Grice explained the model by providing Conversational Maxims. Nevertheless, when you come across the real world, sometimes this expected cooperation in talk exchanges is performed but sometimes it is not observed. This is frequently seen among politicians. Language of politics and media is certainly different from everyday language. Politicians may often say things to imply other things from what their expressions literally mean. In politics, directness sounds not popular. There is a nice anonymous saying, which certifies this idea, it says, "When a diplomat says 'Yes' he means 'Perhaps'; when he says 'Perhaps' he means No; when he says 'No' he is not a diplomat." So, here the question of the problem is: **why, how, when**, a maxim or more are not sometimes abided by and not met in the U.S. Department of State's Press Briefings.

There are studies done using Grice's Cooperative Principle to analyse utterances. Zor (2006) did one of the studies using Grice's CP. The thesis was MA study, which was entitled 'Using Grice's Cooperative Principle and its Maxims to Analyze Problems of Coherence in Turkish and English Essays'. The study concluded that the maxim of relation could be a superordinate maxim among conversational maxim. Another study was done by Miraziz (2016) was entitled 'The Cooperative Principle in Teacher-Student Interaction in English and Kurdish Departments at Salahaddin University-Erbil'. One of the concluded points of Miraziz's study was that the observance of Conversational maxims more frequently occurred by students and teachers of English Department rather than the Kurdish Department.

The current study aims at exploring the extent Conversational Maxims are observed in U.S. Department of State's Press Briefings and illustrating the reasons and factors behind maxims flouting and violating in U.S. Department of State's Press Briefings. It is hypothesized that politicians and diplomats do not often follow the Cooperative Principle. Most of non-observable cases of Cooperative Principle done are intentional to implicate implicatures. Flouting, violating or opting out the maxims in politics seems something justifiable.

The press briefings that the spokesperson of U.S. Department of State holds are usually presented several times per month, then these press briefings are written and released on the State Department's website.

After a short statement given by the department's spokesperson, Ms. Heather Nauert, in the press conference, the journalists ask her questions pertained to hot global issues so that they can get the answers.

This study limits its scope to analyse the talk exchanges focusing on Iraqi issues of Department Press Briefings (henceforth DPBs), held by U.S. State Department's spokesperson, Ms. Heather Nauert, which were released in 2017. The analysis is according to the framework of Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle and Conversational Maxims.

It is hoped that this study be of great use for linguists, students, researchers, and all those who are interested in studying language and linguistics in general and pragmatics in particular. Additionally, the study can also be significant for politicians and those who study media, law, international relations and politics. Such a study can also help the politicians have a better understanding of political analysis and interpret utterances more accurately and appropriately.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE

The famous philosopher Herbert Paul Grice (1975, p. 45) in his paper *Logic and Conversation*, proposed Cooperative Principle by saying that "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". Here Grice proposed a guideline the participants of conversation need when they communicate. What Grice stated in terms of conversation agrees with human nature. Grice's statement indicates that when a person speaks, s/he naturally says as required, no more no less, in a way, as it is, truthful, relevant and orderly and clear. Yule (2010, p. 147) notes, "an underlying assumption in most conversational exchanges seems to be that the participants are co-operating with each other". Thus, this conversational cooperation is something natural—it has come from human nature.

2.2 Conversational Maxims

The Cooperative Principle is broken down into some conversational maxims to give more clarification. Each maxim carries its message and has sub-maxims. Grice (1975, p. 45) brought CMs—maxim of Quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation and maxim of manner, to explain and certify CP. Trauth and Kazzazi (1998, p. 729) consider that Grice develops these conversational maxims from his cardinal maxim, which is well-known as Cooperative Principle. Therefore, conversational maxims have been derived from the Cooperative Principle by Grice to illustrate the accurate and concise picture of those principles that underlie successful and affective conversation between participants when communicating.

2.2.1 Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity is that maxim which was taken from Grice's (1975, p. 45) quotation, which says 'make your conversational contribution such as is required'. This maxim commits the speakers to give information as necessary, no less no more. Quantity maxim has two parts or so-called two sub-maxims:

- a. Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange.
- b. Do not make your contribution more than is required.

The following examples can illustrate the maxim of quantity:

(1) A: What are you doing?

B: I am writing an essay.

(2) A: It seems you are feeling good today.

B: right, I am totally good, but the day before yesterday I was very ill in a way that I could neither eat nor drink. In the example (1), B provided adequate information—no less no more while in (2) B gave the answer more than necessary information. In (2) A just wanted to be sure whether B is good today but B provided additional information about his or her state in the day before yesterday.

2.2.2 Maxim of Quality

Maxim of quality demands that the speakers say the truth when being asked. Birner (2013, p. 49) states that maxim of quality is sometimes paraphrased as 'say what is true'. Additionally Yule (2000, p. 37) illuminates that this maxim means 'try to make your contribution one that is true. Similarly Levinson (1983, p. 101) indicates that the maxim of quality consists of the following two sub-maxims:

- a. Do not say what you believe to be false.
- b. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

Grice (1975, p. 47) clarifies that contributions are seen and expected to be genuine not spurious. Consider the following examples:

(3) A: Where is Baghdad Province?

B: It is in Iraq.

In the above example, it is seen that B is cooperative since B did not contribute what B believed to be false or B does not lack adequate evidence, but B could observe and follow the maxim of quality by being truthful, as B is asked the question by A, 'where is Bagdad', and B answered truthfully by saying that 'it is in Iraq'.

2.2.3 Maxim of Relation

Maxim of relation is also called relevance maxim. The requirement of relation maxim is to be relevant when conversation occurs. Grice (1989, p. 27) maintains that participants should be relevant to their conversation. In other words, when one speaks about something, s/he has to be relevant and say things that are pertinent to the discussion. Denham and Lobeck (2013, p. 343) demonstrate that the maxim of relation implicate that participants of verbal conversation should only say things that are relevant, in other words this maxim requires the speaker to stick to the topic and not to say something that is irrelevant. See the following instance below:

(4) Husband: Where is my pen?

Wife: It is in your bag.

2.2.4 The Maxim of Manner

Grice (1989, p. 26-27) expounds that maxim of manner requires that participants of conversation should be perspicuous. He also adds this maxim has the super-maxim 'Be perspicuous' and various sub-maxims as follows:

- a. avoid obscurity
- b. avoid ambiguity
- c. be brief
- d. be orderly

Griffiths (2006, p. 134) corroborates that maxim of manner indicates utterances in conversation should to be clear: brief, orderly and not obscure. Consider the following example:

(5) 'The plane taxied down the runway, and took off to the west' rather than 'the plane took off to the west and taxied down the runway', which might confuse as to what actually happened (Aitchison 1999, p. 98).

2.3 Non-Observance of the Maxims

People naturally observe and follow conversational maxims when they exchange talks. However, in conversation participants do not always necessarily observe CMs either intentionally or unintentionally. Grice (1979, p. 49) discovers that speakers do not constantly abide by the CMs, but they sometimes fail to observe one maxim or more.

Since components of the meanings of utterances are not propositional in nature, speakers deliberately go against one or more of the maxims to convey a message (Cruse, 2006, pp. 64 ff.).

Aitchison (2010, pp. 127-8) articulates that sometimes people apparently break CM. For proving this, she has provided the following instances:

(6) If someone said: 'what is for supper?' if the reply was like that: Billy fell downstairs.

(7) Or if someone told an overt lie, such as 'Pamela is an elephant'.

In the above examples, Aitchison (2010, pp. 128) states that listeners try to interpret what people say, in another way, hearers make attempts to draw and infer from the utterances which have not directly provided the answers to the listeners' queries, due to the fact that the CMs are not observed but they are overtly broken (See also Malmkjær, pp. 419-20; Cobely, 2001, p. 196; Devitt and Hanley, pp. 154 ff.).

Thomas (1995, p. 64) clarifies five ways of non-observance of CMs: *flouting*, *violation*, *infringing*, *opting out*, and *suspending*. However, before talking about the five ways of non-observance of CMs, the following figure illustrates that the specific technical terms of non-observance of CMs indicate the reasons and causes of the non-observance of CMs.

2.3.1 Flouting the Maxims

Flouting one maxim or more occurs when a speaker in conversation does intentionally fail to obey a CM. As Grice (1975, p. 49) spells out that the speaker in talk exchange may not observe a maxim so that s/he can provoke the listener to find out the intended and hidden meaning rather than surface meaning (see also Fasold & Connor, 2006, pp. 161 ff.).

2.3.1.1 Flouting the Maxim of Quantity

Flouting the maxim of quantity occurs when a speaker in conversation gives an amount of information, which is either too little or too much. Similarly, Leech (1983, p. 140) states that flouting can be seen when the

speaker blatantly gives more or less information that the situation requires. In other words, the speaker gives incomplete words when s/he is speaking (see Genetti, 2014, p. 185). Consider the following example:

(8) Jack: Did you wash the patio and the yard?

Fran: I washed the patio.

2.3.1.2 Flouting the Maxim of Quality

Flouting the maxim of quality arises when someone says something, which is patently untrue, or lacks adequate evidence. An implicature can be produced by the speaker's contribution, which is blatantly false. However, it is important to bear in mind that the speaker does not try to deceive the listener in any way; in other words, the speaker wants by his or her untrue words to implicate another possible meaning (Thomas, 1995, pp. 67-69). See the example below:

(9) "A woman says": I am a man.

The above example illustrates the blatant breach of the maxim of quality, this probably implicates that the woman wants the hearer to infer that 'she is as much as a man is brave'.

To Grice (1975, pp. 53-4) a speaker has some options to flout the maxim of quality as follows:

1- Irony or sarcasm: this type of flouting of the quality maxim occurs when a participant of conversation *ironically* says untrue thing which is originally the paradox meant by the speaker (Finch, 2000, 161).

(10) This is a nice man.

Here the listener should be sure that the speaker hates that man but s/he ironically calls out *nice man*. Another example can be interesting on sarcasm:

2- Metaphor: flouting the maxim of quality occurs when someone says something so blatantly false that s/he must have meant something other than what s/he has literally said. For instance, metaphor is a good example of flouting the quality maxim (Birner, 2013, pp. 49 ff.). Consider the following:

(11) John is a flower.

In (14) flouting the maxim of quality is blatant and non-deniable. When the listener hears such an expression, s/he tries to infer and find the hidden intention beyond literal meaning. Here the speaker might implicate that when you see flower and smell it and you will be pleased, similarly you will be pleased when you see John.

3- Hyperbole: Cutting (2002, p. 37) argues that one can flout the maxim of quality when s/he exaggerates as in hyperbole. See the ample example below:

(12) Elizabeth eats keyboard when she writes on computer.

In (12) the speaker knows that what s/he claims is not true and not believable by the listener, but the speaker wants to implicate that Elizabeth is so fast in writing on computer in a way no one can compete her.

2.3.1.3 Flouting the Maxim of Relation

The maxim of relation means being relevant. This can be flouted by saying something which is very observably unrelated to the topic discussed. Thus, the speaker flouts the relation maxim in such a way that makes the conversation unmatched and irrelevant to the participants' topic (Levinson, 1983:11). Look at the following exchange:

(13) A: do you think David passed the exams?

B: I have a train to catch.

2.3.1.4 Flouting the Maxim of Manner

Another way of flouting occurs when conversers deliberately breach the maxim of manner by not avoiding obscurity, ambiguity or not being brief and orderly in the talk exchange. When someone breaks the maxim of manner, it should be via flouting to implicate and convey that additional meaning which cannot be found from literal meaning (see Levinson, 1983, p. 104; Denham & Lobeck, 2013, p. 344). Consider the following example which provided by Hornsby (2014, p. 210):

(14) Paul: Did John cook you dinner last night?

Mary: He handed over a plate containing items, which could be described as food, some of which had been heated in an oven. Some of it was edible.

The implicated answer from Mary, it seems to be 'Yes', but her wordy failure to offer it requires Paul to draw the appropriate inference.

2.3.2 Violating the Maxims

Violation of the CMs is another way of non-observance that sometimes occurs in the talk exchange. Grice (1975, p. 75) states that a speaker quietly and unostentatiously violates (a) CM(s) when s/he means by the violation to mislead the listener.

Birner (2013, p. 43) affirms that to violate a maxim is to fail to observe it. Actually, in violation, the interlocutor tries to do so inconspicuously with the assumption that the hearer will not realize that the maxim is

violated. In other words, violations of the maxims are aimed to deceive the addressee (see also Thomas, 1995, p. 72; Finch, 2000, pp. 160-61).

2.3.2.1 Violating the Maxim of Quantity

Birner (2013, p. 46) explicates that violation of the maxim of quantity happens when a speaker says too little, but in such a way that the listener is not expected to notice the violation. Cutting, (2002, pp. 40 ff.) believes that the quantity maxim violation takes place when an interlocutor gives insufficient information for hiding the complete information from the hearer. Take the following ample example about recommendation writing, which has been provided by Birner (2013, p. 46):

(15) Ms. Smith is intelligent, insightful, and organized. (Actually, she had stolen a great deal of money from my department). thus If the letter mentions her intellect, insight, and organization, but fails to mention and give a full description about her dishonesty, this will have violated the quantity maxim by failing to say adequate information about her (Birner 2013, p. 46).

In (15) this omission, not saying enough information about Ms. Smith, does not seem to be noticed and felt by the reader. Hence, the reader will draw no inference about the dishonesty of Ms. Smith and then this leads (the reader) to be deceived and misled into believing that Ms. Smith is a suitable candidate for the job. Thus, not giving information about something to mislead other(s) is violation of quantity maxim.

2.3.2.2 Violating the Maxim of Quality

Violation of the quality maxim arises when a speaker does not want to tell the truth, and the listener is not aware that the speaker has not told her or him the truth. Candlin (1985 p. 31) expounds that violation of the maxim of quality can be found in a lie as a case of a speaker saying something false in a way that the listener cannot infer the true face of the matter (see also Atlas, pp. 12 ff.). Consider the following example:

(16) Child: Mum, where is my dad. Mother: Darling, he is abroad.

In (16) the violation of quality maxim takes place as the child's father died, but the mother hides the true news about her husband by saying he is abroad lest the child should be unhappy. Here, this is considered the violation of the maxim of quality since the listener (the child) believes what his or her mother told him or her.

2.3.2.3 Violating the Maxim of Relation

Violations of the relation maxim takes place when the speaker says some utterance to make the addressee infer a relation between this utterance and the context, as result, this violation causes the addressee to falsely believe some relation exists. This overlaps a great deal with flouting of quantity maxim, as to say something unconnected leads to say too much, and saying too much often triggers irrelevance. Here is an ample example (Birner, 2013, p. 57):

(17) John: Do you have any bank accounts in Swiss banks?

Elizabeth : No, sir. John : Have you ever? Elizabeth: The company had an account there for about six months, in Zurich. Here, Elizabeth violates the maxim of quantity by not saying enough. Further, she did not answer the particular question that she was asked. However, in the response, she also violates the maxim of relation; as Elizabeth's reply about an account held by the company is strictly unrelated to what she has been asked. Thus, her answer makes the hearer to infer that this must be relevant information to the question.

2.3.2.4 Violating the Maxim of Manner

Another type of violation is the manner maxim violation. This violation occurs in conversation whenever the participant is not orderly and brief and clear in the talk exchange to mislead the hearer. As this breach occurs, it may lead to obscurity and ambiguity and not brief and nor clear in the contribution (Grice, 1975, pp. 45-46). Hornsby (2014, pp. 206 ff.) demonstrates that politicians may have a strong interest in violation of CMs. As they are obscure or ambiguous about unpopular policies. When a politician prefaces remarks with 'Let me be clear'. This indicates and proves that the maxim of manner is about to be violated. Another piece of evidence is that many of the interviewer's stock responses can be noticed as demanding of the interviewee that the maxims should be observed and followed. Look at the following example which has been provided by Hornsby (2014, p. 206):

(18) A journalist: 'You haven't been clear, have you, Prime Minister, about who will actually benefit from this proposal?

the above example indicates that the violation of the manner maxim as most of the times the politicians has not been clear in their talk exchange. It might be s/he wants to confuse the topic so that the listeners cannot arrive at the truth of the matter.

2.3.3 Infringing the Maxims

Infringing the CMs is another way of non-observance of the maxims. Thomas (1995, p. 74) explicates that infringement of the maxims of conversation takes place when an interlocutor who, has no intention to create an implicature and no intention to cheat or mislead the listener, fails to observe a maxim is said to *infringe* the maxim.

In other words, this type of non-observance originates from imperfect linguistic performance rather than from any desire on the part of the speakers to generate a conversational implicature. Thus, this might befall for the participant of the talk exchange has an imperfect ability of the language. This is because the speaker's performance is impaired in one way or another such as nervousness, drunkenness, excitement, because of some cognitive impairment, or because the interlocutor is unable to speak clearly.

Cutting (2002, p. 41) asserts that Grice listed infringement of the CMs as another way of non-observance of CP. Cutting confirms that the imperfectness of the speakers in terms of language leads to infringement (see also Partridge, 2012, p. 47). Consider the following examples:

(19) An English native waiter in a cafeteria asks a non-native speaker: Sir, would you like to have tea or coffee?

A non-native speaker English: yes.

(20) Someone with tongue-tied in a store: Do dodo you you have have tea tea tea..... (but actually he wants to say teapot, because of tongue-tied he could not completely pronounce it)

The shopkeeper: Aha, you need tea....

2.3.4 Opting out the Maxims

Opting out the maxims of conversation can also be considered non-abiding by CMs. In opting out the interlocutors refuses to cooperate since of the existing of some justifications. Grice (1975, p. 49) finds out a converser opts out in the talk exchange when he or she unwillingly shows refusal to observe the CMs accordingly. Birner (2013, pp. 43 ff.) indicates that opting out arises in conversation when an interlocutor refuses to have role in cooperative conversation. Allott (2010, p. 48) opting out CMs can happen when there is no comment in conversation—when a person is asked a question, but instead of answering the question, s/he has no comment, this is seen as the opting out the CP.

Mesthrie (2001, p. 149) argues that a participant of conversation opts out of observing CMs by signifying opposition to collaborate in the way that the maxim necessitates. In daily life, you can find many instances of opting out in the talk exchange. In other words when the speaker cannot, perhaps for legal or ethical reasons, respond as required. Otherwise, the speaker may wish to avoid generating a false implicature or appearing uncooperative. Look at the following example from a British MP, who was asked a question about talks he had with the Libyan leader Colonel Gadaffi. But he answered like that:

(21) Well, honestly, I cannot tell you anything, because I was told to keep such news in secret.

The above example indicates that confidentiality (secrecy) may give reasonable justifications to the speaker to opt out when not observing the CMs.

2.3.5 Suspending the Maxims

Suspending the maxims of conversation is counted as non-observance of CMs. Suspending happens when there is no expectation on the part of any participant that the maxims will be fulfilled. As the converser does not abide by CMs. The reason might be culturally-specific to a particular event. The suspending of the quality maxim can be noticed in funeral orations and obituaries, when the description of the deceased needs to be praiseworthy and exclude any potentially unfavorable aspects of their life or personality. As well, this can be seen from poetry when it suspends the manner maxim since it does not aim for conciseness, clarity and lack of ambiguity. In the case of telegrams, telexes and some international phone calls, the maxim of quantity is suspended because such means are functional (Thomas, 1995, pp. 76-78). Consider the following instance, which illustrates the case of suspending of the CMs:

(22) Last time you were with that FBI man – asking about the one who got killed,' she said, respecting the Navajo taboo of not speaking name of the dead. 'You found out who killed that man? (Thomas 1995:76).

In (22) the woman does not observe the quantity maxim, as she speaks in imprecise words about a person who was killed. Even she knows him very well, but since her tradition does not allow the people to mention the names of the dead. This case prevents her to observe the CMs, but this leads to suspending the maxims.

2.4 Clash

Clash is put under non-observance of the maxims by Grice (1975, p. 49). Thomas (1995, pp. 64-6) states that clash could be better to be placed alone as it includes simultaneously both observance and non-observance of the CMs. A participant in conversation may not observe a maxim to abide by another. Thomas (1995:66) emphasizes that for some reason a speaker in conversation is confronted with a clash between, for

instance, two maxims: either he tells the truth or s/he gives just the right amount of information that the situation requires.

In accordance with Grice (1979, p. 49) clash of CMs befalls when a converser cannot be completely cooperative. S/he observes, for example, the quality maxim, but breaches the quantity maxim. Try to notice the following instance:

(23) A: Where is Ms. Heather? B: She is somewhere in the outside.

In (23) B has not observed the maxim of quantity so that s/he can abide by the maxim of quality. As A asked B about Ms. Heather's place at the moment of speaking, and B was not sure about Ms. Heather's place as B couldn't be informative as much as necessary in order not to tell a lie.

2.5 Hedges

Yule (2010, p. 148) explicates that there are certain types of expressions used in conversation, called hedges, to display that a speaker follows the maxims while being co-operative in conversation. Thus, hedges may be defined as words or phrases employed in the talk exchange to show that the participants of conversation are not fully certain about something. In other words, there are some expressions used in conversation which indicate uncertainty and inaccuracy about the thing talked about. The expressions like, sort of or kind of, can frequently be used in daily communication, are ample examples of hedges.

Hornsby (2014, pp. 203-4) believes that speakers may select to use hedges, to warn their interlocutors that they do not believe themselves to entirely be able to satisfy the requirements of the quality (or of another) maxim (see also Yule, 2000, pp. 38-9; Crystal, p. 2008, p. 227). Look at the following examples:

(24) As far as I know the math exam is not going to be taken.

(25) Now, correct me if I am wrong, but as an assistant director I should say something, the project costs 550 000 \$.....

2.6 Implicature

Crystal (2008, p. 238) defines implicature as a technical term which is used in pragmatics, derived from the work of the philosopher, Paul Grice (1913-88) that denotes what is suggested and conveyed in an utterance, even though neither expressed nor strictly implied by the utterance (see also Grice, 1975, pp. 43 ff.). Finch (2005, p. 233) illustrates that implicature is an extra and additional meaning beyond what is overtly spoken in an utterance. Yule (2010, pp. 148-9) argues that implicature is an additional conveyed meaning inferred from an utterance said or written. Implicatures can be based on understanding three crucial points:

- (a) The usual meaning of what is said.
- (b) Contextual information—shared or general knowledge.
- (c) The assumption that the speaker obeys what Grice calls the cooperative principle (see Al-Sulaimaan, 2011, pp. 160 ff.).

An implicature can be classified into two kinds: conventional and conversational (or non-conventional) implicature (Cruse, 2006, pp. 24 ff.).

2.6.1 Conventional Implicature

Conventional implicature depends on the conventional meaning of the words of the sentences (Grice, 1975, p. 44). Conventional implicatures can be defined as components of the meanings of utterances that are not propositional in nature, but they have a steady link with specific linguistic expressions and therefore they cannot be cancelled without anomaly (Cruse, 2006, p. 36). Levinson (1983, p. 127) clarifies that conventional implicatures are non-truth conditional aspects of meaning as they have not been derived from subordinate pragmatic bases like maxims of conversation, rather they are conventionally connected with certain expressions and lexical items. Here is an instance:

(26) A: Who are those two standing by the door?

B: That is my mother and her husband.

The implicature and the additional meaning from the above utterance can be interpreted that the man is not B's father; even B did not say this explicitly.

2.6.2 Conversational Implicature

Crystal (2008, p. 238) defines *Conversational implicature* (also called non-conventional implicature) as a term used in pragmatics to refer to that implication which can be derived from the form of an utterance which is based on the Grice's CP. Archer et al. (2012, p. 49) acknowledge that to Grice, conversational implicatures are resulting from contextual clues. Conversational implicatures are implicit meaning, which can be found when there is flouting of CMs. Conversational Implicature has the following features (Baker & Ellece, 2011, pp. 59-60):

- Conversational Implicature is not entailment.
- Conversational Implicature is defeasible.

- Conversational implicature is non-detachable.
- Conversational implicature is calculable (measurable).

Conversational is of two types (Cruse, 2006, pp. 37-9):

- a- Generalized Conversational Implicature: it does not require specific contextual conditions to its inference. In other words, this type of implicature arises without depending on particular context. It is worth mentioning that generalized conversational implicature is something universal (Levinson, 1983, p. 126).
- b- Particularized conversational implicature: it is that implicature which relies on the particular context of an utterance to make inference. In other words, particularized conversational implicature does not need only general knowledge but it also needs specific knowledge about the speaker, the listener, and about that context in which the utterance is expressed in order to work out the conveyed meanings (see Levinson, 1983, p. 126).

2.7 U.S. Department of State

U. S. Department of State is one of the departments of United States of America. The department is the executive branch of the U.S. federal government, whose principal responsibility is the conduct, under the direction of the president of U.S. foreign policy. Department of State is equivalent to Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Department of State is also called State Department. SD gives advice to the President of U.S. and is responsible for the international relations, negotiates treaties and agreements with foreign entities, and represents the U.S. at the United Nations. The Department was established in 1789 to replace the Department of Foreign Affairs (1781-1789) of the Confederation government (Plischke, 1999, pp. 27-8).

2.8 Department Press Briefings

One of the offices of U.S. Department of State is the Office of Press Relations. The Office gives assistance to the President of USA and Secretary of State by providing explanation of the foreign policy of the USA and the positions of the SD to domestic and other foreign journalists. The office also delivers logistical support and information to the Secretary and other Department officials for events involving media coverage and participation. The Press Office also replies press queries, monitors media for breaking international events, and holds special Press Briefings and conference calls. Additionally, the Press Office coordinates interview requests from the national media for senior State Department officials other than the Secretary of State (“Office of Press Relations”).

Department Press Briefings are those briefings that the spokesperson of U.S. Department of State holds usually several times per month. After a short statement given about the Secretary’s performed issues, by the department’s spokesperson in the press conference, the journalists ask the spokesperson questions pertaining to hot global issues so that they can get the answers. After the process is practically finished then these press briefings are written and released on the State department’s website (“Press Releases”).

III. NON-OBSERVANCE THE EXCHANGES OF DEPARTMENT PRESS BRIEFINGS

In section three, the paper sheds light on the talk exchanges of briefings of U.S. Department of state concerning Iraqi issues released in 2017, which are non-observable according to Grice’s Cooperative Principle. In this chapter the study selects the exchanges were not observed according to the adopted model (Grice’s (1975) Cooperative Principle).

1.1 Non-Observance of the Maxims

1.1.1 Flouting Maxims

1.1.1.1 Flouting Maxim of Quantity

- (1) **QUESTION:** In Iraqi Kurdistan, the president on Wednesday – President Barzani on Wednesday announced that Iraqi Kurds are going to hold an independence referendum on September 25th. So what is the United States reaction to this Kurdish independence move?

MS NAUERT: The United States – and we have talked about this one before – we support a unified, stable, democratic, and a federal Iraq. We understand and appreciate the legitimate aspirations of the people of Iraqi Kurdistan. We have expressed our concerns to the authorities in the Kurdistan region that holding a referendum, even a nonbinding resolution at this time, will distract from urgent priorities – and that would be the defeat of ISIS, the stabilization, the return of displaced people, managing of the region’s economic crisis, and resolving the region’s internal political disputes. We would also encourage the regional authorities to engage with the Government of Iraq on a full range of important issues between the future of relations between Baghdad and Erbil (“Department Press Briefing - June 8, 2017”).

In the above interaction, one asked the spokesperson, Ms. Heather Nauert, of U.S. Department of State, about the decision of referendum of Iraqi Kurdistan, which was issued by the President Barzani. Here, the questioner

wanted to know what the reaction of United States would be to the Kurds' announcement of referendum. Nauert's response was that United States did not support such a project. Next, Nauert gave additional information, which indicates that this referendum could reduce the focus of fighting against ISIS. Here, the person asked the question just wanted to know United States' reaction, but Nauert gave additional information. Thus, according to the researcher's inference, Nauert's answer can implicate that United States supports what is important to them. In this interaction, it can be said there is flouting in the maxim of quantity as in the exchange additional and non-asked information was added to deliver ³ implicature and a new message.

- (2) **QUESTION:** Here. Yesterday, Iraqi Prime Minister Abadi announced that ISIS defeat was close at hand. And so what are your plans – how is the liberation of Mosul – once it's liberated, which will be soon – how is that going to change what you're doing in Iraq? What are your plans for the future of that area?

MS NAUERT: Well, they wouldn't be our plans for the future of the area; it would be the Iraqi Government's plans. There is a Government of Iraq, so the Government of Iraq can decide how they want to govern themselves and what will take place in – certainly in certain areas. Our focus right now is on the liberation of Mosul. The Iraqi prime minister talked about how he believes that this will be done sooner rather than later. I'm not going to characterize a timeline. Our U.S. forces and coalition partners and the Iraqi Government are out there hard at work to try to get ISIS out of the remaining parts of Mosul. There is a lot of work left to be done, there's also – we have also had some successes – and when I say “we,” I mean the Iraqis, coalition, and the United States Government – in bringing a lot of people back to Mosul in the safer parts where we've gotten ISIS out, and now some of those people have been able to come back in. I think the latest numbers are somewhere around 300,000 (“Department Press Briefing - June 27, 2017”).

In (2) Heather Nauert was asked what the plans of U.S. would be after ISIS was defeated in Iraq. Nauert answered that United States would not have plans, but Government of Iraq would—Iraqi Government knows how to decide and govern their country. Then Nauert added extra information concerning ISIS. She said that force of U.S. and with their coalition partners and the Iraqi Government would work together to derive ISIS out of the remaining parts of Mosul. Then, she added more by saying that there had been a lot of tasks and duties to be performed in spite of having some successes. According to Grice's CP, there is non-observance in maxim of quantity in the interaction (2). As additional information has been provided. So, there is flouting as the additional information may implicate that U.S. with their collation partners have played a great role in deriving ISIS out in many areas in Iraq. Another implicit meaning may be aimed is that ISIS has not completely been defeated yet.

- (3) **QUESTION:** Today is the third anniversary of the Yezidi genocide. I don't know if you have a statement on that. But also a question on the minorities, that they are concerned about their future, even after ISIS, what's going to happen to them – the Yezidis themselves and also the Christians. So what is the United States plan to protect the Yezidis and also the other minorities in Iraq as we are going through the stabilizing phase of Iraq? So what are your plan to protect them from further genocide or aggressions in the future?

MS NAUERT: Today is the third anniversary of the – what happened to the Yezidis, Christians, and some Shia Muslims in Iraq. We honor and mourn those who lost their lives, who died at the hands of ISIS. It was brutal. [...] So I just want to say on behalf of the U.S. Government how deeply sorry we are about that and how we have not forgotten what happened to those individuals there. [...] You asked me the question about what the United States Government is doing about that. We are providing some money to the Iraqi Government. [...] we've provided \$1.4 billion in humanitarian assistance for vulnerable, displaced, and conflict-affected Iraqis in Iraq and in the region. We've provided funding to the Iraqi Government to help document those atrocities for future prosecution. I know the United Nations is involved in a certain part of this. For more specifics, I'd have to get that from the United Nations. The UK is also involved in this as well. They have a proposed investigative mechanism. They see that as one way to expand Iraq's capacity for accountability. So it's something that we care about. It's something that we have certainly funded. That and the loss of the Iraqi people is not something that we'll forget. (“Department Press Briefing - August 3, 2017”)

In the exchange (3), a Kurdish journalist asked Nauert that day was the third anniversary of the Yezidian genocide, so as U.S. what they would say on this anniversary. Nauert directed U.S. mourning towards Yezidian people. Nauert, then, described that wrongdoing and catastrophes happened to Yezidi people in a way that could show deepest feeling of sympathy and compassion. Nauert added many other things, which were not asked to comment. Hence, according to the Cooperative Principle, it is inferred that the answer for the question was exaggerated to convey additional message, which indicates and implicates that U.S. has strong mercy toward the victims of Yezidian people.

Then, in the second part of the exchange, the journalist asked what plans U.S. would have to protect Yezidian people and the other minorities too in Iraq. In return to this question, Nauert said that U.S. would provide some money to the Iraqi Government. Later, she ended her speech by saying that the loss of the Iraqi people was something unforgettable. So in the first part of the interaction, Nauert supplied adequate information with

additional comments while in the second one, she did not answer appropriately. But she just talked about some funds allocated to the victims as a help. Thus, it can be said that in this conversation, there is flouting in maxim of quantity. Providing less or more information than normal manner is considered breaching maxim of quantity if the speaker means the listener to infer the hidden meaning of the implicit utterance.

- (4) **QUESTION:** Breakup from Iraq or declaration of independence. So would the United States support these negotiations between Erbil and Baghdad?

MS NAUERT: I mean, certainly if Erbil and Baghdad want to sit down and have a conversation with one another, that is certainly fine. As you know, we have expressed very serious concerns about holding a referendum, even a referendum that's considered to be an unbinding referendum. What we would like to see is a stable, secure, and unified Iraq.

As we talk about the referendum that the Kurds want to hold in September – late September, I believe it is – we look at that and say we understand what you're going for, we understand what the goal is, but let's not take our eye off the ball. Let's not take our eye off of ISIS. And ISIS is the major serious threat in Iraq right now, and we're concerned about a referendum at this time that that referendum would be further destabilizing (“Department Press Briefing - August 15, 2017”).

In the above exchange, a reporter asked Nauert if Kurdistan declared its independence, would U.S. support Kurdistan in this stance. Nauert commented that if Erbil and Bagdad wanted to sit down together to solve this by conversation and negotiating, it would be good. Nauert did not end her speech, but she overstated by saying that U.S. expressed serious concerns regarding the referendum. Then, she justified their concern for the referendum, as this would take focus away on ISIS (Islamic State in Iraq and Syria) as result this would create further destabilizing in the area. As Nauert delivered supplementary answer to the question. So, here there is flouting in quantity maxim. The possible implicature may indicate that U.S. does not like this referendum, as the interests of America would be at risk.

- (5) **QUESTION:** Thanks. Iraq has requested – has formally requested the UN's help in investigating ISIS for war crimes. Can you give us some idea of what the next steps are going to be and what your role is going to be in that?

MS NAUERT: So one of the things we've addressed here before is the amount of aid that we've helped to provide to Iraq, I believe also through the United Nations as well. I would need to double check on that. I have it in my notes somewhere. And part – what that is – the aim of that is to help the Iraqi Government and to help the United Nations to be able to identify some of those who have been involved in these – what we can call war crimes, genocide, and all of that (“Department Press Briefing - August 18, 2017”).

The above interaction states that Nauert was asked to talk about UN's help in investigating ISIS for war crimes and U.S. role in this and what would be some detail of the next steps. Nauert first stated that it was previously talked about the amount of aid U.S. provided to help Iraq. In addition, she confessed UN would take the same way. She informed that U.S. would help United Nations to be able to identify some of those who have been involved in these – what we can call war crimes, genocide. Nauert did not give adequate information to the question. This implies flouting quantity maxim. As Nauert gave less information compared to the question.

- (6) **QUESTION:** And one more question. Aren't you worried that by clearly taking the side of Baghdad you might discourage compromise on the side of Baghdad, or you might actually increase --

MS NAUERT: I would take issue with the premise of your question. We don't see it as taking sides with Baghdad. We support a unified, democratic Iraq. Okay?

QUESTION: But by opposing the referendum, isn't that taking side with Baghdad's position?

MSNAUERT: We support a unified, democratic Iraq, and we want everybody to keep the – keep their eye on the ball, and that is annihilating ISIS (“Department Press Briefing - September 26, 2017”).

Here, Ms. Nauert was asked that if United States did not take the side of Bagdad. As by opposing the appointed referendum would indicate that U.S. support Baghdad's position. Nauert denied that and added that United States of America would support a unified, democratic Iraq so that that they could keep their eye on the ball which would be the focusing on fighting against ISIS. Thus, according to Cooperative Principle, here there is flouting in maxim of quantity. Here there is flouting. By this flouting in the talk exchange U.S. wanted the Iraqi Government not to interpret that U.S. encourage and motivate the Kurds to hold Referendum.

- (7) **QUESTION:** And what about these implicit threats of military action against the Kurdistan region? What is your view of them?

MS NAUERT: Military action by --

QUESTION: By Turkey, Iran, and Iraq.

MS NAUERT: Look, we want safety and security for the Iraqi people. We had tremendous concerns with this referendum. We've certainly talked about that a lot. That referendum had no basis in the Iraqi constitution or the law, and I'll just leave it at that. Okay? (“Department Press Briefing - September 26, 2017”).

The spokesperson of U.S. Department of State was asked to indicate the view of State department according to the Iraqi force's implicit threats by mobilizing troops and transferring heavy weapons against the Kurdistan region, as well as Turkey and Iran had roles in this. Nauert indicated the view of United States of America concerning this by saying that they wanted safety and security for the people of Iraq. As U.S., they had had extreme concerns with this referendum. This was because this referendum had no legal basis in the constitution of Iraq. Here Nauert showed the view of America about the implicit threading by Iraq, Iran and Turkey. She gave additional information by saying that the referendum might create problem, as it had no support and back in terms of Iraqi constitution and law. Here it can be said there is flouting in quantity maxim by giving extra information and beyond the question. The possible implicature may imply that this implicit threatening is the outcome of the referendum Kurds are going to hold.

- (8) **QUESTION:** As you know, a couple of days after the Kurdistan referendum, the relations between Baghdad and Erbil is getting complicated, as you and many others expected. Kurdistan now is almost besieged by Turkey, Iran, and Iraq, and there is a feeling among the people in Kurdistan that the United States is keeping silent and that's – means giving the green light to Iraq to do whatever they want to do.

MS NAUERT: “Keeping silent” would be a mischaracterization of the U.S. position on this. We have been very clear from the beginning that we oppose that referendum because we thought it would be destabilizing. As we see some of these reports in the media, unfortunately, that has been borne out. This is destabilizing. We want Kurdistan – we want the Kurds, we want Iraq – the central government of Iraq to remain focused on the fight against ISIS. We have concerns that this will take the focus off the fight against ISIS.

That being said, I want to be very cautious about inflaming tensions. We understand the concerns that many in the region have, and the United States Government doesn't want to do anything to inflame tensions in that arena. We want to avoid anything that would contribute to any additional instability (“Department Press Briefing - September 28, 2017”).

In above interaction, Nauert was asked about Kurdistan referendum, the relationships between Baghdad and Erbil, which had been getting complicated. Kurdistan now had almost been blockaded by Turkey, Iran, and Iraq, and on the other hand Kurds felt that the United States was keeping silent and that would be considered referencing to green light to Iraq to do whatever they want. Nauert superficially answered that ‘keeping silent’ would not mean like that. U.S. would oppose this referendum. U.S. did not want to destabilize the area. But, U.S. would want the focus be on fighting against ISIS. She also explained ‘keeping silent’ was misinterpreted. But Nauert did not comment on the blockade against Kurdistan after referendum. So, here Nauert did not provide full reply for the inquiry. That is why here there is flouting in quantity maxim.

- (9) **QUESTION:** That's just the Iraqi Government – it seems that the parliament asking the Iraqi Government to ask all of the foreign consulates and representatives in Erbil to close. Have you received any warning or any message from the Iraqi Government to close your embassy?

MS NAUERT: Our embassy – our consulate, rather, in Erbil remains open (“Department Press Briefing - September 28, 2017”).

In (9) a journalist asked to know whether the parliament asked Government of Iraqi to request all foreign consulates and representatives to close their office in Erbil. Nauert did not deny this, but she inadequately said that U.S. embassy and consulate were still open. She refused to say yes. But she just said their offices were open. Hence, in this conversation there is flouting in maxim of quantity. One potential implicature may be is that this news is just a claim.

- (10) **QUESTION:** -- a lot of allies are feeling abandoned. You kind of see this feeling widely shared among the Kurds in social media. They say they fought alongside U.S. troops to topple Saddam Hussein. Kurdistan is – has been the place where no U.S. soldier has been killed or kidnapped or even wounded. And they say they even helped retake Arab territory such as Mosul because the United States asked them to do that and – but when they needed the United States, you basically tell them you're on your own, you abandon them.

MS NAUERT: I would disagree with the last part of your assessment. Okay? We – and that's why I wanted to say I recognize that our U.S. forces have fought alongside, have died alongside those from the south, those from the north, all Iraqis. We see it as a federal, unified, democratic Iraq. That is what we would like. The United States had cautioned against this referendum many months ago because we saw it as taking the focus off of the fight against ISIS, an entity that has so brutally decimated the people of Iraq. Doesn't matter if they're Kurds, Arabs, Shias, Sunni, doesn't matter. They have hurt the people of Iraq. Iraqis are our friends and that's why I want to go back to what we call for, which is a unified, democratic Iraq. Okay?

QUESTION: But this force that has taken Kirkuk, I mean, you can see their flags. They are Shia militias led by – like Qasem Soleimani was seen in pictures with them and --

MS NAUERT: My understanding – my understanding is that this had been – that this had been coordinated, that the Kurds were aware of the movements as they were taking place. I'm not the military expert, so I'd have to refer you to DOD beyond that. Okay? But that is my understanding (“Department Press Briefing - October 17, 2017”).

In brief, a Kurdish journalist said that in social media was something spread, it was shared that Kurds thought that they have been abandoned by U.S. so the journalist asked that Kurdistan is that place where no U.S. soldier has been killed, kidnapped or wounded. As Kurds have always been by the side of United States. However, when Kurds needed U.S. help, the U.S. did not answer Kurds. Nauert denied and added something, which was not asked. She talked about U.S. forces fighting alongside Iraqis against ISIS. The journalist asked Nauert to provide the answer the questioner meant. The journalist said that forces that had taken Kirkuk, They were Shia militias led by Qasem Soleimani. Nauert responded saying that what had happened was previously coordinated. As the Kurds, themselves were aware of the movements. All in all the answer was inadequate. There is flouting in this exchange in maxim of quantity. The possible implicature may be that Kurds had disputes among themselves. So how could U.S. help them!?

(11) QUESTION: Okay. And one more question: Hadi al-Ameri, head of the Popular Mobilization Forces, had said that U.S. troops must leave Iraq once ISIS is defeated. What's your comment on that?

MS NAUERT: Yeah. Overall, the United States, as we are in other countries as well, we're there at the request of the government. We are there at the request of the Iraqi Government. We are there to defeat ISIS. That's all I have for you on that. Okay? ("Department Press Briefing - November 30, 2017").

In this exchange, Nauert was asked about Hadi al-Ameri's threatening, head of the Popular Mobilization Forces. Al-Ameri publically said after the ISIS, U.S. force should be off in Iraq. Thus, what would the response of United States be to this threatening. Nauert did not reply Amari's threatening, but she said that U.S. was a part of coalition against ISIS, U.S. troops were in Iraq at the request of Government of Iraq. Thus, it can be said that Nauert's response is not adequate. According to Grice's CP there is flouting in quantity maxim in this exchange. The implicature may be is that U.S. transacts with the president of Iraq, as he is number one in terms of legal authority in Iraq.

(12) QUESTION: Okay, and I want to follow up on that topper. The Kurdish Prime Minister Nechirvan Barzani complained today that the talks with Baghdad which you, the KRG, they've all – you've repeatedly called for, have not even started. So in the deputy secretary's meeting with the Iraqi deputy foreign minister, was there any discussion of when those talks would begin?

MS NAUERT: Well, those talks would have to be agreed to between the Iraqi central government and also between the Kurds. So I'm not sure that they would commit to us that those talks will begin on a certain date, but we continue to call upon the Government of Iraq to sit down with the Kurds and have a conversation about this ("Department Press Briefing - November 30, 2017").

The question asked here is that Prime Minister of Iraqi Kurdistan, Nechirvan Barzani expressed his concern about talks with Baghdad since it had not begun yet. Next Nauer was asked when would the talk start. Nauert stated that she did not know whether she would be informed or no. But after that Nauert added that they would continue to call upon Both Bagdad and Erbil to sit down together to have conversation. As supplementary information was provided to the inquiry, there is flouting in maxim of quantity. The possible implicature maybe is that the conversation is going to begin is by the help of the United State.

1.1.1.2 Flouting Maxim of Relation

(13) QUESTION: You said "the legitimate aspirations of Iraqi Kurdistan." So you do – so you believe that independence is a legitimate aspiration for the Kurds?

MS NAUERT: We believe that this is an internal Iraqi matter, first and foremost. What the U.S. Government cares about – and of course we have our friends in the north, we have our friends in the Government of Iraq – but first and foremost we have to defeat ISIS. Once that is done, this is something that they can then address ("Department Press Briefing - June 8, 2018").

In the above interaction, Nauert was wanted to say whether United State believes that the independence of Kurdistan would be a legitimate aspiration for the Kurds. She stated that this was an internal matter. Then she changed the topic by saying that U.S. has friends in the Iraqi Government. Then she changed the topic to say something about ISIS. Thus it can be said that there is flouting in maxim of relation in this interaction, as Nauert changed the topic. The plausible implicature maybe is that Nauert changed the topic so that she could reduce tension. As the topic was very sensitive and it was related to both Bagdad and Erbil.

(14) QUESTION: One more question on the Amnesty International report. They have made some accusations against the coalition and the Iraqi forces, arguing that they might – war crimes might have been committed by the coalition and Iraqi forces in Mosul because --

MS NAUERT: I'm familiar with the Amnesty International report. And some would say let's take a step back and take a look at this. The coalition and its forces do everything that they can to avoid civilian casualties. That's something as Americans and I know the coalition as a whole takes very, very seriously. Let's remember why we are engaged in this fight against ISIS. Let me remind you of something I just said – the beheadings of

civilians, the beheadings of children, the crucifixion of Christians, the burning of the Jordanian pilot in the cage. All of these things – I can go on and on about the atrocities that have taken place in that region over a few numbers of years. So we will continue to take that fight to ISIS and continue to allow Iraqi civilians to come home. The United States, coalition partners, have had that win, if you will, but we know that it's not over yet ("Department Press Briefing - July 11, 2017").

In (14) Ms. Heather Nauert was invited to comment on Amnesty International report. The report accused the coalition and Iraqi forces with having committed war crimes in Mosul. Nauert said that she would be familiar with the Amnesty International report. Then she changed the topic by saying that the coalition had done everything so as to avoid civilian casualties. Then she said that "Let's remember why we are engaged in this fight against ISIS". Then she reminded the attendants that ISIS beheaded civilians, children, and the crucifixion of Christians. Additionally, they burnt the Jordanian pilot in the cage. Then she added they would continue to fight ISIS and continue to allow Iraqi civilians to come home. Here there is a change to talk about the crimes that the ISIS committed against civilians by beheading. So, it can be said that here is flouting in relation maxim. The possible implicature is that U.S. and the coalition did not commit war crimes.

(15) QUESTION: Thank you. The Kurdish president, Massoud Barzani, yesterday had an op-ed published in The Washington Post making the case for Kurdish independence. He said the referendum is binding, contrary to previous media reports. He also said that it will not be a unilateral step by the Kurds; it will be a result of a negotiated settlement with Baghdad. So my question is: Would the United States support it if the Iraqis, like, do it in a negotiated settlement among themselves?

MS NAUERT: I think what we would continue to say about that is that the fight against ISIS is on and that would be the top U.S. concern and probably the top Iraqi concern, I would imagine, at this time. We support our partnership with the Government of Iraq. We continue to support that. We want to see the sole focus stay on ISIS. You've had far too many Iraqis who have had to leave their homes because of ISIS and the horrific things that they have done in that country. So we would like to see ISIS out and then, once Iraq has stabilized and people can go back to their homes ("Department Press Briefing - June 29, 2017").

In the above exchange, Nauert was asked that Massoud Barzani, the President of Iraqi Kurdistan spoke to The Washington Post. Barazani said that Kurds were going to hold referendum for independence. He also stated that it would not be a unilateral step by the Kurds. But it would be a result of a negotiated settlement with Baghdad. Then the one asked the question told Nauert U.S. would back this referendum, if it was solved by negotiation with Iraq. Nauert immediately changed the topic by talking about ISIS. She elaborated saying that United States would continue to fight against ISIS since it would be the ultimate gist to U.S. and Iraq. Then she stated that U.S. would continue to back and support the Government of Iraq to fight against ISIS and defeat them.

Here the changing topic is considered breaking of maxim of relation. As here, there is flouting in relation maxim, implicature should be available in the interaction. Thus, by this changing topic Nauert might mean that what was important for the U.S. was defeating ISIS not that referendum.

(16) QUESTION: But it's not about the referendum itself. It's the timing?

MS NAUERT: And ultimately this is going to have to be worked out with the Iraqi people, but I just want to be clear, ISIS is the main fight that Iraqis have been fought – fighting for years now, hoping to get people back into western Mosul as they've started to come back in. There are operations taking place up in the north in Tal Afar. We haven't talked about that a whole lot, but there are a lot of concerning activities on the part of trying to get ISIS out of Iraq. And we see that as the sole focus where we need to stay – where we need to keep the eye on the ball. Okay ("Department Press Briefing - August 15, 2017").

In the above exchange, Nauert was asked if U.S. had problem with the Kurdistan referendum because of the timing. Nauert at once changed the topic matter by talking about something unrelated. She talked about ISIS. Nauert stated that ISIS would be the major aim and purpose. There were operations taking place up in Tal Afar. Similarly, maxim of relation is broken. There is flouting. The potential implicature can be inferred that U.S. sees defeating ISIS is more important than that referendum the Kurds are going to do.

(17) QUESTION: Thank you. So on your statement, you said that you will continue your historic relationship with the Kurdish people. Do you mean only the Kurdish people or with the Kurdish government as well?

MS NAUERT: Well, I think our conversations will be ongoing. We will continue to have conversations both with our friends in Baghdad as well as our friends in the north as well. We have a lot of conversations, as you all know. We have a close relationship with both. The United States Government and the coalition's concern about this and the timing of this referendum was we didn't want to splinter Iraq. We see the primary issue as taking on ISIS, defeating ISIS, annihilating ISIS, so that they never come to try to rule over and terrorize the Iraqi people again. We'd like to keep our eye on the ball with that. That failed; that is a concern of ours and is deeply disappointing ("Department Press Briefing - September 26, 2017").

In the talk exchange (17), the question directed to Nauert was that if U.S. would continue their historic relationship with the Kurdish people or with the Kurdish government as well. Nauert altered the topic by saying other things, which were unconnected to the question. She said that U.S. talks would be ongoing with both their friends in Baghdad and their friends in Erbil. As U.S. had relationship with both. Then she said something about the Kurdistan referendum and its timing and said that The United States Government would keep their eye on the ball with that. According to Grice's CP, maxim of relation here was not abided by. Here, there is flouting in maxim relation to implicate that United States does not have only relations with Kurdistan, but they have also strong ties with Government of Iraq.

1.1.1.3 Flouting Maxim of Manner

(18) QUESTION: Well, that there's a civilian catastrophe. It took the Iraqi forces to – and the Peshmerga to task for going after civilians under the aegis, kind of, of the United States.

MS NAUERT: I think what I would say about that is let's remember the real focus of the humanitarian and civilian casualty situation in Iraq, and that is ISIS. And we talked about this the other day. Were it not for ISIS, were it not for ISIS forcing so many people from their homes – and now through the work of the coalition many people, hundreds of thousands of people have been able to go back to their homes in Mosul alone. And so the real focus, the real reason why there has been misery in Iraq and Syria as well is because of ISIS, not the coalition and not the coalition partners.

MS NAUERT: Hold on, Said. Nothing could be further from the truth on that. I was sitting in a meeting earlier today. As I was sitting in the meeting in this building today with members of the international coalition – it included members from Iraq as well – where the primary focus was talking about how you start to bring people back home, into their homes in western Mosul.

[...] I just announced at the very top of this humanitarian assistance, new pledges of humanitarian assistance on the part of USAID going into Iraq. That is significant. Perhaps sometimes folks like to look for one place, one situation of misery, and forget to see the progress that is being made. We have been clear here that there is a lot of work that is left to be done; no doubt about that. Western Mosul was just liberated. There are still bad guys in there as the military effort goes back in to try to figure out if anybody was left behind, but we are optimistic about the ability to bring people back into western Mosul. It's not going to be overnight. This will take some time, but this will eventually happen ("Department Press Briefing - July 13, 2017").

Ms. Heather Nauert was asked to say something about that civilian catastrophe happened by ISIS, in terms of the role of the Iraqi forces, Peshmerga and the United States to task and look after these civilians. Nauert answered in long elaboration and talked many things. She said that it was necessary to remember the focus of the humanitarian and civilian casualty condition in Iraq. What disaster happened to the civilians by ISIS. Nauert elaborated more and more by saying that she was sitting in a meeting earlier that day with members of the international coalition, including members of Iraq too. In the meeting, it was being talked about how to bring people back home, into their homes in western Mosul. Then Nauert talked about eastern Mosul, saying that hundreds of thousands of people had been brought back into eastern Mosul and some services have been provided. Actually according to Cooperative Principle, Nauert breached maxim of manner, as she gave long elaboration in a way the one asked the question forgot exactly what his or her question was. So there is here flouting in maxim of manner, as Naurt was not brief, unambiguous. The expected implicature may be is that U.S. with their coalition partners have helped Iraqi people in defeating ISIS and bringing people back to their homes with providing many services.

(19) QUESTION: Today the Syrian army has cleared the last – the last hurdle in the fight against ISIS in the Bukamal area, which is on the Iraqi-Syrian border. It's Tal Afar on the Iraqi side; it's the same town. So update us on your efforts and your activities. There's also political engagement with Astana, and there is a prelude to Geneva, so just sort of --

MS NAUERT: Okay. Starting from today, let me just mention Brett McGurk is in the region. I don't know if we have sent out any information from – on that. We have. Okay. So he is in Brussels today meeting with Secretary of Defense Secretary Mattis and their counterparts to talk about the overall global coalition's contributions to the contributors in the D-ISIS coalition, which now is 73 governments and also various entities that take place in that.

[...] A lot of people have been asking questions about Secretary Tillerson and the President and whether or not they will sit down with Russian President Vladimir Putin. So let me just mention to you that if they were to – and we don't have any meetings to announce, because that was not a part of the official schedule – an issue that we are interested in having conversations about is looking for new ceasefire zones.

I continue to go back to the success we've had, the coalition has had, with the ceasefire zone that's held since July – a tremendous success. If we can get to another ceasefire zone, that helps get us closer to the Geneva process. We are not a party to the Astana process. We support the Geneva talks led by Staffan de Mistura. We believe that the Geneva process is the right way to go under the UN Security Council resolutions and that ultimately the people of Syria will decide who is going to lead that country. But go back to saying, once again – unfortunately, it's a long way off, but we're getting a little bit closer to that point. The fight is not over; the fight

is still going to take quite a bit of time. Caution everybody on patience on that, but we're plowing ahead with it ("Department Press Briefing - November 9, 2017").

In this interaction, Ms. Heather Nauert was invited to update on the fight against ISIS in the Bukamal area where is located in the Iraqi-Syrian border. Nauert gave a lot of detail. Nauert stated Brett McGurk was in Brussels that day to meet with Secretary of Defense Secretary Mattis and their counterparts to address overall global coalition's contributions. Nauert informed that the meeting was taking place on the sidelines of a NATO meeting and McGurk's briefing. Next Nauert said something Secretary Tillerson and the President as many people asked her.

Nauert then went back to talk about the success the coalition had had, with the ceasefire zone that was held since July. Nauert explicated that U.S. would believe that the Geneva process was the right way in which the people of Syria could decide who was going to lead that country. Then Nauert went back to say more on Syria. She stated that the fight was not over; the fight was continues. This would seem to take quite a bit of time.

Actually, the way Nauert gave journalists updated information was really not brief, not unambiguous, not clear, even not orderly. Therefore, in this interaction, it is inferred that Nauert breached maxim of manner. There is flouting in manner maxim in the exchange. The likely implicature maybe Nauert wanted to show that U.S. provides assistance and peace to the world.

(20) QUESTION: -- your objection is to the timing of the referendum --

MSNAUERT: We've talked about that. Yeah. I think I've been clear about the concerns related to the timing of the referendum.

QUESTION: But it's not about the referendum itself. It's the timing?

MS NAUERT: And ultimately this is going to have to be worked out with the Iraqi people, but I just want to be clear, ISIS is the main fight that Iraqis have been fought – fighting for years now, hoping to get people back into western Mosul as they've started to come back in. There are operations taking place up in the north in Tal Afar. We haven't talked about that a whole lot, but there are a lot of concerning activities on the part of trying to get ISIS out of Iraq. And we see that as the sole focus where we need to stay – where we need to keep the eye on the ball. Okay ("Department Press Briefing - August 15, 2017").

In this conversation, Ms. Nauert was asked whether U.S. would have problem with Kurdistan referendum because of its timing. As this question was asked many times Nauert said that U.S. was clear about the concerns related to the timing of the referendum. Then for confirming the question, the reporter re-asked Nauert by saying so the problem with the timing of the referendum not the referendum itself. Nauert stated that this was going to have to be worked out with the Iraqi people. Then Nauert added and overlapped the referendum topic with ISIS fighting and issue. She talked about western Mosul and the issue of trying to derive ISIS out of Iraq. Finally, Nauert said they should keep fighting ISIS.

Actually, the way Ms. Heather Nauert answered the question indicates that there is flouting in maxim of manner in this talk exchange. As she was not brief, not unambiguous and even not orderly. The possible implicature designates that Nauert wanted the Kurds to know that there are many problems, which prevent successful referendum for the time being.

1.1.2 Violating the Maxims

1.1.2.1 Violating Maxim of Quality

(21) QUESTION: Okay. So the Pentagon issued a statement, which resonated what other U.S. officials from the State Department have said about the liberation of Mosul. It said we have to – we need to address the conditions that led to the rise of ISIS in Iraq. So I want to know whether the United States mission from now on will be to address those conditions in Iraq and what are those conditions.

MS NAUERT: I think our mission in Iraq – we'll do what we can to support the Iraqi Government and the people of Iraq. We are not going to unilaterally decide what's best for the Iraqi Government. We have had close cooperation with them and we are very, very pleased to see the liberation of Mosul. Let's not forget it was not that long ago where the most horrific things on the part of ISIS were taking place in Mosul, where we saw the beheadings of civilians, where we saw the crucifixion of Christians, where in various parts of Iraq and Syria we've seen people burned in cages, we've seen people drown. So I think it's a real welcome sight – not that the fight is over, but a welcome sight that Mosul has been liberated. Again, a tough fight ahead for the Iraqi Government, other governments in the area, coalition partners. That's something that we're addressing here in Washington. But we remain committed to that and also to the Iraqi people and the Iraqi Government ("Department Press Briefing - July 11, 2017").

Ms. Heather Nauert was asked that if from now on Pentagon would start to speak about the conditions that led to the rise of ISIS in Iraq. Nauert replied by saying that U.S. would not unilaterally decide what would be the best

for the Government of Iraq. U.S. had had strong cooperation and ties with Iraq and very pleased to see the Mosul liberation. Then Nauert flashed back the horrific events had happened to Iraqi people because of the ISIS, like civilian beheadings, the crucifixion of Christians, in various parts of Iraq. Nauert added many other things, indicating a great contribution and assistances provided by U.S. to Iraqi people.

In this exchange, there is violating in maxim of quality. U.S. of America knows many things well in terms of rising ISIS and other things in all over the world. So, forming a mission to investigate the reasons that led to rising ISIS is something needless. Therefore, their statement seems to mislead people of the world. As here and there, people say that U.S. knows everything happening in the world due to the fact that they have developed equipment in terms of technology which help their intelligence agents and spy staff to discover whatever they seek for.

Another point indicating violation maxim of quality is that United States deals with Iraq and many other countries as a commander. Thus, the relationship and tie is not a coordinated manner. When Nauert stated that U.S. would not unilaterally decide what would be the best for the Government of Iraq is something untrue. U.S. behavior in reality with many countries and states is unilateral and one-sided. Here, what is stated is untrue. This is said to mislead others.

(22) QUESTION: (Laughter.) Well, thank you. An Iraqi Shia militia claimed that the U.S. attacked it on the border – it was on the border with Iraq and Syria, and that it killed dozens of its fighters, as well as seven Iranian Revolutionary Guards, including a commander. And then ISIS claimed responsibility for the attack and the U.S. has denied it – the Pentagon at least.

Can you explain to us what happened there?

MS NAUERT: So we don't know exactly what happened there, but I can tell you this: The reports that you reference are false. The United States had nothing to do with this. The United States coalition did not conduct any strikes in that area on the date and that time of the alleged attack. ISIS we know claimed responsibility for that attack, and we had nothing to do with it. The assertion that the coalition is conducting operations with ISIS is simply preposterous. And I hope that answers the question ("Department Press Briefing - August 3, 2017").

In (22) Heather Nauert was asked to explain about that an Iraqi Shia militia claimed that their forces were attacked on the border with Iraq and Syria by the United States. The Iraqi force accused U.S. with the attack. Then Nauert answered stating that they did not know the accuracy of the happening. She then denied and refused the reports and described them as false. Next, she said that U.S. coalition had not conducted any strikes in that area on the date. In this interaction, as stated by many people, as now and then here and there Shia groups threaten U.S. by attacking on them, so the U.S. attacked them to push them back on their stance and threatening. Thus, U.S. was aware very well and its force attacked the Iraqi Shia force. If it is so, as many people think the reality is like mentioned, here the provided information is untrue and the answer is considered as violation of quality maxim. This is because the supplied news is untrue to mislead people.

1.1.3 Opting Out the Maxims

(23) QUESTION: Iran's Ayatollah Khamenei has spoken very sharply to the Iraqi Prime Minister Abadi. He's warned him against weakening the Hashd al-Shaabi and relying on the U.S. Khamenei also accused the U.S., along with Saudi Arabia, of creating ISIS. And Khamenei stated his opposition to the presence of U.S. forces in Iraq. What is your response to all that?

MS NAUERT: So as you all have seen here before, the statement of – statements of various foreign officials, I'm not going to comment on every single statement that comes out. So I'm not going to comment on that. But we can say that our partnership with the Government of Iraq is steadfast. They have been a strong partner of ours, and that will continue. That won't change ("Department Press Briefing - June 22, 2017").

Ms. Heather Nauert was asked that Ayatollah Khamenei in Iran had sharply encouraged Iraqi Prime Minister Abadi. Khamenei had warned Abadi against weakening the Hashd al-Shaabi. Khamenei had advised Abadi not to depend on United States. Khamenei had also accused the U.S., with Saudi Arabia, of creating ISIS. Nauert did not want to comment on this. She just said that their partnership would be with the Iraqi Government. The Iraqi Government has been strong partner to United States. Here there is opting out in relation maxim according to Grice's CP and CMs. Here, Nauert refused to answer the question and comment on Ayatollah Khamenei's speech against America. Nauert seemed to be told that should keep some things secret, not say anything about them publically—thus this was seen as something confidential. That is why according to Grice's CP, Nauert broke CMs by opting out.

(24) QUESTION: The former ambassador to Iraq, Ryan Crocker, said today on CNN it was a mistake for the U.S. to come down so hard against the referendum once it was clear it was going to happen and that it probably emboldened Baghdad to take a harsher posture than it otherwise 13 9/28/2017 would have. And he also stressed the importance of managing the tensions that now exist in the region. What is your response to that?

MS NAUERT: The only thing I will respond to – and I’m always hesitant to respond to other officials or world leaders who specifically have a comment or an opinion on something – but he does bring up – that last point is a valid one, and that is we would like to see some calm on all sides. The United States does not want to do anything that would inflame tensions. That’s why I’m going to be very cautious with my words. We will continue to offer our assistance to help facilitate any dialogue, if we are asked. Okay? (“Department Press Briefing - September 28, 2017”).

In this interaction, a journalist said that the former ambassador to Iraq, Ryan Crocker said that it was a mistake for the U.S. to be against the referendum of Kurdistan. Then the journalist asked Ms. Heather Nauert to tell U.S. response to this. Nauert said that U.S. would not like to do anything that might lead to or inflame tensions. Then Nauert said that “. That’s why I’m going to be very cautious with my words.” In this exchange, Nauert explained that she would not like to comment on speeches and opinions of officials or world leaders when they say something about specific topics. So, in this exchange, Nauert unwillingly did not like to answer and cooperate due to confidentiality. Thus, it can be said that in this exchange there is an opting out of CMs as the responder did not want answer the inquiry.

(25) QUESTION: Last week, the Iraqi parliament approved in principle a law that would allow child marriages for girls as young as nine years old and that would impose Shiite jurisprudence on all Iraqis. Today, an MP in the Kurdistan region parliament rejected it, saying that it’s unenforceable in the Kurdistan region because the Kurdistan region has its own laws. What’s your comment on the Iraqi draft law?

MS NAUERT: Yeah. So often we don’t comment on draft legislation; often we don’t comment on other country’s legislation (“Department Press Briefing - November 9, 2017”).

In (25) a reporter said that the Iraqi parliament certified and accepted a law, which could give allowance to child marriages for girls who are nine years old. For the response the question, the spokesperson of U.S. Department of State, Ms. Heather Nauert said that as U.S. they would not comment on draft legislation of other countries and states. In this conversation, it was seen that Heather Nauert would unwillingly not respond the question. For this it can be said that here there is opting out of CMs as implied that this is something internal and private issues of other countries.

(26) QUESTION: Do you think it was in effect when Qais al-Khazali took Albu Kamal from the Iraqi side, that the prime minister was enforcing his writ?

MS NAUERT: I don’t want to comment on that. I mean, that would – some of that would just be in Department of Defense’s lane. Okay (“Department Press Briefing - November 9, 2017”).

In this talk exchange, Ms. Heather Nauert was asked about one of the leader of Hasdi Al-Shabi, Qais Al-Khazali, But, Heather Nauert said that she would not comment on this. This response can indicate there is non-observance in this interaction as Nauert unwillingly refused to comment on the inquiry. So it can be said that there is an opting out in CMs in this interaction.

(27) QUESTION: if – his plan is to use the parliament to put pressure on the Iraqi Government to ask U.S. forces to leave. If that happens, you’ll just pick up and leave?

MS NAUERT: Laurie, I just don’t have anything more for you on that. We are there at the request of the Iraqi Government. Okay? (“Department Press Briefing - November 30, 2017”).

In (27) Ms. Heather Nauert was asked if, in the Iraq, U.S. force was asked to leave Iraq, what the response and reaction of the U.S. stance would be. Nauert sounded that she could not answer such a question. She stated that she did not have anything on this. It seemed that mentioning such a matter is something confidential. That is why she did not give information about this.

(28) QUESTION: According to the KRG presidency’s website, Mr. – in the phone call between Mr. Tillerson and Barzani, Mr. Tillerson encouraged Erbil to negotiate with Baghdad. Do you – is that the case? What else did Mr. Tillerson think

MS NAUERT: I don’t have a readout of that conversation (“Department Press Briefing - August 15, 2017”).

In (28) the spokesperson of U.S. Department of State, Ms. Heather Nauert was invited to inform about that phone calling occurring between Mr. Tillerson and Barzani, in which Mr. Tillerson encouraged Barzain to sit down and negotiate with Baghdad according to the KRG presidency’s website. Nauert replied by saying that she did not have readout about this. This is assumed that Nauert was told that she would not say anything about this phone calling which happened between Barzani and the Secretary Tillerson. If the matter is like mentioned, it can be said that in this talk exchange Nauert opted out CMs. As she could not give information about the calling because of some confidentiality.

IV. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The talk exchanges analyzed in this chapter are all non-observed ones which are taken among fifty exchanges. The exchanges are taken from U.S. Department Press Briefings, focusing on Iraq Issues in 2017. They are twenty-eight. Twenty exchanges no-observed were found in the Department Press Briefings are flouting. Twelve of the flouting were maxim of quantity. Maxim of relation in flouting were five entities. In addition, the two remained exchanges in flouting covered were maxim of manner. Regarding violation maxims, only two violations in quality maxim could be found. The final attempt made to find non-observance of CMs was opting out. Six talk exchanges in terms of opting out CMs were recorded. To clearly explain the results and finding of the talk exchanges of the Department Press Briefings, the following table illustrates all non-observance talk exchanges, which were released concerning Iraqi issues in 2017.

Table 1 Non-Observance Talk Exchanges of Press Briefings of U.S. Department of State

No.	No-observance of CMs	CMs	Rate of Occurrences	The Total Occurrences	The Percentage
1	Flouting	Quantity	12	20	56%
		Relation	5		
		Manner	3		
		Quality	0		
2	Violation	Quality	2	2	
		Quantity	0		
		Relation	0		
		Manner	0		
3	Opting Out	CMs	6	6	
4	Infringing	CMs	0	0	
5	Suspending	CMs	0	0	
The Total Occurrences of the All				28	

V. CONCLUSION

Meaning is not restricted to linguistic expressions alone. This is because meaning is related and directed by the intention of the interlocutors. Non-observance cases of CMs in DPBs can be good evidence to prove and show the reality of this matter. The Cooperative Principle has really played a vital role in expounding and helping to understand meaning construction in U.S. Department of State's Press Briefings.

Non-observance cases of the talk exchanges in DPBs analyzed took 56% and those exchanges show that if they were observed, this could have led to risks of U.S. interests. This was fully and clearly felt and seen in those exchanges, which have been opted out (see the examples, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28).

In non-observance cases, one important fact has been proved which is keeping and protecting the interests of the United States is very important for those who are doing politics in U.S. Department of State. To confirm this fact, Ms. Heather Nauert said that "I'm going to be very cautious with my words" (see (24)). Thus, non-observance of the talk exchanges of the DPBs occur to keep and protect interests of U.S. and its people and let them not be at risks and dangers.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Grice, P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* (pp. 41-58). New York, NY: Academic Press. Available from https://edge.edx.org/assetv1:Brown+CSCI2951+2018_T2type@asse+block/grice75pdf.
- [2]. Zor, B., M. (2006). Using Grice's Cooperative Principle and its Maxims to Analyze Problems of Coherence in Turkish and English Essays. (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University
- [3]. Miraziz, P. Y. (2016). The Cooperative Principle in Teacher-Student Interaction in English and Kurdish Departments at Salahddin University. (Unpublished master's thesis). Salahasddin University-Erbil.
- [4]. Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language* (4th ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [5]. Trauth, G. P. & Kazzazi, K. (Eds.). (1996). *Routledge Dictionary of Language*. London and New York: Routledge.

- [6]. Birner, B. J. (2013). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- [7]. Yule, G. (2000). *Pragmatics* (5th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [8]. Denham, K. & Lobeck, A. (2013). *Linguistics for Everyone: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA 02210 USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- [9]. Griffiths, P. (2006). *An Introduction To English Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [10]. Aitchison, J. (1999). *Linguistics*. London: Hodder Headline.
- [11]. Cruse, A. (2006). *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [12]. Aitchison, J. (2014). *Understand Linguistics: Teach Yourself Guide*. London: Hodder Headline.
- [13]. Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [14]. Fasold, R. & Connor, J. (Eds.). (2006). *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [15]. Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- [16]. Genetti, C. (2014). *How Languages Work. An Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [17]. Finch, G. (2000). *Linguistic Terms and Concepts*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [18]. Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. London and New York: Routledge.
- [19]. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [20]. Candlin, C. N. (1985). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). New York and London: Routledge.
- [21]. Atlas, J. D. (2005). *Logic, Meaning, and Conversation: Semantics, Underdeterminacy, Implicature, and Their Inference*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- [22]. Hornsby, D. (2014). *Linguistics: A complete Introduction*. London: Hodder & Stoughton Ltd.
- [23]. Allott, N. (2010). *Key Terms in Pragmatics*. London: Continuum.
- [24]. Mesthrie, R. (2011). *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [25]. Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- [26]. AL-Sulaimaan, M. M. D. (2011). *Semantics and Pragmatics*. (2nd ed.). Mosul: Daar Ibin Al- Atheer Li Al-Tibaa' ti Wa Al- Nashr.
- [27]. Finch, G. (2005). *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed.). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [28]. Cruse, A. (2006). *A Glossary of Semantics and Pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [29]. Archer, D., Aijmer, K., & Wichmann, A. (2012). *Pragmatics: An Advanced Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.
- [30]. Baker, P. & Ellece, S. (2011). *Key Terms in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- [31]. Plischke, E. (1999). *U.S. Department of State: A Reference History*. Westport, Connecticut London: Greenwood Press.
- [32]. U.S. Department of State (December 19, 2017). *Press Releases*. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/index.htm> [Accessed: 19th February 2018].
- [33]. U.S. Department of State (June 8, 2017). *Department Press Briefing*. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/06/271653.htm> [Accessed: 12th December 2017].
- [34]. U.S. Department of State (June 27, 2017). *Department Press Briefing*. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/06/272215.htm> [Accessed: 17th December 2017].
- [35]. U.S. Department of State (August 3, 2017). *Department Press Briefing*. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/08/273018.htm> [Accessed: 2nd January 2018].
- [36]. U.S. Department of State (August 15, 2017). *Department Press Briefing*. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/08/273454.htm> [Accessed: 5th January 2018].
- [37]. U.S. Department of State (August 18, 2017). *Department Press Briefing*. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/08/273533.htm> [Accessed: 9th January 2018].
- [38]. U.S. Department of State (September 26, 2017). *Department Press Briefing*. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/09/274443.htm> [Accessed: 16th January 2018].
- [39]. U.S. Department of State (September 28, 2017). *Department Press Briefing*. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/09/274493.htm> [Accessed: 18th January 2018].
- [40]. U.S. Department of State (October 17, 2017). *Department Press Briefing*. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/10/274875.htm> [Accessed: 18th January 2018].
- [41]. U.S. Department of State (November 30, 2017). *Department Press Briefing*. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/11/276085.htm> [Accessed: 5th February 2018].

- [42]. U.S. Department of State (July 11, 2017). Department Press Briefing. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/07/272535.htm>[Accessed: 25th December 2017].
- [43]. U.S. Department of State (June 29, 2017). Department Press Briefing. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/06/272265.htm>[Accessed: 19th December 2017].
- [44]. U.S. Department of State (July 13, 2017). Department Press Briefing. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/07/272575.htm>[Accessed: 27th December 2017].
- [45]. U.S. Department of State (November 9, 2017). Department Press Briefing. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/11/275450.htm>[Accessed: 24th January 2018].
- [46]. U.S. Department of State (June 22, 2017). Department Press Briefing. Available from: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/dpb/2017/06/272114.htm>[Accessed: 14th December 2017].

IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) is UGC approved Journal with Sl. No. 5070, Journal no. 49323.

Dr. Suhayla H. Majeed "Non-observance of Conversational Maxims in the Exchanges of Department Press Briefings." IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 23 no. 06, 2018, pp. 67-86.