UC Journal, e-ISSN 2774-9401, Vol. 6, No. 1, May 2025, pp. 80-91

UC Journal: ELT, Linguistics and Literature Journal
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/UC
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE BETWEEN AN ENGLISH TEACHER AND STUDENTS

Muhammad Reza[1*], Luwandi Suhartono[2], and Yanti Sri Rezeki[3]
[1,2,3]Tanjungpura University, Indonesia
muhammadreza1667@gmail.com[1], luwandi10@gmail.com[2],
and yantifkip2022@gmail.com[3]
*correspondence: muhammadreza1667@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.24071/uc.v6i1.9629
received 25 August 2024; accepted 31 May 2025

Abstract
This study analyzed the conversational implicatures in the conversation between the English teacher and the students during an English class session in one of the classrooms at SMP Negeri 9 Pontianak. The purposes of this study were to identify the types of conversational implicatures used by the English teacher and the students, and also to describe the implied meaning of the conversational implicatures used by the English teacher and the students during one English class session in the classroom. This study focused on analyzing the conversation using Paul Grice's theory of conversational implicature. The results of this study demonstrated the usage of two different types of conversational implicature by both the teacher and the students: generalized and particularized. The analysis also demonstrated that the implied meanings derived from these conversational implicatures conveyed a variety of communicative purposes beyond the literal meaning of the words spoken. These included informing, requesting, ordering, confirming, and expressing ignorance.

Keywords: conversational implicature, maxim, pragmatics

Introduction
Language is one of the important components of human communication because it enables people to successfully express their ideas, feelings, and thoughts. It plays as symbols, sounds, and rules that enable people to convey meaning and understand one another. In the context of education, language plays a significant role and impacts how effectively teachers and students communicate with one another. Language not only functions as a communication tool but also as a tool that facilitates the transfer of knowledge and understanding of the material being studied. Therefore, language proficiency is very important in creating effective communication in classroom learning.

In achieving effective communication in the classroom, teachers and students may communicate clearly and directly with each other throughout all stages of the teaching process: pre-teaching, whilst-teaching, and post-teaching. Thus, the usefulness of language in supporting the effectiveness of

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

communication between teachers and students can be created, enabling the smooth transmission of knowledge. However, this does not mean that communicating messages indirectly hinders the achievement of effective communication. Sometimes teachers and students, either consciously or unconsciously, express themselves indirectly, especially in the pre-teaching stage when assessing prior knowledge or in the post-teaching stage when giving feedback. Nevertheless, understanding can still be achieved due to the unique communication relationship that exists within the classroom. This happens because of the communication relationship between teachers and students in the classroom is influenced by various factors, such as shared knowledge, cultural backgrounds, and the specific context of the classroom environment, including its established rules and expectations. By understanding the context and being cooperative, teachers and students can still achieve effective communication even if the message is not directly stated.

Related to the importance of understanding context in language to achieve effective communication, pragmatics is a linguistic field examining how language in used in context to facilitate successful communication. It focuses on understanding meaning within its context (Yule, 1996). It explores how meaning is conveyed not only through the literal content of an utterance but also through its context of use (Darweesh & Al-Khanji, 2024). It utilizes everything beyond the literal content of an utterance such as context, tone, gestures, rules, and cultural norms to understand the meaning of an utterance. Therefore, an understanding of pragmatics is essential in understanding a more complex conversation.

In addition to the important role pragmatics plays in understanding language in context to achieve effective communication, Grice (1975) also proposed a principle called cooperative principle to help people achieve effective communication. This principle is based on the idea that conversational participants collaborate and typically make an effort to create effective communication by adhering a conversational maxim. Maxim is a set of rules that participants in a conversation must follow for their words to be understood. People must adhere to cooperative principles to prevent misinterpretation, as communication plays a significant role in information exchange and social relationship building (Yulianti et al., 2022). When one flouts the maxims, it could give rise to a conversational implicature (Grice, 1975).

Conversational implicature is a fundamental idea in pragmatics that affects how speech is produced and understood (Ye, 2022). It is any meaning that a speaker implies in the utterance of a phrase but is not a literal part of what is uttered (Huang, 2017; Legiansyah & Supri, 2020; Lesmana, 2022). In other words, what a speaker says might be quite different from what he intends. The actual meaning is derived from the conversational context and relies on the speaker's intention and the hearer's ability to infer what the speaker said. In the classroom context, teachers and students often engage in common interactional purposes that beyond the literal meaning of their words. By sharing the same common knowledge, culture, and context, they can still understand each other's intentions. This is also referred to as conversational implicature. Teachers might use conversational implicature to indirectly guide or correct students, while students might use it to negotiate tasks or express confusion without directly challenging authority. Analyzing these exchanges can offer insights into how learning is

facilitated through implicit communication. However, most of the students are still not aware that such utterances they unconsciously say might fall under the category of conversational implicature. Therefore, understanding conversational implicature is important for effective communication, as it helps teachers and students to utilize specific situations and contexts in interpreting the intentions of others.

Previous studies by Mappaita (2022) and Sofyan et al. (2022) explored conversational implicature in classroom settings. Mappaita analyzed the types of implicature used by teachers, while Sofyan et al. identified types and described implied meanings in teacher-student conversations at a specific Islamic boarding school. Both studies utilized Yule's theory of conversational implicature. Based on the studies above, the purpose of this research was to address these gaps by investigating the types and the implied meanings of conversational implicatures used by the English teacher and the students in the classroom at SMP N 9 Pontianak using a different theory of conversational implicature. The researcher of this study used Grice's theory because it offers a set of clear principles and guidelines for identifying, categorizing, and analyzing implicatures in teacher-student interaction. By using Paul Grice's theory, the researcher can ensure consistency and precision in his analysis, leading to more reliable and insightful findings. The researcher conducted this study at SMP N 9 Pontianak because the researcher had found several examples of conversational implicature in the classroom when the researcher was implementing the teaching assistance program at SMP Negeri 9 Pontianak. Therefore, this study aimed to identify the types of conversational implicature and describe the implied meanings of the conversational implicature used by both English teacher and students in the classroom at SMP N 9 Pontianak.

Literature Review

Pragmatics

Pragmatics is one of important branches of linguistics that studies language in context (Jiang & Yu, 2023). It explores how the meaning of a language is conveyed not only through an utterance's literal content but also through the context in which it is employed. Kroeger (2022) emphasized that pragmatics is interested in the features of meaning that are dependent upon or emerge from the use of words and sentences. This explains that pragmatics is about understanding the meaning of words and sentences based on how people use them. It focuses on the way language is used in real-life situations and how that affects the meaning. In other words, it is not just about the words themselves, but also about the context in which they are used and the intentions of the speaker. For the study of pragmatics, context is crucial and necessary (Luo, 2016). It provides the necessary background information that helps to understand and interpret the meaning of something.

Cooperative principle

The main purpose of conversation is to share information on a particular topic with the aim of conveying a message (Yokossi, Datondji, & Koutchadé, 2022). In order for communication to run effectively during a conversation, the speakers and the listeners must fulfill the cooperative principle (Ramdan, 2020). It

is a theory that explains how people successfully communicate with each other in everyday social communication. Grice (1975) states the cooperative principle is when each person in a conversation expects each of them to make such conversational contributions as are required, at the moment in which the conversation occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the conversational exchange. This principle is based on the idea that conversational participants collaborate and typically make an effort to be cooperative to create effective communication. The cooperative principle consists of four maxims:

a. Quantity: The contribution should be as informative as required.
b. Quality: The contribution should be truthful.
c. Relation: The contribution should be relevant to the ongoing conversation.
d. Manner: The contribution should be clear.

Maxim is a set of rules that participants in a conversation must follow for their words to be understood. It is important that people adhere to cooperative principles to prevent misinterpretation, as communication plays a significant role in information exchange and social relationship building (Yulianti et al., 2022). When one flouts the maxims, it could give rise to a conversational implicature (Grice, 1975).

Conversational implicature

Understanding the conditions or context around an utterance to know the meaning of the sentence is neccessary since a sentence in conversation may have several meanings (Cristina & Afriana, 2021). In pragmatics, conversational implicature is the implied meaning that a speaker conveys beyond the literal words used in a conversation. It is a process of inferring meaning of an utterance by considering how an utterance interacts with its surrounding context (Alsalloom, 2022). It is based on the cooperative principle, which is the idea that speakers and listeners cooperate to achieve effective communication. When a speaker flouts the cooperative principle, the listener must infer the speaker's intent and underlying meaning based on the conversational context at that time (Lei, 2022; Li, 2021). An example of conversational implicature is when a speaker says something to convey a certain intention (Nassar & Al-Ghrafy, 2020). Grice (1975) classification of conversational implicature includes generalized and particularized conversational implicature. The conversational implicature that can be understood without having to rely on any particular context is called generalized conversational implicature. Meanwhile, particularized conversational implicature, also called ad-hoc implicature, depends on particular context (Elmahady, Subaiah, & Mohammed, 2022).

Method

The research design of this study was descriptive research. It requires the researcher to work closely with the data, using minimal frameworks and interpretations to explain it, and organizing the information into systematic categories (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The data of this study was collected from a single English class session involving one English teacher and ninth-grade

students. A video recording was made of the entire 60-minute class session to capture the conversations between the teacher and students.

Following the recording, the conversation was transcribed into written form to facilitate analysis. The researcher then employed observation techniques, repeatedly watching and analyzing the recording and transcript to identify instances of conversational implicature and the surrounding context. A table of classification was used to categorize the identified utterances based on Grice's theory.

Conversation Analysis (CA) served as the primary method for data analysis. CA involves examining naturally occurring spoken interactions to understand communication patterns (Mahmud, 2017). The researcher followed Sidnell's (2013) three-step approach to CA: observation, identifying and collecting the phenomenon, and describing the practice. This process resulted in the identification of 11 utterances from the 353 dialogues that were categorized as conversational implicature.

Findings and Discussion

Types of conversational implicature

The findings showed that during a single English class session in one of the ninth-grade classrooms at SMP Negeri 9 Pontianak, both the teacher and the students used two different types of conversational implicatures: generalized and particularized.

Table 1. Types of coversational implicature

Teaching Stages	Conversational Implicature	
	Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
Pre-teaching	2	2
Whilst-teaching	3	2
Post-teaching	1	1
Total	6	5

Total Conversational Implicature : 11

A total of eleven instances were categorized as conversational implicatures within interactions between the English teacher and the ninth-grade students at SMP Negeri 9 Pontianak. Of these eleven instances, six instances belong to generalized conversational implicature and five instances belong to particularized conversational implicature. Among the six generalized conversational implicatures, two instances were found in the pre-teaching session, three instances were found in the whilst-teaching session, and only one was found in the post-teaching session. Meanwhile, from five instances that were categorized as particularized conversational implicature, two instances were found in both pre-teaching and whilst-teaching sessions, while only one was found in the post-teaching session.

The implied meaning of the conversational implicature

The researcher relied on the classroom context, which included both linguistic and non-linguistic, to interpret the implied meaning of the conversational implicatures uttered during the conversation. The results demonstrated that the implied meaning conveyed communicative purposes such as informing, requesting, ordering, confirming, and expressing ignorance.

Informing

The results showed that the teacher and the students used conversational implicature to provide or give information to the listener.

Data 1
Teacher: Can you see it?
Students: **Blurry**

This conversation happened in the pre-teaching session. At that time, the teacher was presenting a PowerPoint in front of the class. The student's utterance "blurry" is considered as generalized conversational implicature because it conveys an additional meaning that is not explicitly stated, and it can be understood without requiring any particular context. The teacher can understand this implied meaning based on their common knowledge that the word "blurry" typically refers to a lack of clarity or sharpness. In responding to the teacher's question, the student could have simply said "No" or "I can't", but they chose to give information by saying "blurry". The student's response could also be seen as flouting the maxim of quantity because it only provides partial information and does not fully answer the teacher's question. Therefore, the student's utterance "blurry" is categorized as generalized conversation implicature, and the implied meaning of it is that the students can not see the PowerPoint.

Data 2
Teacher: Do I usually not laugh?
Students: **Rarely, ma'am.**

This conversation happened in the post-teaching session. At that time, the teacher was asking about how students felt after they learned the material. The student's utterance is considered as generalized conversational implicature because it is communicated based on a scale of values, and it conveys an additional meaning that is not explicitly stated. The student's response implicates the scale usually < rarely < never. By using "rarely" instead of the stronger alternative "never", the student conversationally implicated that while the teacher does not laugh often, it does not mean that the teacher never laughs. Therefore, the implied meaning in this utterance is that the teacher does laugh on some occasions, just not usually.

Requesting

The results showed that the students used conversational implicature to indirectly seek an action or response from the listener.

Data 3
Teacher: How about you, Mutia? Can you make coffee?
Mutia: I can
Teacher: How?
Mutia: **Buat kopi..... tidak bisa bahasa Inggris, ma'am.**

This conversation happened in the pre-teaching session. At that time, the teacher was asking the students to explain the process of how to make their favorite foods or drinks. Mutia's utterance "Buat kopi..... tidak bisa bahasa Inggris, ma'am." could be seen as flouting the maxim of relation as it does not directly answer the teacher's question. In this case, the teacher needs further context to grasp the implied meaning of Mutia's utterance. Given that the student is Indonesian and has limited English proficiency, Mutia's response suggests that she is familiar with the process of making coffee, but she is unable to explain it in English. Therefore, Mutia's utterance is considered as particularized conversational implicature and the implied meaning in Mutia's utterance is that she wants to explain how to make coffee using her native language, which is Indonesian.

Data 4
Teacher: Oh, Iyan. Can you make it? Can you make fried chicken, Iyan?
Iyan: **Tidak bisa bahasa Inggris, ma'am.**

This conversation happened in the pre-teaching session. At that time, the teacher was asking the students to explain the process of how to make their favorite foods or drinks. Iyan's utterance could also be seen as flouting the maxim of relation as it does not directly answer the teacher's question. In this case, the teacher needs further context to grasp the implied meaning of Iyan's utterance. Given that the student is Indonesian and has limited English proficiency, Iyan's response suggests that he is familiar with the process of making fried chicken, but he is not able to explain the process in English. Therefore, Iyan's utterance is considered as particularized conversational implicature and the implied meaning in his utterance is that he wants to explain how to make fried chicken his native language, which is Indonesian.

Ordering

The results showed that the teacher used conversational implicature to ask the students to do something.

Data 5
Jaka: Can I use this marker, ma'am?
Teacher: **I mostly brought permanent markers.**

This conversation happened during the teaching and learning session. At that time, the teacher was asking the student to come forward and answer question number three on the whiteboard. The teacher's utterance "I mostly brought permanent markers." is considered as particularized conversational implicature because it relates to the classroom rule that students are not allowed to use permanent markers on the whiteboard. The teacher's utterance could be seen as

flouting the maxim of quantity by giving too much information that is not needed. The implied meaning in the teacher's utterance is that the student, in this case, Jaka, can not use that marker, and the teacher indirectly asks the student to use another marker that is not permanent.

Data 6
Angga: Izin ke toilet, ma'am. Bolehkah, ma'am?
Teacher: **Toilet..... Bolehkah?**

This conversation happened during the teaching and learning session. At that time, one of the students came forward and asked for permission to go to the toilet using Indonesian. The teacher's utterance in this conversation is considered as a particularized conversational implicature. The student needs special context to understand the meaning of the utterance, and it also flouts the maxim of manner. The context is that all the students must use English when they want to ask for permission, especially permission to go to the toilet. The implied meaning in teacher's utterance is that the teacher wants the student to repeat his request in English. It is a particularized implicature rather than generalized, as it depends on understanding the specific classroom context and rules that have been established between the teacher and students.

Data 7
Students: Stand up, please! Give greeting! Assalamu'alaikum warrahmatullahi wabarakatuh
Teacher: Wa'alaikumussalam warrahmatullahi wabarakatuh
Students: Thank you, ma'am! Goodbye and see you later!
Teacher: **Goodbye and thank you, ma'am!**
Students: Goodbye and thank you, ma'am!

This conversation happened in the post-teaching session. At that time, the students thanked and greeted the teacher, and the teacher responded by repeating what the students said. The teacher's utterance "Goodbye and thank you, ma'am!" is considered as particularized conversational implicature because there is a special context that accompanies it, and the utterance could also be seen as flouting the maxim of manner. The context is when saying greetings, students are supposed to say it together and in unison. However, in the context of this conversation, the students did not say it compactly, and there were even some students who were just silent. Therefore, it can be interpreted that the teacher's utterance is particularized conversational implicature, and the implied meaning in the teacher's utterance is that the teacher wants the students to repeat their greetings together and in unison.

Confirming

The results showed that the students chose not to respond verbally, which can convey various meanings depending on the context. In this conversation, the students' nonverbal responses are categorized as an act of verifying or validating something indirectly.

Data 8
Teacher: Any question until here? Are you sure no question until here?
Students: **(silent)**
Teacher: Okay, if you don't have any questions, now you can open your student worksheet.

This conversation happened during the teaching and learning session. At that time, the teacher had just finished teaching about procedure text material. The student's silence can be interpretd as a generalized conversational implicature, conveying an implicit meaning. The silence could also be seen as flouting the maxim of quantity as it does not give any information. The students' silence serves as an indirect way of conveying that they do not have further questions or are not expressing any uncertainties or concerns about the material presented, creating a generalized conversational implicature because it is based on the general assumption that students are usually silent or say nothing when they do not have any question.

Data 9
Teacher: Alpi, do you know the answer to number 3?
Alpi: (silent)
Teacher: Jaka?
Jaka: **(stood up and grabbed a marker)**

This conversation happened during the teaching and learning session. At that time, the teacher and the students were discussing and correcting the assignment. Jaka's nonverbal response can be clasified as a generalized conversational implicature as it does not require specific context for the teacher to infer the implied meaning of the student's action. Additionally, the utterance could also be seen as flouting the maxim of quantity by not giving the information needed. Jaka's nonverbal response serves as an indirect way of conveying that Jaka knows the answer to question number 3.

Expressing ignorance

The results showed that the students chose not to respond verbally, which can convey various meanings depending on the context or situation. In this conversation, the students' silence is categorized as an act of admitting that they do not know something.

Data 10
Teacher: Okay. Yeah, we'll learn about procedure text. Do you know what is procedure text?
Students: **(silent)**

This conversation happened in the pre-teaching session. The students' silence can be considered as generalized conversational implicature because it is based on the general assumption that students typically do not know technical terms unless the teacher has been specifically taught them, and the utterance could be seen as flouting the maxim of quantity by not giving information needed. The fact that the students remain silent implies that they may not know the procedure

text since it is the new material that they will learn that day. The implied meaning from their silence serves as an indirect way of conveying that they do not know the answer.

> Data 11
> Teacher: Now, pay attention here. In text procedures, we use simple present tense and imperative. What is imperative?
> Students: **(silent)**
> Teacher: What is imperative?
> Students: **(silent)**

This conversation happened during the teaching and learning session. At that time, the teacher and the students were discussing the elements found in procedure texts. The student's silence can be interpreted as a generalized conversational implicature, given the general assumption that students typically do not know technical terms unless the teacher has been specifically taught them. Additionally, and the silence could also be seen as flouting the maxim of quantity, as it does not give any informatio needed. The fact that the students remain silent implies that they may not know the answer or are not confident in their understanding of the term "imperative" as it relates to procedure texts. Therefore, the meaning conveyed here is that the students are indirectly communicating their uncertainty or lack of knowledge about the term "imperative" in the context of procedure texts by not responding to the teacher's question.

Conclusion

There were two types of conversational implicatures found from the teacher-student conversation: generalized and particularized. A total of 11 instances were identified as conversational implicature within the teacher-student conversation. Six utterances belonged to generalized, relying on general conversational principles for interpretation. The remaining five instances were categorized as particularized, requiring additional context specific to the classroom environment for understanding the implied meaning. The analysis demonstrated that the implied meanings derived from these utterances conveyed a variety of communicative purposes beyond the literal meaning of the words spoken. These included informing, requesting, ordering, confirming, and expressing ignorance. These findings highlight the crucial role of conversational implicature in enriching communication and conveying nuanced messages between the teacher and students.

References

Alsalloom, F. A. (2022). The effectiveness of consciousness-raising approach in interpreting conversational implicature using audiovisual input. *Journal of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching, 28*, 55–95. https://doi.org/10.2458/jslat.5259

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). Thausand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publication, Inc.

Cristina, V., & Afriana, A. (2021). The functions of conversational implicature in tv show "F.R.I.E.N.D.S": Pragmatics approach. *Journal BASIS*, *8*(1), 75–84. https://doi.org/10.33884/basisupb.v8i1.2935

Darweesh, S. M. A., & Al-Khanji, R. R. (2024). Conversational implicatures in medical discourse: An analysis of doctor-patient dialogues in amman, Jordan. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *14*(7), 2203–2210. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1407.28

Elmahady, O. R. M., Subaiah, S., & Mohammed, S. B. A. (2022). Investigating the importance of conversational implicature and violation of maxims in daily conversations. *Arab World English Journal*, *13*(2), 109–122. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no2.8

Grice, H. . (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech arts* (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.

Huang, Y. (2017). Implicature. In Y. Huang (Ed.), *The oxford handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 155–179). New York: Oxford University Press.

Jiang, X., & Yu, L. (2023). Pragmatics online, kate scott. routledge: New york (2022), ix+168pp. *Journal of Contemporary Language Research*, *2*(1), 68–71. https://doi.org/10.58803/jclr.2023.385313.1006

Kroeger, P. R. (2022). *Analyzing meaning: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics* (3rd ed.). Berlin: Language Science Press. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6855854

Legiansyah, G., & Supri, I. Z. (2020). Investigating implicature in illocutionary acts employed by museum guide and English speaking tourists. *English Journal Literacy Utama*, *4*(2), 208–217. https://doi.org/10.33197/ejlutama.vol4.iss2.2020.416

Lei, W. (2022). A study of conversational implicature in Lady Chatterley ' s lover from the perspective of cooperative principle. *Academic Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, *5*(5), 83–90. https://doi.org/10.25236/AJHSS.2022.050513

Lesmana, A. H. P. (2022). Implicature analysis of Abdur's stand up comedy on Kompas TV. *Research on Applied Linguistics and Literature*, *1*(2), 44–50.

Li, S. (2021). Conversational implicature instruction as a pedagogical strategy for English majors in a Chinese context: A pragmatic-analysis of its effectiveness. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *11*(10), 1279–1287. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1110.16

Luo, Y. (2016). Context and its significance to pragmatics. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, *5*(8), 17–21.

Mahmud, M. (2017). *Doing discourse analysis: An introduction.* Yogyakarta: Phoenix Publisher.

Mappaita, S. P. (2022). The implication of conversational implicature used by teachers in offline classroom interaction. BATARA *DIDI: English Language Journal*, *1*(2), 78–89. https://doi.org/10.56209/badi.v1i2.47

Nassar, H. M. A., & Al-Ghrafy, A. M. G. (2020). The understandable English conversational implicatures by Yemeni EFL. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, *2*(1), 65–80. https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v1i3.71

Ramdan, A. H. (2020). Implicature of the utterances at court: A pragmatics study. *English Journal Literacy Utama, 4*(1), 186–192. https://doi.org/10.33197/ejlutama.vol4.iss1.2020.390

Sidnell, J. (2013). Basic conversation analytic methods. In J. Sidnell & T. Stivers (Eds.), *The handbook of conversation analysis* (pp. 77–100). Chichester, UK: Blackwell Publishng Ltd.

Sofyan, A., Yudistira, R., Muta'allim, M., Alfani, F. R., & Ghaffar, A. A. (2022). The analysis of conversational implicature between students and teachers at Al-Azhar Islamic boarding school. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa, 8*(1), 65–72. https://doi.org/10.55637/jr.8.1.4042.65-72

Ye, Y. (2022). Interpretation of conversational implicature in the film green book from the perspective of the cooperative principle. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 12*(5), 943–947. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1205.15

Yokossi, D. T., Datondji, A. C., & Koutchadé, I. S. (2022). A pragmatic study of generalized and particularized implicatures in "the arrangers of marriage" from adichie's the thing around your neck. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research, 10*(4), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.37745/ijellr.13/vol10n4118

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

Yulianti, S., Arafah, B., Rofikah, U., Idris, A. M. S., Samsur, N., & Arafah, A. N. B. (2022). Conversational implicatures on Saturday Night Live talk show. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 13*(1), 189–197. https://doi.org/10.17507/JLTR.1301.22