BATARA DIDI:
English Language Journal

The Implication of Conversational Implicature Used by Teachers in Offline Classroom Interaction

Suci Pole Mappaita[1]

[1]English Education Deparment,Graduate Program, State university of Makassar, Indonesia

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the variation or types of Conversational Implicatures used by teacher interactions in the classroom. This study uses qualitative or descriptive methods and uses them according to the theory of Yule. Data were taken from junior high schools and several teachers as research subjects. The data were analyzed by recording and transcribing and also the data was collected using selection, description, and verification techniques. The author categorizes several dialogues spoken by the teacher which show the types of conversational implicatures in-class interaction. The results showed that there are variation or types of conversational implications in classroom interactions that are used by teachers, including (1) specific implicatures, (2) general implicatures, and (3) scaled implicatures. conversational implications identified by the teacher using specific conversational implicatures of the dominant type.

Introduction

One form of human relations that cannot be separated in life in the world is a social relationship between humans. In this case, indicated by the form of interaction. This interaction is well structured and related and, if mutual understanding in communication, will be in line with the purpose of the conversation. To achieve good interaction and communication, we must be able to use a tool or a medium used by the most important human being called language. Language as a system of phonetic symbols is arbitrary and is used by society, language to collaborate, communicate, and define themselves (Uktolseja et al., 2019). From this, we can conclude that language is the focus and also the main key in human interaction. Language is the main tool that plays an important role in human life, for example as a medium for sending messages and communicating (Gibson t al., 2019). According to Buz et al (2016) in every act of communication, the speaker expects that the listener or interlocutor will understand and be able to catch what he wants to be informed so that there is no misunderstanding. To avoid these misunderstandings, one must be able to know and understand how to use words in communication between speakers and listeners according to the situation and to whom to speak

---

[1] Corresponding author: Suci Pole Mappaita, Corresponding Address: Jl. AP. Pettarani Makassar, Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia

by paying attention to the meaning contained in each utterance which is called conversational implicature in linguistics.

Conversational implicature is a basic assumption in a conversation in which the listeners and listeners adhere to cooperative principles and maxims. Maxim is an assumption to use speech in the information given by the speaker or writer. Betti & Khalaf (2021) conveys the message that conversational implications are not part of what is actually said, but can result from proper investigation or direct violation of the speaker. This suggests that it is more than a logical conclusion. Speech implication is speech that suggests something other than what was actually said (Abrar et al., 2018). The speaker's intentions are not expressed clearly as well as in different ways (Hellbernd & Sammler, 2016). In other words, the implication is an intention, desire, or utterance hidden from the mind which is then communicated (Moore, 2017; Tsoumou, 2020). From the explanation above, it can be concluded that an implicature is an indirect speech that provides more information and requires the speaker to guess what is meant by the narrative. The guess or conjecture depends on the context of the speech and the background of the speech.

Communication can be said to be good and effective if it requires good understanding and connectivity between the language and its users (Omotayo, 2015). Wilson & Kolaiti (2017) says that every utterance is seen to communicate various propositions, some explicitly and others implicitly. Many language users use language based only on their needs because there are no accurate and internationally agreed rules for using language (Kupisch & Rothman, 2018). However, culturally, instead of conveying a message through direct communication, sometimes we can also say it indirectly (Yonashiro-Cho et al., 2016). In addition, the symbols used by speakers in conversation in communication do not only refer to the subject but also to realize their meaning.

Huang & Snedeker (2018) argues that implicature depends on understanding the background context and situation of the two speakers. and also the benefits of conversational implicature according to (Nida, 2015) provides an explanation of the facts and meanings of linguistics that cannot be achieved by linguistic theory, and also provide a clear and real description and explanation of apparent differences of the intended language users. Implicatures are also useful for explaining different and seemingly unrelated meanings from what is said. Based on the explanation above, the researcher concludes that implicature is communication caused by the existence of contextual conversational goals. The inference of information or messages conveyed is outside of what is said in the true sense and violates the maxims in the principle of cooperation (Tsojon & Jonah, 2016). The information conveyed sometimes requires the speaker to guess what the speaker means. This can happen in the communication environment, one of which is in schools, which occurs between teachers and students

Skordos & Papafragou, (2016) states that such inferences are needed to construct the meaning of the delivery resulting from certain conversational implicatures that are carried out and Speech inferences do not occur in the context at all. Therefore, this study focuses on analyzing the types of implicature conversations that are carried out and occur by teachers in interactions in the school classroom with their students.

The reason the researcher chose the topic of this research is that the researcher wants to know the forms of conversational implicatures that are often used by teachers in class when conducting learning activities in class. In addition, the researcher also wanted to know what types of conversational implicatures the teacher dominantly used in the classroom when teaching and learning activities were taking place. This will certainly be interesting because researchers directly see, listen, and listen to the conversational implicature process that occurs.

Pragmatics has a lot of research on the science of linguistics, one of which is implicature. Pragmatics is a linguistic field that emerged and developed in the field of linguistics. Furthermore Mazzarella et al (2018) pragmatics is said to be the study of how to express more than what the speaker says. Pragmatics is a field of linguistics that studies various languages, including conversational implicatures. Implicature is a sentence or word that is implied or has an implied meaning or other meaning. In other words, the speaker's meaning is not part of what is said, but an aspect of what the speaker means. What the speaker wants to convey is much richer and more abundant than what the speaker expresses directly. Linguistic meaning cannot be determined fundamentally by mediated and understood meaning. This is in accordance with the view that an utterance can mean a statement that is not part of the utterance (Gisladottir et al., 2015). This implicit statement is called conversational implicature.

Implicature approaches the form of a variety of concepts contained by speech in a language situation or position that is not a component of the speech spoken by the speaker made by the speaker and does not pronounce the actual meaning intended. Thus, the definition of conversational implicature is something hidden or implied meaning in a conversation in actual language use. Implicature is determined to consider if what is intended by the speaker is different from what is shown prosaically and also Anggrarini (2017) implicature is a star additional meaning, which must be maintained if the principle of cooperation can be implemented. It can be said that implicature is indirect control, in other words, the meaning of speech is often hidden so that what is implied does not look too conspicuous.

Conversational implicature is an important concept in pragmatics. Conversational implicatures are the implications of pragmatic knowledge contained in conversations that occur as a result of violating the principles of the conversation itself (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2020). In line with the limitations on pragmatic implications, conversational implicature is a proportion or 'statement' implicative, It may have a different meaning, meaning, or meaning from what the speaker actually said in the conversation (Clark et al. 2019). The meaning of the conversation is that the utterance that has meaning in the form of a statement actually stems from the fact that it is not part of the utterance (Aresta, 2018). Nor is it the result of what is required of the specific implicatures do not have to appear in conversation and do not rely on a particular context to interpret them (Yulianti et al., 2022). Sofyan et al (2022) states that conversational implicatures can be divided into three types: specific conversational implications, general conversational implications, and scaled conversational implications.

Methods

Researchers use a qualitative research approach for facts and data collection and analysis. Qualitative research is a general term for an extensive choice of approaches and methods for the study of social life (McCusker & Gunaydin, 2015). The researcher, therefore, used a qualitative content analysis method to interpret the explicit speech implicatures used by the teacher in classroom interaction with the text-based linguistic data selected for this study. The source of the data was taken from Elementary school in classroom interaction by teachers and recorded during the learning activities take place.

Basically, the authors use these measures to collect qualitative data following the analysis of Woods et al (2016). First, a textual analysis of the transcript of the records was conducted and identified the conversations in the transcript. Transcripts containing conversational implicatures. Furthermore, by using theory on conversational implicatures which divides There are three types of conversational implication: specific implication, implication, and scale

implication. The researcher explained the data discovery by describing the data regarding the types of conversational implicatures and the dominant conversational implicatures uttered by the teacher. Selected data were analyzed in three main stages: data reduction, data presentation, inference, and validation (Azar & Hassanien, 2015). The analysis consists of several steps based on the theory of Miles and Huberman. First, the researcher recorded and made a transcript of the classroom interaction between the four teachers. Second, the resulting transcript is then analyzed based on the problem in this study, namely, there are 3 types of conversational implicatures. and Finally, the data is presented in the form of paragraphs or extracts because it uses a qualitative methodology.

Results and Discussion

This part discusses the type of conversational Implicature by the teacher in Classroom. They can be seen in the following extracts:

Specific conversational implicatures

Extract 1

> *Teacher: kepala..*
>
> *Student:kepala..*
>
> *Teacher: pundak lutut kaki lutut kaki...masih ada yang tidak fokus...oke, tepuk tangan dulu- **aduh@@ bau lain-lain lagi***
>
> *Student: aiiiihhh,, aih @@@@*

In extract 1 above, it refers to a special type of conversational implicature, where special conversational implicature is a meaning It comes from the conversation by recognizing or referring to the social context of the conversation, the relationship between the speakers, and their shared knowledge in the utterance. In this case, the implicature describes the relationship between the speaker and the listener. In the extract, the teacher talks to his students by saying ***"Aduh"*** which means that the activities carried out by the students have things that the teacher complains about and the teacher continues by saying ***"@@smell others again@@"(bau lain-lain lagi"*** in the statement, the teacher says that the teacher smells something and make the utterance into humor that makes other students laugh. This shows that teachers use special implicatures because of their relationship with students without thinking students will be offended.

Extract 2

> *Teacher: sikaap? Yah Menonjolkan dari…*
>
> *Student: aaah? Tidak--*
>
> *Teacher: **kenapa bkan besokpi mudatang?***
>
> *Student: itu ibu…*
>
> *Teacher: eeee duduk moko cepak jammoko--jammoko jelaskangi ditauji bilang ko sudah terlambat.*

The extract above is a special type of conversational implicature, where special conversational implicature is the implied meaning contained in the speaker's utterance by looking at the relationship between the speaker and the listener. From this extract, the teacher said ***"kenapa***

bukan besokpi mudatang?"(why don't you come tomorrow) to students who enter class means students who have just entered class are very late because they missed some explanations about the material. The special implicature here can be seen from the teacher who dares to give a sarcastic impression to the students because of the relationship between the teacher and the students.

Extract 3

> *Teacher: iya bagus... kita iya nak?-kita iya nak..kita iya nak? Iyaaa masih SMA belum masanya...anu ini yang biasa na bilang orang cinta-cinta monyet...mutau itu monyet?*
>
> *Student: tauuu..*
>
> *Teacher: itukan juga salah satu pembhambat kemajuan negara kesatuan.*
>
> *Student: (aiiihhhhh)..*
>
> *Teacher: pacar-pacaran...dik...**sekolahmi dulu baik-baik yah**...*

Extract 3 above shows special conversational implicatures. special conversational implicature is a meaning It comes from the conversation by recognizing or referring to the social context of the conversation, the relationship between the speakers, and their shared knowledge in the utterance.The teacher tells the students ***"sekolah dulu baik-baik yah…"(just do good school)*** meaning that the teacher told the students not to have a special relationship with their close friends and told them to focus on their school. It can be seen here that this particular conversational implicature emphasizes the relationship between speaker and listener where the teacher gives advice to all his students.

Extract 4

> *S: kantongnya bu @@@@*
>
> *T: kalo tidak ada ini tidak ada tetesan.*
>
> *S: @@@@@*
>
> *T: **atau kalo ini kantong berbunyi kalo jalan (kresek kresek kresekk) , bagus ini tidak berbunyi***
>
> *S : @@@@@@@@@*

The extract above is a special type of conversational implicature, where special conversational implicature is the implied meaning contained in the speaker's utterance by looking at the relationship between the speaker and the listener. The class situation at that time studied the human reproductive system. From this extract, the teacher said *"**atau kalo ini kantong berbunyi kalo jalan (kresek kresek kresekk)"((or if this is the bag it reads if it goes (crack crackle crack))*** which means that the teacher explains the advantages of the male reproductive system. And also saying ***"bagus ini tidak berbunyi "(good this doesn't sound)*** means the function of the male reproductive system to the students. It can be seen that it is said to be a special implicature because the teacher gives humor to the students in explaining the material so that the students laugh.

Extract 5

> *S: Sperma dan sel telur.*
>
> *T: Yah itu sel sperma dan sel telur, kalo hewan reproduksi seksual dan non seksual , yaitu aseksual kalo hewan di air reproduksinya internal atau eksternal ? kalo hewan*

*air internal karena ovum dan sperma bertemu di air , **katak dan ikan cukup datang [prettttt] buang sperma [pretttt] datang katak betina [ekekeke]***

S : @ @ @ @ @ @

In Extract above, it shows special conversational implicatures. Special conversational implicatures are where special conversational implicature is the implied meaning contained in the speaker's utterance by looking at the relationship between the speaker and the listener. The teacher says to his students *"**katak dan ikan cukup datang [prettttt] buang sperma [pretttt] datang katak betina [ekekeke]"** (Frogs and fish just come [prettttt] throw sperm [pretttt] come female frogs [ekekeke])* The use of the words "prett" and "ekekek" is included in a special type of conversation where these words are meaningful in the activities of the reproductive system between male and female frogs. It is said with special conversational implicatures because the teacher gives meaning indirectly but is packed with humor so that students can laugh and it can be seen from the special relationship between the teacher and the students who are free and full of laughter.

General conversational implicatures

Extract 6

> *Teacher: janganmiki mencatat karna sudahmi dicatat to?..itu nanti saya jelaskan..yang pertama nilai substitusi..yang pertama cara substitusi..yang kedua cara..**yang sudah biasa- yang kalian pake..***
>
> *Student: iya ibu*

From the extract above are types of General conversational implicature, that is implicature whose existence is not concerned with a particular context in it or in the situation. and is not required to take into account the additional meaning conveyed, when the teacher says to the students. *"**yang sudah biasa-"**(the usual-)* means that it reminds us how to solve problems that have been taught and explained previously to be used. and *"**yang kalian pake..**" (you wearing...)* Your word is referring to the student, which students usually use in the problem.

Extract 7

> *Teacher: apa lagi? ada saluran. saluran vasdifren saluran yang panjang ini, p-anjanggggg*
>
> *Student: yang kayk urat bu?*
>
> *Teacher: Iya, saluran yang bawa sampe ke pesikulaseminalis, saluran apa lagi ? Saluran ejakulasi. Saluran kemih atau saluran uretra ee terus saluran kelenjar, terus prostat ,ee terus apa lagi kelenjar couper . ini kelenjar campuran antara sperma dan mani. **Kalo laki-laki mau disunat ininya yang dipotong***
>
> *Student: ihhh@ @ @ @ @*

From the extract above are types of general conversational implicatures, that is implicature whose existence is not concerned with a particular context in it or in the situation and is not required to take into account the additional meaning conveyed. Speech sentence *"**Kalo laki-laki mau disunat ininya yang dipotong"(If a man wants to be circumcised, this is what is cut)** dari kata **"ininya"(this)*** Meaningful or referring to the structure of the previous language where the teacher explains the reproductive system and its parts. The teacher shows that if a man performs circumcision then the reproductive part is cut or removed without mentioning the organ directly.

Extract 8

> *T: kenapai? Apa kau fahri ?...*
>
> *S : tidak ji bu%*
>
> *S : anu bu na bahas mandul.*
>
> *T: Ohh mandul, mandul itu banyak penyebabnya , **kalo laki-laki jumlah itunya kurang** ..*

The extract above includes types of general conversational implicature extracts or implicatures that are carried out based on the structure of the sentence only. The general implicature is in the sentence *"**kalo laki-laki jumlah itunya kurang** . "(**"If it's a male, the amount is less**)* dari kata *"**itunya"(This)*** means or refers to the part of the male reproductive system without mentioning it directly.

Scaled Conversational Implicatures

Extract 9

> *Teacher: kalo ini.. diubah menjadi tiga kali satu tambah dua kali satu pangkat 3 kurang dua kali satu?*
>
> *Student: tujuh*
>
> *Teacher: tambah...tentukan-*
>
> *Student: tiga kali tiga*
>
> *Teacher: **berapapun pangkatnya kalo angkanya satu otomatis hasilnya?***

The extract above, it includes conversational implicature on a scale. Scaled implicature states a value from a value scale of a context in a conversation. The scale implicature seen in this extract is when the teacher says *"**berapapun pangkatnya kalo angkanya satu otomatis hasilnya?"((whatever the rank, if the number is one, the result will be automatic?)*** kata *"**Berapapun"(whatever)*** refers or has the meaning that the teacher explains that all numbers may be included in the multiplication in the context of mathematics.

Extract 10

> *Teacher: .....hmm.. kenapa bsa ? karena biasa di dalam kelenjar prostat ada sperma yang lama. Biasa ini ada kakek-kakek tua yang tidak mampu lagi mengeluarkan sperma , tidak bisa lagi olahraga. **Kalo prostat rata-rata orang tua--***
>
> *S: orang tua bede @@@@*
>
> *T: ihh ...memang orang tua*

The extract above includes conversational implicature on a scale. Scaled implicature states a value from a value scale of a context in a conversation. The scale implicature seen in this extract is when the teacher says *"**Kalo prostat rata-rata orang tua—"(If the prostate is an average parent—)*** the teacher's use of the word *"**rata-rata"(average)*** refers to or means that half or more of the elderly population has the prostate disease.

Extract 11

> *Teacher: jadi untuk selanjutnya (eee) Karena kalian punya buku ... ee coba di kerja halaman 130 di tugas kelompok LK 5, tugas kelompok LK 5 bisa di kerja berempat supaya cepat , **sedikitji 2 nomorji nah 2 nomorji***

Student: Iye bu.

Teacher: iyoo kan nomor 1 anuji , tumbuhan mati , jadi baca-baca mi dulu itu halaman 72 – 73 kerjakan memangi nah%

The extract above includes scaled conversational implicatures. Scaled implicatures express a value from a value scale of a context in a conversation. The scalable implicature seen in this extract is when the teacher says "*sedikitji 2 nomorji nah 2 nomorji* "*(only a few, only two numbers)* the word *"sedikitji"(only a few)* refers to the meaning that the given task can be calculated and can be done quickly with approximately only 5 task numbers given by the teacher.

Effective communication creates a key that directs professional relationships between teachers and students in the classroom to achieve common goals (Sileo, 2011). There are eleven extracts that have been analyzed and discussed above which show the types of conversational implicatures used by teachers in classroom interactions. The findings show that teachers use several variations of conversational implicatures include specific conversational implicatures (the relationship between speaker and listener), general conversational implicatures (according to the previous context, and also scaled conversational implicatures.

The first type is Specific Conversational Implicatures, found in extracts 1,2, 3, 4, and 5. Specific conversational implicatures are implicatures that occur in communication events that occur in specific contexts. Geurts (2019) explains further that to find out this type of implicature we need to take into account the information we know about the communication event. Suryadi & Muslim, (2019) said that specific conversational implicatures are implicatures that are unique to the particular context in which their conversation takes place. In extracting the type of specific conversational implicature used by the teacher, it has an implied meaning, but because of the close relationship between the teacher and students, the teacher uses language that is packed with humor.

The second type is called General Conversational Implicatures. Generalized conversational implicatures do not require a special context. In general conversational implicatures usually occur in conversations without referring to certain features of the context in the conversation.This is in line with the opinion reveals that general conversational implicatures do not require special background knowledge and certain speech contexts are required to make the necessary conclusions. Papi (2010) suggests that general conversational implicatures are implicatures that remain constant in all contexts. In extracts and types of general conversational implicatures, the teacher conveys something according to the previous structure and context.

And the third type is called scaled conversational implicature, in this type of implicature, certain information will be conveyed by choosing words that express the value of the value scale in conversation. The implicature scale is a measure of the service value of a product or service, such as the Quantitative scale: to some extent, little, almost, all frequency scale: sometimes, often, always temperature scale: cold, warm, hot Scale certainty: may be the negative value from the choice of words or statements of a certain scale in the phenomenon A form of rejection of high (top) or low (bottom) numbers or values. In other words, if the speaker uses or speaks on one side of the value in a conversation, it means that the speech contains a negative contradiction to that value.

The dominant type of conversational implicature used by the teacher is a special conversational implicature where the use of this special conversational implicature is used with humor but has an implied meaning that can be seen in the relationship between the teacher and students. wherein the use of this type of implicature the teacher gives utterances that do not think the

students will be offended or angry but because of the relationship between the teacher and the students, the teacher uses more types of special conversational implicatures in conveying utterances from the implied meaning.

Conversational implicatures have implied speech meanings that can be understood depending on the context and the ability to do something related to the speech being spoken. Implicature is used to respect another person or interlocutor so that the speaker considers who he is talking to, on what occasions the conversation took place, and also the extent to which the conversation was intended. Implicatures make conversations more lively and meaningful. Context has an important role to know the meaning intended by the speaker. Conversational implicature has been carried out by many conversation participants. In fact, not all listeners can follow and refer to what the speaker means. For listeners to see the context of the conversation that occurred is a very important thing. Mozuraitis et al (2015) translates that context as (1) aspects of the physical and social environment related to speech, and (2) shared knowledge possessed by speakers and listeners. Furthermore, Alsmari (2020) explains that the factor of using conversational implication which is a pragmatic competency teaching approach can produce positive results in the development of communication for teachers and students in the classroom. This can be seen from the positive results, one of which is as a basic building of communicative competence.

Conclusion

This study examines the types of conversational implicatures used by teachers in classroom interactions. Three types of conversational implicatures were found in this study, namely specific conversational implicatures which explain the special relationship between teachers and students who are close and without gaps, general conversational implicatures occur because they are based on structure and context, and are scaled conversational implicatures. implicature to convey a value based on the context. The dominant type of conversational implicature used by the teacher is a special conversational implicature where the use of this special conversational implicature is used with humor but has an implied meaning that can be seen in the relationship between the teacher and his students. These findings provide valuable input for the study of communication in educational settings by considering the importance and breadth of conversational implicature in educational settings.

References

Abrar, M., Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Asyrafi, F., & Marzulina, L. (2018). " If our English isn't a language, what is it?" Indonesian EFL Student Teachers' Challenges Speaking English. *The Qualitative Report*, *23*(1), 129-145. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315278858

Alsmari, N. (2020). The effect of flipped classroom instruction on developing Saudi EFL learners' comprehension of conversational implicatures. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *10*(2), 107-127. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v10n2p107

Anggrarini, N. (2017). Conversational Implicature Analysis Of Text Message Between Native Speakr And Foreign Language Speaker Of English. *Wiralodra English Journal*, *1*(1), 59-73. https://doi.org/10.31943/wej.v1i1.17

Aresta, R. (2018). The influence of translation techniques on the accuracy and acceptability of translated utterances that flout the maxim of quality. *Humaniora*, *30*(2), 176-191. https://doi.org/10.22146/jh.33645

Azar, A. T., & Hassanien, A. E. (2015). Dimensionality reduction of medical big data using neural-fuzzy classifier. *Soft computing*, *19*(4), 1115-1127. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-014-1327-4

Betti, M. J., & Khalaf, N. S. (2021). A Pragma-Stylistic Study of Implicature in Shakespeare's Hamlet and Twelfth Night. *International Linguistics Research*, *4*(3), p12-p12. https://doi.org/10.30560/ilr.v4n3p12

Buz, E., Tanenhaus, M. K., & Jaeger, T. F. (2016). Dynamically adapted context-specific hyper-articulation: Feedback from interlocutors affects speakers' subsequent pronunciations. *Journal of memory and language*, *89*, 68-86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2015.12.009

Clark, L., Pantidi, N., Cooney, O., Doyle, P., Garaialde, D., Edwards, J., ... & Cowan, B. R. (2019, May). What makes a good conversation? Challenges in designing truly conversational agents. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1-12). https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300705

Derakhshan, A., & Eslami, Z. (2020). The effect of metapragmatic awareness, interactive translation, and discussion through video-enhanced input on EFL learners' comprehension of implicature. *Applied Research on English Language*, *9*(1), 25-52. https://doi.org/10.22108/are.2019.118062.1476

Geurts, B. (2019). Communication as commitment sharing: speech acts, implicatures, common ground. *Theoretical linguistics*, *45*(1-2), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1515/tl-2019-0001

Gibson, E., Futrell, R., Piantadosi, S. P., Dautriche, I., Mahowald, K., Bergen, L., & Levy, R. (2019). How efficiency shapes human language. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, *23*(5), 389-407. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.02.003

Gisladottir, R. S., Chwilla, D. J., & Levinson, S. C. (2015). Conversation electrified: ERP correlates of speech act recognition in underspecified utterances. *PloS one*, *10*(3), e0120068. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0120068

Hellbernd, N., & Sammler, D. (2016). Prosody conveys speaker's intentions: Acoustic cues for speech act perception. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *88*, 70-86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2016.01.001

Huang, Y. T., & Snedeker, J. (2018). Some inferences still take time: Prosody, predictability, and the speed of scalar implicatures. *Cognitive psychology*, *102*, 105-126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2018.01.004

Indriani, M. S. (2012). Makna Pragmatis Dalam Percakapan Novel Menjaring Seribu Mimpi Karya Mira Karmila. *Prasi: Jurnal Bahasa, Seni, dan Pengajarannya*, *8*(14). https://doi.org/10.23887/prasi.v8i14.443

Kupisch, T., & Rothman, J. (2018). Terminology matters! Why difference is not incompleteness and how early child bilinguals are heritage speakers. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *22*(5), 564-582. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916654355

Mazzarella, D., Reinecke, R., Noveck, I., & Mercier, H. (2018). Saying, presupposing and implicating: How pragmatics modulates commitment. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *133*, 15-27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.05.009

McCusker, K., & Gunaydin, S. (2015). Research using qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods and choice based on the research. *Perfusion*, *30*(7), 537-542. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267659114559116

Moore, R. (2017). Gricean communication and cognitive development. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, *67*(267), 303-326. https://doi.org/10.1093/pq/pqw049

Mozuraitis, M., Chambers, C. G., & Daneman, M. (2015). Privileged versus shared knowledge about object identity in real-time referential processing. *Cognition*, *142*, 148-165. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2015.05.001

Nida, E. A. (2015). A Componential Analysis of Meaning. In *A Componential Analysis of Meaning*. De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110828696

Omotayo, F. O. (2015). Knowledge Management as an important tool in Organisational Management: A Review of Literature. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, *1*(2015), 1-23. http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1238

Papi, M. B. (2010). How does pragmatics fit with the brain? New challenges from complex systems theories. *Italian journal of linguistics*, *22*(1), 209-228.

Siddiqui, A. (2018). The principle features of English Pragmatics in applied linguistics. *Advances in language and literary studies*, *9*(2), 77-80. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.9n.2p.77.

Sileo, J. M. (2011). Co-teaching: Getting to know your partner. *Teaching exceptional children, 43*(5), 32-38. https://doi.org/10.1177/004005991104300503

Simaremare, Y. N., Nainggolan, W. C., & Herman, H. (2021). Pragmatics Analysis on Conversational Implicature Used in Mulan (2020) Movie. *Middle European Scientific Bulletin*, *15*. https://doi.org/10.47494/mesb.2021.15.696

Skordos, D., & Papafragou, A. (2016). Children's derivation of scalar implicatures: Alternatives and relevance. *Cognition*, *153*, 6-18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2016.04.006

Sofyan, A., Yudistira, R., 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

Suryadi, H., & Muslim, M. (2019). An analysis of conversational implicature strategy in a drama "the bear" by Anton Chekhovand its application in ELT. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, *7*(2), 82-95. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v7i2.1956

Tsojon, I. Y., & Jonah, P. K. (2016). An Analysis of the Pragmatic Implicatures of Selected Advert Billboards around Jos Metropolis in Terms of Grice (1975) Maxims of Cooperative Principle. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, *3*(1), 42-49. http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijelt.v3n1p42

Tsoumou, J. M. (2020). Analysing speech acts in politically related Facebook communication. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *167*, 80-97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.06.004

Uktolseja, L. J., Sujaja, H., & Matinahoru, M. F. (2019). A contrastive analysis between English and Indonesian kinds of sentences. *IJET (Indonesian Journal of English Teaching)*, *8*(1), 54-61. https://doi.org/10.15642/ijet2.2019.8.1.54-61

Widdowson, H. (2015). ELF and the pragmatics of language variation. *Journal of English as a lingua franca*, *4*(2), 359-372.https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2015-0027.

Wilson, D., & Kolaiti, P. (2017). Lexical pragmatics and implicit communication. *Implicitness. From Lexis to Discourse/P. Cap and M. Dynel (Eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins*, 147-175. *http://digital.casalini.it/9789027265487*.

Woods, M., Paulus, T., Atkins, D. P., & Macklin, R. (2016). Advancing qualitative research using qualitative data analysis software (QDAS)? Reviewing potential versus practice in published studies using ATLAS. ti and NVivo, 1994–2013. *Social Science Computer Review*, *34*(5), 597-617. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439315596311

Yonashiro-Cho, J., Cote, S., & Enguidanos, S. (2016). Knowledge about and perceptions of advance care planning and communication of Chinese-American older Adults. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, *64*(9), 1884-1889. https://doi.org/10.1111/jgs.14261

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