Conversational Implicatures in Students' Communication and its Type: A Pragmatic Study

by Muhammad Sarlin

Submission date: 29-Jun-2023 01:25AM (UTC+0800)
Submission ID: 2124015808
File name: 1310105_Telaumbanua_2020_E_R.pdf (311.51K)
Word count: 5976
Character count: 33412

International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change. www.ijicc.net
Volume 13, Issue 10, 2020

Conversational Implicatures in Students' Communication and its Type: A Pragmatic Study

Sadieli Telaumbanua[a], Godlif Sianipar[b], Muhammad Sarlin[c], Afdaliah[d], Irwan Fathurrochman[e], [a]Indonesian Education Department, Universitas Prima Indonesia, Medan, Indonesia, [b]Faculty of Literature, Universitas Katolik Santo Thomas, Medan Indonesia, [c]Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia, [d]Department of Accounting, Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang, Makassar, Indonesia, [e]Institut Agama Islam Negeri (IAIN) Curup, Indonesia, Email: [a]sadielitelaumbanua@unprimdn.ac.id, [b]godlif@yahoo.com, [c]sarlin_muh@ung.ac.id, [d]1966afdaliah@gmail.com, [e]irwan@iaincurup.ac.id

This study explores the lingual form and process of conversational implicature that appears in student communication in classes at Universitas Prima Indonesia. In this research, observation and interviews are used as the primary method to collect the data. The study is based on descriptive qualitative research. The collected data is analyzed through three stages of the flow model: data reduction, data presentation, and data verification. The findings indicate that there are three forms of lingual found: command lingual; news lingual form; and question lingual form. The lingual form was chosen in the conversation of students at Universitas Prima Indonesia with the expectation that speakers and speech partners would not feel offended. Proximity factors of communication cause the lingual form of declarative, imperative, and questioning in a conversation. These findings are expected to form the basis of capturing the implied intent of the speaker and trying to convey the messages to the speech partner.

Key words: pragmatics, teaching, and learning, communication, conversational implicature

Introduction

This study offers a review of the conversational implicature in a social group within the school environment, namely the Universitas Prima Indonesia. In communication between students, it is possible for a conversation that contains specific purposes that are sometimes different from what is contained in the speech to emerge. The key problem examined in this research is the nature of the lingual form of conversational implicature that appears in communication between students at Universitas Prima Indonesia. The paper also asks: what types of conversational implicature appear in communication between students at Universitas Prima Indonesia?

Humans, as social beings, communicate with others in their own communities. The occurrence of communication between people is marked by the person who is the source of information (the communicator) and the person who is the recipient of information (the communicant) (Santoso & Apriyanto, 2020a). Communication is said to be successful if the communicator's message can be understood precisely by the communicant as intended by the communicator. The connection uses language as the medium (e.g., Bazarova et al., 2013; Lister et al., 2009).

Through human language expressing feelings and opinions, even with language, humans can think and reason. A language is a primary tool for communication between people (see Beard, 2018; Louneva, 2010; Swann & Deumert, 2018). In other words, humans will be very dependent on a language. Furthermore, language is important because humans are social creatures; that is, beings who cannot live without other people. In other words, there is interaction (or communication) between humans for a range of purposes. The language used by humans is not static. Rather, this language develops according to the needs of its human users (Gee & Handford, 2012; Santoso & Apriyanto, 2020b).

Various phenomena that arise in practical life will significantly affect a language. Often the rules of language agreed upon stagnate according to the ways that the language is used at the grassroots level (Kumar, 1987; Tsiplakides & Fragoulis, 2009). Assessment of a language at the structural level alone often does not produce a maximum study (see Caldas-Coulthard & Coulthard, 1996; Okada, 2010). The working conditions of language used are often "out" of structural norms, but the communication process that occurs does not encounter an obstacle, and instead results in more effective and efficient communication (see Galdia, 2017; Kotorova, 2014; Nazaryan & Gridchin, 2006; Simon Michel, 2013). That is what drives a study of a language not only from a structural perspective, but as one that must also be linked to aspects outside the structure of language (Santoso & Apriyanto, 2020b).

Among the language studies that can accommodate aspects outside of the language contained within the study are pragmatics and discourse analysis (e.g., Coulthard, 2005; Jorgensen & Philips, 2002; Levinson, 1983). In these two fields of study, a language involves aspects outside the language that contributes to the meaning of communication. Involving characters outside the language is appropriate when looking at the phenomenon of language use at a practical level, especially one that is quite diverse.

In communication, it can be assured that a conversation will occur. This conversation is primarily an oral language event between two or more participants who generally converse in a relaxed atmosphere. The conversation is a forum that enables the realization of the principles of cooperation and courtesy in language events. For this reason, it is necessary to understand the conversational implications, so that what is said can be understood by the interlocutor. One part of the pragmatic study is the *conversational implicature* (see Caldas-Coulthard & Coulthard, 1996; Commission et al., 2009; Gee & Handford, 2012; Levinson, 1983; Nunberg, 2002). These conversations often contain specific purposes that differ from the structure of the language used. In these conditions, the use of language may have intentions that are hidden behind the structural use of language. In such terms, a conversational implicature study has the right role in studying the use of language.

Interaction among students can have a positive impact on the atmosphere of communication in the classroom (Febriyanti, 2011; Matsumoto, 2008), meaning that the function of language as a communication tool becomes even more important. Both English as an international language and Indonesia as the national language are a communication tool that have four aspects of language skills: those of listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Apriyanto, 2019; Jondeya, 2011; Khadidja, 2009)

Moreover, linguistic studies are divided into two types: structural and functional language studies (Flick, 2014; Kotorova, 2014). In this case, the most appropriate study to facilitate conversations amongst students in classroom learning is functional studies (Shing et al., 2010), and pragmatic studies (Cook, 2014; Santoso & Apriyanto, 2020; Van Dijk, 2015). The pragmatic study is a study of the purpose behind the speech of a speaker and interlocutor who are both bound by context (Mey, 2001; Nunberg, 2002). According to pragmatic experts such as Carnap (1937) who was a philosopher and logician, pragmatics is the study of abstract concepts. Pragmatics studies the relationship of concepts that are signs. Furthermore, Montague (1970) contends that pragmatics is the study of the "indexical" or the "deictic". This understanding is related to the theory of pragmatic or deixis: that is, the use of language that refers to specific references.

On the other hand, Leech (1983) sees pragmatics as a field of study in the context of linguistics

but which has semantic links. Semantic flow is seen as a part of pragmatics and complementarity, or it sees semantics and pragmatics as two complementary fields. Still. Leech (1983) adds that semantics is the study of language bound by context. In pragmatic studies, various linguistic features that are linked to context can be found, such as social context, time, place, atmosphere, education, and culture (see Shuy, 2007). This pragmatic study concerns aspects of the intention behind someone's speech. Therefore, the role of speech context is influential in understanding the purpose of speech in communication. Various speech acts such as locution, illocution, and perlocution are used by the lecturer and students in their conversation, and contain various purposes behind their speech (Farinde et al., 2015). Leech (1983) notes that pragmatics also equates to speech situation. The role of the context of speech determines the purpose of speech in a conversation, such as opinion.

Kotorova (2014) and Levinson (1983) have found that pragmatic studies could not be separated from the context of speech. Language as a communication tool is used in various contexts to convey messages to the reader. Related to this, Bohn & Frank (2020) explain that pragmatics in addition to communicating the mandate, duties, and the needs of the speaker, proscribes that the purpose of communication is to maintain the social relations of the speaker with the listener. Thus, the strategy taken is not only the strategy that guarantees the highest pragmatic clarity by adhering to the principles of Grice's principles. This principle needs to be truly informative (no more or no less), correct, relevant, concise, orderly, not vague, and ambiguous. (Grice, 1975; Wang, 2011). On the other hand, the markers' pragmatics are more visible in the strategies of the speakers in producing speech (see Li, 2015; Zaides et al., 2018)

Speech acts in lecturer and student conversations use a variety of different speech strategies. Related to the various speech strategies used in the conversation is the creation of a plan in producing the speech. In other words, sometimes the speaker must say something different from what he intended with a specific purpose, meaning that the utterances conveyed are implicitly meaningful (Khan, 2010; Lindblad, 2011). Thus, in every speech act someone has a different speech function.

In communicating, the speaker and the interlocutor need the means to communicate in all contexts. Armstrong (2003) explains that one lingual unit can be used to express several functions in communication, and a specific communicative function can be expressed with several lingual units. Therefore, this object becomes a pragmatic study, especially in the field of implicature. In line with this implicature, Grice (1975) has stated that the implicature is divided into two parts: conventional and non-conventional implicature.

Methodology

The study aims to describe the lingual form and process of conversational implicature that appears in student's communication at Universitas Prima Indonesia. The method of the study for data collection is the observation method and interview through a descriptive qualitative point of view. The collected data was analyzed with a focus on the lingual form, meaning the level of the sentence. The sentence already contains propositions that make a direct contribution to the speaker who is conveying the implicature of the conversation. The term 'lingual form' here is said to contain conversational implicature.

Findings and Discussion

The data to be examined comes from the perspective of the conversational implicature taken from the conversation that took place between students of the Indonesian language and literature education study program, at Universitas Prima Indonesia. The researchers focused more on the level of form lingual meaning of the sentence, because the sentence had to contain propositions which contributed directly to the speaker in delivering conversational implicatures. The term lingual form here is said to contain conversational implicature.

The form of conversational implicature is based on sentence meaning level.

Based on its meaning, the sentence can be divided into four types, namely declarative, imperative, interrogative, and exclamative sentences (Gee & Handford, 2012).

Data 1 - Lingual form of declarative sentences

> Fitri Simarmata: "Hey friends, the task is not finished yet, I haven't done question number 4" (IP 1-A)
> Josua Krismanto: "what question have you worked on?"
> Fitri Simarmata: "I'm still working on question number 3"
> Josua Krismanto: (Rushed to get a book and to work on question number 4).

Speech context: a conversation occurs when Josua Krismanto with his friends undertake a group assignment in class. In the first data, there is a conversational implicature. The implication is seen in the utterances conveyed (Josua Krismanto). The statement presents a form of informational speech, which only tells us that the task has not been completed, and furthermore that Josua Krismanto said that he was working on question number 3 and question number 4. After the reaction from Josua's speech partner, he immediately set about working on question

number 4. In the conversation, there was a process of speech implications; the speaker who intended to ask the interlocutor to do something was not stated directly, but was implied behind the informative speech. Associated with the type of implicature of Grice, the conversational implicature is conventional because the opposite party can understand the meaning of the speaker (Grice, 1975).

Data 2 - Lingual form of declarative sentences

> Yesi Ebrilala Sitepu: "later, after finishing the first hour, let's go to the canteen."
> Marshinta Uli Sidabutar: "Later, the second hour, he will immediately teach." (IP 2-A)
> Perawati Banjarnahor: "It doesn't take long. I just want to buy a drink."

Speech context: a conversation occurs when the first lesson starts. The Yesi sentence is an invitation, and the answer to that question is usually acceptance or rejection. Marshinta's response can be understood as a subtle rejection of Yesi's invitation. In this case, Marshinta does not use direct terms like "lazy/unwilling," but rather an indirect rejection. It means that the denial was implicated in the utterance of "The second-hour person will immediately teach you," while the utterance itself does not take the form of rejection.

Data 3 - Lingual form of imperative sentences

> Mira Wida Yanti Ziliwu: "Remember! The book contains 50, here's the money" (IP 3-A)
> Peronika: "Yes" (*walking out*)
> Feby Anolya Gultom: "I got it. Buy me a stove." (*laughing*) (IP 4-A)

Speech context: the conversation occurred when Peronika was going to a cooperative to buy something. Suddenly, Mira called Peronika to ask to buy a book that they had previously talked about. There are several implicatures in the conversation. First, an intention to ask for help to buy a book, which is only realized in the form of the words: "The book contains 50, here's the money.". This can be caught by the speech partner. In this case, the conversation that had taken place was based on a presumption. The speaker (Peronika) knew the speech partner (Mira) indeed wanted the book, but because he did not have time to go out to buy the book, he finally asked the speaker (Peronika). This conversation also found a speech that contains other conversational implicature. In the utterances offered by Mira, it is quite clear when interpreted: that is, she asks Peronika to buy a stove. The implication of the context of the conversation that appears is just a joke because, the request is very unlikely to be realized.

Data 4 - Lingual form of imperative sentences

Todo Maja Kusbianto: "The table is shifted, so it looks neat."
Mega Situmorang: "I do this alone." (IP 5-A)
Elisa Putri Br Kaban: (*silent*)

Speech context: a conversation occurs when cleaning the classroom. Conversations that occur in this data are included in the conventional conversational implicature. In this case, the context of the situation is very influential in the emergence of the conversation. In this conversation, taken literally, it is an informative speech. However, also related to the context of the situation at that time is that the table had to be moved immediately. In the room, there were only three people: Todo, Mega, and Elisa. Elisa when it did not help move the table. The conversation could be implied as a request to Elisa to help move the table immediately.

Data 5 - Lingual form of imperative sentences

Cristy Josepine Jorenia Tarigan: "Clean this room immediately! late afternoon." (IP 6-B)
Veronica Febriana S: (*Take a broom and then clean up the room*)

The conversational implicature above is expressed in the lingual form of an imperative sentence (Apriyanto & Nurhayaty, 2019; Levinson, 1983). In such a context, if interpreted in such a way it would be difficult to accept because the time was still morning, and evening time was still some time away. The speech has more implications as a form of a joke or as a form of innuendo because the room is not immediately cleaned.

Data 6 - Lingual form of declarative sentences

Budi Artawan : "Where are you going to go, Di?"
Betris Malumma Br Manik: "fill the stomach" (IP 7-B)
Polma J. Sinambela: "hurry up"

The conversation contained conversational implicature, which is classified as a conventional conversation implicature. The implication is seen in the second dialogue. In the dialogue, there is an implication that is quite easy to capture just by literally interpreting the words used in the speech. Although the speech is quite easy to understand, it still includes the implication of the conversation, because the intention of the speaker asks for time to eat, which is hidden (or implicated) in the speech.

Data 7 - Lingual form of declarative sentences

Suaibah: (*arrived*) "Are you ready?"
Asni Sumarni Saragih: "Ready"
Suaibah: "Where are they going?"
Asni Sumarni Saragih: "Still a break in the canteen."
Suaibah: "Where will you go, As?"
Asni Sumarni Saragih: "To the canteen, will you come?"
Suaibah: "The lesson has begun." (IP 8-B)
Asni Sumarni Saragih: "Just a minute" (*while going to the canteen*)

The context of this speech occurs in the classroom. In the conversation outlined above, there is a conventional implicature, which is when (Suaibah) says, "The lesson has begun." In this case, a process of speech implications occurs – the speaker (Suaibah) who intends to forbid the interlocutor (Asni) not to leave the classroom, does not directly prohibit but is implied behind an informative speech (Goodwin, 1973; Irawati, 2008). This conversation also found presuppositions. In this case, the two participants have known each other's role in group activities, one being the first presenter and the other is the second. Presupposition occurs when suddenly (Suaibah) comes and only says, "Are you ready?", and the speech partner (Asni) responded with "ready" speech. A speech process such as this will be complicated to follow up if it does not have a common knowledge base (presupposition) between the speaker and the speech partner (see Benotti & Blackburn, 2001; Jorgensen & Philips, 2002; Levinson, 1983).

Data 8 - Lingual forms of interrogative sentence

Agrita Sari: "Buddies, there are tasks from Mr. Sadieli, do the tasks. Next week these should be gathered!"
Rindana Sidika Perak Simanullang: "Great, giving up tasks, great!!! Ta, let's just do this task at your house later."
Agrita Sari: "My sister is sick. How about we make it in your house?" (IP 9-C)
Rindana Sidika Perak Simanullang: "alright"

Speech context: a conversation occurs in the classroom when Agrita comes from the lecturer room then provides information that there is an assignment from Mr. Sadieli. The implication of the conversation can be seen in the Agrita utterance, "My sister is sick. How about we make it in your house?" The statement contains information about Agrita's rejection of Rindana's invitation. The form of rejection uttered by Agrita speakers is not done openly or directly, but indirectly; that is, by throwing out a sentence in the form of lingual questioning (interrogative) (Heritage,

2002; Levinson, 1983). Speakers do this with the aim that people who invite or offer something are not offended. According to the data analysis, it can be deduced that the linguistic form of conversational implicature that appears in student's communication at Universitas Prima Indonesia is dominated by the lingual form of news sentences, the lingual form of command sentences and the lingual form of question sentences (interrogative). The lingual form is an exciting (interactive) sentence, and empathic sentences are not found in this data. The form of lingual news sentences can be observed in data 1, 2, 6, 7, then the data of the lingual form of command sentences in data 3, 4, and 5, and the lingual form of question sentences is found in data 8.

Conversational implicature in communication between students

Implicature has pragmatic implications when contained in the one form lingual speaker and is uttered to the hearer during a conversation (Nunberg, 2002; Wang, 2011). From the results of data analysis that has been done, it is found that there are five kinds of conversational implicature in communication between students of Indonesian language and literature education study programs at Universitas Prima Indonesia. The five kinds of implicature of the conversation are inviting, rejecting, mocking, ordering, and informing the facts. Each of the conversational implicatures is presented in the following section.

1. "Inviting" Conversational Implicature

Inviting means asking the interlocutor to do something together (Abdolrezapour, 2012). Data showing the implications of the inviting conversation can be observed in the following quotation:

> *Citation 2*
> Yesi Ebrilala Sitepu: "later, after finishing the first hour. Let's go to the canteen."
> *Citation 8*
> Rindana Sidika Perak Simanullang: "Great, giving up tasks, great!!! Ta, let's just do this task at your house later."

The two quotations above are the implications of an inviting conversation marked with the word "come on", as a form of Yesi's invitation to the speech partner to go to the canteen, along with Rindana's invitation to make an assignment at Agrita's house. The lingual form used by speakers in the inviting conversation implicature is the lingual form of news sentences (declarative). The choice of the question sentence to convey the invitation in this speech does not seem to impose his will on the speech partner.

2. "Rejecting" Conversational Implicature

Conversational implicature "rejecting" is intended not to carry out any desired by the speaker to the hearer. Data showing the implications of rejecting conversation can be observed in the following data:

Citation 2

Marshinta Uli Sidabutar: "Later, the second hour, he will immediately teach." (IP 2-A)

Citation 7

Suaibah: "The lesson has begun." (IP 8-B)

Citation 8

Agrita Sari: "My sister is sick. How about we make it in your house?" (IP 9-C)

The three utterances contain the implications of rejecting conversations expressed in the lingual form of news sentences (declarative) in the data quotation 2 and 7, and the lingual form of the question sentence in quotation 8. The lingual form of the news sentence and the lingual form of the sentence in question to reject the invitation of the speaker are carried out by the speaker with the speaker's goal being that the speech partner does not feel offended (see Jarrín, 2012; Vanderhallen, Miet & Vervaeke, 2014).

3. "Mocking" Conversational Implicature.

Mocking conversational implicatures are also found in the communication between students of Indonesian language and literature education at University of Prima Indonesia. Implicatures mock conversation with the intent expressed by the speaker's joke, and this is also disclosed with satirical intent. Implications of mock or sarcastic conversations are expressed in the lingual form of command sentences. The lingual form choice of the command is to insinuate or mock his friend because of the closeness or familiarity of the speaker and the speech partner (Shaheed, 2000; Waskita, 2014). This data can be found in data 5:

Citation 5

Cristy Josepine Jorenia Tarigan: "Clean this room immediately! late afternoon" (IP 6-B)

4. "Ordering" Conversational Implicature.

The type of implication "ordering" is done by the speaker to the speech partner with the aim that the speech partner wants to do something for the benefit of himself or others. Data showing the conversational implicature of order can be observed in data 3, 4, 5:

Citation 3

Mira Wida Yanti Ziliwu: "Remember! The book contains 50, here's the money" (IP 3-A)

Citation 4
Todo Maja Kusbianto: "The table is shifted, so it looks neat."
Citation 5
Cristy Josepine Jorenia Tarigan: "Clean this room immediately! late afternoon" (IP 6-B)

In this conversation event, the speaker is more likely to use the lingual command form than the question lingual form. The choice of lingual order by the speaker to the speech partner is due to the familiarity between them.

5. "Asking/request" Conversational Implicature

Citation 1
Fitri Simarmata: "Hey, friends, the task is not finished yet. I have not done question number 4." (IP 1-A)

Type of Asking/request conversational Implicature of Universitas Prima Indonesia students is expressed in the form of lingual news (declarative). The declarative form of news lingual was chosen in the conversation with the aim that the speech partner is not offended (see Arvanitidou & Gasouka, 2011; Gee & Handford, 2012; Heritage, 2002; Lee, 2007). The statement in the quotation suggests that question number 4 has not yet been done and, at the same time, asks the interlocutor to work on it immediately.

6. "Informing a Fact" Conversational Implicature

The conversational implicature in informing the fact is quite dominant in the conversation events between students of the Indonesian language and literature education study program at Universitas Prima Indonesia. This conversation implicature is used by the speaker to tell or convey information to the speaker (see Apriyanto & Nurhayaty, 2019; Boeriswati, 2012; Pennebaker & Niederhoffer, 2003; Nihal, 2010; Pennebaker et al., 2003). Because of its nature of informing or informing facts, it is always supported by news sentences. Data related to the conversational implicature of facts can be found in the following data:

Citation 1
Fitri Simarmata: "Hey, friends, the task is not finished yet. I have not done question number 4." (IP 1-A)
Citation 4
Mega Situmorang: "I do this alone." (IP 5-A)
Citation 6

Betris Malumma Br Manik: "fill the stomach" (IP 7-B)
Citation 7
Suaibah: "The lesson has begun." (IP 8-B)
Citation 8
Agrita Sari: "Buddies, there are tasks from Mr. Sadieli, do the tasks. Next week these should be gathered!"

The first data citation intends to inform you that the task has not been completed. The fourth data excerpt informs that only Mega works while the other friends don't work. The Metris speech at the sixth quote intends to inform him that he wants to eat in the canteen. Next, in the Suaibah utterance, "The lesson has begun", informing the interlocutor not to go to the cafeteria because it has changed hours. Speech from Agrita: "Friends, there is an assignment from Mr. Sadieli, do the tasks, next week these should be collected!" The eighth citation of data also intends to inform his friends that there are new tasks to be done.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis and discussion of the findings of this study on the conversational implicature that occurs in communication between students of the Indonesian language and literature education study program at Universitas Prima Indonesia, the main findings are as follows: 1) There are three forms of lingual found in this study, most notably in the form of declarative, imperative, and interrogative. The choice of lingual form in conversations between students of Indonesian language and literature education study programs at Universitas Prima Indonesia has the aim that speakers and speech partners will not feel offended. Furthermore, the lingual forms of declarative, imperative, and interrogative with regards to students' conversation are caused by expertise factors. It will affect the form of communication that occurs. 2) The conversational implicature in student's communication at Universitas Prima Indonesia has six kinds of conversational implicature. The six kinds of implicature of the conversation are inviting, rejecting, mocking, ordering, asking, and informing the facts. Throughout this study, the researchers sought to convey to students and lecturers ways to conduct a more in-depth research of the implicature of conversations, especially conversations that occur between students of Indonesian language and literature education study programs on campus. By understanding the implicature of the conversation, one is undoubtedly able to capture the implied intent that the speech partner is trying to convey.

REFERENCES

Abdolrezapour, P. (2012). The effect of expectation of compliance on the preferred request strategy: Cross-cultural and situational variation in Iranian and American speech communities. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, *32*(3), 383–404.

Apriyanto, S. (2019). *Gender Strategies in Learning English* (Junaidi (ed.); 1st ed., Vol. 73). Sulur Pustaka. www.sulur.co.id

Apriyanto, S., & Nurhayaty, A. (2019). Born In Social Media Culture: Personality Features Impact In Communication Context. In Y. Nasucha (Ed.), *icollit* (pp. 167–175). UMS Press.

Armstrong, E. (2003). Communication culture in acute speech pathology settings: Current issues. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *5*(2), 137–143.

Arvanitidou, Z., & Gasouka, M. (2011). Fashion, Gender and Social Identity. *First Fashion Colloquia - London*, 1–19.

Ash-Shaheed, S. Q. (2000). "The America I Have Seen": In the Scale of Human Values (1951). *America in an Arab Mirror*, 9–27.

Bazarova, N. N., Taft, J. G., Choi, Y. H., & Cosley, D. (2013). Managing Impressions and Relationships on Facebook: Self-Presentational and Relational Concerns Revealed Through the Analysis of Language Style. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *32*(2), 121–141.

Beard, A. (2018). Speech, language and communication: a public health issue across the lifecourse. *Paediatrics and Child Health (United Kingdom)*, *28*(3), 126–131.

Benotti, L., & Blackburn, P. (2001). *Conversational implicatures*. 1–10.

Boeriswati, E. (2012). The Model of Speaking in Teaching Indonesian to Foreign Speakers Based on Self-Regulated Learning and Anxiety Reduction Approaches. *Sino-US English Teaching*, *9*(5), 1154–1163.

Bohn, M., & Frank, M. C. (2020). *The pervasive role of pragmatics in early language Manuel*.

Caldas-Coulthard, C. R., & Coulthard, M. (1996). Texts and Practices. In *Routledge*.

Carnap, R. (1937). *The Logical Syntax of Language*. International Library of Psychology, Philosophy, and Scientific Method.

Commission, E., Declaration, U., Rights, H., Charter, U. N., Nations, U., Union, E., Union, E., Commission, E., Convention, E., & Rights, H. (2009). *The Police Interview Techniques and Language*. *September 1953*, 1–346.

Cook, J. (2014). Context, expectation and conversational implicature: A pragmatic analysis of good. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(5), 857–864.

Coulthard, M. (2005). Some forensic applications of descriptive linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, *9*, 9–28.

Farinde, R. O., Olajuyigbe, O. A., & Matthew, A. (2015). Discourse Control Strategies in Police-Suspect Interrogation in Nigeria. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *5*(1), 146–158.

Febriyanti, E. R. (2011). Teaching speaking of English as a foreign language: problems and solutions. *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pembelajarannya.*, *1*(2), 133-146.

Flick, U. (2014). The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis. In Katie Metzle (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook*. SAGE Publication.

Galdia, M. (2017). *Lectures on Legal Linguistics*. Peter Lang Edition.

Gee, J. P., & Handford, M. (2012). The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis. In *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*.

Goodwin, C. (1973). Voicing: Reported Speech and Footing in Conversation. *Reporting Talk*, 16–46.

Grice, H. . (1975). Logic and Conversation. In *Studies in the Way of Words* (pp. 305–315). Harvard University Press.

Heritage, J. (2002). The limits of questioning: Negative interrogatives and hostile question content. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *34*(10–11), 1427–1446.

Husein, Ismail, Dwi Noerjoedianto, Muhammad Sakti, Abeer Hamoodi Jabbar. "Modeling of Epidemic Transmission and Predicting the Spread of Infectious Disease." Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy 11.6 (2020), 188-195. Print. doi:10.31838/srp.2020.6.30

Husein Ismail, Rahmad Syah, "Model of Increasing Experiences Mathematics Learning with Group Method Project", International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology, pp. 1133-1138, 2020.

Irawati, L. (2008). *LEARNING STRATEGIES USED BY DIFFERENT GENDER IN SPEAKING CLASS OF IKIP PGRI MADIUN*. Sebelas Maret University.

JamesW. Pennebaker, M. R. M., & Niederhoffer, and K. G. (2003). Learning a Natural Language Interface with Neural Programmer. *Psychology*.

Jarrín, O. F. (2012). The integrality of situated caring in nursing and the environment. *Advances in Nursing Science*, *35*(1), 14–24.

Jondeya, R. S. (2011). *The Effectiveness of Using Information Gap on Developing Speaking Skills for the Eighth Graders in Gaza Governorate Schools*.

Jorgensen, M., & Philips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* (1st ed.). SAGE Publication.

Khadidja, K. (2009). *the Effect of Classroom Interaction on Developing the Learner' S Speaking*. MENTOURI UNIVERSITY.

Khan, S. (2010). *Strategies and spoken production on three oral communication tasks :a study of high and low proficiency EFL learners*. *September*, 395.

Kotorova, E. G. (2014). Describing Cross-cultural Speech Behavior: A Communicative-pragmatic Field Approach. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *154*(October), 184–192.

Kumar, K. (1987). Curriculum , Psychology and Society. *Economic and Political Weekly*, *22*(12), 507–512.

Lee, H. (2007). *Essentials of Behavioral Science Research: A First Course in Research Methodology*. 160.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Li, W. (2015). Effective Teaching in the Use of Pragmatic Markers for Chinese EFL Learners. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *3*(11), 822–829.

Lindblad, M. (2011). *Communication Strategies in Speaking English as a Foreign Language In the Swedish 9th grade national test setting*. *August*, 1–31.

Lister, M., Dovey, J., Giddings, S., Grant, I., & Kelly, K. (2009). *New media: a critical introduction*.

Louneva, T. (2010). Business Negotiations between Americans and Japanese. *Cultural Adjuct*, *2*(May).

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction (2nd ed)* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

Montague, R. (1970). Pragmatics and Intensional Logic. *Semantics of Natural Language*, *22*(1/2), 68–94.

Nazaryan, A., & Gridchin, A. (2006). the Influence of Internet on Language and " Email Stress ". *Law and Politics*, *4*, 23–27.

Nihal. (2010). *Using Drama in Teaching English for Young Learners*. SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ.

Nunberg, G. (2002). The Pragmatics of Deferred Interpretation. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, 344–364.

Okada, Y. (2010). Role-play in oral proficiency interviews: Interactive footing and interactional competencies. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *42*(6), 1647–1668.

Pennebaker, J., R.Mehl, M., & Niederhoffer, K. G. (2003). Psychological Aspects of Natural Language Use: Our Words, Our Selves. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*, 547–577.

Santoso, D., & Apriyanto, S. (2020a). Algorithms of language in speech by the president of republic indonesia. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, *24*(6), 125–136.

Santoso, D., & Apriyanto, S. (2020b). Pragmatics implicature analysis of police interrogation: Forensic linguistics analysis. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, *24*(6), 115–124.

Shing, Y. L., Lindenberger, U., Diamond, A., Li, C., & Davidson, M. C. (2010). *Memory Maintenance and Inhibitory Control Differentiate from Early Childhood to Adolescence*. *October 2014*, 37–41.

Shuy, R. W. (2007). Language in the American Courtroom. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *1*(1–2), 100–114.

Simon Michel, C. (2013). Investigating the Use of Forensic Stylistics ans Stylometric Techniques in the Analyses of Authorship on a Publicly Accessible Social Networking Site (Facebook). *Vasa*, *July*, 222.

Swann, J., & Deumert, A. (2018). Sociolinguistics and language creativity. *Language Sciences*, *65*, 1–8.

Tsiplakides, I., & Fragoulis, I. (2009). Project-based learning in the teaching of English as a foreign language in Greek primary schools: from theory to practice. *English Language Teaching*, *2*(3), 113–119.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Acceptability in context. *Acceptability in Language*, 39–61.

Vanderhallen, Miet & Vervaeke, G. (2014). Between Investigator and Suspect: The Role of theWorking Alliance in Investigative Interviewing. In R. Bull (Ed.), *Investigative Interviewing* (p. 63). Springer.

Wang, H. (2011). Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *2*(5), 1162–1167.

Waskita, D. (2014). Transitivity in Telephone Conversation in A Bribery Case In Indonesia: A Forensic Linguistics Study. *Jurnal Sosioteknologi*, *13*(2), 91–100.

Yasuyo Matsumoto. (2008). Investigating classroom dynamics in Japanese university EFL classrooms [The University of Birmingham]. In *A thesis Doctor of Philosophy* (Issue September).

Zaides, K., Popova, T., & Bogdanova-Beglarian, N. (2018). Pragmatic markers in the corpus "One Day of Speech": Approaches to the annotation. *CEUR Workshop Proceedings*, *2303*, 1–16.

Conversational Implicatures in Students' Communication and its Type: A Pragmatic Study

ORIGINALITY REPORT

6%	5%	3%	1%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	repository.ung.ac.id Internet Source	2%
2	eudl.eu Internet Source	1%
3	Submitted to UIN Jambi Student Paper	1%
4	ejournal.unib.ac.id Internet Source	1%
5	repository.unikama.ac.id Internet Source	1%
6	conference.upgris.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
7	dokumen.pub Internet Source	<1%
8	journal.uin-alauddin.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
9	journaldatabase.info Internet Source	<1%

10	library.unismuh.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
11	repository.ar-raniry.ac.id Internet Source	<1%
12	www.tandfonline.com Internet Source	<1%
13	David D'Acunto, Annamaria Tuan, Daniele Dalli. "chapter 12 Are Online Reviews Helpful for Consumers?", IGI Global, 2020 Publication	<1%

Exclude quotes	On	Exclude matches	Off
Exclude bibliography	On		