
UNVEILING THE HIDDEN LANGUAGE: A ROADMAP TO MASTERING IMPLICATURES IN ENGLISH

Siti Sudartini

Postgraduate Student of Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia
Lecturer of Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Adi Sutrisno

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

Ni Gusti Ayu Roselani

Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

<https://doi.org/10.59009/ijlllc.2024.0075>

ABSTRACT

This article highlights the importance of understanding implicature in EFL communication. It examines how language proficiency, cultural background, and teaching methods impact the effectiveness of implicature training. The study finds that proficiency levels influence the comprehension and use of implicatures, while cultural backgrounds affect their interpretation. Additionally, diverse teaching methods, especially hands-on and exploratory approaches, significantly enhance implicature training. Recommendations for educators include tailoring teaching methods to individual student needs, integrating implicature lessons into the curriculum, and using additional resources to boost student engagement. Future research should focus on factors influencing implicature training, conduct longitudinal studies to assess training effectiveness, and explore technological tools to improve implicature understanding. This study provides valuable insights and practical guidelines for improving EFL learning through better implicature training.

Keywords: Implicature, English as a Foreign Language (EFL), Language Proficiency, Teaching Methods.

1. INTRODUCTION

In language communication, understanding implicature has a very important role (Ahlsén, 2008; Ahmed, M., & Shazali, 2010; Carston, R., & Hall, 2012). In the study of pragmatics, the understanding of implicature is considered to have a very important role in language communication (Mehdi, M., & Zahra, 2006; Geurts, 2019). Implicature, first introduced by pragmatic philosopher Paul Grice, refers to the implied meaning contained in an utterance, beyond the literal meaning of the words used (Neale, 1992; Mehdi, M., & Zahra, 2006; Bianchi, 2013). Grice developed the Cooperative Principle which emphasises that in communication, speakers and listeners tend to cooperate and follow certain rules, including the principles of openness, relevance, amount, and efficient manner (Abdi, R., Rizi, M. T., & Tavakoli, 2010; Shuwei, 2014).

In this regard, there are many studies that try to investigate further related to implicature, especially based on the Cooperative Principle theory, many of which are as follows. Lindblom (2001) with the title "Cooperating with Grice: A cross-disciplinary metaperspective on uses of Grice's cooperative principle", highlights the active role played by what is termed as verbal silence in communication.

Furthermore, there is also research conducted by (Hossain, 2021), on "The principles underlying what is communicated and not said: a cursory discussion of Grice's cooperative principle and its maxims". The main findings of the study, explained in two contexts: first, speakers deliberately obey the maxims in the conversation which essentially confirms Grice's cooperative principle theory in the fulfilment of at least some maxims. Secondly, speakers exploit the maxims either intentionally or disobeying them by deciding to violate, delay, scoff, violate, or opt out of the conversation. This situation is motivated by the emergence of conversational implicature. A competent listener should be able to arrive at conclusions that make it possible to draw meaning from what the speaker says. In principle, this research confirms how people should consider fulfilling the principle of cooperation in order to succeed in communication, which is mainly based on Paul Grice's theory of implicature, which is considered one of the most important contributions to pragmatics.

Based on the theoretical perspectives as well as the praxis of the results of many studies, it can be said that the concept implies that in the context of communication, implicature plays an important role in helping speakers convey their intentions effectively and helping listeners understand the context and communicative purpose (Yus, 1999; Kecskes, 2021). Thus, understanding implicature is not just about recognising the literal meaning of words, but also about understanding the nuances, hidden intentions, and social context surrounding the conversation (Atlas, 2005; Puri, Anindita, 2023). This suggests that understanding implicature is a key component in facilitating effective communication and in understanding the messages conveyed in everyday language (Gibbs Jr, 2002; Telaumbanua, S., Sianipar, G. J., Sarlin, M., & Fathurrochman, 2020; Çiftlikli, S., & Demirel, 2022).

Implicature refers to the implied meaning conveyed through language, beyond the literal interpretation of words. In the context of English, the ability to recognise and use implicatures appropriately is necessary to achieve effective communication (Bouton, 1999; Kecskes, 2021). Implicatures can help speakers convey their intentions more subtly and complexly, as well as allow listeners to understand context and nuances that are not explicitly spoken. In the context of English, the ability to recognise and use implicatures appropriately plays a crucial role in achieving effective communication (Bach, 2006). Implicature, as one of the important aspects of language pragmatics, provides an additional dimension to communication that goes beyond the literal meaning of the words used (Leech, G., & Thomas, 2002).

Examples of implicature in English can be found in a variety of everyday communication situations. One common example is the use of the phrase "It's getting late" in a conversation. While the phrase literally just states that it's getting late, in certain social contexts, it can also be taken as an implicature to imply that the time to leave is approaching or the situation is no longer appropriate. Another example is when someone offers a guest a drink by saying, "Would you like a cup of tea?" Although the question literally asks the guest's desire for tea, the implied implicature is that the host wants to offer the guest something to drink, and other options may also be available. Implicature can also be found in the use of humour or jokes, where indirectly conveyed messages can contain additional meanings that are fun or intriguing (Yus, 2003; Kotthoff, 2006; Dynel, 2017). By understanding and recognising implicatures in various English contexts, speakers and listeners can interpret messages more precisely and understand the nuances of communication that are not explicitly stated.

Implicatures allow speakers to convey their intentions in more subtle and complex ways, which cannot always be expressed explicitly (Saul, 2002; Sbisà, 2021). For example, the use of implicatures can help speakers convey criticisms, appeals, or wishes more politely or diplomatically. In addition, the ability to recognise implicatures also allows listeners to

understand contexts and nuances that are not directly expressed, which can avoid misunderstandings and improve understanding in communicative interactions. Therefore, understanding and applying implicatures appropriately is crucial in facilitating effective communication in English, as well as improving fluency and interactional ability in diverse English contexts (Manowong, 2011; Alsmari, 2020). Therefore, understanding implicature is not just about understanding the words spoken, but also about understanding the context, culture, and even the intention of the speaker. In this article, an exploration of the importance of understanding implicature in English will be presented as well as various methods to improve this ability in learners of English as a foreign language.

In the context of learning English as a foreign language (EFL), understanding implicature is one of the challenging aspects for learners. The main challenge faced by learners is the difference between their home language and English in terms of structure, culture, and communication conventions komunikasi (Taguchi, 2005; Abdelhafez, 2016; Rızaoğlu, F., & Yavuz, 2017; Kecskes, 2021). For example, learners who come from a more open or direct language background, may struggle to understand the implicatures that are often used in English to convey intentions that are not explicitly stated. In addition, the variation in the use of implicatures between different dialects and styles of English can also complicate understanding for learners. Psychological factors such as confidence in communication and fear of mistakes can also affect learners' ability to grasp implicatures appropriately. Therefore, as asserted by Bouton (1999); Cignetti, L. M., & Di Giuseppe (2015); Köylü (2018), that a comprehensive understanding of the challenges faced by learners of English as a foreign language in understanding implicatures is crucial in the development of effective teaching strategies.

The main purpose of this article is to present the most effective approach to improving EFL learners' understanding of implicature. In order to achieve this goal, this article will present a comprehensive framework consisting of three main parts. First, the article will provide an in-depth introduction to the concept of implicature in English, including its definition, types, and relevant examples. Second, the article will discuss in detail the various methods that can be used in implicature training, both explicit and implicit approaches. Finally, the article will present an empirical study that tests the effectiveness of these methods in improving the understanding of implicature in learners of English as a foreign language. Thus, the structure of this article is designed to provide an in-depth understanding of implicature as well as provide practical guidance for teaching and learning English as a foreign language.

2. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Concept of Implicature in English

Implicature, in the context of pragmatics, refers to the additional or implied meaning contained in an utterance or statement, which exceeds the literal meaning of the words used (Recanati, 2003; Bezuidenhout, A. L., & Morris, 2004; Davis, 2016). The definition was first proposed by a pragmatic philosopher Paul Grice, who developed the theory of 'Communicative Cooperation' to explain how humans communicate effectively (Borge, 2012; Pedersen, 2016; Kopp, S., & Krämer, 2021; Kecskes, 2023). This theory establishes a framework for effective communication by emphasising the underlying principles of cooperation between speakers and listeners.

The 'Communicative Cooperation' theory proposed by pragmatic philosopher Paul Grice proposes that in communication, humans not only exchange information, but also implicitly seek to cooperate in order to achieve mutually recognised understanding (Ladegaard, 2009; Oswald, 2010; Poggi, 2016; Dulcinati, 2018). Grice argues that effective communication

occurs when the speaker (or writer) and the listener (or reader) participate in 'co-operation' to interpret and understand the message (Chinelo Obasi, J., & Udofot, 2013; Moore, 2018). According to Grice (Lindblom, 2001; Németh T, 2004; Wang, 2011), speakers and listeners tend to co-operate in communication by following the principles of openness, relevance, amount, and efficient manner.

In the context of implicature, the Cooperation Principle plays an important role in directing speakers to use language in a way that produces implicatures that can be widely understood by listeners (Bouton, 1999; Wang, 2011). According to this theory, effective communication requires adherence to principles of cooperation such as the principles of openness, honesty, and relevance (Tatsenko, N. V., Kozlovska, H. B., & Ushchapovska, 2017; Howard, 2018). Grice also emphasises the importance of the use of implicatures, where speakers implicitly convey additional information through the use of non-literal language. As such, Grice's Communicative Cooperation theory provides a foundation for understanding how humans communicate effectively through coordination and cooperation to achieve mutually recognised understanding (Reich, 2011; Moore, 2018).

Grice (Mooney, 2004; Kearns, 2010; Hossain, 2021) identifies two types of implicatures: conversational implicatures, which arise directly from violations of the Cooperation Principle, and conventional implicatures, which are related to socially and culturally recognised language use. First, conversational implicatures refer to those that arise directly from the Principle of Cooperation being violated in conversation (Attardo, 1993; Lumsden, 2008; C. Bianchi, 2013). These implicatures are often indirect or implied, and occur when the speaker does not directly state something, but the listener can draw inferences based on the context and assumptions (Levinson, 2000). For example, when someone says, 'There is a guest in the living room,' the conversational implicature is that the speaker intends for the listener to act or respond to the presence of the guest. However, this message is not directly expressed in the sentence. Conversational implicature often depends on the context, shared knowledge, and assumptions that the speaker and listener are assumed to have. Thus, in everyday communication interactions, understanding conversational implicature is crucial to understanding the message that the speaker is actually conveying.

Second, conventional implicatures are implicatures associated with socially and culturally recognised language use. These implicatures can stem from certain social norms, conventions, or stereotypes associated with language use (Traugott, 2006; Huang, 2012; Jeshion, 2013). Examples are implicatures associated with certain expressions, idiomatic phrases, or popular expressions that have additional meanings beyond their literal meanings. By understanding these different types of implicatures, speakers and listeners can be more sensitive to the nuances and complexities in language communication, and improve their ability to understand and use language effectively. By elaborating on the communicative framework brought about by the Cooperation Principle, Grice's theory provides a deep insight into how implicatures are formed and interpreted in everyday conversational contexts (Kleinke, 2010; Lambrou, 2023).

The main role of implicatures in communication is to enable speakers to convey their intentions more effectively, even if they are not directly expressed (Carston, R., & Hall, 2012; Geurts, 2019). Implicatures allow speakers to communicate subtly, imply, or convey more complex messages by utilising context and shared knowledge between the speaker and listener (Bergen, 2016; Rohde & Kurumada, 2018). As such, implicatures play an important role in enriching communication by enabling more nuanced expressions, avoiding confusion, and facilitating deeper understanding between parties involved in language interactions.

Approaches to Implicature Learning

In implicature learning, two main approaches are often used: explicit and implicit approaches (Carston, R., & Hall, 2012; Ifantidou, 2013; Taguchi, N., & Yamaguchi, 2019). Explicit approaches tend to involve direct teaching by systematically explaining concepts, while implicit approaches emphasise indirect or unstructured learning through direct exposure to communicative contexts containing implicatures. Although the concept of these approaches is heavily influenced by pragmatic theories such as Paul Grice's Principles of Cooperation or more general theories of learning, their use in the literature is more a representation of common educational practices rather than a single theory. What follows is a more comprehensive explanation of the two types of approaches.

Explicit Approach: Direct Teaching Method on Implicature

The explicit approach to teaching implicature is a method that emphasises understanding and directly teaching the concept of conversational implicature to learners (Forman, E. A., & Larreamendy-Joerns, 1998; Derakhshan, A., & Eslami, 2020). Linguists such as Paul Grice emphasise the importance of understanding implicatures in everyday communication, and the explicit approach aims to convey this concept clearly to students (Saul, 2002). In an educational context, this method involves systematically presenting the theory and principles of implicature, often through examples and exercises designed to help students understand how implicatures are formed and understood in communication situations. In this context, the teacher or instructor explicitly introduces the concept of implicature to students, explaining the definition, types, and examples of implicature in English. In addition, students are given step-by-step exercises designed to help them recognise implicatures in various communication contexts. Direct teaching methods often involve the use of visual presentations, group discussions, and reasoning exercises to help students understand the concept better (Cohen, E. G., Lotan, R. A., Abram, P. L., Scarloss, B. A., & Schultz, 2002; Mayer, 2004).

The explicit approach can also involve in-depth analyses of written or spoken texts to identify the implicatures they may contain. Thus, the explicit approach in teaching implicature aims to provide students with a strong and deep understanding of how additional meanings in communication can be understood and applied in various communicative contexts (Gibbs Jr, 1999; Çiftlikli, S., & Demirel, 2022). With this approach, students are given a deep understanding of the concept of implicature and how to recognise and use it in language communication.

In EFL classrooms, an explicit approach is used to teach students the concept of implicature. The teacher starts by explaining in detail what implicature is, which is the additional meaning implied in a statement. The teacher also outlines the principles underlying the formation of implicatures, such as the principles of openness and relevance in communication. After the explanation, the teacher presents concrete examples of implicatures in various communicative situations, both in the form of daily conversations and relevant reading texts. The students are then asked to analyse the examples, identify the elements that make up the implicature, and understand how the implicature is understood in the communicative context. Furthermore, students engage in exercises specifically designed to hone their ability to recognise and use implicatures, both through written and oral exercises. With this approach, students can gain a solid understanding of implicature and be able to better apply it in various communicative situations in English.

The explicit approach to implicature learning in EFL learning contexts has both advantages and disadvantages that need to be considered. One of the main advantages is that it provides students with a clear and structured understanding of the concept of implicature (Levinson, 2000; Alsmari, 2020). With detailed explanations and concrete examples, students can deeply understand how implicatures are formed and understood in English communication. Moreover, the explicit approach allows teachers to provide appropriate guidance and additional enrichment according to students' needs, thus strengthening their understanding of implicature (Chierchia, G., Fox, D., & Spector, 2012; Chong-yuan, 2021).

However, the explicit approach in implicature learning also has its drawbacks, among which is that it may be too formal or abstract for some students, especially for those with a lower level of English comprehension (Nguyen, T. T. M., Pham, T. H., & Pham, 2012). Overly technical or complex explanations can confuse students and hinder their learning process. In addition, explicit approaches tend to focus on conceptual understanding, so they may place less emphasis on practical application in real communicative contexts (Robyn Carston, 2006). This can make it difficult for students to recognise and use implicatures in everyday English interactions.

Thus, while explicit approaches can provide a deep understanding of implicatures, it is important to strike a balance between structured explanations and more practical application-orientated approaches in EFL learning. A combination of both approaches can maximise learning effectiveness and help students develop more complete English communication skills.

Implicit approach: Direct Learning from Native Language Contexts

The implicit approach to implicature learning refers to a way of conveying and teaching the concept of implicature indirectly, without providing direct explanation or learning of the concept (Taguchi, 2005). In this approach, understanding of implicature is developed through practical experience, observation, and exposure to diverse communicative situations. Learners are given the opportunity to observe and understand implicatures in real-life contexts, either through direct interaction with others or through reading materials or conversations presented without special emphasis on the concept of implicature. This approach assumes that learners will naturally absorb and internalise the concept of implicature through deep learning experiences, without the need for explicit explanation of the concept (Tsai, 1998). The implicit approach can be effective in building a more intuitive and natural understanding of implicatures (Cooren, F., & Sanders, 2002; Sbisà, 2021), although it can sometimes take longer to reach a deep level of understanding.

The implicit approach to implicature learning leads learners to learn indirectly through exposure to authentic language contexts where implicatures naturally occur (Taguchi, N., & Yamaguchi, 2019). This approach is based on the idea that learning occurs effectively when learners are engaged in relevant and meaningful communicative situations (E. A. Soler, 2005; Manowong, 2011). In this context, learners are exposed to everyday conversations, written texts, or social interaction situations where implicatures are used naturally by native English speakers. Through this direct experience, learners can begin to recognise patterns of implicature, understand the context in which the implicature appears, and expand their pragmatic skills in using English more appropriately and effectively.

This implicit approach is often considered more contextualised and engaging for learners, as they are actively involved in authentic communicative situations (Soler, 2007; Zufferey, S., Moeschler, J., & Reboul, 2019), which can increase motivation and engagement in English language learning. While this approach can provide significant benefits in the development of implicature understanding, there are challenges in ensuring that learners are

exposed to adequate and relevant contexts and have sufficient support to facilitate the understanding and appropriate use of implicatures.

In the context of EFL learning, an implicit approach to implicature learning may occur through students' direct experiences in various communicative situations. For example, in a classroom conversation or role-play session, teachers may present situations containing implicatures without explicitly explaining the concept to students. Students are then asked to interact and respond to the situation according to their understanding, which will lead to the natural observation and understanding of the implicature. Moreover, in EFL learning, the use of reading materials or media that contain implicatures can also be an implicit way of introducing the concept to students. For example, students can read dialogues in short stories or watch videos depicting diverse communicative situations where implicatures can be found. Through direct experience with language in different contexts, students can gradually develop an intuitive understanding of implicature without the need for structured formal explanations (R. Carston, 1998; Manowong, 2011). This implicit approach allows students to learn naturally through their own communicative experiences ((Teresa Guasti, M., Chierchia, G., Crain, S., Foppolo, F., Gualmini, A., & Meroni, 2005), which can result in a more durable and applicable understanding in their daily use of English (E. A. Soler, 2005; Taguchi, N., & Roever, 2017).

The implicit approach to implicature learning in EFL learning contexts has advantages and disadvantages that need to be considered. One of the advantages is that this approach allows students to learn naturally through their own communicative experiences (Teresa Guasti, M., Chierchia, G., Crain, S., Foppolo, F., Gualmini, A., & Meroni, 2005). By gaining hands-on experience in various conversational situations or through reading materials and media, students can gradually develop an intuitive understanding of implicatures without the need for structured formal explanations. This approach also helps students actively engage in learning, as they can directly apply their understanding of implicature in real communicative situations (Taguchi, 2015; Alsalloom, 2022).

However, the implicit approach also has its drawbacks, one of which is that students may not always be aware of or able to recognise implicatures in a given communicative situation (Sitdikova, F. B., & Asmolovskaya, 2021). Without explicit guidance or explanation, some students may have difficulty in identifying implicatures or understanding their meaning appropriately. Moreover, this approach can be less effective for students who need more structured explanations and guidance to understand more complex language concepts such as implicature (R. Carston, 1998; Sbisà, 2021). The lack of a clear understanding of implicature may also hinder students' ability to apply the concept in different communicative contexts.

Thus, while the implicit approach can provide a natural learning experience and encourage student engagement, it is important to realise that this approach may not be suitable for all students. A balance between implicit and explicit approaches in implicature learning can help maximise learning effectiveness, meet the needs of diverse students, and ensure a deeper understanding of implicature concepts in EFL learning (Taguchi, 2008; Manowong, 2011).

Factors Affecting the Success of Implicature Learning

The success of implicature learning is influenced by a number of complex factors. Some of these factors, the main ones are related to at least three things: language proficiency level, cultural background, and teaching methods (Bouton, 1999; Abdelhafez, 2016; Rızaoğlu, F., & Yavuz, 2017). Firstly, factors contributing to the success of implicature training, especially in the context of language proficiency level, is an interesting area of research in linguistics education (Kurt, 2018; Çiftlikli, S., & Demirel, 2022). An individual's language proficiency level has a significant impact on the understanding and use of implicatures in verbal

interactions (Rızaoğlu, F., & Yavuz, 2017; Köylü, 2018). Individuals with higher language proficiency tend to have greater sensitivity to linguistic nuances, allowing them to more precisely recognise implicatures in everyday conversations. For example, in English, the use of modal words such as 'could' or 'might' can carry implicatures about the likelihood or possibility of an event occurring. Individuals who are proficient in language may be able to more easily understand such implicatures and use them appropriately in appropriate contexts. However, for individuals with lower levels of language proficiency, recognising such implicatures may become more difficult and require additional practice and more detailed explanations. Therefore, in designing implicature training, it is important to consider participants' language proficiency level as a major factor in customising learning approaches and providing appropriate support to facilitate effective understanding and use of implicatures.

Secondly, factors that influence the success of implicature training, especially those related to cultural background (Manowong, 2011; Abdelhafez, 2016; Rızaoğlu, F., & Yavuz, 2017), are aspects that require special attention in the context of linguistic education. A person's cultural background significantly affects their perception and understanding of implicatures in verbal communication (Lee, 2002). Each culture has unique norms, values and communicative conventions, which shape the way individuals understand and use implicatures in everyday conversations (Kotthoff, 2006; Senft, 2014). For example, in some cultures, the direct use of implicatures may be considered impolite or undesirable, while in other cultures, it may be considered an integral part of effective communication. For example, in a more formal or hierarchical culture, the use of implied or indirect implicatures may be favoured over the use of direct or explicit ones. Conversely, in a more relaxed or egalitarian culture, direct implicatures may be more commonly used and accepted. Therefore, an understanding of cultural norms and their underlying assumptions, is a key element in assessing the success of implicature training (Škerlavaj, M., Štemberger, M. I., & Dimovski, 2007). In the context of language learning, it is important to integrate knowledge of culture with the aim of developing students' ability to use implicatures appropriately and effectively in verbal interactions. By recognising and attending to these cultural factors, a more holistic and context-oriented approach to learning can be designed to facilitate more effective understanding and application of implicatures in cross-cultural communication.

Third, factors impacting the success of implicature training, especially those related to teaching methods (Alsmari, 2020; Çiftlikli, S., & Demirel, 2022), are the subject of significant attention in linguistic education literature. The selection of appropriate teaching methods plays a crucial role in the effectiveness of implicature learning. The approaches used by teachers can range from structured direct teaching methods to approaches that are more centred on exploratory and student-centred learning. Teaching methods that emphasise clear explanations of implicature concepts and provide structured exercises can help students deeply understand the concepts. For example, direct teaching may involve explanations of types of implicatures and exercises that require students to identify implicatures in various communicative contexts. On the other hand, more exploratory teaching methods, such as project-based learning or problem-based learning, can provide more contextualised and in-depth learning experiences in understanding implicatures. A concrete example is the use of simulated communicative situations in the classroom where students have to use implicatures to achieve certain goals, such as negotiating or convincing interlocutors. Therefore, the selection of appropriate teaching methods, which take into account the needs and characteristics of students, can be key in improving the effectiveness of implicature training in language learning contexts.

Based on the above, the development of EFL curriculum and teaching, especially in the context of implicature, has an important relevance in the context of improving linguistic

education. Implicature training by considering appropriate approaches can provide valuable insights for curriculum designers in developing more effective and purposeful learning programmes. Curricula that focus on good implicature teaching can help strengthen students' ability to understand and use implicatures appropriately in diverse communicative situations. For example, the curriculum can be designed to include specific modules that emphasise the teaching of implicature, both directly and implicitly, in various authentic English contexts. In addition, the teaching of implicature can be integrated into existing subject matter, such as grammar, vocabulary, and speaking skills, to enhance a thorough understanding and application of the concept of implicature. Thus, curriculum development that takes into account the implications of the findings of this study can strengthen the learning of English as a foreign language and improve students' communicative proficiency in real-life situations.

3. CONCLUSION

In examining the factors that influence the success of implicature training, this article highlights the importance of considering language proficiency level, cultural background, and teaching methods in the context of EFL learning. The findings of this study show that an individual's language proficiency level has a significant impact on their ability to understand and use implicatures in communication. In addition, one's cultural background also plays a significant role in their understanding of implicatures, as cultural norms and underlying assumptions can influence the way one interprets and uses implicatures in conversation. On the other hand, the teaching method used also affects the success of implicature training. Structured direct teaching can help students understand implicature concepts in depth, while a more exploratory and context-centred approach can facilitate implicit understanding of implicature. With these factors in mind, curriculum development and teaching English as a foreign language can be improved to enhance students' understanding and application of implicature in communication.

Based on the findings of this study, there are several recommendations that can be implemented by English language education practitioners to improve the effectiveness of implicature teaching. Firstly, practitioners need to pay attention to the diversity of language proficiency levels among students and adjust teaching approaches according to their individual needs. This can be done by providing a variety of learning strategies that accommodate different levels of language proficiency. Secondly, implicature teaching should be integrated into the English curriculum, both in grammar and speaking skills. Thus, students will have wider opportunities to understand and apply implicatures in various communicative contexts. Third, English education practitioners can utilise additional resources, such as interactive learning materials or project-based activities, to enhance students' engagement in implicature learning. By adopting innovative and engaging approaches, students can be more motivated to deepen their understanding of implicature. By implementing these recommendations, English education practitioners can strengthen the teaching of implicature and improve students' communicative abilities in English.

The review of future research directions in the context of implicature training for EFL learners highlights several areas that require further exploration. Firstly, future research could explore in more depth the influence of factors that affect implicature training, such as language proficiency, cultural background and teaching methods. Further studies in this regard can provide deeper insights into how these factors interact with each other and impact the understanding and application of implicature in communication.

In addition, future studies could involve longitudinal studies to evaluate the effectiveness of implicature training over a longer period of time and identify factors that

contribute to the maintenance of implicature understanding over time. Furthermore, research could explore the application of technology in implicature training, including the development of digital platforms or interactive software specifically designed to enhance students' understanding of implicature. By focusing on these research areas, future research is expected to make a significant contribution to our understanding of implicature training and provide valuable guidelines for English language education practitioners in improving EFL learning and teaching.

REFERENCES

- Abdelhafez, A. M. (2016). The effect of conversational implicature instruction on developing TEFL students' pragmatic competence and language proficiency. *US-China Education Review A*, 6(8), 451–465. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2161-623X/2016.08.001>
- Abdi, R., Rizi, M. T., & Tavakoli, M. (2010). The cooperative principle in discourse communities and genres: A framework for the use of metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(6), 1669–1679. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.11.001>
- Ahlsén, E. (2008). Conversational implicature and communication impairment. *The Handbook of Clinical Linguistics*, 32–48. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444301007>
- Ahmed, M., & Shazali, M. (2010). The interpretation of implicature: A comparative study between implicature in linguistics and journalism. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 35–43. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2859505
- Alsallloom, 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://journals.librarypublishing.arizona.edu/jslat/article/id/5259/>
- 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://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Effect-of-Flipped-Classroom-Instruction-on-EFL-Alsmari/84ab8a0e0618733d84379ac51ea635456158ea17?p2df>
- Atlas, J. D. (2005). *Logic, meaning, and conversation: Semantical underdeterminacy, implicature, and their interface*. Oxford University Press.
- Attardo, S. (1993). Violation of conversational maxims and cooperation: The case of jokes. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19(6), 537–558. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(93\)90111-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(93)90111-2)
- Bach, K. (2006). Pragmatics and the philosophy of language. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, 463–487. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756959>
- Bergen, L. (2016). *Joint inference in pragmatic reasoning*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. <https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/106430>
- Bezuidenhout, A. L., & Morris, R. K. (2004). *Implicature, relevance and default pragmatic inference*. Springer Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230524125_12
- Bianchi, C. (2013a). Implicating. *Pragmatics of Speech Actions*, 107–142. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214383>
- Bianchi, C. (2013b). Implicating. *Pragmatics of Speech Actions*, 83–118.
- Borge, S. (2012). Communication, cooperation and conflict. *ProtoSociology*, 29, 23–241. <https://doi.org/10.5840/protosociology20122912>
- Bouton, L. F. (1999). Developing nonnative speaker skills in interpreting conversational implicatures in English. In *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 30, Issue 1, pp. 47–70). Cambridge University Press.
- Carston, R., & Hall, A. (2012). Implicature and explicature. In *Cognitive Pragmatics* (pp. 47–

84). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110214215.47>

- Carston, R. (1998). *Pragmatics and the explicit-implicit distinction*. University of London, University College London (United Kingdom).
- Carston, Robyn. (2006). Relevance theory and the saying/implicating distinction. In *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756959>
- Chierchia, G., Fox, D., & Spector, B. (2012). The grammatical view of scalar implicatures and the relationship between semantics and pragmatics. *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*, 3, 2297–2332.
- Chinelo Obasi, J., & Udofot, I. (2013). Pragmatics and effective communication in English: A study of selected Nigerian university undergraduates. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 7(4). <https://openurl.ebsco.com/EPDB%3Aagcd%3A4%3A14565620/detailv2?sid=ebsco%3Aplink%3Ascholar&id=ebsco%3Aagcd%3A93580665&crl=c>
- Chong-yuan, Z. (2021). Explicit speech act instruction for developing EFL students' pragmatic competence. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(4), 26–35. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3909556>
- Çiftlikli, S., & Demirel, Ö. (2022). The relationships between students' comprehension of conversational implicatures and their achievement in reading comprehension. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 977129. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.977129>
- Cignetti, L. M., & Di Giuseppe, M. S. (2015). Pragmatic awareness of conversational implicatures and the usefulness of explicit instruction. *Revista Nebrija de Lingüística Aplicada a La Enseñanza de Lenguas*, 19, 42–70. <https://doi.org/10.26378/rnlael019282>
- Cohen, E. G., Lotan, R. A., Abram, P. L., Scarloss, B. A., & Schultz, S. E. (2002). Can groups learn? *Teachers College Record*, 104(6), 1045–1068. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9620.00196>
- Cooren, F., & Sanders, R. E. (2002). Implicatures: a schematic approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(8), 1045–1067. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00028-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00028-0)
- Davis, W. A. (2016). Implicature. *Irregular Negatives, Implicatures, and Idioms*, 51–84. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-7546-5_2
- 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>
- Dulcinati, G. (2018). *Cooperation and pragmatic inferences*. UCL (University College London). <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10053950/>
- Dynel, M. (2017). But seriously: On conversational humour and (un) truthfulness. *Lingua*, 197, 83–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2017.05.004>
- Forman, E. A., & Larreamendy-Joerns, J. (1998). Making explicit the implicit: Classroom explanations and conversational implicatures. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 5(2), 105–113. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327884mca0502_4
- 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>
- Gibbs Jr, R. W. (1999). Interpreting what speakers say and implicate. *Brain and Language*, 68(3), 466–485. <https://doi.org/10.1006/brln.1999.212>
- Gibbs Jr, R. W. (2002). A new look at literal meaning in understanding what is said and implicated. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(4), 457–486. [112](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-</p></div><div data-bbox=)

2166(01)00046-7

- Hossain, M. M. (2021). The application of Grice maxims in conversation: A pragmatic study. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 3(10), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2021.3.10.4>
- Howard, H. A. (2018). *Deception, trust, and credibility: a Gricean exploration*. The University of <https://www.proquest.com/openview/167c9872c94965b5fde87c05b6a8ccbc/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750>
- Huang, Y. (2012). *The Oxford dictionary of pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Ifantidou, E. (2013). Pragmatic competence and explicit instruction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 59, 93–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.12.008>
- Jeshion, R. (2013). Slurs and stereotypes. *Analytic Philosophy*, 54(3), 314–329. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phib.12021>
- Kearns, K. (2010). Implicature and language change. *Variation and Change: Pragmatic Perspectives*, 6, 123–140. <https://www.torrossa.com/en/resources/an/5015539#page=134>
- Kecskes, I. (2021). Processing implicatures in English as a Lingua Franca communication. *Lingua*, 256, 103067. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103067>
- Kecskes, I. (2023). The Paradox of Communication: A Socio-Cognitive Approach to Pragmatics. In *The Socio-Cognitive Approach to Communication and Pragmatics* (pp. 23–44). Springer Publishing.
- Kim, K. H. Y. (2006). *Reflective practice in arts education*. Springer Publishing.
- Kleinke, S. (2010). Speaker activity and Grice's maxims of conversation at the interface of pragmatics and cognitive linguistics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(12), 3345–3366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.05.008>
- Kopp, S., & Krämer, N. (2021). Revisiting human-agent communication: The importance of joint co-construction and understanding mental states. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 580955. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.580955>
- Kotthoff, H. (2006). *Pragmatics of performance and the analysis of conversational humor*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/HUMOR.2006.015>
- Köylü, Y. (2018). Comprehension of conversational implicatures in L2 English. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 15(3), 373–408. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2018-0011>
- Kurt, Ş. (2018). *Raising EFL learners' awareness of suprasegmental features as an aid to understanding implicatures*. Bilkent Üniversitesi (Turkey). <https://www.proquest.com/openview/2ddc84595f684bfc258e479baf587199/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=2026366&diss=y>
- Ladegaard, H. J. (2009). Pragmatic cooperation revisited: Resistance and non-cooperation as a discursive strategy in asymmetrical discourses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(4), 649–666. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.09.021>
- Lambrou, M. (2023). Stylistics, conversation analysis and the cooperative principle. In *The Routledge handbook of stylistics* (pp. 141–160). Routledge.
- Lee, J. S. (2002). Interpreting conversational implicatures: A study of Korean learners of English. *The Korea TESOL Journal*, 5(1), 1–26.
- Leech, G., & Thomas, J. (2002). Language, meaning and context: pragmatics. In *An encyclopedia of language* (pp. 105–124). Routledge.
- Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. MIT press.
- Lindblom, K. (2001). Cooperating with Grice: A cross-disciplinary metaperspective on uses of

- Grice's cooperative principle. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(10), 1601–1623. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(00\)00069-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00069-2)
- Lumsden, D. (2008). Kinds of conversational cooperation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(11), 1896–1908. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.03.007>
- Manowong, S. (2011). The study of ability to interpret conversational implicatures in English of Thai EFL learners. *The Asian Conference on Language Learning*, 138–148.
- Mayer, R. E. (2004). Should there be a three-strikes rule against pure discovery learning? *American Psychologist*, 59(1), 14–19. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.1.14>
- Mooney, A. (2004). Co-operation, violations and making sense. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(5), 899–920. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.006>
- Moore, R. (2018). Gricean communication, joint action, and the evolution of cooperation. *Topoi*, 37(2), 329–341. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11245-016-9372-5>
- Neale, S. (1992). Paul Grice and the philosophy of language. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 509–559. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25001485>
- Németh T, E. (2004). The principles of communicative language use. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 51(3–4), 379–418. <https://doi.org/10.1556/aling.51.2004.3-4.7>
- Nguyen, T. T. M., Pham, T. H., & Pham, M. T. (2012). The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(4), 416–434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.01.003>
- Oswald, S. (2010). *Pragmatics of uncooperative and manipulative communication*. Université de Neuchâtel.
- Pedersen, J. (2016). Apes in conversation: The role of the human interlocutor. *Language & Communication*, 50, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2016.07.009>
- Poggi, F. (2016). Grice, the law and the linguistic special case thesis. *Pragmatics and Law: Philosophical Perspectives*, 231–248. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-30385-7_1
- Puri, Anindita, and F. X. B. (2023). Understanding and Evaluating Conversational Implicature and Inference: A Theoretical Analysis. *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference Entitled Language, Literary, And Cultural Studies, ICON LATERALS 2023, 11-12 July 2023, Malang, Indonesia*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.11-7-2023.2340638>
- Recanati, F. (2003). Embedded implicatures. *Philosophical Perspectives*, 17, 299–332. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3840877>
- Reich, W. (2011). The cooperative nature of communicative acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(5), 1349–1365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.024>
- Rızaoğlu, F., & Yavuz, M. A. (2017). English language learners' comprehension and production of implicatures. *Hacettepe Egitim Dergisi*. <https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2017027932>
- Rohde, H., & Kurumada, C. (2018). Alternatives and inferences in the communication of meaning. In *Psychology of Learning and Motivation* (Vol. 68, pp. 215–261). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.plm.2018.08.012>
- Saul, J. M. (2002). Speaker meaning, what is said, and what is implicated. *Nous*, 36(2), 228–248. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3506193>
- Sbisà, M. (2021). Presupposition and implicature: Varieties of implicit meaning in explicitation practices. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 182, 176–188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.05.027>
- Senft, G. (2014). *Understanding pragmatics*. Routledge.
- Shuwei, Y. (2014). *The use of Grice's cooperative principle in Chinese TV talk shows*. University of Malaya (Malaysia). <https://www.proquest.com/openview/5148f1cba7f4e49c0b60fdd884537c01/1?pq->

origsite=gscholar&cbl=2026366&diss=y

- Sitdikova, F. B., & Asmolovskaya, M. V. (2021). Implicatures in the context of communicative act. *Revista EntreLinguas*, e021049–e021049. <https://doi.org/10.29051/el.v7iesp.3.15707>
- Škerlavaj, M., Štemberger, M. I., & Dimovski, V. (2007). Organizational learning culture—the missing link between business process change and organizational performance. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 106(2), 346–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2006.07.009>
- Soler, A. (2007). E. Fostering EFL learners' awareness of requestin g through explicit and implicit consciousness-raising tasks. *Investigating Tasks in Formal Language Learning*, 221–241. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853599286-014>
- Soler, E. A. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System*, 33(3), 417–435. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.06.005>
- Taguchi, N., & Roever, C. (2017). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Taguchi, N., & Yamaguchi, S. (2019). Implicature comprehension in L2 pragmatics research. In *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (pp. 31–46).
- Taguchi, N. (2005). Comprehending implied meaning in English as a foreign language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(4), 543–562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005>
- Taguchi, N. (2008). The role of learning environment in the development of pragmatic comprehension: A comparison of gains between EFL and ESL learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 30(4), 423–452. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263108080716>
- Taguchi, N. (2015). “Contextually” speaking: A survey of pragmatic learning abroad, in class, and online. *System*, 48, 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.001>
- Tatsenko, N. V., Kozlovska, H. B., & Ushchapovska, I. V. (2017). *The universal pragmatic principle of cooperation in the light of empathic communication*. X, 1–6. <https://doi.org/0.21474/IJAR01/512>
- Telaumbanua, S., Sianipar, G. J., Sarlin, M., & Fathurrochman, I. (2020). Conversational Implicatures in Students' Communication and its Type: A Pragmatic Study. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*. *Www. Ijicc. Net*, 13(10). <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3969086>
- Teresa Guasti, M., Chierchia, G., Crain, S., Foppolo, F., Gualmini, A., & Meroni, L. (2005). Why children and adults sometimes (but not always) compute implicatures. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 20(5), 667–696. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01690960444000250>
- Traugott, E. C. (2006). Historical pragmatics. In *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 538–561). Wiley Online Library. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756959>
- Tsai, C. C. (1998). An analysis of scientific epistemological beliefs and learning orientations of Taiwanese eighth graders. *Science Education*, 82(4), 473–489. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-237X\(199807\)82:4<473::AID-SCE4>3.0.CO;2-8](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-237X(199807)82:4<473::AID-SCE4>3.0.CO;2-8)
- Wang, H. (2011). Conversational implicature in English listening comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(5), 1162–1167. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.5.1162-1167>
- Yus, F. (1999). Misunderstandings and explicit/implicit communication. *Pragmatics. Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, 9(4), 487–517. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.9.4.01yus>
- Yus, F. (2003). Humor and the search for relevance. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(9), 1295–1331. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00179-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00179-0)
- Zufferey, S., Moeschler, J., & Reboul, A. (2019). *Implicatures*. Cambridge University Press.