



THE AWARENESS AND REALIZATION OF GRICE'S COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLES IN THE CONVERSATIONS AMONG NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKERS

Retnowaty[✉]

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Info Artikel

Sejarah Artikel:
Diterima Oktober 2013
Disetujui Oktober 2013
Dipublikasikan
November 2013

Keywords:
awareness, realization,
Grice's cooperative principle,
implicature, conversation

Abstract

Pragmatics gives different interpretation of meaning even when it is not said or written. This study was using descriptive qualitative approach. The objects of the study were non-native English speakers at the fourth semester of post-graduate program (S2) majoring English Education of Semarang State University in the academic year 2012/2013. The unit of analysis of this study were utterances which contain the observance and non-observance of Grice's cooperative principle. Furthermore, to know how they were aware of those principles, a pragmatic awareness test was given to each participant. Based on the test, most participants were aware enough of Grice's cooperative principle. From all utterances, most participants appeared to observe the maxim of relation. It can be inferred that they tried to answer the question with relevant answer. The realization of non-observance of Grice's cooperative principle was mostly shown in flouting the maxim of quantity that they gave more or less information than it was needed. Moreover, we can infer that non-native English speakers who were aware of Grice's cooperative principle would be easier to realize it in their conversations because they understood the concept of how to create successful, effective and efficient communication.

© 2013 Universitas Negeri Semarang

[✉] Alamat korespondensi:
Kampus Unnes Bendan Ngisor, Semarang, 50233
E-mail: pps@unnes.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

We try to convey our meaning as clearly as possible in the conversation because we want to make other people understand what we are talking about. As Grice (1975:45) stated, speakers intend to be cooperative in conversation because a successful conversation will happen if the speaker and the hearer can understand each other's utterances well. They are also expected to obey cooperative principle to conduct an efficient and effective use of language in conversation.

Grice (1975:45) introduces cooperative principle as follows:

"Make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged".

That is to say, we need to say everything essentially based on our purpose when we are doing conversation with other people. Cooperative principle has four maxims: maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner. Those maxims can be used to describe how participants in conversation derive implicatures. It is a common phenomenon. And it often happens in our daily life when we talk to other people.

Grice uses the term implicature to refer to what a speaker can infer or suggest, as different from what the speaker factually says. Because there are times when people say (or write) exactly what they mean, but generally they are not totally explicit. Since, on the other occasions, they try to transfer something more than their words. Moreover, Grice's theory is an attempt at explaining how a hearer gets from what is said to what is meant, from the level of expressed meaning to the level of implied meaning.

However, before realizing Grice's cooperative principle and its maxims, it is better to be aware or understand the knowledge about them. It is very helpful. We can say that the awareness may influence the realization. The knowledge of Grice's cooperative principle and its maxims will guide people conducting efficient

and effective use of language in conversation since they are learning English as a foreign language and their grammatical knowledge does not guarantee a corresponding level of pragmatic awareness and that even advanced learners may fail to comprehend or to convey the intended intentions.

There have been a number of researches concerning with the phenomena of cooperative principle, its maxims and conversational implicature. One of the studies is conducted by Masykuri (2011), that is "Non Observance of Cooperative Principle in English Comic Strip: *The Adventure of Tintin; the Black Island*". In his study, Masykuri describes the conversational implicature found in the dialog among characters in comic strip entitled *The Adventure of Tintin; the Black Island*, which is influenced by non-observance maxim. The most common type of non-observance maxim found in his study is violating the maxim of quantity (23%) and no characters violate maxim of manner (0%).

Another study is conducted by Pajarwati, E. in 2012 in the study entitled "The Grician Cooperative Principle in Native and Non-Native Communication Breakdowns". The study shows that the maxims that occasionally found in the English conversation of the native and non-native speakers at *Rumah Belajar Cinta Anak Bangsa (RBCAB)* were the quantity one. The way they convey messages tended to be less or more than required. The second place was taken by the maxim of quality and the percentage of the two maxims had a far cry. They avoided saying words that they believe to be false. Maxim of relation was flouted only five times in the conversation. The consideration of being relevant with the topic was held tightly by the respondents. The maxim of manner mostly stuck with the regulation. Mostly, those violations arouse because of the lacking of vocabulary, grammar and cultural background that supported the breakdown to occur in the study.

The differences among this study and the other previous studies are on the research problems. The first previous study just explains that there are conversational implicatures found in the dialog among characters in comic strip

entitled *The Adventure of Tintin; the Black Island*, which is influenced by non-observance maxim and analyzed how each non-observance of the maxims occurs in that comic strip. The second previous study just shows that the maxims that occasionally found in the English conversation of the native and non-native speakers. It also finds some violations because of the lacking of vocabulary, grammar and cultural background that supported the breakdown to occur in the study.

Moreover, it seems that this study is more interesting than the previous studies because it explores deeper and wider areas. This study does not only describe how non-native English speakers realize Grice's cooperative principle whether they observe it or not, but also describes how their awareness of Grice's cooperative principle. Furthermore, this study will describe how their awareness of Grice's cooperative principle may influence their realization in their conversations by using a pragmatic awareness test which the other previous studies did not do. Based on the studies above, a topic relayed to awareness and realization of cooperative principle in casual conversation among non-native English speakers has not been worked out. It motivates me to conduct a study of this particular interest.

Speech Act

Speech act is one of pragmatics elements introduced by Austin in 1962. According to Austin, the speech act itself can be divided into three component acts which underlie the issuing of an utterance: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. A locutionary act "includes the utterance of certain noises, the utterance of certain words in a certain construction and the utterance of them with a certain 'meaning'" (Austin, 1962:94). In summarized, locutionary acts are those acts which convey literal meaning with the help of a given syntax and lexicon (For example, it is cold in here). An illocutionary act is viewed as the force carried with words or sentences (To illustrate, by telling someone "It is cold in here", someone is actually asking someone else to close

the window). It is the act performed in saying the locution. The last is perlocutionary act which means the consequential effect of utterance on an interlocutor or the change caused by the utterance (For instance, someone closes the window because of someone else's statement).

Grice's Theory of Cooperative Principle and Its Maxims

The Cooperative Principle enables one participant in a conversation to communicate on the assumption that the other participant is being cooperative. Otherwise communication would be very difficult, and perhaps break down altogether. In short, these maxims specify what participants have to do in order to converse in a maximally efficient, rational, co-operative way: they should speak sincerely, relevantly and clearly, while providing sufficient information. Grice's Cooperative Principle consists of several maxims that appear very simple, straightforward, and common-sensual at first sight, they are the maxims of quality, quantity, relevance and manner. If the participants both have the expectation to achieve a successful conversation, they must cooperative with each other, and speak sincerely, sufficiently, relevantly and clearly.

The cooperative principle by Grice (1975) has four maxims, and each has their own regulations respectively:

1. The maxim of Quality: (i) Do not say what you believe to be false; (ii) Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
2. The maxim of Quantity: (i) Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purpose of the exchange; (ii) Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
3. The maxim of Relevance: (i) Make your contribution relevant. The maxim of Manner: (i) Avoid obscurity; (ii) Avoid ambiguity; (iii) Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity); (iv) Be orderly.

Non-observance of the Maxims

Any implied meaning risks being (mis) understood by the hearer as the speaker intended it to be uptaken, since a speaker may imply something that the hearer may fail to infer appropriately. As a result, there are cases when a speaker fails a maxim or several maxims in conversation in order to convey additional meaning. He/she may intentionally or unintentionally fail to fulfill the maxims due to their purpose(s) of interaction. He/she does not fulfill a particular maxim, for example, they do not speak clearly and choose to lie (Thomas, 1995:64).

Non-observance of the maxims means the maxims in cooperative principle are not obeyed the cooperative principle. One major reason for non-observing the maxims is to make conversation easier. The other reason we use the conversational to communicate indirectly are we sometimes need to avoid telling the truth because our frankness may hurt us or someone else and speech acts can cause faced threatening acts to their addressee. Grice (1975) in Thomas (1995:74) stated that a participant in a talk exchange may fail to fulfill a maxim in various ways, which include the following: flouting the maxim, violating the maxim, infringing the maxim, opting out the maxim, and suspending the maxim.

METHODS

This descriptive qualitative study focused on data interpretation based on the research problems and concentrated on the result of pragmatic test about the awareness of Grice's cooperative principle and also the recorded conversations among the participants. The main focuses on this study were how non-native English speakers were aware and realized the observance and non-observance of Grice's cooperative principle among their friends in their conversation.

Data in this research were the result of pragmatic test about the awareness of Grice's cooperative principle and utterances which contained the observance of Grice's cooperative principle and also utterances which contain

implicature for non-observance of the Grice's cooperative principle. They were produced by non-native English speakers at the fourth semester of post-graduate program (S2) majoring English Education of Semarang State University in the academic year 2012/2013 based on some reasons, such as: they were all in the same level; they were relatively in the same average score; they have studied Pragmatics subject and they have been studying English for the same period of time, since elementary until now.

Based on Creswell (2007:37), in qualitative research, researcher is as the key instrument. Thus, the key instrument is the researcher herself since she was the one who actually gather the information. She learnt the previous studies, obtained the data and analyzed them. The researcher then interpreted the awareness and realization of cooperative principle and the relation between them based on her experiences and background knowledge. She was supported by other instruments, like pragmatic awareness test, camera and mobile phone to get the data.

She also prepared a pragmatic awareness test to know their awareness of Grice's cooperative principle. A multiple choice inferencing task was compiled by applying and/or adapting some of the items devised by Bouton (1988, 1994, 1999) in Murray (2011:8-18). These examples were deliberately chosen because they were found in some literatures. In other words, some studies have been used them as the instrument. They were also felt to have authenticity as a sample because the preferred multiple choice responses had originally been developed on the basis of actual native speaker interpretations of speakers' meaning in a set of scenarios. Furthermore, the distractors were adapted from the most common non-native speakers' 'incorrect' answers. However, there were some modifications according to the needs.

The data were obtained by choosing five pairs, making an appointment with each pair when and where they can do the conversation by calling them or sending text messages, meeting them two by two in scheduled the time and

place, asking each pair to do pragmatic awareness test first before they did a conversation, allowing to them talk freely with their partner using English for approximately half an hour (if they had difficulties in maintaining the conversation, the researcher would give some topics to help them), taking their photos with a camera while recording their utterances using mobile phone, also transcribing and analysing the utterances produced by them and lastly, analysing the results of the test.

Analysis, Results and Discussions

This section shows the data analysis which covers the presentation of findings. It gives descriptions of how non-native English speakers are aware of Grice's Cooperative Principle in their conversation. It also gives descriptions of how non-native English speakers realize the principle including the observance and non-observance of Grice's Cooperative Principle in their conversation. And the last, it gives descriptions how the awareness of Grice's cooperative principle is related to its realization in non-native English speakers' conversations.

Non-native English Speakers' Awareness of Grice's Cooperative Principle

This section presents non-native English speakers' awareness of Grice's cooperative principle from the test. There were fifteen multiple-choice questions related to Grice's cooperative principle. From fifteen questions, for the accumulation, the participants could answer nine questions correctly and six questions incorrectly according to preferred responses.

Realization of Grice's Cooperative Principle

This section presents the realization of Grice's cooperative principle found in the conversations among non-native English speakers. The general profiles of how non-native English speakers realize the observance and non-observance of Grice's cooperative principle are presented in table 1. Then, there is a classification of observance of the maxims in the table 2 and the classification of non-observance of the maxims in table 3. The percentage of each frequency found in the table 1, 2 and 3 is only a way to get more accurate descriptions about them.

Table 1. Realization of Grice's Cooperative Principle

No.	Realization of Grice's Cooperative Principle	Frequency	%
1	Observance of Maxim	688	82.9%
2	Non-observance of Maxim	142	17.1%
Total		830	100%

From all utterances by non-native English speakers' conversations from the first until the fifth conversation, most appear to observe the maxims of Grice's cooperative principle. It is the first findings. It is shown from the table that there are 82.9% utterances which observe the maxims. This study indicates that there is a tendency that the participants did not create many implicatures in their conversations. They tried to observe all maxims, like the maxim of

quantity, quality, relation and manner. They also tried to speak clearly, truthfully, gave just right amount of information and answered the question with relevant answer in order to directly address the partner's goal in asking the question. Furthermore, the participants sometimes did not observe Grice's cooperative principle. It is the second findings. It is shown that there are 17.1% utterances which did not observe the maxims.

Table 2. Classification of Observance of Grice's Cooperative Principle

No.	Classification of Observance of Grice's Cooperative Principle	Frequency	%
1	Observing the Maxim of Quantity	110	16.00%
2	Observing the Maxim of Quality	180	26.16%
3	Observing the Maxim of Relation	201	29.21%
4	Observing the Maxim of Manner	197	28.63%
Total		688	100%

From all utterances by non-native English speakers' conversations from the first until the fifth conversation, most appear to observe the maxim of relation, and the percentage is 29.21%.

It can be inferred that they tried to answer the question with relevant answer in order to directly address the partner's goal in asking the question.

Table 3. Classification of Non-observance of Grice's Cooperative Principle

No.	Classification of Non-observance of Grice's Cooperative Principle	Frequency	%
1	Flouting the Maxim of Quantity	64	45.1%
2	Flouting the Maxim of Quality	12	8.5%
3	Flouting the Maxim of Relation	54	38%
4	Flouting the Maxim of Manner	10	7%
5	Violating the Maxim	1	0.7%
6	Opting out the Maxim	1	0.7%
Total		142	100%

From all utterances by non-native English speakers' conversations from the first until the fifth conversation, most of the participants appear to flout the maxim of quantity. It is shown from the table that there are 45.1% utterances from the participants that flout the maxim of quantity. This study indicates that there is a tendency that the participants sometimes do not observe the maxims, especially the maxim of quantity because they gave more or less information than needed.

Realization of Observance of Grice's Cooperative Principle in the Conversations among Non-Native English Speakers

If we observe all the maxims, we will answer clearly (Manner), truthfully (Quality), give just the right amount of information (Quantity) and answer the question with relevant answer in order to directly address the partner's goal in asking the question (Relation). Presentation of the data was done by presenting important phrases only. The following excerpt

from the conversations in which the observance of Grice's cooperative principle was done by the participants.

Example 1 (dialog 1, between E and R)

E and R are classmates. They were talking about Patinese culture.

R (181) : so you are poor (laughing), the Patinese is poor, can I say like that?

E (182) : no

When E and R werere talking about Patinese culture, R asked whether he can conclude that Patinese is poor by expecting motorcycle or other presents from the man who wants to propose the girl from Pati or not. Then, E answered by saying "no". E observed the maxim of manner by answering clearly. She observed the maxim of quality by answering truthfully. She also observed the maxim of quantity by giving just the right amount of information by saying no and she observed the maxim of relation by directly addressing R's goal in asking the question. She has said precisely what she meant, no more or less, and has generated no

implicature (i.e. there is no distinction to be made here between what she says and what she means, there is no additional level of meaning). It can be inferred that E observed the maxim of quantity, quality, relation, and manner.

Realization of Non-Observance of Grice's Cooperative Principle

Non-observance of the maxims means the maxims in cooperative principle are not obeyed the cooperative principle. There are some types of non-observance of the maxims like flouting, violating, infringing, opting out, and suspending the maxim. Presentation of the data was done by presenting important phrases only. The following excerpt from the conversations in which the maxim of quantity is flouted by the participants.

Example 2 (dialog 3, between A and T)

A and T are classmates. They were talking about maxim which is one of pragmatic's lesson they got in their class.

A (226) : why do you say maxim? What can, can you give me the example of what is it maxim?

T (227) : maxim is a word,

When A and T were discussing maxim as one of pragmatic's lesson they got in their class, A asked a question about the definition of maxim itself and the example of it. However, T only answered that maxim is a word. The hearer or A still does not get the complete answer. T should give explanation and example about maxim that was being asked by A. Here, we found the speech acts from this dialog, they are locutionary act, illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect. Locutionary act is what the speaker said or the literal meaning of the utterance. T said maxim is a word. In fact, it is

true that maxim is a word. The illocutionary force is the intention of speaker in this case T, by saying that utterance. T maybe wanted to tell a joke by not completing his answer. To crosscheck the truth, we can prove it by looking at the perlocutionary effect which is how the utterance was received by the listener. The perlocutionary effect shows that A laughed at his next turn and he thought that T was joking by mentioning maxim as a word, not its real definition because everyone in this world knows that maxim is a word. The locution and illocution literally have different meaning. This example shows the hearer gets the point of what the speaker intends to, even though the speaker says less of word. It can be inferred that T flouted the maxim of quantity because he provided insufficient information.

The Awareness of Grice's Cooperative Principle by Non-Native English Speakers and Its Realization in their Conversations

From all questions from the test, most participants appeared to aware the Grice's cooperative principle. This study indicates that there is a tendency that the participants understand the basic concepts of Grice's cooperative principle and the maxims. They tried to answer the questions with their knowledge about them, without opening the books or browsing in the internet. If we look the utterances by non-native English speakers' conversations from the first until the fifth conversation, most appeared to observe the maxims of Grice's cooperative principle. The table below shows the relation between the awareness and realization of Grice's cooperative principle to make the analysis clearer.

Table 4. The Awareness and Realization of Grice's Cooperative Principle

No	Awareness of Grice's Cooperative Principle	Frequency	%	Realization of Grice's Cooperative Principle	Frequency	%
1	Aware	86	57.3%	Observance	828	99.76%
2	Not Aware	64	42.7%	Non-observance	2	0.24%
Total		150	100%	Total	830	100%

After looking at the explanation above, it can be concluded that there is a relation between non-native English speakers' awareness of Grice's cooperative principle and their realization in conversation. Based on the test, 57.3% of the questions have been answered according to the preferred responses. It can be inferred that the participants were aware enough of Grice's cooperative principle. And later when they did conversations with their friends, they realized the observance of the maxims better than the non-observance ones. It is shown from the table that there are 99.76% utterances which observe the maxims. From the description, we can infer that non-native English speakers who are aware of Grice's cooperative principle will be easier to realize it in their conversations. In other words, the awareness of Grice's cooperative principle is closely related to its realization in non-native English speakers' conversations.

CONCLUSION

The study was set to describe how non-native English speakers are aware and realize the Grice's cooperative principle, also the relation between the awareness and the realization in their conversations. Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that most participants were aware of Grice's cooperative principle. In the realization, most participants observed Grice's cooperative principle because it describes best practices in a conversation in order to facilitate the process of conversation to be smoother for both the listener and the speaker, but the participants frequently

did not observe these maxims in order to achieve certain purposes.

Lastly, non-native English speakers who were aware of Grice's cooperative principle would likely be easier to realize it in their conversations because they understood the concept of how to create successful, effective and efficient communication. In other words, the awareness of Grice's cooperative principle is closely related to its realization in non-native English speakers' conversations. Grice's cooperative principle can be one of the solution to conduct successful, efficient and effective communication, like has been stated by Grice (1975). Although cultural background is usually a quite problem for us, it can be handled by a good cooperation between the speaker and the hearer.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2007). Grice's Cooperative Principle at work in an ESL Classroom: a case for teaching implicature. *Journal of Inquiry and Research*, Vol. 8, pp. 77-95. Available online at http://opac.kansaigaidai.ac.jp/cgi-bin/retrieve/sr_bookview.cgi/U_CHARSET.UTF-8/DB00000202/Body/r086_05.pdf. Downloaded on 20 October 2012.
- Brown, G & Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Walter, E, et al. 2008. *Cambridge Advanced Learners Dictionary*. 3rd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J.W. 2007. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design - Second Edition: Choosing among Five Approaches*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Cutting, J. 2002. *Pragmatics and Discourse: a Resource Book for Students*. London: Routledge.
- Eggs, S & Slade, D. 1997. *Analysing Casual Conversation*. London: Cassel.
- Davies, B. 2000. Grice's Cooperative Principle: Getting the Meaning Across. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 8, pp. 1-26. Available online at <https://www.leeds.ac.uk/linguistics/WPL/WP2000/Davies.pdf>. Downloaded on 20 September 2012.
- Fakharzadeh, M & Rasekh, A.E. 2010. On the Applicability or Non-Applicability of the Gricean Maxims to Nursery Rhymes. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, Vol. 1 (1), pp. 37 – 73. Available online at: <https://sites.google.com/site/linguisticsandlanguage/teaching/>. Downloaded on 01 July 2012.
- Grice, H.P. 1975. *Logic and Conversation*. [In: Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3, Speech Acts, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan. New York: Academic Press 1975, 41–58]
- Grundy, P. 2000. *Doing Pragmatics: Second Edition*. London: Arnold.
- Haugh, M. 2002. The Intuitive Basis Of Implicature: Relevance Theoretic Implicitness Versus Gricean Implying. *Pragmatics*, Vol. 12 (2), pp. 117-134. Available online at: <http://elanguage.net/journals/pragmatics/article/download/317/250>. Downloaded on 01 July 2012.
- Khosravizadeh, P & Sadehvandi, N. 2011. Some Instances of Violation and Flouting of the Maxim of Quantity by the Main Characters (Barry & Tim) in Dinner for Schmucks. *International Conference on Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, Vol. 26, pp. 122-127. Available online at: <http://sharif.ir/~khosravizadeh/linkfile/violation.pdf>. Downloaded on 01 July 2012.
- Leech, G.N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Inc.
- Levinson, S.C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Masykuri, E.S. 2011. Non Observance of Cooperative Principle in English Comic Strip *The Adventure of Tintin; the Black Island*. Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang Thesis (unpublished).
- Mey, J.L. 1993. *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Morris, C. (1938). Foundations of the Theory of Signs. *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science 1:2*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Murray, J.C. 2011. Do Bears Fly? Revisiting Conversational Implicature in Instructional Pragmatics. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, Vol. 15 (2) pp. 1-30. Available online at <http://www.tesol-ej.org/pdf/ej58/a4.pdf>. Accessed on April, 27th 2012.
- Nanda, et al. 2012. Conversational Implicature of the Presenters in Take Me Out Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 1 (2), pp. 120-138. Available online at: http://jurnal.upi.edu/file/Sheila-final_120-138.pdf. Downloaded on 01 July 2012.
- Pajarwati, E. 2012. The Gricean Cooperative Principle in Native and Non-Native Communication Breakdowns. Semarang: Universitas Negeri Semarang Thesis (unpublished).
- Pham, D.T. 2010. The Cooperative Principle: Does Grice's Framework Fit Vietnamese Language Culture?. *Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, Vol. 1 (2), pp. 197 – 219. Available online at: <https://sites.google.com/site/linguisticsandlanguage/teaching/>. Downloaded on 01 July 2012.
- Pop, A. 2010. Implicatures derived through Maxim Flouting in Print Advertising: A Contrastive Empirical Approach. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics (TWPL)*, Vol. 33, pp. 1-8. Available online at: <http://twpl.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/twpl/article/viewFile/6653/9342>. Downloaded on 01 July 2012.
- Searle, J. R. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Sedivy, J.C. 2007. Implicature During Real Time Conversation: A View from Language Processing Research. *Philosophy Compass*, Vol. 2 (3), pp. 475–496. Available online at: <http://semantics.uchicago.edu/kennedy/classes/s09/experimentalsemantics/sedivy07.pdf>. Downloaded on 01 July 2012.
- Sihai, W. 2008. Study on Teaching the Interpretation of Conversational Implicature in Listening Comprehension. *CELEA Journal*, Vol. 31 (2), pp. 66-74. Available online at: http://www.celea.org.cn/teic/79/080801_66.pdf. Downloaded on 04 September 2012.

- Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. 1986. *Relevance: Communication & Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publisher Ltd.
- Thomas, J. 1995. *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Publishing.
- Wang, H. 2011. Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 2 (5), pp. 1162-1167. Available online at: <http://ojs.academypublisher.com/index.php/jltr/article/view/5542>. Downloaded on 01 July 2012.
- Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.