A Pragmatic Analysis of Conversational Implicature in Selected Political Speech

Suad Faisal Hassan, Babylon University, English Department, College of Education, Iraq, suad7149@gmail.com, **Prof. Dr. Salih Mahdi Adai AlMamoory** salihmehdi@yahoo.com, Babylon University, English Department, College of Education for Human Sciences, Iraq

Abstract

The current study examines the utilization of Cooperative Principles as a framework for analyzing political speeches. The objective is to get insights into the extent to which these principles are adhered to and identify instances where politicians deviate from the conversational maxims. The research conducted in this study is qualitative, wherein the researcher extracts passages for analysis. This study aims to analyze the extracts to identify instances where the Conversational Maxims are not observed and determine the frequency of their occurrence in the dialogues. The current investigation results demonstrate that politicians frequently employ specific categories of non-observance of conversational maxims when delivering their speeches. These categories encompass flouting, violating, and suspending the maxims. Additionally, the study revealed that politicians encounter many circumstances that result in their failure to adhere to conversational maxims.

Introduction Language serves as a medium of communication. The platform serves as a means for individuals of all backgrounds to engage in the exchange of information and the expression of thoughts and ideas. The act of interpretation and socialization is crucial within the context of society. According to Goldstein, language refers to how individuals transmit their emotions, thoughts, concepts, and personal encounters via sounds or symbols (Goldstein, 2008). Effective communication has a pivotal role in establishing and nurturing interpersonal connections. Individuals utilize communication to exchange information and ideas throughout a conversation. Generate multiple interpretations. When individuals participate in verbal communication, they should consider the semantic significance the interlocutors utilize. Due to the inherent variability of language, communication can give rise to diverse interpretations across different settings. Therefore, it is imperative for a listener or hearer to carefully analyze the indicated meaning within a given situation as utilized by the speaker. In essence, comprehending the implicit significance is essential in facilitating practical discourse. An implicit connotation occasionally arises in every discourse. This phenomenon occurs when individuals engage in interpersonal communication to interact with others. In order to narrate a story, produce ideas, or convey information indirectly, individuals often employ implicit means. The phenomenon in question is commonly referred to as implicature. Implicature arises when individuals endeavor to discern the intended meaning conveyed by their words without being explicitly stated as part of the communicated message. The statement is inquiring about a particular topic. Individuals often express implicit meanings or messages as a means to foster a sense of intimacy within conversational interactions. On certain occasions, individuals may choose not to express their intended message explicitly. In numerous cases, speakers convey a more profound meaning beyond the literal content of their words. For instance, if one were to express the statement: "The temperature in this room is low." The intended request is for the individual to provide their jacket, close the window, or employ If there is no electric

heater available, I will be compelled to vacate this location. The interpretation of the statement is contingent upon the contextual factors and can be ascertained through an analysis of the interlocutors' relationship. Speakers possess the ability to convey messages that are contrary to their literal meaning. For instance, when an individual fails to attend a meeting and subsequently appears on a different day without offering an apology or providing a justification, their actions can be interpreted as conveying an opposing message. I am pleased to learn about your existence. The text has a high level of punctuality. Regrettably, your phone has been experiencing a decline in effectiveness as of late, or it was rather exhilarating to have witnessed your presence at the meeting yesterday. According to Thomas (1995), there is a curiosity regarding the ability of speakers to effectively convey a meaning that differs from their literal words, as well as how listeners can comprehend the suggested message directly. Significance of the Study Pursuing knowledge through academic study is crucial for individuals who possess a genuine interest in comprehensively exploring and analyzing language scientifically. The analysis of written and spoken language involves the examination of implicit ideas sent by the sender to the recipient. These investigations above Facilitate the linguist's ability to analyze the pragmatic elements influencing the selection of each speech and its impact on the recipient. Furthermore, this study allows the reader to examine the principles governing political language and its efficacy. In addition, this analysis examines the techniques employed by adept politicians to effectively persuade their audience and convey messages of reassurance and empowerment, which are essential in navigating critical situations and tense occasions. The Aim of Study The current study uses a pragmatic analysis approach, as it aims to analyze conversations scientifically by employing linguistic terms that emphasize the discourse's underlying background and contextual factors. Implicature is a prominent aspect of several branches within the field of pragmatics. This study's primary focus is examining word and sentence structures within a given language. This study examines the utilization of conversational implicatures by guests participating in political interviews. The research focuses on the many types and functions of these implicatures. The constraints lie in the limited scale of the dataset. The research investigation was centered on a single interview. The analysis of additional interviews was constrained due to the necessity of limiting the content. To enhance the persuasiveness of the argument, it is recommended that future research endeavors undertake a comprehensive analysis of a broader range of speeches and interviews. Theoretical Background Cooperation and Implicature The term "cooperation" describes human behavior in the context of communication (Davies, 2007). Effective communication occurs when a sender and receiver are involved in the conversational interaction. When individuals are engaged in verbal communication, specifically those who are speaking and those who are listening, when engaging in a conversation, individuals often possess an implicit expectation that both parties involved will exhibit a cooperative demeanor. To provide further clarification, it is expected that when an individual refers to "my wife," the recipient of the statement is to acknowledge the underlying assumption that the speaker is genuinely married rather than engaging in purposeful deception, confusion, or manipulation of others. Therefore, it is widely accepted that individuals engaged in a conversation typically exhibit honesty and provide relevant information. One can find utility in envisioning a scenario where one's sibling assembles a sandwich for one's consumption. Upon completion, she inquires about the quality of the sandwich. The response provided asserts that a sandwich is indeed a sandwich. In this scenario, upon hearing the response above, it may be inferred that the speaker engages in cooperative discourse while conveying a specific message. The listener is thus tasked with deciphering the intended meaning. From a purely logical standpoint, the response lacks

communicative significance as it conveys a highly evident statement. Nevertheless, it is frequently employed in interpersonal discourse to convey information beyond the explicit content of the message. For instance, the phrase "Business is business" and the saying "boys will be boys" are often used in colloquial language to convey certain attitudes or behaviors. The aforementioned linguistic constructions are commonly referred to as tautologies, as stated by Yule (1996). Non-conventional or conversational implicature is closely linked to the cooperation principle and Grice's maxims. Grice's definition of the cooperation principle entails generating conversational implicatures that are appropriate and relevant to the ongoing discourse—the acknowledged purpose or direction of the conversation in which you are currently involved. According to Grice's seminal work in 1975, Conversational implicatures refer to the inherent characteristics that communicate supplementary significance beyond the literal meaning of the words (Thomas, 1995). The phenomenon can be noticed either through direct or indirect means. In alternative terms, individuals possess the capacity to perceive and comprehend the cooperative principle inherent in a discourse, or they lack awareness of its existence. According to Henry (1996), intentions play a crucial role in communication acts and are specifically applicable to speech acts. This will facilitate examining the adherence to and transgressions of Grice's maxims. When adherence to the maxims is not achieved, conversational implicature arises. According to Searle (1985), the interaction between the speaker and hearer is guided by the Cooperative Principle, which consists of certain maxims. Pragmatics The field of pragmatics emerged as a distinct language level separate from previous levels. Adams (1985) posits that the development of linguistics in the twentieth century has occurred progressively, advancing from one linguistic level to another. This progression has unfolded from the study of phonology to syntax, then to semantics, and ultimately to pragmatics. There exist numerous definitions of pragmatics that primarily seek to distinguish it from semantics. According to Morris (1983), pragmatics can be defined as the study of the relationship between signs and their interpreters. According to Gadzar (1979), pragmatics encompasses utterances that possess a meaning that is characterised by a reduced number of truth criteria. However, Mey (2001) agrees that the primary focus of pragmatics is on the individuals who use language. He argues that the study of language can be split into two distinct aspects: language as a product of human activity and language as it is used by humans. According to Levinson (1983), pragmatics pertains to the examination of linguistic elements, such as deictic and indexical terms, which need consideration of the individuals utilizing the language. According to Leech (1983), the concept of "pragmatic eclecticism" is proposed as a means to establish boundaries for pragmatics and distinguish it from semantics. Moreover, the field of pragmatics is reliant upon the recognition and comprehension of the figurative or concealed significance within a given conversational interaction. In the year 1968, John Austen introduced a classification system for the concept of speech actions, which subsequently became a foundational principle within the field of pragmatics. Subsequently, John Searle further advanced this linguistic theory in a philosophical manner in order to elucidate the concept of intended meaning in spoken language. In the year 1975, Grice made a further move by signalizing implicatures that determine the precise meaning found in a language that people hear in a dialogue or conversation. Implicature In interpersonal communication, it is typical for a speaker's intended message to be conveyed indirectly rather than explicitly during a conversation. In order to grasp the fundamental meaning, the recipient must rely on both verbal input and background knowledge, as the intended meaning is not explicitly stated. The concept of implicature, as developed by Grice, is utilized in this study. Grice's work showcases the ability to communicate

concepts or thoughts not explicitly expressed in the utterance and deviate from conventional speech patterns—the repercussions or outcomes of a particular action or event. The phenomenon referred to as implicature involves the use of implicit statements. Levinson posits that implicature provides a comprehensive elucidation of how utterances can convey additional meaning beyond their literal content. This suggests that the meaning of a speech can extend beyond its explicit meaning in certain instances. Gazdar defines implicature as a proposition inferred from the context in which a statement is made despite not being a necessary consequence of the statement's meaning or a presupposed assumption. The statement was indeed vocalized. Moreover, implicature is a concept often veiled inside utterances but not inherent to the utterances per se. The distinctions between utterance and implicature can occasionally challenge the listener's comprehension. However, it is worth noting that in many instances, the speaker and listener share a common background of knowledge and experiences, facilitating a seamless exchange of ideas and information. Consequently, implicature endeavors to distinguish between the meaning that is explicitly conveyed and the meaning that is implicitly conveyed. Parker provides an illustrative instance of implicature. John: "Uncle Chester is coming over for dinner tonight." Marry: I guess I'd better lock up the liquor. Uncle Chester is about to come to John and Marry''s house for dinner. The example provided above entails an implicature that suggests that Uncle Chester has developed a dependency on alcoholic beverages. Due to this rationale, Mary has formulated a strategy to withhold the beverages, potentially indicating a desire to conceal them due to her aversion to her uncle's inebriated state. Mary's statement encompasses implicature when the intended meaning differs from the literal expression. Maulana says that three essential elements necessitate discussion about implicature. Firstly, speech can give rise to more than one implicature in some communicative contexts.Furthermore; the implicit connotations are not inherent components of the discourse. Finally, the intended implications of the discourse need to be aligned with the explicit statements made. The number 55 is the value being referred to. The correlation between speaker meanings is discernible within Grice's typology. Functions of Implicates The intentional use of implicatures can effectively stimulate individuals' interest, attentiveness, and excitement. Channel's (1994) work further explored and provided a more comprehensive analysis of these functions. According to the author, implicatures serve the purpose of self-protection. The act of exerting power and displaying civility, providing information, entertaining the audiences, and the absence of precise information. In their seminal works, Brown and Levinson (1978 & 1987) identified the several roles of implicature, which include the maintenance of politeness and the creation of a sense of humor. The authors discuss the concept of linguistic politeness as a strategy employed to demonstrate consideration for individuals' social reputation or "face." According to the individuals above, individuals deviate from straightforward and unambiguous communication to safeguard their self-image and also consider the needs of their recipient. The authors overview several politeness tactics, categorizing them into positive and negative approaches. Positive strategies include making offerings, engaging in humor, and expressing sympathy. On the other hand, harmful politeness methods involve hedging, offering apologies, and showing deference. Implicatures can be a beneficial mechanism for achieving an economy of language, as they enable the conveyance of a more significant amount of information with fewer words (Geis, 1987). The phenomenon occurs when a speaker intentionally violates the maxim of quantity by deliberately withholding a certain amount of information, hence generating an implicature. Self-protection refers to the actions and strategies individuals employ to safeguard themselves from using implicature, which can serve as a means of

expressing caution, even in situations where the speaker possesses knowledge of the material being conveyed. In such a scenario, the speaker provides approximate information to prevent potential conflicts with others, should it be discovered that their statement is incorrect. In his work, Price (2000) asserts that the primary attribute of political discourse that warrants significant consideration is the underlying power dynamics—the speaker endeavors to influence the listener by utilizing the authority bestowed upon him. As a result, the speaker is. It is the speaker's responsibility to captivate their audience's interest through persuasive and compelling language. The use of indirect utterances in political texts is considered better, as it reflects a conscious understanding of the social and political implications of one's thoughts and intentions. From the perspective of the speaker. This particular characteristic serves the purpose of developing and maintaining steady communication between the individual and their audience. In order to underscore and provide essential details, One of the fundamental characteristics of language is its function as a medium for transmitting information. Hale (2003) emphasized that language users can convey literal signals to their addressers, either implicitly or explicitly. In order to captivate and engage the viewers, the primary objective is to provide entertainment. Using humor can serve as a valuable mechanism for fostering a positive atmosphere and cultivating interpersonal relationships, particularly within Western cultural contexts. According to the research conducted by Brown and Levinson (1987), joking is considered to be a practice of positive politeness. Indirect utterances can serve as an effective means of entertaining someone and cultivating their fondness. Given that implicatures are not expressly expressed, this allows speakers to disavow any intention to transmit such meanings (Yule, 1996). Politicians can evade the obligation of defending their claims due to the audience's active involvement in making inferences about the underlying assumptions. Therefore, it is incumbent on the audience to decipher the significance of verbal expressions. Discourse and Pragmatics The conceptualization of discourse analysis encompasses various interpretations that have undergone evolutionary changes over time. Stubbs, as cited in Baker (year), defines discourse analysis as a methodological approach to examine the organization of language beyond the level of individual clauses or sentences. Consequently, discourse analysis involves the analysis of larger linguistic units, such as spoken interactions or written texts. Numerous scholars commonly characterize discourse analysis as a subfield within the domain of Linguistic inquiry. The field of study examines language as it is employed in various contexts, encompassing the interplay between language and its surrounding environment. According to Jones, discourse analysis encompasses a range of activities that involve the conversion of actions into textual form and the subsequent conversion of texts back into action. This research examines language usage in practical contexts, where language is not solely employed for communication purposes but also for accomplishing specific tasks. Discourse analysis primarily examines language within its contextual framework due to the definitions above. Discourse analysis and pragmatics exhibit several shared characteristics and areas of overlap. Both employ methodologies to examine the connection between language and contextual background characteristics. Moreover, both disciplines encompass the analysis of written material and its purpose. In his work, Cutting (Yule) underscores the importance of studying the contextual meaning of words. This entails examining the aspects of meaning that can be elucidated through understanding the physical and social environment, socio-psychological factors that influence communication, and knowledge of the specific temporal and spatial context in which the words are uttered or written. Furthermore, another characteristic of these entities is the presence of text, which refers to the ability to be expressed through oral and written communication. This aspect

analyzes how linguistic units combine to create significance and coherence for individuals engaging with the discourse. Finally, pragmatics and discourse analysis share a common focus on function, which serves as a connecting factor between the two fields. The field of pragmatics includes the study of Speech Act theory, which examines how speakers utilize their utterances to convey various types of communicative acts, such as threats, promises, and others. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) incorporates the notion that discourse mirrors and shapes power dynamics. Generalizad Conversational Implicature Levinson posits that generalized conversational implicature refers to implicatures that arise throughout a conversation independent of specific contextual elements. The recipient readily comprehends the speaker's intended message without necessitating significant cognitive effort or hidden implications. Furthermore, the recipient of the information does not necessarily require specialized knowledge to comprehend the discourse, as it is delivered within a broad framework that facilitates immediate understanding for the listener. Moreover, Yule asserts that the speaker's intended meaning can be comprehended without supplementary contextual information. The absence of any requirement for prior information facilitates the comprehension of the speaker's utterance. Grice illustrates generalized conversational implicature, wherein the statement "X is meeting a Woman this evening" typically implies that the individual to be met by X is someone other than X's spouse, maternal figure, sibling, or even intimate companion. This phenomenon typically arises when X encounters individuals who hold significant importance to him, leading him to refrain from explicitly referring to them as "women."The numerical value is provided in (Grice, 1975). In this scenario, the hearer can make an inference without relying on prior information. The hearer readily comprehends the suggested meaning due to its presence within the utterance. Another instance of generalized conversational implicature is also observed in the following example: Jake: did you buy the ice cream and the milk? Jill: I bought the ice cream In the example above, Jake inquires about Jill's purchase of ice cream and milk, indicating the presence of two distinct items to procure. However, Jill's response is limited to discussing only one aspect without mentioning the other. If he were to purchase both items, he would have made reference to them. Based on the available evidence, one can deduce that the implicature suggests that Jill purchases solely the ice cream, excluding the milk. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the preceding dialogue does not necessitate prior knowledge or contextual information, as it remains within general discourse. Therefore, it can still be classified as a generalized conversational implicature. Political Speech Language is an inherent and distinctive attribute exclusive to the human species. Individuals commonly utilize it for many objectives, including the exchange of thoughts, concepts, knowledge, and information, as well as the sharing of experiences and the expression of ideas. The acquisition and understanding of information and facts. Politicians employ this strategy to generate rhetoric and foster beliefs that establish novel realities, substantiate assertions, or introduce fresh notions. According to Bayley (2000), power is only exerted within social relationships, and language plays a crucial role in maintaining these relationships. As a result, politicians employ language manipulation as a means to influence people's thoughts. Furthermore, the language politicians employ often tends to be euphemistic and ambiguous. According to Orwell (1946:157), its purpose is to imbue falsehoods with an air of truthfulness, elevate acts of murder to respectability, and create an illusion of substance from mere empty rhetoric. Certain scholars argue that an inherent connection exists between language and politics. According to Chilton and Schaffner (1994, 1997), language is an indispensable political component. They further suggest that using language in forming social groups contributes to the emergence of what is commonly called "politics" comprehensively. Moreover, Pelinka (2007) asserts

that language should be regarded as a political phenomenon, necessitating continuous examination akin to other areas of language studies, such as literature and linguistics. This approach enables the exploration of the potency of spoken words, particularly in instances where politicians employ cryptic, semantically dense, and covert language, often opting for an indirect mode of communication. They engage in obscure communication. Murray Edelman's scholarly efforts in 1988 emphasized the significance of language and the symbolic aspects of politics. The individual executed a demonstration of the linguistic. Turn within the context of their work. The field of study I am interested in is political science. In his perspective, he posits the significance of fabricating meaning about political practice and constructing beliefs regarding events, policies, leaders, problems, and crises, which either rationalize or contest the current state of affairs. According to the author (1988), the concept of "inequalities" is essential. In an additional scholarly contribution, the author asserts that the processes of creating meaning within politics encompass political actions and the political discourse required to delineate and interpret them. According to the author (1964:1), both symbolic forms have a significant role in shaping and spreading public interpretations of inherently confusing and intricate political occurrences. In summary, Edelman argues that politics is a symbolic construct, subject to diverse interpretations and expressed through the public's encounters with events. Politics includes more than just the use of language; nonetheless, a significant portion of political activity is indeed centered upon language. Partington (2003) argues that a substantial aspect of politics involves engaging in and debating over language. Data Collection and Analysis: Analysis of Political Speeches In order to foster mutual comprehension, individuals often exhibit cooperative behavior in their linguistic interactions. In order to foster effective communication and establish mutual understanding, individuals must communicatively

employ language and ensure cooperation. Cooperation is crucial in facilitating comprehension and promoting harmonious interaction between the speaker and the listener. To maintain the sustainability of cooperativeness in their conversations, addresses must adhere to Grice's Cooperative Principles. Nevertheless, suppose individuals need to adhere to Grice's Cooperative Principle. In that case, it signifies that the participants are intentionally disregarding, infringing upon, deviating from, choosing not to follow, or temporarily disregarding one or more Conversational Maxims. The primary source utilized in this study comprises a transcript of an interview conducted by TIME magazine with Donald Trump on June 17th, 2020, focusing on his re election campaign. The individuals participating in the conversation are Edward Felsenthal, who holds the positions of TIME Editor-in-Chief and CEO, Massimo Calabresi, the Washington Bureau Chief, Brian Bennett, the Senior White House Correspondent, and Tessa Berenson, the White House Correspondent. Analysis of Speeches TIME: —It seems that as if you are sticking rather than you drew out. What are your major concern with Iran's sudden raids? PRESIDENT TRUMP: —Ok. It is a funny ridiculous. Do you want to take the information I knew yesterday – Those who get aids from the Straits? The big companies and some states. Just it is necessary to tell you something. 60% percent of oil goes to China. And 25% percent goes to Japan" The above dialogue demonstrates that Trump disregarded the principles of quantity, quality, and approach, as evidenced by his excessive response to the interviewer's question regarding the potential attack on Iran. Regarding violating the maxim of quantity, President Trump has failed to provide the necessary informative contributions, as he has exceeded the expected quantity in his utterances. The interviewee needs to consider the importance of concise communication. In other words, the respondent needed to provide more concise responses and avoid superfluous verbosity. Moreover, President Trump provided an excess of

information above what was necessary. TIME: —It is clear that this issue means that you might take war over destructive nuclear weapons strategically and make problems in Strait of Hormuz? PRESIDENT TRUMP: —That's right, I didn't say that that, but I might with no doubt control nuclear weapons," In the given discourse, it is evident that the interviewee (President Trump) deviates from the conversational maxim of quantity by choosing not to provide a comprehensive response to the interviewer (TIME). This deviation may stem from the interviewee's need for more expectation to deliver an extensive speech or the sensitivity surrounding ongoing political matters and diplomatic affairs. Within the discourse, the respondent (President) must adhere to the conversational principle of quality. Essentially, the individual in question contravenes the principle of quality by asserting, "Incidentally, I maintain an exceptionally positive rapport with China." This statement reveals Mr. Trump's inclination to deceive the listener (the interviewer) potentially. Furthermore, it can be observed that Mr. Trump deviates from the principle of quantity by offering an excessive amount of information in response to the inquiry regarding the intended message he wishes to convey to the demonstrators in Hong Kong. Furthermore, the interviewee, President Trump, violated the method principle by failing to articulate his viewpoint concisely and engaging in excessive verbosity. TIME: —Please tell us some of your big themes of your challenging Campaign in which you raise a sign that say —Promises Made, Promises Kept.‖ Currently, one cannot say that the wall you promise to be built will be completed‖ PRESIDENT TRUMP: "No, no we are busy with constructing and building the wall at the present time no one can easily understand, it is our main concern." TIME: —The walls are 654 miles, you did only 61 ones PRESIDENT TRUMP: Well, they are maximally 550." TIME: What about the fences PRESIDENT TRUMP: "By the end of 2019,we will have completed more than 460 miles with renewing great amount of construction. We are renovating and mending. All areas which don't have walls are also included" The passage from the interview highlights a prominent subject of President Trump's presidential campaign, namely, the construction of a border wall between the United States and Mexico. The individual's behavior indicates a violation of the maxim of quality since they intentionally disseminate false information regarding the progress made in constructing the wall. To illustrate, for the course of his presidency, which spanned three and a half years up until the day of the interview, he successfully constructed 61 miles. Considering how he could construct 450 miles within a single year is perplexing. TIME: How can you send and deliver the promises? PRESIDENT TRUMP: You can imagine that 3.2 is finished at the first quarter. The first process is slow and low. The strong economy will make us to come up with" The italicized section within the exchange above exemplifies President Trump's violation of the principle of relation, as he offers the interviewer an irrelevant answer. It can be observed that an implicature arose in the individual's discourse that is not directly aligned with the interviewer's intended objective. Conclusions The salient findings derived from the interview analysis can be summarized as follows. The researcher discovered that the interviewee occasionally adhered to Grice's four cooperative principles, namely the maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. However, the interviewee needed to demonstrate adherence to the conversational maxims. The application of the Conversational Maxims Theory can be observed in talks by several means, including flouting, breaking, and suspending the maxims. Upon analyzing the political speeches presented during the interview, it was seen that the interviewee occasionally violated the principles of quantity, quality, and method in his replies to the inquiries. Furthermore, there has been a consistent breach of the principles of quality and relation, a phenomenon frequently taken advantage of by politicians due to the nature of their duties and obligations. Furthermore, the amount principle needed to be needed to be adhered to during the

interview. Therefore, the study has concluded that politicians occasionally need to adhere to the conversational maxims put forth by Grice, thereby demonstrating a lack of cooperation in the specific circumstances they find themselves in. In his seminal work, Grice (1976) delineates two distinct categories of implicature, namely "conventional implicature" and "conversational implicature." Both types of utterances possess an added layer of significance that extends beyond the semantic meanings conveyed. the impact of climate change on biodiversity. What sets them apart is how both implicatures consider a specific context. The inferred meaning remains consistent in conventional implicature regardless of the surrounding context. However, in the case of conversational implicature, the implied meaning varies depending on the specific context (Thomas, 1995). Nevertheless, the primary emphasis of this essay is solely on conversational implicatures drawn from Grice's Cooperative Principle (Birner, 2013).

References Adams, J. K. (1985). Pragmatics and fiction. Amsterdam, Philadelphia. J.Benjamins Pub. Co. Bhatia, A. (2006). Critical Discourse Analysis of political conference. Discourse and society, 17, 173-203. Baily, B. (2000). Communicative behavior and conflict. Discourse and society 11(1). 86-108. Birner, B. J. (2013). Introduction to pragmatics: Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell. Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1978) Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage, Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction. New York: Cambridge University Press. Brown, P, & Levinson, S. C. (1987) Politeness some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Channel, J. (1994). Vague Language (Describing the English Language). Oxford:Oxford University Press. Chilton, P. (1985). Language and the nuclear arm debate: nuke speak today. London: Printer. Chilton, P. (2004). Analyzing political discourse. Theory and practice. Journal of pragmatics, 36, 2197-2201. Davieis, B. L. (2007). Grace's Cooperative Principle: meaning and rationality. Journal of Pragmatics, 39(12), 2308-2331. Edelman, M. (1964). The symbolic uses of politics. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. Edelman, M. (1988). Constructing the political spectacle. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Frank Parker, Linguistics for Non-Linguists (London: Taylor and Francis Ltd., 1946). p.31 Gadzar, G. (1979). Pragmatics: Implicature, presupposition and logical form. New York: Academic Press. Geis, M. (1987). The language of politics. New York: Springer-Verlag. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. New York: Academic Press. Gerald Gazdar, Pragmatics: Implicature, Presupposition, and Logical Form (New York: Academic Press, 1979). p.38 Hale, J. (2003). The information conveyed by words in sentences. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research 32(2): 101-123. Henry, R. (1996). Pretending and meaning theory of fictional discourse: Greenwood Press. Joan Cutting, Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students (London, New York: Routledge, 2002). p.2-3 Jacob L. Mey, Concise Encyclopedia of Pragmatics, 2nd ed. (Denmark: Elsevier Ltd., 2009). p.365 Leech, G. N. & Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics: Longman London. Levinson, S. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Morris, C. W. (1970) Foundations of the theory of signs. Chicago, IL. The University of Chicago Press. Mey, L. J. (2001). Pragmatics: an introduction. Carlton, Australia. Blackwell Publishing. Murni Mahmud, Doing Discourse Analysis: An Introduction (Yogyakarta: Phoenix Publisher, 2017). p.4 Maulina N. Putri, "The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in „Midnight Sun" Movie" (UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, 2020). Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. London: Longman. Orwell, G. (1946). Politics and the English Language. In inside the whale and other essays (146-157). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Pelinka, A. (2007). Language as a political category: the viewpoint of political science. Journal of language & politics 6. 129-43. Paul Baker and Sibonile Ellece, Key Term in Discourse Analysis (London and New York:

Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011). p.32 Schaffner. C. (1997). Discourse and politics. Discourse as social interaction. Ed. By Teun van Dijk, 206-30. London: Sage. Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics: Longman London. Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.