



PROPERTIES OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE ON IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL INTERVIEW

Muyassaroh (muyassaja@gmail.com)

Fakultas Tarbiyah Institut Agama Islam Al-Qolam Malang

(Received: Februari 2020 / Revised: Februari 2020 / Accepted: Maret 2020)

ABSTRACT

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji bagaimana ciri-ciri implikatur percakapan yang digunakan dalam wawancara Perjanjian Nuklir Iran (PNI). Metode yang digunakan dalam studi ini kualitatif dengan pendekatan pragmatik. Hasil kajian ini menunjukkan *universality* terdapat di datum karena ia menghasilkan makna yang beragam jika dilihat dari konteks dan latar belakang wawasan. *Reinforcibility* muncul karena datum dibuat eksplisit. Tapi yang dibuat eksplisit bukan pesannya melainkan spekleksikanya. *Non-conventionality* muncul di datum karena datum diinterpretasi menurut konteksnya. Tetapi, konteks tersebut belum bisa menentukan pesan dari datum. *Calculability* ada karena datum butuh proses interpretasi untuk memahami pesan tersembunyinya. *Non-detacebility* muncul karena jika kata di datum diganti dengan sinonimnya, pesannya tetap akan sama. *Defeasibility* ada jika datum tidak konsisten dengan latar belakang wawasan.

Keywords: Ciri-ciri implikatur percakapan, implikatur percakapan, pragmatik.

1. INTRODUCTION

This study aims at investigating the properties of conversational implicature used by the interviewer and the interviewee on Iran Nuclear Deal interview (IND). Conversational implicature refers to any meaning implied in a conversation¹. A lot

¹ Wang, H. Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension. (*Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2011), p. 1

may have been done researches about conversational implicature. However, there seemed to be no discussion about properties of conversational implicature in those researches. The researchers studied intended messages of the conversational implicature only through cooperative principle and its maxims.

To achieve effective analysis of conversational implicature, it is necessary to rely on concept of conversational implicature properties. It is argued that conversational implicature has six properties². The first property is calculability. Calculability refers to processes of interpretation required by a hearer to work the meaning of conversational implicature out³. The second property is non-conventionality. It means that what is conversationally implicated cannot be a part of the conversational meaning of what is revealed⁴. The third property is non-detachability. Conversational implicature is non-detachable because it deals with the semantic content of what is said, rather than linguistic form used. The fourth property is reinforceability. It emerges when conversational implicature can clarify what is previously stated⁵. The fifth property is universality. This property might appear because meaning of conversational implicatures potentially has various interpretations. "This is a consequence of the complex reasoning process involved in deriving implicatures"⁶. The sixth property is defeasibility. That property exists if the conversational implicatures are inconsistent with semantic entailments, background assumptions, contexts, and priority conversational implicatures⁷.

Study on properties of conversational implicature is crucial to undertake due to two points. The first one is to determine whether certain utterance can be categorized into either conventional implicature –it refers to the conventional meaning of the words used⁸–or conversational implicature. It is because conventional implicature sometimes is hard to be distinguished with conversational implicature. The mistake on determining kind of implicature might influence process of interpreting implicature's intended meaning. Secondly, comprehending conversational implicature's properties will uncover intended

² Bublitz, W., & Norrick, N. R. *Foundations of Pragmatics*. (Germany: De Gruyter Mouton, 2011)

³ Chapman, S. *Pragmatics*. (England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)

⁴ *ibid*

⁵ Bublitz, W., & Norrick, N. R. *Foundations of Pragmatics*. (Germany: De Gruyter Mouton, 2011)

⁶ Pott, C. *Presupposition and Implicature*. (Stanford Linguistics, 2012).

⁷ Bublitz, W., & Norrick, N. R. *Foundations of Pragmatics*. (Germany: De Gruyter Mouton, 2011)

⁸ Brown, G., & Yule, G. *Discourse Analyse*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

meaning of that implicature. One of the properties which can provide interpretation of a conversational implicature is calculability. By property of calculability, intended message of conversational implicatures can be identified deeply. It is because by this property, intended message of conversational implicatures is observed through the context, co-text, cooperative principle, and background knowledge⁹. In other words, identifying the properties of conversational implicature in an utterance can lead to achieving the meaning of that conversational implicature itself.

To prove conversational implicatures characterized by the distinctive properties, this study investigates the interview on Iran Nuclear Deal which Steve Inskeep as the interviewer and President Obama as the interviewee. This speech event is taken as the subject due to particular features. The first one is discourse of this talk involves political discourse which often contains the utterances using conversational implicature by the participants. Moreover, conversational implicature in political interview is more complex than that in daily conversation. It is because to comprehend conversational implicature in political interview one needs to know not only general context of that interview but also its context of the current communicative situation and background knowledge about the political world. Secondly, questions addressed by the interviewer, Steve Inskeep, tended to be indirect yet sarcastic questions which required conversational implicatures. Thirdly, the interviewee, Obama often used conversational implicatures precisely when avoiding particular questions and conveying verbose replies. Also, his rhetorical statements were sometimes revealed using conversational implicature. Distinct style of speaking of these two speakers might contain various conversational implicatures.

Conversational implicatures on political discourse have previously been examined by some researchers. Putri¹⁰ investigated the implicatures existing in the transcript of interview between Obama and Hisyam Melhem about political view of Moslem world and solution to the conflict between Palestinian and Israeli. The results of her study showed that Obama violated all of the maxims so this caused the occurrence of implicature. Similarly, Novianingrum¹¹ focused on identifying

⁹ Chapman, S. *Pragmatics*. (England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)

¹⁰ Putri, W. *An Analysis of Implicature as Found in Transcript of Interview between Barack Obama and Hisyam Melhem from al-Arabiya TV*. (Andalas University. Padang, 2011)

¹¹ Novianingrum, D. *Conversational Implicature on ABC Interview between Barbara Walters and Syrian President Bashar al-Assad*. (State Islamic University of Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. Jakarta, 2015).

the implied meaning of the utterance by observing the non-observance maxims on ABC Interview between Barbara Walters and Syrian President Bashar Al-Assad interviews script. The speaker flouted maxim of quantity to avoid misleading towards the listener in order to look for support to achieve speaker's mission. Meanwhile, Adaoma¹² examined conversational implicature on Obama's political speech on "Race and Economic Renewal in America". The analysis proved Obama obeyed Grice's maxims to a great extent and flouted them to a lesser extent.

Their discussion of conversational implicature was only about implicature in general aspect such as its kinds, meanings, and maxims. This present study, therefore, investigates properties of conversational implicature to investigate implicature in different perspectives. The distinct nature of communication is assumed to provide new findings. As the consequence, the findings can contribute for widening findings on implicature. Based on the research background, this study formulates a research question. That is "How are the properties of conversational implicature used by the interviewer and the interviewee on Iran Nuclear Deal interview?"

2. METHOD

This research could be categorized into qualitative research due to some characteristics. Firstly, the datum was gathered through human instrument. Secondly, the datum was in the form of utterances which required deep exploration and interpretation. Thirdly, result of this study was represented using words containing rich description of the analyzed datum.

Furthermore, this study used pragmatic approach. It was because Pragmatics focuses on a different level of meaning –not social and cultural meaning, yet individual, intention-based meaning which could supplement the logical, propositional, and conventional meanings representable through a linguistic code. Besides, pragmatic approach focuses on contextual framework dealing with the very general assumptions that speaker and hearer bring to every occasion of speaking (Schiffrin, 1994). Meanwhile, a different level of meaning and contextual framework emerged in Iran Nuclear Deal interview.

¹² Adaoma, I. E. Analyzing the Political Speeches of Obama on "Race and Economic Renewal in America" in the Light of the Theory of Conversational Implicature. (*Mediterranean Journal of Social Science*, 2016)

Furthermore, source of the datum is video retrieved from <https://1www.youtube.com/watch?v=a6aL5TVVRFI>. Meanwhile, the script is taken from <http://www.npr.org/2015/04/07/397933577/transcript-president-obamas-full-npr-interview-on-iran-nuclear-deal>. This is official website of NPR (National Public Radio) –media association of syndicate of public broadcasting radio in United States. So, the transcript's validity and trustability are well guaranteed.

Some stages are done to collect the datum. The first one is transcribing all utterances in the script. Afterwards, reading fully all utterances on the transcript is done to comprehend their contexts (e.g. the topic, the participants, the scene, and so forth). Then, those utterances containing conversational implicature are underlined to be identified based on their properties. The existences of conversational implicature properties in the underlined utterances, then, are investigated using Grice (1975)'s properties of conversational implicature. The properties consist of six kinds including defeasibility, reinforcibility, non-detacebility, calculability, non-conventionality, and Indeterminacy in which each of the properties has certain criterion(s).

The property of cancelability exists in the conversational implicatures if they are inconsistent with semantic, entailments, background or ontological assumptions, contexts, and priority conversational implicatures. Identifying of this property is undertaken through comprehending context of this datum deeply. Meanwhile, the property of reinforcibility is in the conversational implicatures if they are made explicit without being redundant. It is explored by carefully reading as well as relying more on the structure of the utterance. The next property, non-conventionality, is identifiable process of calculation and reasoning. To prove the existence of the property of non-conventionality, the utterance is worked out on the basis of the linguistically coded content of the utterance, the Cooperative Principle and its maxims, the linguistic and non-linguistic context of the utterance, background knowledge, and the assumption. Furthermore, the conversational implicatures has property of non-detacebility if the utterance with the same semantic content has the same conversational implicature. To discover the this property, one of the words of the datum is replaced with its synonym in order to prove whether or not meaning of the conversational implicature changes after the replaced word. The last property, Indeterminacy is a property of conversational implicature revealing that conversational implicature might indetermine. Conversational implicature might derive different interpretations. To find out this

property, the datum is identified based on perspective of not only its context but also co-text, maxims, and background knowledge.

3. FINDINGS

There were thirty one utterances containing conversational implicatures in IND interview. Intended message of those utterances were identified based on their context to find whether or not the utterances had similar intended messages. From the identification, it was found there were fifteen utterances which implied similar intended messages. On the other hand, the sixteen utterances had distinct intended messages. The sixteen utterances were assumed to provide various properties of conversational implicature. Therefore, the sixteen utterances were selected to be the datum.

Meanwhile, the datum order was based on sequence of topic of the talk. This style of datum order was selected since this study followed flow of the datum. Each topic of the talk was provided in excerpt 1, excerpt 2, etc. Besides, each topic of the talk was given its context. Additionally, each topic of the talk contained some utterances –uttered by Steve as well as Obama –which dealt with the topic of the talk. Certain utterances which contained conversational implicatures were selected to be the datum. The datum was bolded and numbered in bracket –such as (1), (2), (3), etc. –as the datum 1, datum 2, datum 3, etc written on the right side. In addition, each datum was given the discussion of its elaboration of properties of conversational implicature and conclusion of the datum’s kind of conversational implicature properties and intended message. Furthermore, the term *properties of conversational implicature* was abbreviated as PoCI while the term *Iran Nuclear Deal* was abbreviated as IND.

3.1. Excerpt 1

This excerpt contained five datum. Each datum dealt with the topic of this excerpt. That was about the reason why Obama selected Iran to have IND instead of other countries. The datum arose due to the plan of IND which had been a viral. Many issues emerged among the United States and allied nations. The interview of IND on April 2015 at the White House, therefore, was conducted to clarify the issues.

This excerpt contained five datum. Each datum dealt with the topic of this excerpt. That was about the reason why Obama selected Iran to have IND instead of other countries. The datum arose due to the plan of IND which had been a viral. Many

issues emerged among the United States and allied nations. The interview of IND on April 2015 at the White House, therefore, was conducted to clarify the issues.

Steve: **So many of the concerns and questions about the Iran deal (.) seem to me to focus on what kind of a country you think Iran ↑ is. People are asking (.hhh) "what will happen in 10 or 15 years as the deal starts to expire," or they're asking "what will Iran do in the region during the period of the deal? (hhh) All of those concerns seem to get down to the nature of the government itself (.) which makes me begin this by asking (hhh) Do you believe that Iran's government is a government that is capable of changing its ways?**

Obama: [...] **I would argue that this deal is the right thing to do for the United States, for our allies in the region and for world peace regardless of the nature of the Iranian regime.** [...] But (.) this is a good deal (.) if you think Iran's (.) open to change. **BUT IF IT DOESN'T CHANGE, WE ARE SO MUCH BETTER if We Have >this deal in place than if we don't<.** And so (.) I'm not trying to avoid your question. **I — I think that there are::: different trends inside of Iran.** >I think there are hard-liners inside of Iran< that (.) think it is (.) the right thing to do to oppose us (.) to seek to destroy Israel, to cause havoc in places like Syria or Yemen or Lebanon. And then I think there are others (.) inside Iran who think that this is (.) counterproductive.

Datum (1)

In regard of PoCI, datum (1) had some points which were necessary to elaborate. First, if the word “deal” was replaced with word “agreement”, the replacement did not change the meaning. Meaning of this conversational implicature was still about Obama’s reasons of choosing Iran to have IND. It was because the word “deal” and the word “agreement” were synonymous (“agreement”, 2008). The word “agreement” was used to indicate a promise arranged by two different groups or allies (Hornby, 1995). So, the word “agreement” matched to be used for the datum (1)’s context because what Steve meant about the word “deal” in datum (1) was a promise made by two different allies Iran and the. U.S. This matter indicated that property of non-detachability adheres at datum (1). Second, in this context Steve was not asking about Iran in the perspective of its culture, social, and economy. However, because this context related to IND, intended message of datum (1) was to tell Obama that questions were about what Iran which made Obama have the agreement with it. In this sense, datum (1) referred to the property of non-

conventionality. Third, Steve made the word “concerns” more explicit through adding the word “questions”. From the word “questions”, Steve conversationally implicated that what he meant by the word “concerns” was the same as questions. So, it meant that property of reinforceability belonged to datum (1). Fourth, three processes of interpretation were needed to get proper intended message about the datum (1). First, Steve lexically asked Obama about what kind of a country he thought Iran was. Second, contextually, that question dealt with IND. Third, if seen from background knowledge about IND, this deal was controversial. That was some agreed with it and some did not. Thus, from the three processes can be assumed what Steve implicated inside of this question was that why Obama had nuclear deal with Iran rather than with another countries having nuclear such as Iraq, India, and so forth. The previous processes demonstrated that datum (1) had property of calculability.

In short, datum (1) had property of non-detachability, reinforceability, non-conventionality, and calculability. Meanwhile, based on the properties, datum (1)’s intended message was that Steve asked Obama why he chose Iran to have the deal instead of the other countries such as Iraq, India, and so forth.

Datum (2)

Some points in the datum (2) dealing with PoCI were required to be explored. Firstly, the clause “*what will happen in 10 or 15 years as the deal starts to expire?*” presupposed that IND prevailed for 10 or 15 years. Nonetheless, that presupposition becoming the part of conversational implicature meaning could be defeasible if either not until ten or fifteen years, Iran violated the deal and reproduced the nuclear or the deal was extended until more than fifteen years. In this sense, property of defeasibility belonged to this datum. Secondly, if the word “happen” was replaced with the word “occur,” this changed utterance still had the same intended message as the real utterance. The intended message of both utterances was about whether Iran would reproduce the nuclear when the deal started to expire or not? No change of the datum (2)’s intended message existed because the word “happen” and “occur” were synonymous (“happen”, 2008). Besides, the word “occur” was used to express something to take place (Hornby, 1995). It meant the word “occur” was suitable to be used in datum (2)’s context because the word “happen” in the datum (2) dealt with something to take place when IND started to expire. This matter showed that datum (2) had the property of non-detachability. Thirdly, if Steve said “*what will happen in 10 or 15 years*” without adding the prepositional phrase “*as the deal starts to expire*”, Obama must also understand that what Steve meant by “in 10 or 15 years” was time when the

deal expired. However, Steve made it more explicit by adding that prepositional phrase. This case was the indication that datum (2) fulfilled the property of reinforceability. Fourthly, the clause “*what will happen in 10 or 15 years as the deal starts to expire,*” derived two different interpretations. First, if seen from Steve’s following question (i.e. “*Do you believe that Iran's government is a government that is capable of changing its ways?*”), that clause meant that whether or not Iran was capable of changing its regime. Secondly, based on Obama’ utterance (i.e. *Now, ideally, we would see a situation in which Iran, seeing sanctions reduced, would start focusing on its economy, on training its people, on reentering the world community, to lessening its provocative activities in the region*) that clause demonstrated that whether or not in ten or fifteen years Iran had improved its economy and its relation to the world community. In this sense, the datum (2) referred to the property of universality. Fifthly, processes of interpretation were necessary to do in order to get proper the datum (2)’s intended message. First, lexically, Steve asked about what would happen in 10 or 15 years as the deal started to expire. Second, based on the context, the word “deal” here referred to IND. So, it meant “what will happen” here referred to result of IND for ten or fifteen years. Third, based on the background knowledge about IND one of contents of the deal involved prohibition for Iran to produce nuclear. So from the three processes, Steve’s intended question might be whether or not Iran would reproduce the nuclear when IND started to expire. This matter demonstrated that property of calculability belonged to the datum (2).

To conclude, datum (2) contained property of defeasibility, non-detachability, reinforceability, universality, non-conventionality, and calculability. Moreover, based on those properties what Steve implied through the conversational implicature in the datum (2) was that whether Iran would reproduce the nuclear when IND expired or not.

Datum (3)

Concerning PoCI, datum (3) had some points which were necessary to discuss. First, people having no idea about the datum (3)’s context might think that the phrase “*this deal*” referred to any deal done by Iran and United States and its allies. Besides, the people probably interpreted the prepositional phrase “*for the world peace*” denoted that the deal somewhat involved all countries of the world. As the result, they must interpret that datum (3)’s intended message improperly. In short, knowing the datum (3)’s context could help understand that intended message.

The one who uttered the utterance –datum (3) –was Obama who talked about IND done by Iran and United States and its allies. Moreover, in the following utterance Obama said that Iran would start focusing on its economy, on training its people, on reentering the world community. So from the contexts what Obama meant in the datum (3) was that IND could lead Iran on improving its economy and its relation to the world community. The previous facts indicated that datum (3) referred to the property of non-conventionality. Second, point of the datum (3) was that IND was right thing to do for the world peace. Nonetheless, it could be canceled if (1) Iran had hidden plans inside of agreeing IND, (2) State getting much luck was only the United States, the other countries got only marginal roles (3) Iran enemies had chances of destroying Iran. In this matter, datum (3) referred to the property of defeasibility. Third, the word “right” was synonymous with the word “true”. Thus, if the word “right” in the datum (3) was changed into the word “true”, the change did not influence that intended meaning. The intended message of the datum (3) and the synonymously changed statement abide identical. That was IND could lead Iran on improving its economy and its relation to the world community and prevented war. The change did not influence the datum (3)’s intended message since both the word “right” and “true” were similar (“right”, 2008). The word “true” was able to be used in datum (3)’s context. It was because the word “true” was used to indicate something having all the expected qualities of a thing (“true”, 2008). Meanwhile, what Obama meant by “the right thing” –in the datum (3) –was what he expected in IND. In this sense, datum (3) had property of non-detachability. Four, datum (3) might derive different interpretations. One of them was based on Obama’s following statement “*Iran, seeing sanctions reduced, would start focusing on its economy, on training its people, on reentering the world community, to lessening its provocative activities in the region,*” the datum (3) meant that IND could lead Iran on improving its economy and its relation to the world community. Meanwhile, if seen from the datum (3)’s relation to Steve question namely “*Do you believe that Iran's government is a government that is capable of changing its ways?*” seemingly, Obama tried to avoid that question. Obama implied that he did not want to say whether or not he believed in Iranian regime because the most important point was people in the United States must believe in IND. Moreover, if seen from what Obama revealed at American University in Washington that America’s legislators had only choices either diplomacy or war, the datum (3) meant that IND was the best choice since it might prevent war. In that speech he also emphasized that Iran having nuclear weapons was much more dangerous to the world than one having advantageous from exemption from the international sanctions (Kaster, 2015). This case was the indication that datum (3) had the prop-

erty of universality. Five, the phrase “*the world peace*” of the datum (3) involved all countries on the earth. Nevertheless, Obama made what he meant more explicit by adding the prepositional phrase “*for the United States, for our allies in the region*”. It might be as emphasis that the main actor getting many advantageous for IND was the United States and its allies. In this matter, datum (3) fulfilled the property of reinforceability. Five, to comprehend the datum (3)’s intended message required some interpretation processes. Lexically, Obama conveyed that IND was the right thing to do for the sake of the world peace. Besides, if Obama said either yes or no, he was in the position of obeying maxim relevance toward Steve’s question. However, his violating maxim of relevance toward Steve’s question denoted that he did not want to talk whether or not he trusted in Iranian regime. Moreover, in the following utterance Obama said “*Iran, seeing sanctions reduced, would start focusing on its economy, on training its people, on reentering the world community, to lessening its provocative activities in the region*”. So, from the interpretation processes Obama’s intended message was that IND might lead Iran to improve its economy and its relation to the world community on preventing war. The process was the indication that datum (3) has property of calculability.

In conclusion, the datum (3) had the property of defeasibility, non-detachability, reinforceability, universality, non-conventionality, and calculability. In addition, based on those properties, the datum (3)’s intended message was IND could lead Iran on improving its economy and its relation to the world community.

Datum (4)

As regards PoCI, there were some points in datum (4) relating to it. First, the word “change” was synonymous with the word “alter” (“change”, 2008). The word “alter” was used to indicate a change in character, position, size, shape, etc. (Hornby, 1995). It meant the word “alter” matched to be used in the datum (4)’s context. What Obama meant by the word “change” in the datum (4) was Iran’s change in case of violating IND. Hence, if the utterance of the datum (4) was changed into “*But if it doesn’t alter, we are so much better if we have this deal in place than if we don’t,*” this did not change the datum (4)’s intended message. That intended message was still that he could not answer whether or not he believed in the change of Iranian regime. Yet, he wanted to emphasize that IND was the best decision because the United States only had two choices either war or diplomacy. In this sense, datum (4) had property of non-detachability. Second, datum (4) implied that to have IND was the best choice. However, the implication could

vanish if either IND was good only for certain countries or IND strengthened Iran enemies. This showed that datum (4) fulfilled the property of defeasibility. Third, the clause *“if it doesn't change”* might refer to whether or not Iran could change its regime, if seen from Steve's question, –i.e. *“Do you believe that Iran's government is a government that is capable of changing its ways?”* The change of Iranian regime related to Iran's ability to not breach the deal again. Besides, based on Obama's following statement – i.e. *“Now, ideally, we would see a situation in which Iran, seeing sanctions reduced, would start focusing on its economy, on training its people, on reentering the world community, to lessening its provocative activities in the region”* –the clause *“if it doesn't change”* might mean whether or not IND could improve Iran's economy and relation to the world community. Meanwhile, the clause *“we are so much better if we have this deal”* could be assumed that the word *“better”* here was only for the United States and Iran. Some people thought Obama made IND to manipulate Iran to realize American's projects in the region. Conversely, the United States's Allies such as England, France, Russia, China and Germany got only marginal role. The while, Iran's goal on IND was to expand its power toward countries in the Middle East. On the other hand, *“better”* here if seen from Obama's speech at American University in Washington might mean that IND was the best choice since according to him America's legislators had only choices either diplomacy or war. The previous facts indicated that datum (4) had the property of universality. Four, to arrive at the right interpretation of the datum (4), processes of interpretation were necessary to undertake. Lexically Obama stated that IND was so much better to do, though Iran did change. Besides, based on the context, the word *“it”* referred to Iran having nuclear deal with the United States and its allies. Moreover, based on Steve's question –i.e. *“Do you believe that Iran's government is a government that is capable of changing its ways?”* – the word *“change”* in the datum (4) referred to whether or not Iran could change its regime. In this point, Obama flouted maxim of relevance toward Steve's question because the utterance of the datum (4) did not answer Steve's question about whether Obama believed in the change of Iranian regime or not. The flout might imply certain intended meaning. Meanwhile, based on the background knowledge about IND, the deal was undertaken since the American legislators had only two choices either diplomacy or war. In conclusion, from the previous interpretation processes what Obama implicated was that he could not answer whether or not he believed in the change of Iranian regime. Yet, he wanted to emphasize that IND was the best decision because Iran having nuclear weapons was much more dangerous to the world than one having advantageous from exemption from the international sanctions. In this matter, datum (4) fulfilled the property of calculability.

To conclude, datum (4) contained property of defeasibility, non-detachability, universality, and calculability. Meanwhile, based on those properties, datum (4)'s intended message was that Obama emphasized that IND was the best decision. According to him, letting Iran produce nuclear weapons would be much more dangerous to the world rather than exempting Iran for the international sanctions of the nuclear production.

Datum (5)

In regard ofPoCI, some points in datum (5) were necessary to explore. Firstly, the word “think” was synonymous with the word “feel” (“think”, 2008). The word “feel” was used to express an opinion (Hornby, 1995). So, the word “feel” was suitable to be used in the datum (5)' context. It was because what Obama meant by the word “think” in the datum (5) was to express an opinion about differences in Iran. Therefore, if Obama said “*I — I feel that there are different trends inside of Iran*” instead of “*I — I think that there are different trends inside of Iran,*” the datum (5)' intended messages stayed similar. That was because the word “think” was same as the word “feel”. This demonstrated that datum (5) refers to property of non-detachability. Secondly, the phrase “different trends” might refer to any trend for those who did not know the context. They might think “trends” included politics or economy or culture and so on. However, the phrase “different trends” here, based on Obama's next utterance (i.e. “*I think there are hard-liners inside of Iran that think it is the right thing to do to oppose us, to seek to destroy Israel, to cause havoc in places like Syria or Yemen or Lebanon. And then I think there are others inside Iran who think that this is counterproductive. And it is possible that if we sign this nuclear deal, we strengthen the hand of those more moderate forces inside of Iran*”), demonstrated that not all Iranians agreed with IND. This matter was the evidence that non-conventionality belongs to datum (5). Furthermore, it was necessary to do processes of interpretation in order to comprehend intended message of the datum (5). From the lexical content Obama revealed that there were different trends inside of Iran. Moreover, Obama flouted maxim of relevance toward Steve's question about whether or not Obama believed that Iran was able to change its regime. The word “different” here meant not all Iranians had the same thought. Meanwhile, Obama's following statements –i.e. “*I think there are hard-liners inside of Iran that think it is the right thing to do to oppose us, to seek to destroy Israel, to cause havoc in places like Syria or Yemen or Lebanon. And then I think there are others inside Iran who think that this is counterproductive. And it is*

possible that if we sign this nuclear deal, we strengthen the hand of those more moderate forces inside of Iran”–reinforced what was meant by “different trends inside of Iran”. So, Obama’s intended message of the datum (5) was that he could not answer whether he believed in Iran’s capability of changing its regime or not since not all Iranians agreed with IND. The previous processes of interpretation indicated that datum (5) referred to the property of calculability.

In conclusion, datum (5) referred to the property of non-detachability, non-conventionality, and calculability. Meanwhile, based on those properties, the datum (5)’s intended message was that Obama could not answer whether he believed in Iran’s capability of changing its regime or not since not all Iranians agreed with IND.

3.2. Excerpt 2

Except 2 consisted of one datum. The datum was about disadvantageous of economic growth in Iran after IND was formalized. The emergence of the datum was begun when Steve concluded Obama’s previous statements that if Iran started to reproduce nuclear, lifting of many sanctions against Iran would be done. Steve also restated Obama’s statement that IND was good for economic growth in Iran. Nonetheless, at the same time, Steve stated his skeptic about the disadvantageous of Iran’s economic growth.

Steve: =Obviously, the tradeoff for the concessions on the nuclear program is the lifting of many sanctions against Iran(.).

Obama: Yes

Steve: [...] **How if at all, can you prevent Iran from using its new wealth over the next several years to support Bashar al-Assad of Syria, to support Hezbollah, adventures in Yemen, or elsewhere?**

Obama: Well, you know, those are relevant issues. And it is true::: that Iran would not be entering into any deal, I assume (.) if in fact their economy (.) was not under significant pressure [...]

Datum (6)

(6)

In regard of PoCI, there were some points in datum (6) dealing with it. The first one was that the word “prevent” was synonymous with the word “avert”(“prevent”, 2008). The word “avert” matched to be used in datum (6)’s context since that word was used to express “to prevent something” (Hornby, 1995). Meanwhile, what Steve meant by prevent in datum (6) was preventing Iran from using its wealth to support its allies. Hence, if the word “prevent” in the datum (6) was replaced with the word “avert,” its intended message was still similar. Its intended message remained that Obama could not answer whether he believed in Iran’s capability of changing its regime or not since not all Iranians agreed with IND. In this sense datum (6) has property of non-detachability. The second one was that before getting intended question of the datum (6), processes of interpretation were needed. Lexically Steve asked Obama about how if IND made Iran support its allies. Based on the context, “you” here referred to IND instead of Obama. Meanwhile, if seen from background knowledge, Bashar al-Assad of Syria, Hezbollah, adventures in Yemen are countries which allied with Iran and often made damage in the world. So, Steve’s intended question was probably “you said IND is for the world peace. However, how about will Iran use its new wealth the following several years to support the crime of Bashar al-Assad of Syria, Hezbollah, adventures in Yemen or elsewhere?” In this matter, property of calculability belonged to the datum (6).

In short, datum (6) could be categorized into the property of non-detachability and calculability. Meanwhile, based on the two properties, this datum’s intended message was that Obama could not answer whether he believed in Iran’s capability of changing its regime or not since not all Iranians agreed with IND.

3.3. Excerpt 3

This excerpt had two datum which was about what Obama could anticipate about Iran’s violating IND. The datum arose when Steve restated Obama’s argument that IND was for economic growth in Iran. Nonetheless, Steve doubt that Iran would violate IND especially at the time when American business people and European business people did business with Iran. So, Steve asked Obama what he could anticipate. Then Obama said that the answer for that question would be details of IND draft. Meanwhile, the details still needed to work out over the next two to three months.

Steve: This is widely anticipated (.) to cause a lot of economic growth in Iran. Iranian business people are already banking on this.[...] But if there is a

disagreement about whether Iran violates them, aren't you going to face the same problem? = There will be American business people and European business people who will be doing business with Iran, who will be making a lot of money, who will be very reluctant to have that happen. [...] And you can do that again?

Obama: =Well, the (.) (right) We're not going to make this subject (.) to the typical Security Council where one country can hold out (.) and you can't get this done. But these are details that still have to work out (.) be worked out, Steve. **So I don't want to give the false impression that (.) we have all this resolved.** This is why I have said this is an important first step that we've taken. We have a political framework and an understanding, but the devil is in the details, and over the next two to three months we are going to be in a very tough series of negotiations (.) to make sure that the mechanisms we've set in place actually work. [...] **Undoubtedly, the Iranians are going to have some differences in terms of how we implement all the things that have been discussed (.) in the political framework, and this drafting process is going to be really, really tough.**

(7)

(8)

Datum (7)

There were some points in the datum (7) dealing with PoCI. First, the word “false” was similar to the word “wrong” (“false”, 2008). The word “wrong” could be used in datum (7)’s context because that word was used to say something not right (Hornby, 1995). Meanwhile, what Obama meant by the word “false” in the datum (7) was impression which was not right about the details of IND. Thus, if the above statement is replaced with “*So I don't want to give the **faithless** impression that we have all this resolved,*” the change changed nothing to the datum (7)’s intended message. That intended message remained that Obama did not want to answer Steve’s question about whether or not he could guarantee that Iran would not violate IND since details of the deal had not completed yet. This matter demonstrated that property of non-detachability adhered at the datum (7). Second, the datum (7) enabled to derive two different interpretations. If seen from background knowledge that IND would still be formalized in the following month, what Obama meant by uttering the utterance in the datum (7) was to avoid people’ guess that IND had been formalized. On the other hand, based on cooperative principle, Obama flouted quantity maxim of being informative. Steve asked about whether or not he could prevent Iran from violating IND. However, Obama seemed avoiding the question by uttering some utterances which were uninformative. One of the utterances was “*So I don't want to give the false impression that we have all this resolved*”. Thus, Obama’s intended message in the

datum (7) was that he would not answer Steve's question about whether or not he could prevent Iran from violating IND since the draft of that deal was in progress. The previous facts indicated that property of universality belonged to the datum (7). Third, some processes of interpretation were needed to get proper interpretation of the datum (7). Lexically, Obama said that he did not want to give the false impression that IND was done. Moreover, Obama flouted maxim of quantity. Steve asked about his believing in Iran. However, Obama replied it by telling that he did not want to give the false impression on the details of IND draft. Besides, based on Obama's previous utterance, "*But these are details that still have to work out — be worked out,*" the datum (7) implied that draft of IND was not done yet. So, what Obama meant by uttering the utterance of datum (7) was that Obama did not want to answer Steve's question about whether or not he could guarantee that Iran would not violate IND since details of the deal had not completed yet. Those processes of interpretation demonstrated that datum (7) had property of calculability.

To conclude, datum (7) can be classified into the property of non-detachability, universality, and calculability. Meanwhile, what Obama implied through this conversational implicature was he did not want to answer Steve's question about whether or not he could guarantee that Iran would not violate IND since details of the deal was not complete yet.

Datum (8)

As regards PoCI, datum (8) had some points which required to be discussed. The first one was that the word "implement" in the datum (8) was synonymous with the word "apply". The word "apply" was used to say "to use pressure in order to operate something" (Hornby, 1995). This meant the word "apply" was suitable for the datum (8)'s context. This was because what Obama meant by the word "implement" in datum (8) was Iran stopped producing nuclear in order to operate IND. Thus, it did not change what Obama intended to convey if the word "implement" in the datum (8) was changed into the word "apply." His intended message was still that to anticipate Iran from violating the deal, the drafting process should be tightened. This case indicated that property of non-detachability adheres at datum (8). The second one was that Obama implied that though Iran and the United States would coincide with the political framework, it possibly emerged problems especially in case of the implementation. So the drafting process of IND would be tightened. However, the implication could be cancelled if the

draft maker really anticipated the emergence of the problems. In this sense, datum (8) had property of defeasibility. The last one was that to comprehend the speaker's intended message in the datum (8) the processes of interpretation were required. Lexically, Obama revealed that there would be some problems of IND details in term of the implementation. Besides, Obama flouted maxim of relevance through being irrelevant toward Steve's question. Steve's question was about whether or not Obama could guarantee that Iran would keep obeying IND. Answer of this question should be either yes or no along with its explanation. Nonetheless, Obama's answer concerned with the implementation of political frameworks in IND. This meant he implied something. Moreover, Obamas's next utterance (i.e. ... *"the devil is in the details"*...) also indicated that there would be some problems in term of the draft of IND. If so, what Obama implicated was he could not guarantee Iran's obeying IND. However, to anticipate Iran from violating the deal, the drafting process should be tightened. So, those interpretation processes showed that datum (8) referred to the property of calculability.

In conclusion, the datum (8) contained the property of non-detachability, defeasibility, and calculability. Meanwhile, based on those properties, this datum's intended message was that to anticipate Iran from violating the deal, the drafting process should be tightened.

3.4. Excerpt 4

Excerpt (4) contained one datum. That datum was Israel's demand to be a part of IND when it was formalized. The datum emerged when Steve conveyed that Prime Minister of Israel, Netanyahu demanded to be got involved in IND when the deal was finalized. Steve also said that the demand was irrational for diplomats. However, according to him many people would consider it to be a reasonable demand.

Steve: Prime Minister Netanyahu, who you mentioned (.) has added demand in recent days. He said that as part of this deal (.) when it's finalized, Iran should recognize the state of Israel (.) You're smiling as I, as I say that. Diplomats might see that as an obviously inappropriate (.) demand to make in this negotiation, but it sounds reasonable on its face. Many people will find that to be a reasonable=

Obama: =Well-well

Steve: **Why not do that?**

Obama: Well, let me say this (.) it's not that (.) the idea of Iran recognizing Israel (.) is unreasonable. It's completely reasonable and ((LAUGH)) that's U.S. policy.

Datum (9)

In regard of PoCI, there were some points in the datum (9) relating to it. First, if Steve revealed “*Why not **approve** that?*” instead of “*why not do that?*” intended question of the datum (9) was same. The word “approve” was suitable for being used in datum (9)’s context. The word “approve” could be used to express agreeing to accept a request (Hornby, 1995). What Steve meant by the word “do” in datum (9) was agreeing to accept Israel’s request in getting involved Israel in IND. Meanwhile, datum (9)’s intended question was that “if Israel as your ally yet Iran’ enemy wants to be a part of IND, also not all people seems agreeing that demand, will you agree with that demand?” This case was the indication that datum (9) had property of non-detachability. Second, to arrive at correct assumption for the datum (9), processes of interpretation were necessary to do. Steve’s question literally was about whether Obama agreed with Israel’s demand to be part of IND when it was finalized or not. Moreover, based on Steve’s previous statement –i.e. “*Diplomats might see that as an obviously inappropriate demand to make in this negotiation, but it sounds reasonable on its face. Many people will and that to be a reasonable*” –the datum (9) demonstrated that not all people disagreed with that demand. Additionally, if seen from background knowledge, Israel and The United States were allies. The United States promised to give hand and protect the Jews entities in Israel. Thus, Steve’s intended question in the datum (9) might be “If Israel as you ally yet Iran’ enemy wants to be a part of IND also not all people seems agreeing that demand, will you agree with that demand? Those interpretation processes indicated that property of calculability adhered at the datum (9).

In short, datum (9) could be categorized into the property of non-detachability, and calculability. Meanwhile, based on the two properties, Steve’s intended question might be “If Israel as you ally yet Iran’ enemy wants to be a part of IND also not all people seems agreeing that demand, will you agree with that demand?”

3.5. Excerpt 5

Excerpt 5 had two datum. This datum was about suggestions for Israel if IND was formalized. It arose when Steve stated that Israel’s demand for being got involved underlined a broader concern that Israel had. He also concluded Obama’s previous

statement that due to IND, Israel had to defend in ten or fifteen years and longer with a country which was fundamentally opposed to the existence of Israel.

Steve: =The demand that's being made there, (.) of course, underlies a broader concern that Israelis have. You're suggesting implying through this nuclear that Israel must live another 10 or 15 years and longer with a country that is fundamentally opposed to the existence of Israel. **How should Israelis think about Iran↓ in the years to come↓**

(10)

Obama: [...] **The most important thing for Israelis is, to know that they can defend↓ themselves, and that they have(.) America (.) the world's most powerful (.) country (.) there (.) to protect them along:::side>their military and their intelligence operations<**

(11)

Datum (10)

Some points in datum (10) dealing with PoCI were required to be explored. Firstly, the word “how” in the datum (10) could be changed into the word “wherein”. In spite of that, the change did not change the datum (10)’s intended message. That intended message remained same namely Steve wanted to ask Obama about what Israel needed to do if IND was formalized. That was because the word “wherein” was used to say “in what respect”. So, it meant that datum (10) referred to property of non-detachability. Secondly, to get comprehension about intended message of the datum (10) required some interpretation processes. Lexically, Steve asked about how Israelis should think about Iran in the years to come. In addition, the clause “*how Israelis should think about Iran*” –based on the context –dealt with IND. Moreover, if seen from background knowledge, these two countries were inimical. Accordingly, Steve’s intended question was “according to you what does Israel need to do if IND is formalized?” The process showed that property of calculability belongs to this datum.

To conclude, datum (10) could be classified into the property of non-detachability, and calculability. Meanwhile, what Steve implied through the conversational implicature in the datum (10) was what Israel needed to do if IND was formalized.

4. DISCUSSION

Properties of conversational implicatures found in the datum were in line with properties of conversational implicatures constructed by Grice (1975). However, to a great extent, there were the incompatibilities between properties of conversational implicatures discovered in the findings and properties of conversational implicatures proposed by Grice (1975) including non-conventionality, universality, defeasibility, reinforceability, calculability and non-detachability.

Interpretations of conversational implicatures in the datum relied on its context. The findings were in line with Grice (1975)'s property of non-conventionality. According to him, non-conventionality refers to what is conversationally implicated cannot be a part of the conventional meaning of what is revealed¹³. In spite of that, the findings above indicated the context was insufficient to comprehend the datum's implied message. That implied message was intelligible if both the context and the background knowledge were involved in process of interpreting the datum.

Moreover, the findings showed that the datum was made explicit. The findings were quite similar to property of reinforceability proposed by Grice's (1975) –the property of reinforceability deals with conversational implicature which is made explicit without producing too much of a sense of redundancy¹⁴. Nonetheless, there were several points which made the findings were not precisely similar to Grice (1975)'s property of reinforceability. Firstly, what was made explicit in the datum was not its intended meaning instead of its lexical aspect. Secondly, the lexical aspect which was made explicit functioned both as modifier and as cause-effect. Thirdly, some datum was made explicit not within the datum itself yet by its previous and following datum.

In addition, the datum required the processes of interpretation which was identified based on the datum's lexical content, context, Cooperative Principle and its maxims, and background knowledge to achieve the datum's intended message. The findings corresponded to Grice (1975)'s notion about property of calculability. The property of calculability is defined as identifiable process of calculation and reasoning in interpreting conversational implicature including (i) the lexical content (ii) the Cooperative Principle and its maxims, (iii) the linguistic and non-linguistic context of the utterance, (iv) background knowledge, (v) the

¹³ Chapman, S. *Pragmatics*. (England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)

¹⁴ *ibid*

assumption¹⁵. However, the order of the processes was different. The Cooperative Principle and its maxims was in the third process rather than in the second process since Cooperative Principle and its maxims was hard to examine before examining the context of the utterance. Besides, some datum did not need background knowledge to be interpreted. It was because the interpretation was intelligible only through its context. Moreover, it was found that flouting maxim of relevance was automatically flouting maxim of quantity. In short, if certain utterance was irrelevant, ultimately the utterance was uninformative. It could be because the measurement of the informativeness was in its relevance. Similarly, it was unable to find maxim of relevance and quantity in questions. That might be because to see the relevancy and the informativeness, there should be preceding utterance to relate this utterance to the preceding one. The while this question was the beginner.

Meanwhile, the findings demonstrated if word of the datum was replaced with its synonym, the replacement did not change its intended message. The findings proved that Grice (1975)'s property of non-detachability could exist in conversational implicature. According to him, non-detachability property deals with the semantic content of what is said, rather than linguistic form used¹⁶. Thus, if word of a conversational implicature is replaced with its synonym, meaning of that conversational implicature remains same¹⁷. Nevertheless, it was found several problems in non-detachability property. The first one was that two similar words sometimes had no similarities in term of the use. The second one was that if certain word was replaced with its synonym, it made structure of that utterance awkward. The last one was that if certain word of the datum was changed into its synonym it sounded funny.

Additionally, some datum derived different interpretations if seen from different perspectives such as the context, cooperativeness toward the question proposed by the interviewer, and background knowledge. The findings were in line with what Grice (1975) meant by property of universality. The property of universality refers

¹⁵ Pott, C. *Presupposition and Implicature*. (Stanford Linguistics, 2012).

¹⁶ Bublitz, W., & Norrick, N. R. *Foundations of Pragmatics*. (Germany: De Gruyter Mouton, 2011)

¹⁷ Wang, H. Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension. (*Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2011).

to implicature which potentially derives different interpretations because the implicature's meaning is sometimes indeterminate¹⁸.

Furthermore, the findings proved that meanings of conversational implicatures were defeasible if they were inconsistent with their background knowledge. The findings were in line with Grice (1975)'s theory of property of defeasibility. Defeasibility property concerns with meaning of conversational implicatures which can be cancelled if they are inconsistent with semantic entailments, background or ontological knowledge, contexts, and priority conversational implicatures¹⁹. Nevertheless, what was canceled in some datum was not its conversational meaning yet one of its lexical items. Besides, implied meanings in some datum which was in the form of questions could not be canceled.

Overall, the findings proved that all the datum contained three to six properties of conversational implicatures proposed by Grice (1975). The properties which often existed in the datum were non-detachability, and calculability. On the other hand, the properties which rarely emerged were non-conventionality, defeasibility, reinforceability, and universality. However, properties of conversational implicatures which existed in the datum were bit different from Grice (1975)'s conversational implicature properties. In other words, further studies are required to undertake for sake of perfecting the existing theory of conversational implicature properties.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Conclusion

This section concerned with the answer for research question formulated in chapter one. That was "*How are the properties of conversational implicature used by the interviewer and the interviewee on Iran Nuclear Deal interview?*" The answer was based on the findings above.

Properties of conversational implicatures produced by the interviewer and the interviewee on interview of Iran Nuclear Deal (IND) involved properties of

¹⁸ Bublitz, W., & Norrick, N. R. *Foundations of Pragmatics*. (Germany: De Gruyter Mouton, 2011)

¹⁹ *ibid*

conversational implicature proposed by Grice (1975) such as cancelability, non-conventionality, non-detachability, indeterminacy, calculability, and reinforceability.

The property of cancelability existed in the datum 2, 3, 4, 8, 11, and 16 since the six datum was inconsistent with background or ontological assumptions. Meanwhile, the property of reinforceability was in the datum 2, 5, 11, 12, and 15. The five datum had this property because the datum was made explicit without being redundant. The next property, non-conventionality, belonged to the datum 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, and 16. That was because the six datum was worked out using its context in order to find its meaning. Moreover, the property of calculability emerged in all the datum in findings since all the datum required identifiable process of reasoning such as the linguistically coded content of the utterance, the linguistic and non-linguistic context of the utterance, the Cooperative Principle and its maxims, background knowledge, and the assumption in order to find its intended message. Furthermore, all the datum had property of non-detachability because one of the words of each datum did not change its conversational implicature meaning if replaced with its synonym. The last property, Indeterminacy was discovered in the datum 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, and 16. It was because meaning of conversational implicature of the nine datum was indeterminate.

5.2. Recommendations

Based on the findings and the discussion, some recommendations were derived. The first one is for the next researchers –who are interested in investigating properties of conversational implicature. In case of subject, they should involve subject outside political discourse. They can take religion discourse, in sermon for example. It is because sometimes in this speech event, the advice is revealed using conversational implicature in order to euphemize the advice. Another subject that the next researchers may choose is students of expatriate school. In such the school students commonly are from different countries along with different cultures. The differences in the cultures may carry various conversational implicatures. The students' activity, the next researchers take as the datum is when they have class presentation precisely in question and answer session. In the session, many of the students will speak up. The utterance uttered by every student is assumed to have unique properties of conversational implicature. In spite of that sermon and class presentation have tendency to be set. In short, they are not fully spontaneous speaking. It is because when people want to speak in front of many people – including in sermon and class presentation –generally they have made a draft in case of what they will speak up. If so, if the next researchers prefer natural and

spontaneous speaking, they may take conversation between people who are doing a transaction in a market. In this speech event, properties of conversational implicatures relating to social aspect can probably be achieved. Furthermore, in any speech event, the next researchers take, they should know its background knowledge since to comprehend conversational implicature one has to know not only the context but also background knowledge. Additionally, the next researchers should use participant observation as the datum instrument. Collecting the datum through this observation enables to get deep comprehension about the context. Similarly, to get deeper comprehension about the context, they can use the theory of ethnography of SPEAKING's Dell Hymes. Moreover, the next researchers do not need to use theory of conversational implicature properties proposed by Grice (1975). Properties of conversational implicature's Grice (1975) have little differences from properties of conventional implicature. To find out properties of conversational implicature, the next researchers can use grounded theory since no one has proposed theory of conversational implicature properties except Grice (1975).

Meanwhile, with reference to properties of conversational implicature's Grice (1975) there should be background knowledge in comprehending the property of non-conventionality since sometimes context is not able to interpret conversational implicature. In addition, the property of calculability is useful as the steps in interpreting conversational implicature. []

REFERENCES

- Adaoma, I. E. (2016). Analyzing the Political Speeches of Obama on “Race and Economic Renewal in America” in the Light of the Theory of Conversational Implicature. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Science*.7(3), 253-262.
- Amir. (2015). *Apa di Balik Perjanjian Kerangka Kerja Dengan Iran Seputar Program Nuklirnya?* HTI. Retrieved from <http://hizbut-tahrir.or.id/2015/04/16/apa-di-balik-perjanjian-kerangka-kerja-dengan-iran-seputar-program-nuklirnya/>
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analyse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bublitz, W., & Norrick, N. R. (2011). *Foundations of Pragmatics*. Germany: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Chapman, S. (2011). *Pragmatics*. England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Februarini, R. (n.d.). *Sejarah Hubungan Antara Amerika Serikat dengan Kuba*. Academia edu. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/12824170/Sejarah_Hubungan_Antara_Amerika_Serikat_dengan_Kuba
- Hawskin, P. (2015). *The Girl on the Train Novel*. Random House Group Company.
- Hornby, A. S. (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kantor (n.d.). *A man who had no eyes Short Story*.
- Kaster, Carolyn. (2015). *Obama tentang Perjanjian Nuklir Iran: Pilih Diplomasi daripada Perang*. VOA. Retrieved from <http://www.voaindonesia.com/a/obama-tentang-perjanjian-nuklir-iran-pilih-diplomasi-daripada-perang/2903729.html>
- Larson, (n.d.). *A Metropolitan Man Drama*.

- Novianingrum, D. (2015). *Conversational Implicature on ABC Interview between Barbara Walters and Syrian President Bashar al-Assad*. State Islamic University of SyarifHidayatullah Jakarta. Jakarta.
- NPR.(2015, June 16). Transcript of Interview of Iran Nuclear Deal. [Web log post]. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/2015/04/07/397933577/transcript-president-obamas-full-npr-interview-on-iran-nuclear-deal>
- Pott, C. (2012). *Presupposition and Implicature*. Stanford Linguistics.
- Putri, W. (2011). *An Analysis of Implicature as Found in Transcript of Interview between Barack Obama and HisyamMelhem from al-Arabiya TV*. Andalas University. Padang.
- Wang, H. (2011). Conversational Implicature in English Listening Comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 2(5), 1162-1167.
- Yule, G.(2010).*The Study of Language*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.