

Identification Conversational Implicature of Integrated Islamic School Ad Durrah Learners

Mhd. Syafril Hanif¹, Sholihatul Hamidah Daulay²

^{1,2}Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Medan,, Indonesia
mhd.syafrilhanif@uinsu.ac.id

Abstract. The purpose of this study was to collect descriptions of the conversational implicatures made by students while they were engaged in a dialogue of other students. The descriptive qualitative research method was used in this study. The writer used student conversations from the student dialogue conversation task as the data source for this study. This activity was carried out between October and November of 2023 as part of the study's data collection methodology, which involved asking students to create a dialogue on paper. By recording the dialogue's outcomes, categorizing and identifying the data, assessing the data, and summarizing the data, the data was qualitatively analyzed. The primary tool used in this study was the researcher herself, along with observations and interviews to corroborate the findings. The study's conclusions are as follows: conversational implicatures that were identified in student speeches and discussion were divided into two categories: generalized and particularized implicatures. Compared to the implicature of a particularized conversational implicature, the generalized conversational implicature is more frequently encountered. Because of this, even if they do not yet grasp conversational implicature, kids essentially already use it. Based on the study's findings, the researcher recommends that English teachers provide students with a foundational understanding of conversational implicature in writing, particularly when teaching conversation, narrative texts, and other types of texts.

Keyword: Conversational; Implicature; Descriptive; Particularized

Received: 28-02-2024

Revised: 26-04-2025

Accepted: 30-09-2025

Corresponding Author: Mhd. Syafril Hanif; mhd.syafrilhanif@uinsu.ac.id



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

INTRODUCTION

Language is an integral part of human life, serving as the primary medium for communication. It allows individuals to express thoughts, emotions, and ideas clearly and effectively. To ensure that messages are understood as intended, language must be used efficiently. A shared language facilitates mutual comprehension among speakers, enabling the exchange of information, including inquiries about people, locations, professions, directions, and even emotions such as

love, frustration, despair, or sympathy. The effectiveness of communication depends on how well speakers and listeners interact.

However, interpersonal dialogue doesn't always run smoothly. Miscommunications can arise from lies, ambiguities, or irrelevant discussions that can leave participants feeling confused, particularly in written exchanges. As Blert (2017) notes, writing is a form of human communication that utilizes signs and symbols to express language and emotion. It serves as an extension of spoken language in many cultures. Writing offers a means to convey spoken thoughts, but it should not be confused with language itself.

Students often struggle to translate discussions into writing. In their spoken exchanges, they engage in a natural question-and-answer format. Yet, authentic conversations also involve nuances that are easily overlooked. Many students in the English Education Department write dialogues that lack conversational implicatures. Furthermore, they often use these implicatures in spoken language without even realizing it. They engage in conversation, unaware of the subtleties and implications woven into their words.

Conversational implicature, as defined by Grice in 1967, refers to situations where the intended meaning extends beyond the literal interpretation of words. In everyday conversations, what remains unspoken can be understood as conversational implicature. Levinson (1983) further elaborates that the term "implicature" is often used to distinguish this kind of meaning from logical implication. Essentially, it focuses on grasping the deeper significance behind words, sentences, or statements during interactions.

Conversational implicatures are understood and interpreted when both the speaker and listener consider the specific context of the conversation. Grice (1975, as cited in Cummings 2005) contends that violations of the cooperative principle's maxims can lead to the emergence of conversational implicature. While the formal term "conversational implicature" is accurate, the simpler term "implicature" is often used in practice.

Grice also categorizes implicatures into two types: generalized implicatures and particularized implicatures. A generalized conversational implicature occurs when no additional contextual information is necessary to interpret the implied meaning. Levinson (1983) describes it as an occurrence that lacks reliance on specific contextual features. In other words, the additional meaning can be derived without needing specific background knowledge or assumptions. According to Grice (1989), this type of implicature is characterized by the use of a particular word form in an utterance that typically conveys this additional meaning under normal circumstances.

For instance, consider the following exchange:

A: *"Hey! I'm just watching Twice's music video on YouTube. "*

B: *"Oh really? Have you watched Red Velvet's concert video in North Korea? "*

In this conversation, when B responds with "Oh really? " and follows up with "Have you seen Red Velvet's concert video in North Korea? ", the intent is to keep the dialogue flowing. This statement serves as a reaction to A's comment while simultaneously steering the conversation in a new direction. A's remark, "Hey! I'm just watching Twice's music video," clearly indicates her current activity, but B deviates from the topic of Twice to introduce a new subject, which demonstrates a subtle conversational implicature. B's inquiry shifts the focus of the discussion, thus breaking the rule of quantity by not elaborating on A's video.

Another example of generalized conversational implicature can be seen in this exchange analyzed by Najwa (2016) in the context of the movie "Frozen":

David: *"Did you invite Bella and Riko to your party tonight? "*

Lenita: *"I invited Bella. "*

Lenita's response lacks a specific context within the exchange. Initially, there seems to be ambiguity until David nudges further about whether Riko will also be attending the celebration. Lenita's comment only mentions inviting Bella, implicitly suggesting that Riko was not invited. This scenario illustrates generalized conversational implicature, where the meaning conveyed can be understood without additional context.

According to Paltridge (2006:70), conversational implicatures arise not merely from the words used but rather from the specific context in which they are spoken. These implicatures stem from the relational maxim, meaning the speaker anticipates that the listener will discern the intended meaning by considering the relevance of the conversation. Yule (1996:234) further explains that particularized conversational implicatures convey an additional implied meaning that relies on specific or local knowledge. These implicatures manifest when certain assumptions are made within particular conversational settings, necessitating a unique context for their interpretation.

Take, for instance, the following exchange between A and D:

D: *"Hehehe... oh my God. But thanks anyway. Actually, I'm not an expert cook, but when I went to my hometown, I learned cooking from my mom. Well, what kinds of ingredients did you use?"*

A: *"Hoo, I see. Nice relationship between mother and daughter. Hmm, I included some potatoes, chillies, cabbage, peppers, onions, garlic, and salt. Am I correct?"*

D: *"Carrots?"*

In this dialogue, A's inquiry, "What kind of ingredients did you use?" and D's subsequent question about carrots illustrate a particularized conversational implicature. A goes into detail about the spices, prompting D's response that relies on the context of their earlier conversation. This exchange highlights how specialized contextual knowledge informs the implicature present in their dialogue. Discussions often unfold within distinct settings like this, where understanding the intended meaning behind specific phrases relies on contextual inferences. Notably, the questions posed within this discourse are interrogative, further enriching the conversation.

Here is a rewritten version of the provided text: An illustrative example from another researcher can be found in Najwa's 2016 analysis of conversational implicature in the movie "Frozen".

"In a conversation, Ana asks: *"Hey, are you coming to Willy's party?"* to which Samuel replies, *"My parents are visiting."*

As demonstrated by this exchange, Samuel's response to Ana's question is somewhat insufficient. Rather than providing a clear yes or no answer, he fails to clarify whether he can attend the party due to his parents' visit. To enhance the clarity of his response, Samuel could have stated, "No, I can't come to Willy's party tonight because my parents are visiting." This would clearly inform Ana that he will be spending the evening with his parents, who prefer quiet family time. Ultimately, the meaning of Samuel's response deeply relies on the context of the conversation, placing it within the realm of specific conversational implicature.

Grice (1991) outlines five key characteristics of conversational implicature:

1. In certain situations, conversational implicatures can be canceled either explicitly or through context.
2. Conversational implicatures are often inseparable from what is actually said. Typically, there are no more suitable alternatives for expressing certain ideas, leading people to rely on conversations rich in implicature to convey their intended meanings.
3. While conversational implicature depends on the conventional meaning of the sentence used, the implications themselves are not part of that conventional meaning.

4. The truth of the content conveyed through conversational implicature is not determined solely by the words spoken, but rather can be inferred from the manner in which those words are expressed.
5. It is challenging to provide precise definitions for the nature of conversational implicatures.

In agreement with Grice's earlier views, H. P. Grice (as cited in Mujiyono, 1996: 40) identifies five key characteristics of conversational implicature:

1. **Cancelability:** In certain situations, conversational implicatures may be canceled either through explicit statements or by contextual cues.
2. **Non-detachability:** Typically, there is no other more fitting way to convey a message without relying on utterances that include the implicature, making them inseparable.
3. **Non-conventionality:** While conversational implicatures depend on the conventional meanings of the sentences used, their specific content is not encompassed by these conventional meanings.
4. **Calculability:** The truth of an implicature's content is not solely reliant on what is explicitly stated; rather, it can be inferred through the manner in which the speaker delivers their message.
5. **Indeterminacy:** Conversational implicatures resist precise definitions, making their nature somewhat ambiguous.

In addition to Grice's framework, C. Stephen Levinson (1997: 119) outlines four primary characteristics of conversational implicature:

1. **Cancelability:** This implies that a conclusion can be retracted if additional premises or reasons are introduced that challenge the original statement.
2. **Non-detachability:** Implicature is inextricably linked to the semantic content of what is spoken, meaning that it cannot be separated from the speech itself.
3. **Calculability:** Each implicature should theoretically allow for the construction of an argument that aligns the literal meaning of the speech with cooperative principles and their respective maxims.
4. **Non-conventionality:** Understanding the literal meaning often necessitates recognizing the implicature within a specific context, as implicature does not form part of that conventional meaning.

Overall, the insights from these three scholars reveal a shared perspective on the characteristics of conversational implicature. Unified, their conclusions highlight that conversational implicature possesses the following traits: (1) it can be canceled in certain contexts (cancelability); (2) it is often inseparable from how something is expressed (non-detachability); (3) it relies on a pre-existing understanding of the conventional meanings of the sentences involved (non-conventionality); and (4) the truth of the implicature is independent of what is specifically stated (calculability).

Levinson (1983) elaborates on the utility of the concept of conversational implicature, identifying four key benefits:

1. It facilitates a meaningful and functional explanation of linguistic phenomena that traditional linguistic theories might overlook.
2. The concept clarifies how the explicit spoken content can diverge from the speaker's true intention, while still being comprehensible to the listener.
3. It simplifies the semantic description of various relationships between clauses, even when those clauses share identical structural wording.
4. Limited number of foundational aspects of implicature can account for a wide array of seemingly unrelated or contradictory linguistic phenomena.

This research focuses on analyzing conversational implicature in writing, particularly in the context of classroom instruction. The theoretical framework explores how conversational implicature can be utilized in teaching writing effectively. The researcher aims to identify the forms and functions of conversational implicature within classroom discussions. To uncover these nuances, insights were gathered from both students and the instructor. The initial activity involved observing students during a lecture to gain a better understanding of their interactions.

Levinson (1983) defines conversational implicature as a term distinct from logical implications, entailments, and logical consequences, which are typically used to refer to inferences drawn solely from logical and semantic content. Through this research, the investigator hopes to enhance the understanding of conversational implicature for both students and instructors, showcasing its importance in the writing process.

METHOD

This research used descriptive method with qualitative approach or on the other hand it is descriptive qualitative. Descriptive qualitative research is the goal of qualitative descriptive studies with comprehensive summarization, in everyday terms, of specific events experienced by individuals or group of individuals. Qualitative research always has descriptive quality, it means that the data which are analyzed and the data analysis result have the form of phenomenon descriptive, not nominal form or coefficient about relationship among variable (Aminuddin, 1999). We could infer that qualitative research was systematic application of the problems and the data here that could be oral or written.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this research are derived from data collected through classroom observations and interviews. The observation was conducted on October 9, 2023, in the Topaz Class at Integrated Islamic School Ad Durrah Medan, focusing on the learning process and lasting approximately 120 minutes. Through careful analysis, the researcher identified 20 instances of conversational implicature linked to various communicative actions. Each instance sheds light on the primary intent behind the utterances made by the speakers. The data for this analysis was sourced from student conversation assignments, conducted on October 23, 2023. The first set consisted of dialogue samples from 10 randomly selected students out of a total of 32 in the Topaz Class. The second set included 22 instances categorized into generalized and particularized conversational implicature.

Generalized conversational implicature emerged as a means for speakers to indicate disinterest in the conversation topic, avoid certain statements, or shift the discussion in a new direction. In contrast, particularized conversational implicature was observed as an effort by some individuals to introduce a broader range of personal motivations into the discourse. The main objective of incorporating targeted conversational inquiry in students' assignments is to yield more accurate insights into their written communication styles.

Moreover, to enhance their understanding of writing English conversations whether in writing courses or other contexts students are encouraged to engage beyond simple yes-or-no questions. They can also apply Grice's principles regarding conversational implicature from pragmatic theory, fostering a deeper comprehension of the nuances involved in conversational exchanges.

Table 1.

Identification Conversational Implicature

No.	Dialogue Conversation	Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
1.	Student 001	7	3
2.	Student 002	7	3
3.	Student 003	9	1
4.	Student 004	7	3
5.	Student 005	8	2
6.	Student 006	8	2
7.	Student 007	7	3
8.	Student 008	5	5
9.	Student 009	7	3
10.	Student 010	7	3
Amount		72	28

Table 2.

Identification Conversational Implicature

No.	Dialogue Conversation Student 1	Conversational Implicature	
		Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
1.	I think it's late!		✓
2.	I'm looking for bread	✓	
3.	where is the cheese?	✓	
4.	I want ordinary cheese		✓
5.	what is the price for a piece of bread?	✓	
6.	I want to buy a piece of bread if it's cheap	✓	
7.	what about cheese?	✓	
8.	cheap well unlike anywhere else		✓
9.	okay, I'll buy this cheese	✓	
10.	This is the money, thank you	✓	

Table 3.

Identification Conversational Implicature			
No.	Dialogue Conversation Student 2	Conversational Implicature	
		Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
1.	So far I can still breathe. You?		✓
2.	what happened with him?	✓	
3.	You know? Ali also suffered from typhus	✓	
4.	I went to the hospital Yesterday	✓	
5.	I met his mother	✓	
6.	what if we visit them?	✓	
7.	when I finish tutoring		✓
8.	maybe I'm a bit late so		✓
	we just meet at the hospital		
9.	maybe I'm a bit late so we just meet at the hospital	✓	
10.	Don't forget to bring food for them	✓	

Table 4.

Identification Conversational Implicature			
No.	Dialogue Conversation Student 3	Conversational Implicature	
		Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
1.	please sign-in and have a seat	✓	
2.	let me pull your record	✓	
3.	I don't see it as long as it's here		✓
4.	who is your name?	✓	
5.	follow me to room 12 please. here we are	✓	
6.	what are your reasons for seeing me?	✓	
7.	any others?	✓	
8.	did you run a fever too?	✓	
9.	where there any changes in your diet or your weight lately?	✓	
10.	it looks like you have pneumonia other than that, I do not see any problems	✓	

Table 5.

Identification Conversational Implicature			
No.	Dialogue Conversation Student 4	Conversational Implicature	
		Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
1.	wait a minute		✓
2.	what time is it now?	✓	
3.	I'd like to make a reservation for 2 people on Friday night	✓	
4.	after praying, sir		✓
5.	I will discuss it with my friend first		✓
6.	what time after the Maghrib prayer <u>what</u> time is it sir?	✓	
7.	okay, my name is <u>asep</u>	✓	
8.	Don't forget to present the best	✓	
9.	I trust you	✓	
10.	I will promote this place later	✓	

Table 6.

Identification Conversational Implicature			
No.	Dialogue Conversation Student 5	Conversational Implicature	
		Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
1.	how will you get there?	✓	
2.	have you book your flight?	✓	
3.	same with you		✓
4.	where would you like to go <u>next?</u>	✓	
5.	can we take a <u>bus</u> instead?	✓	
6.	I will call my friend	✓	
7.	I just call her to ask her Condition		✓
8.	<u>hahaha</u> ... just kidding	✓	
9.	What about the <u>next?</u>	✓	
10.	that's bad	✓	

Table 7.

Identification Conversational Implicature

No.	Dialogue Conversation Student 6	Conversational Implicature	
		Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
1.	You didn't see it from before?	✓	
2.	you know	✓	
3.	cloudy sky again		✓
4.	soon the rain will come		✓
5.	Mother hasn't returned from the market	✓	
6.	why ask me?	✓	
7.	mother and father went to the market	✓	
8.	Mother may stop eating first and then go home	✓	
9.	not of your business	✓	
10.	well you know right!	✓	

Table 8.

Identification Conversational Implicature

No.	Dialogue Conversation Student 7	Conversational Implicature	
		Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
1.	his father is sick		✓
2.	ask directly, yes		✓
3.	I took the book first	✓	
4.	You don't intend to visit him?	✓	
5.	I will go after school Hours	✓	
6.	You can take the bus right?	✓	
7.	wait for me at the bus stop later	✓	
8.	I'll call you	✓	
9.	I bought it		✓
10.	You only need to bring Yourself	✓	

Table 9

Identification Conversational Implicature			
No.	Dialogue Conversation Student 8	Conversational Implicature	
		Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
1.	since the singer started singing I've been here		✓
2.	What do you want to drink?	✓	
3.	moccacino tastes good		✓
4.	suitable for tonight, don't you think?	✓	
5.	what are we going to discuss tonight?	✓	
6.	but I can't linger here	✓	
7.	but I'm just kidding	✓	
8.	Just look at the singers who are beautiful too		✓
9.	Your voice is good, but it's better if you don't Sing		✓
10.	Yo ariel Noah from hongkong/lu only need to bring yourself		✓

Table 10.

Identification Conversational Implicature			
No.	Dialogue Conversation Student 9	Conversational Implicature	
		Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
1.	It looks like you are happy Today	✓	
2.	I know, you must walk together with the Charman	✓	
3.	That's right, I'm just Guessing		✓
4.	It looks like you officially Invented	✓	
5.	did you come alone?	✓	
6.	wah, you're really great	✓	
7.	let's go have tea		✓
8.	Sweet tea tastes right		✓
9.	You will not invite him?	✓	
10.	but I will invite him hahaha ...	✓	

Table 11.

Identification Conversational Implicature

No.	Dialogue Conversation Student 10	Conversational Implicature	
		Generalized Conversational Implicature	Particularized Conversational Implicature
1.	I prefer fried rice than a Soup		✓
2.	I like spicy fried rice with Chicken		✓
3.	I have a receipt book from my mother	✓	
4.	I <u>need to</u> take the book first.	✓	
5.	I will come in a minute	✓	
6.	how much rice do I <u>have</u> to take?	✓	
7.	what do I have to <u>do</u> next?	✓	
8.	the salt is already beside you		✓
9.	it smells really yummy	✓	
10.	I can't wait to eat it.	✓	

Table 12.

Shapes and Functions of Speech

No.	Dialogue Conversation	Shapes and Functions of Speech		
		Interrogative Forms (Questions)	Declarative Forms (Statement)	Imperative Forms (Commands)
1.	Student 1	1	1	2
2.	Student 2	1	1	-
3.	Student 3	1	1	2
4.	Student 4	1	2	1
5.	Student 5	1	1	-
6.	Student 6	3	1	-
7.	Student 7	1	1	2
8.	Student 8	1	1	1
9.	Student 9	1	1	1
10.	Student 10	1	1	-
Amount		12	11	9

Conversational implicature can take on three distinct shapes and functions: (1) declarative form, (2) interrogative form, and (3) imperative form. Additionally, the researcher identified utterances containing conversational implicature. The collected data, derived from various speeches, comprised 12 instances of interrogative speech, 11 instances of declarative speech, and 9 instances of imperative speech.

CONCLUSION

The researcher came at the following conclusion based on the findings: the goal of the study is to determine the implicature of a conversation that takes place based on background context, findings, and discussion during a conversation. Grice's idea of cooperation is used to analyze the evolving conversational implicature. Every conversation that takes place has a goal that may be attributed to a communicative action in each category. The analysis of the data used the discussion sentence from the students' conversation tasks.

Students found speech data with conversation implicatures in the speech conversation task assignment. These are then divided into two categories: generic conversational implicatures and particularized conversational implicatures. The majority of conversational implicatures, of the two types discovered, are found in the spoken dialogues that the students create.

There are just two pieces of information in the discussion dialog, notwithstanding the particularized conversational implicature. There have been identified kinds of speech in utterances having implicatures that differ from the speaker's aim when speaking to their partner. The speech takes on three distinct forms: (1) declarative form, (2) Interrogative speech form, and (3) imperative form. The declarative speech form, out of the three, is most frequently heard in speeches with conversational implicature. The distinction between indirection and direct speech is meant to preserve civility and prevent offending the other person by making demands, implying things, or tacitly declining an invitation. Thus, declarative speech uses intention in communication.

REFERENCE

- Achmad, H.P. dan Alek Abdulloh. (2012). *Linguistik Umum*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Adhi, Hangga Nurzani. 2015. *A Pragmatic Analysis of Conversational Implicature in English Zone Coursebook for Senior High School Students Year Xi*. Skripsi. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Aditama Satria. (2015). *The Analysis of Conversational Implicature in the Despicable Me movie*. Skripsi. English Education Department, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Muria Kudus University.
- Chaer, Abdul. (2010). *Kesantunan Berbahasa*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Chaer, Abdul & Leonie Agustina. (2010). *Sosiolinguistik: Perkenalan Awal*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Daulay, S. H. (2021). Literasi Digital: Pentingkah di Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Waktunya Merdeka Belajar*, 179-187.
- Daulay, S. H., Faridah, F., Shaumiwaty, S., & Kurniati, E. Y. (2021). How to Enlarge Students' Literacy Culture in the Digital Era?. *Prosiding Nasional Pendidikan: LPPM IKIP PGRI Bojonegoro*, 2(1), 80-84.
- Daulay, S. H., Azmi, N., & Pratiwi, T. (2022). The Importance of Expressing Politeness: English Education Student's Perspectives. *Tarling: Journal of Language Education*, 6(1), 49-68.
- Daulay, S. H., Ningrum, D. W., & Nasution, P. S. (2022). Learning Process of Online Class by Using Language Politeness Principles. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun*, 10(2), 403-420.
- Daulay, S. H., Wandira, B., & Kurniati, E. Y. (2024). Professionalizing Your English Language Teaching: edited by Christine Coombe, Neil J. Anderson, and Lauren Stephenson, 2020, 435 pp., price€ 64, 99 (hardcover),€ 53, 49 (eBook), ISBN 978-3-030-34761-1 (hardcover), ISBN 978-3-030-34762-8 (eBook).

- Dormauli, P. P., Rahayu, N., & Nimashita, H. (2022). Conversational Implicature as Communicative Acts in the *Hidamari No Kanojo* Novel. *Conversational Implicature*, 1.
- Fauziah, Anamariyatul. (2015). *Analysis of Implicatures Found in the Movie Script Entitled (In Time)*.
- Grice. H. P. (1967). *William James Lecture Series*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Kaharuddin, A., & Latif, I. (2017). *The Essential of Discourse Analysis for Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. Yogyakarta: Trust Media Publishing.
- Levinson, s. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Makin, Zahrul Fauzi. (2015). *The Analysis of Conversational Implicature and its Violation Maxims in The Movie Grown Ups 2 2013*. Uin Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta.
- Matthew B, M., & Huberman, A. M. (1992). *Analisis Data Kualitatif*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia-UI Press.
- Nabila, A., & Daulay, S. H. (2023, July). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics Failure In ESL Classroom. In *Conference on English Language Teaching* (pp. 308-317).
- Munir, M. (2011). English Implicature. Dipetik Mei 7, 2017, dari Misbakhudin Munir: <https://misbakhudinmunir.wordpress.com/2011/11/30/english-implicature/>
- Mustikawati, Firda. (2011). *Implikatur dalam Wacana Nuwun Sewu pada Surat kabar Solo Pos*. Skripsi S1. Yogyakarta: BSI FBS UNY.
- Sersanawawi, L., & Daulay, S. H. (2023). Indonesian Junior High School EFL Textbook: Intercultural Pragmatic Perspective. *Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature Studies*, 3(1), 1-8.
- Wandira, B., Hasibuan, S., Daulay, S. H., & Siregar, L. (2024). The cognitive foundations of reading and its acquisition: a framework with applications connecting teaching and learning: by Wesley A. Hoover and William E. Tunmer, Cham, Springer, 2020, 263 pp., € 110, 77 (hardcover), € 106.99 (eBook), ISBN 978-3-030-44194-4 (hardcover), ISBN 978-3-030-44195-1 (eBook).