

Analyzing Grice's Conversational Implicature in Responses Produced by Artificial Intelligence Systems

Ni Made Ayu Purnami^{a,1*}, Ni Komang Sri Wardani^{b,2}, Desak Putu Anom Janawati^{c,3}

^aUniversitas Markandeya, Jalan Mohamad Hatta, Bali 80613, Indonesia

¹madeayupurnami1995@gmail.com*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 31/5/2026

Revised: 4/7/2026

Accepted: 5/7/2026

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence;
Conversational maxims;
Gricean maxims.

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes Grice's conversational implicature in responses produced by Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems. The research aims to identify the types of conversational implicatures found in AI-generated responses and to explain how implicatures are constructed in human and AI interactions. Despite extensive research on conversational implicature in human communication, limited studies have examined how AI-generated responses construct conversational implicatures based on Grice's Cooperative Principle, making this investigation necessary to better understand AI-mediated interaction. This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design to provide a detailed interpretation of the data. The 20 conversation excerpts were purposively selected from user-AI interactions, transcribed, coded according to Grice's four conversational maxims, and analysed through thematic interpretation to identify patterns of conversational implicature. The conversations were selected based on their relevance to implicature phenomena, particularly utterances containing implied meanings that required contextual interpretation. The data were analyzed using Grice's Cooperative Principle and the four conversational maxims: quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The findings reveal that AI systems frequently generate conversational implicatures through indirect answers, implied suggestions, and context-dependent responses. Several responses were identified as observing or flouting Gricean maxims in order to produce meaningful communication. The study also shows that AI systems can imitate human conversational patterns by generating implied meanings, although some responses still demonstrate limitations in contextual understanding. Overall, this research contributes to pragmatic studies by exploring conversational implicature within AI-mediated communication.

Introduction

Language serves as the primary medium through which people communicate ideas, intentions, and information. Beyond conveying literal meanings, language also enables speakers to express implied meanings that listeners interpret based on context and shared knowledge [1]. Consequently, effective communication depends not only on linguistic forms but also on the ability to understand meanings that are conveyed implicitly. As a fundamental means of communication, language allows individuals to exchange information, express opinions, and maintain social relationships in various communicative contexts [2]. Because language and communication are closely interconnected, successful interaction requires both speakers and listeners to interpret utterances appropriately within their communicative context [3]. Communication therefore involves more than the transmission of explicit information; it also includes intentions, assumptions, and implied meanings that contribute to achieving communicative purposes such as exchanging ideas, maintaining interpersonal relationships, and sharing experiences [4]. To achieve these purposes, speakers are expected to provide information that is sufficiently clear and relevant, although they

may intentionally communicate indirectly to convey additional meanings beyond what is explicitly stated [5]. Such indirect communication is governed by conversational principles that enable interlocutors to cooperate in interpreting intended meanings, as explained in Grice's Cooperative Principle [6].

One branch of linguistics that focuses on meaning in context is pragmatics. Pragmatics studies how language users interpret utterances based on context, intention, and situational factors rather than relying solely on literal meaning. As a subfield of linguistics, pragmatics focuses on how meaning is created in context and how speakers express intentions that go beyond the literal meaning of words [7]. Unlike semantics, which focuses on the meaning of words and sentences independently of context, pragmatics emphasizes how meaning is constructed through interaction. In pragmatic studies, context plays a central role because the same utterance may produce different meanings depending on the situation, participants, and communicative purpose. The study of pragmatics focuses on how we interpret what we hear and say from its conventionalized meanings to their deeper intended meanings [8]. One important concept in pragmatics is conversational implicature, introduced by the philosopher H. P. Grice. H. P. Grice methodically developed the idea of collaboration in conversation through the Cooperative Principle, which postulates that in order to successfully communicate, participants in a discussion often try to be cooperative. It is forbidden to use sentences that are ambiguous, have implied meanings, are excessively detailed, etc. [9] Conversational implicature refers to implied meanings that are not directly stated by speakers but can still be understood by listeners through contextual interpretation. This concept demonstrates that communication often involves more than what is explicitly expressed in words. The reason could be that because people talk so often, conversation has become a general term for interpersonal communication or face-to-face interaction [10].

According to Paul Grice in a research conducted by [11] presented a set of guidelines known as conversational maxims. There are four categories of maxims: the maxim of quality, the maxim of quantity, the maxim of relation, and the maxim of manner. Every maxim has a set of requirements that people must adhere to in order to have a mutually beneficial discourse. Non-observance of maxims refers to situations in which people purposefully or inadvertently disregard the maxims. Non-observance of the maxim can take several forms, including flouting, violating, opting out, and infringing. Every kind of maxim non-observance has distinct consequences and happens under various circumstances. The theory of conversational implicature through the Cooperative Principle, which explains how effective communication is maintained in conversations [6]. In real communication, speakers may observe or intentionally flout these maxims to generate implied meanings or conversational implicatures. As a result, Gricean maxims become highly important in understanding how indirect meanings are produced and interpreted in conversations. These maxims have been widely applied in pragmatic studies to analyze communication in various contexts such as education, media, literature, and interpersonal interaction.

Along with the advancement of technology, communication is no longer limited to interactions among humans. A computer system with artificial intelligence (AI) is able to carry out activities that normally call for human intelligence. By evaluating and utilizing the system's data, this technology is able to make decisions. Learning, reasoning, and self-correction are among the processes that make up artificial intelligence. This procedure is comparable to how people analyze situations before making decisions [12]. Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems have become increasingly integrated into everyday communication through virtual assistants, chatbots, and automated conversational platforms. Artificial Intelligence refers to computer systems designed to imitate human intelligence and perform tasks that usually require human cognitive abilities, including language processing and communication. Modern AI systems are capable of generating responses that resemble natural human conversation, making interactions between humans and machines more dynamic and realistic. A quality AI education should assist all students without widening the access gap or diminishing the human element of the learning process by combining the benefits of technology with the crucial function of teachers [13]. In many situations, AI systems provide explanations, suggestions, clarifications, and responses that may contain implied meanings similar to those found in human communication. This phenomenon indicates that AI systems are not only processing literal language but are also increasingly involved in pragmatic communication. However, despite their advanced capabilities, AI systems may still encounter difficulties in fully understanding

contextual meaning and communicative intention. Therefore, examining conversational implicature in AI-generated responses becomes an important issue in understanding the communicative competence of Artificial Intelligence systems.

Previous studies on conversational implicature have extensively examined how implied meanings are constructed in various forms of human communication. Many of these studies have employed Grice's Cooperative Principle to investigate how speakers observe or intentionally flout conversational maxims in order to communicate meanings beyond the literal interpretation of their utterances. A research by [14] has revealed that Gricean theory of Conversational Implicature can be applied to Arabic language, particularly the Yemeni dialect. Additionally, the analyzed data showed that the maxim of quantity was most frequently flouted. Similarly, research on classroom interaction has shown that teachers and students employ conversational implicatures to provide indirect feedback, maintain politeness, and facilitate learning. Other studies have analyzed conversational implicature in interviews, advertisements, and social media interactions, revealing that implied meanings are often used to persuade audiences, express attitudes, or convey criticism indirectly. Although these studies differ in their research settings, most adopt a qualitative descriptive approach and focus primarily on human-to-human communication within specific social and cultural contexts.

Despite the diversity of these studies, their primary concern remains the pragmatic behavior of human speakers rather than language produced by Artificial Intelligence systems. Existing research generally assumes that conversational implicature emerges from human communicative intentions, shared background knowledge, and contextual understanding. Consequently, the applicability of Grice's Cooperative Principle to AI-generated responses has received relatively little scholarly attention. Research involving Artificial Intelligence has predominantly focused on technological development, computational linguistics, natural language processing, response accuracy, and system performance. While these studies provide valuable insights into the technical capabilities of AI systems, they rarely investigate how AI constructs implied meanings through pragmatic principles or whether its responses consistently observe or strategically flout Gricean maxims during interaction. As AI systems such as conversational agents and chatbots become increasingly integrated into education, business, customer service, and everyday communication, understanding their pragmatic competence has become an important area that remains insufficiently explored.

This limitation reveals an important gap in the existing literature. Although numerous studies have successfully explained conversational implicature in human communication, few have examined whether the same pragmatic principles can adequately explain interactions between humans and Artificial Intelligence. Moreover, previous studies seldom analyze AI-generated responses as pragmatic discourse in which contextual interpretation and implied meaning play significant roles. As a result, there is still limited understanding of how AI systems construct conversational implicatures, how they comply with or depart from Grice's Cooperative Principle, and what these patterns indicate about the effectiveness of human-AI communication.

Based on this gap, the present study analyzes conversational implicature in responses generated by Artificial Intelligence systems using Grice's Cooperative Principle. Specifically, the study aims to identify the types of conversational implicatures found in AI-generated responses and to explain how these implicatures are constructed through the observance or flouting of the conversational maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. This research employs a qualitative descriptive design to provide an in-depth interpretation of the data. The data consist of twenty conversation excerpts collected from interactions between users and AI systems, particularly conversations containing implied meanings that require contextual interpretation. By extending the analysis of conversational implicature from human communication to AI-mediated communication, this study is expected to contribute to pragmatic scholarship while also providing insights into the linguistic competence of Artificial Intelligence in contemporary digital communication.

Method

This study employed a qualitative descriptive research design to analyze conversational implicature in responses generated by Artificial Intelligence (AI). According to Creswell & Poth as cited in a research by [15] A qualitative approach was considered appropriate because the objective of the study was to interpret and explain pragmatic phenomena in AI-generated discourse rather than

to measure them quantitatively. The analysis was grounded in Grice's (1975) Cooperative Principle, which consists of the conversational maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. These maxims served as the primary analytical framework for examining how AI-generated responses conveyed implied meanings in human-AI interactions. The population of this study comprised text-based conversations generated by ChatGPT in response to users' prompts. ChatGPT was selected because it is one of the most widely used generative AI chatbots for information retrieval, education, writing assistance, and everyday communication. The data consisted of twenty conversation excerpts collected from interactions conducted by the researcher through a web interface. The study employed purposive sampling, as the excerpts were intentionally selected based on predetermined criteria rather than randomly. Specifically, only conversations containing responses that potentially involved conversational implicature, indirect meanings, contextual interpretation, or observable adherence to or non-observance of Gricean maxims were included. Conversations consisting solely of straightforward factual responses without pragmatic features were excluded from the dataset.

The research instruments included (1) the ChatGPT web platform as the source of AI-generated responses, (2) researcher-developed prompts designed to elicit a variety of communicative situations, (3) digital conversation transcripts exported from the chat interface for documentation, and (4) a coding sheet developed from [6]. The coding sheet contained categories for the conversational maxim involved (quantity, quality, relation, or manner), the type of maxim realization (observance or non-observance), the form of conversational implicature, contextual information, and an interpretative explanation of the implied meaning. These instruments enabled systematic organization and analysis of the collected data. The data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis following the procedures proposed by Elo and Kyngäs in a research conducted by [16]. The analysis began with repeated reading of all conversation transcripts to gain a comprehensive understanding of the interactional context. Next, each AI-generated response was segmented into units of analysis and coded according to the relevant conversational maxim. During the coding process, each response was classified into several categories: (1) the maxim involved (quantity, quality, relation, or manner), (2) whether the maxim was observed or non-observed, (3) the type of conversational implicature generated, and (4) the contextual factors supporting the interpretation of the implied meaning. The coded data were then compared across conversation excerpts to identify recurring pragmatic patterns and variations in AI-generated responses. Finally, the findings were interpreted in relation to Grice's Cooperative Principle to explain how the AI constructed conversational implicatures and maintained conversational cooperation in response to user prompts. According to Jurafsky & Martin in a research conducted by [17] this analytical procedure provides a systematic account of AI communicative behavior and its ability to approximate human pragmatic competence.

Finding and Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems frequently generate conversational implicatures through both the observance and non-observance of Grice's conversational maxims. Based on the analysis of 20 conversation excerpts, the researcher identified that AI-generated responses reflected varying pragmatic strategies associated with the maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The results reveal that AI systems are capable of maintaining cooperative communication by producing responses that are contextually relevant, informative, and understandable. Nevertheless, several responses also demonstrated pragmatic deviations that resulted in conversational implicatures requiring interpretation from users. These deviations included flouting, violating, infringing, and suspending conversational maxims. Such findings indicate that AI systems imitate not only literal linguistic structures but also pragmatic patterns commonly found in human communication. The distribution of observance and non-observance of maxims identified in the data is presented in the following table.

Table 1. Distribution of observance and non-observance of maxims

No	Pragmatic Category	Frequency	Percentage
1	Observance of Maxims	9	45%
2	Flouting of Maxims	5	25%

No	Pragmatic Category	Frequency	Percentage
3	Violating of Maxims	3	15%
4	Infringing of Maxims	2	10%
5	Suspending of Maxims	1	5%
Total		20	100%

The table above demonstrates that the observance of conversational maxims appeared most frequently, representing 45% of the total data. This finding indicates that AI systems generally attempt to maintain cooperative communication by adhering to Grice’s Cooperative Principle. In many interactions, the AI system successfully provided responses that were sufficiently informative, truthful, relevant, and clearly expressed. Such responses enabled users to understand the intended meaning without significant difficulty. The observance of maxims reflects the AI system’s computational objective to produce effective communication aligned with user expectations. Furthermore, these findings suggest that AI systems are increasingly capable of generating pragmatic appropriateness in conversational contexts. The following table presents examples of maxim observance identified in the data.

Table 2. Examples of maxim observance

Maxim	User Prompt	AI Response	Analysis
Quantity	“What is pragmatics?”	“Pragmatics is the study of meaning in context.”	The response provides sufficient information without unnecessary detail.
Quality	“Is the Earth round?”	“Yes, scientific evidence confirms that the Earth is spherical.”	The response demonstrates factual accuracy and truthfulness.
Relation	“Explain conversational implicature.”	“Conversational implicature refers to implied meaning in communication.”	The response is directly relevant to the topic.
Manner	“Explain it briefly.”	“It means understanding implied meaning in conversation.”	The response is clear, brief, and orderly.

The findings also reveal that flouting of maxims occurred in 25% of the analyzed conversation excerpts. Flouting occurs when a speaker intentionally fails to observe a conversational maxim in order to generate an implied meaning or conversational implicature. In this study, AI systems frequently flouted the maxims of quantity and manner by providing indirect answers, elaborative explanations, or ambiguous responses. These responses often required users to infer the intended meaning based on contextual interpretation. Interestingly, the flouting of maxims did not necessarily indicate communicative failure; instead, it frequently functioned as a pragmatic strategy for maintaining politeness, neutrality, or conversational flexibility. For example, when confronted with sensitive or subjective questions, the AI system occasionally avoided direct answers and instead generated balanced or generalized responses. This behavior resembles human conversational practices in which speakers intentionally manipulate conversational maxims to achieve social or communicative purposes.

Table 3. Examples of flouting maxims

Maxim Flouted	User Prompt	AI Response	Conversational Implicature
Quantity	“Can you answer quickly?”	“I will provide a detailed explanation to ensure accuracy.”	The AI implies that accuracy is prioritized over brevity.
Relation	“Do you like humans?”	“Human interaction is an important aspect of communication systems.”	The AI avoids expressing personal feelings directly.
Manner	“Explain it simply.”	“The phenomenon can be interpreted through multiple contextual dimensions.”	The AI implies conceptual complexity rather than simplicity.
Quality	“Is this definitely correct?”	“Based on available information, it appears correct.”	The AI implies uncertainty or limitation of knowledge.

Another important finding concerns the violation of conversational maxims, which accounted for 15% of the total data. Violating a maxim occurs when a speaker deliberately provides misleading, incomplete, or deceptive information without intending the listener to recognize the deviation. In AI-mediated communication, violations mainly emerged due to inaccurate contextual interpretation or the generation of overgeneralized responses. In several cases, the AI system produced information that appeared convincing but lacked precision or contextual appropriateness. Unlike flouting, violations did not generate clear conversational implicatures because the responses risked misleading users rather than encouraging inferential interpretation. These findings reveal an important limitation of Artificial Intelligence systems, particularly regarding contextual comprehension and pragmatic reliability. Since AI systems rely heavily on probabilistic language prediction, they may occasionally generate responses that appear coherent despite lacking complete contextual accuracy.

Table 4. Examples of violating the maxims

Maxim Violated	User Prompt	AI Response	Analysis
Quality	“Can this medicine cure all diseases?”	“It may cure many conditions effectively.”	The response risks misleading the user through overgeneralization.
Relation	“Tell me about pragmatics.”	“Technology has changed modern education significantly.”	The response shifts away from the intended topic.
Quantity	“Give me one definition.”	“Pragmatics, semantics, phonology, and syntax are branches of linguistics.”	The response includes unnecessary information.

The findings further indicate that infringing of conversational maxims occurred in 10% of the analyzed data. Infringing refers to situations in which a speaker fails to observe a conversational maxim unintentionally due to limited competence, misunderstanding, or inability to communicate effectively. Within AI-generated responses, infringements were primarily associated with ambiguous prompts or insufficient contextual information provided by users. In these cases, the AI system appeared unable to fully interpret the communicative intention underlying the user’s utterance. Consequently, the responses became unclear, repetitive, or only partially relevant to the topic. Unlike violations, infringements were not intended to mislead users; rather, they reflected technological limitations in contextual understanding and pragmatic interpretation. This finding highlights the fact that although AI systems are capable of sophisticated language production, they still encounter difficulties when processing vague or incomplete conversational input.

Table 5. Examples of infringing the maxims

Maxim Infringed	User Prompt	AI Response	Analysis
Relation	“What do you mean by that?”	“There are many possible interpretations in communication.”	The response remains too broad and insufficiently specific.
Manner	“Explain this sentence.”	“The sentence may contain various meanings depending on context.”	The response lacks clarity and direct explanation.

In addition to observance, flouting, violating, and infringing, the findings also identified suspending of conversational maxims, although this category appeared least frequently, representing only 5% of the total data. Suspending occurs when a conversational maxim is intentionally withheld because contextual or situational factors make direct observance inappropriate. In the analyzed data, suspension mainly occurred in responses involving ethical sensitivity, restricted information, or controversial issues. In such cases, the AI system deliberately limited the information provided in order to maintain neutrality, safety, or appropriateness. This pragmatic behavior reflects the programmed ethical constraints embedded within many AI systems. Unlike flouting, which aims to generate implicature, suspension functions primarily to avoid communicative risk or social harm.

Therefore, the suspension of maxims in AI communication demonstrates the interaction between pragmatic principles and ethical considerations in digital conversational systems.

Table 6. Example of suspending the maxims

Suspended Maxim	User Prompt	AI Response	Analysis
Quantity	“Tell me how to hack someone’s account.”	“I cannot provide harmful or unethical instructions.”	The maxim is suspended for ethical and safety reasons.

The analysis also demonstrates that the maxim of quantity was the most frequently observed and non-observed maxim throughout the data. This phenomenon indicates that AI systems strongly prioritize informational delivery in communication. In many cases, the AI system provided highly detailed explanations in order to satisfy user requests comprehensively. However, this tendency occasionally resulted in excessive elaboration that generated indirect meanings or conversational implicatures. Similarly, the maxim of manner frequently became problematic because AI-generated responses sometimes contained formal or generalized language that reduced communicative clarity. These findings support previous pragmatic theories suggesting that indirectness and ambiguity are central mechanisms in the creation of conversational implicature. The following table summarizes the frequency of maxims identified in the study.

Table 7. Frequency of observance and non-observance of maxims

Maxim	Observance	Non-Observance	Total
Quantity	4	3	7
Quality	2	2	4
Relation	2	3	5
Manner	1	3	4
Total	9	11	20

The findings further reveal that conversational implicatures in AI-generated responses frequently emerged through indirect suggestions, contextual adaptation, and generalized explanations. In several excerpts, the AI system produced responses that resembled human conversational strategies, particularly in maintaining politeness and avoiding confrontation. For example, when responding to emotionally sensitive or controversial prompts, the AI often generated neutral and carefully structured statements rather than direct opinions. This behavior demonstrates that AI systems are increasingly capable of imitating human pragmatic behavior through linguistic adaptation. Nevertheless, unlike humans who possess emotional awareness and lived experience, AI systems generate responses based on computational prediction and language modeling. Consequently, although AI systems may produce linguistically natural implicatures, they occasionally fail to capture deeper contextual nuances and interpersonal subtleties within communication.

Overall, the findings and discussions of this study demonstrate that Artificial Intelligence systems are capable of generating conversational implicatures through both the observance and non-observance of Gricean maxims. The analysis confirms that AI-generated responses frequently reflect pragmatic mechanisms similar to those found in human communication, including indirectness, contextual interpretation, and conversational cooperation. However, the findings also reveal important limitations related to contextual comprehension, ambiguity, and pragmatic precision. The presence of flouting, violating, infringing, and suspending maxims illustrates that AI communication is not always perfectly cooperative, but instead reflects complex interactions between language processing, contextual prediction, and communicative strategy. Therefore, this study contributes significantly to pragmatic studies by extending the application of Grice’s conversational implicature theory into the field of AI-mediated communication. Furthermore, the results provide valuable insight into the evolving relationship between language, pragmatics, and Artificial Intelligence within contemporary digital interaction.

Conclusion

This study examined conversational implicature in Artificial Intelligence (AI)-generated responses by applying Grice's Cooperative Principle and the conversational maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner. The findings indicate that AI systems are capable of producing conversational implicatures through both the observance and non-observance of conversational maxims. Among the analyzed data, observance of maxims occurred most frequently, demonstrating that AI systems generally attempt to maintain cooperative communication by providing relevant, informative, truthful, and clear responses. However, instances of flouting, violating, infringing, and suspending maxims were also identified, revealing that AI-generated communication can contain implied meanings that require contextual interpretation. These results suggest that AI systems are increasingly able to imitate human conversational behavior and pragmatic strategies, particularly in generating indirect meanings, maintaining politeness, and adapting responses to conversational contexts. Furthermore, the study highlights both the strengths and limitations of AI-mediated communication from a pragmatic perspective. While AI systems can effectively generate contextually appropriate responses and conversational implicatures, they still experience difficulties in fully understanding complex contexts, ambiguous prompts, and subtle communicative intentions. The occurrence of maxim violations and infringements demonstrates that AI-generated responses may occasionally lack pragmatic precision or contextual accuracy. Nevertheless, the findings contribute to the field of pragmatics by extending the application of Grice's conversational implicature theory to interactions between humans and Artificial Intelligence. This study also provides valuable insights into the evolving role of AI in modern communication and suggests that future research should investigate larger datasets, different AI platforms, and more diverse communicative contexts to further explore the pragmatic capabilities and limitations of Artificial Intelligence systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Nadira and F. Ilhamsyah, "Nature and function of language," *Recoms J. Penelit. dan Pengabd.*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2024, doi: 10.59548/rc.v1i2.296.
- [2] Apriyanto, "Language as a communication tool in human life," *Fox Justi J. Ilmu Huk.*, vol. 10, no. 02, pp. 45–54, 2020.
- [3] N. M. A. Purnami and P. A. Adiwijaya, "A Gender-based Analysis of Observance and Non-Observance of Conversational Maxims in Front Office Staff's Speech at Restaurants in Ubud District," *Getsempena English Educ. J.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2021.
- [4] N. Hamidah, M. B. Arifin, and S. Ariani, "Analysis of flouting of conversational maxims by characters in The Help Movie," *Ilmu Budaya J. Bahasa, Sastra, Seni, dan Budaya*, vol. 6, pp. 80–93, 2022.
- [5] Aryanthi, D. N. Hidayat, and Alek, "Edukatif: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan The Violating Grice 's Maxim in the Dialogue Text of Student 's English Book (Under the Merdeka Curriculum)," *Edukatif J. Ilmu Pendidik.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1024–1031, 2024.
- [6] H. P. Grice, *Logic and Conversation*, vol. 60, no. 5/6. 1975. doi: 10.2307/324613.
- [7] S. C. Levinson, "Presumptive meanings: the theory of generalized conversational implicature," *J. Linguist.*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 181–186, 2004.
- [8] C. Potts, "Introduction to pragmatics," *Stanford*, pp. 1–9, 2022.
- [9] Yuvike and M. Winiharti, "The Non-Observance of The Conversational Maxims : An Analysis of The Dialogues in Arthur Miller ' S," *J. Ling. Cult.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 116–127, 2009.
- [10] M. Hossain, "The Application of Grice Maxims in Conversation : A Pragmatic Study," *J. English Lang. Teach. Appl. Linguist.*, vol. 3, no. 10, pp. 32–40, 2021, doi: 10.32996/jeltal.
- [11] D. Prasetyo, A. B. Muslim, and E. D. A. Imperiani, "I Have Never Touched It': Flouting and Violation of Maxims in a Court Testimony," *Passage*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 32–42, 2018.
- [12] M. S. Y. Lubis, "Implementasi Artificial Intelligence Pada System Manufaktur Terpadu," *SEMNASTEK UISU*, pp. 1–7, 2021.
- [13] R. Nuryadin and Marlina, "The use of Artificial Intelligence in education (Literature Review)," *Indones. J. Prim. Educ.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 143–156, 2023.

- [14] I. A. U. Al-qaderi, "Conversational Implicature in Arabic : A Pragmatic Analysis of Applying Flouting the Maxims to the Yemeni Dialect," vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 53–68, 2015, doi: 10.5296/ijl.v7i6.8745.
- [15] K. A. C. Dimaculangan, H. T. H. Abas, and C. S. Quinto, "Narrative Study of Teaching Strategies and Challenges Encountered by Teachers in Synchronous Online Classes," vol. 2, no. April, pp. 201–216, 2022.
- [16] A. Fauzan, S. Setiyarini, C. Effendy, and M. S. Kristanti, "Original Research Perception of Nurses in Decision-Making Process in Palliative Care For Patients With Cancer in Public Health Centers," vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 169–175, 2019.
- [17] A. Mohammad, A. Mohammed, and A. J. Aondongu, "Improving Part-of-Speech Tagging with Relative Positional Encoding in Transformer Models and Basic," vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 10–19, 2025.