

Conversational Implicature In The Netflix Sex Education Series: A Pragmatics Study

Hafidz Rahayu Khomaeni Arief ^{a,1,*}, Ervina CM Simatupang ^{b,2}

^{a,b} English Departement, Widyatama University, Cikutra 204A, Bandung, Indonesia

¹hafidz.rahayu@widyatama.ac.id; ²ervina.simatupang@widyatama.ac.id

* Corresponding Author



Received 24 June 2026; accepted 30 June 2026; published 30 June 2026

ABSTRACT

The research explores conversational implicature in Sex Education Season 1, Episode 5, focusing on how implied meanings reflect cultural heritage and improve teen communication. The objective of this research was to identify and classify instances of conversational implicature in the episode and to analyze their functions in depicting adolescent social and cultural dynamics. The theories used were Levinson's pragmatics framework. Using a qualitative descriptive method, the researcher analyzed transcripts and identified 21 instances of conversational implicature: 12 (57%) generalized implicatures, understood without specific context, and 9 (43%) particularized implicatures, relying on background knowledge. The results showed that the main functions of these implicatures were economy of expression (48%), contextual adaption (29%), and social appropriateness (24%). These implicatures help characters communicate efficiently, adapt to social settings, and maintain politeness or indirectness, thereby highlighting the social and cultural dynamics of adolescence. The implications of the study suggest that conversational implicature is a key linguistic tool in the series portraying the complexities of adolescent interaction and cultural identity in modern media, and that pragmatic language use in popular culture both mirrors and shapes social interaction and identity development among youth

KEYWORDS

Conversational
Implicature
Pragmatics
Types
Functions

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license

1. Introduction

People connect socially with one another. People create mutual gain by means of reciprocal relationships, interaction, and communication. Mutual comprehension and communication between speakers and hearers constitute as well-established interaction mechanism. Information communication is absolutely vital. Effective communication helps one to understand desired material. Language helps speakers and hearers to communicate, hence promoting idea sharing. When the speaker and the hearer agree on the meaning of the message, then good communication takes place. Grasping communication means understanding implied as well as clear meanings. Pragmatics, according to Levinson (1983), is the study of language from a functional standpoint; that is, it seeks to explain aspects of linguistic structure by means of non-linguistic influences and causes. Finally, human social bonds are essentially created by reciprocal interactions and communication that give structure for mutual understanding and teamwork. Good communication depends on exact language use, which lets listeners and speakers trade inferred meanings. Pragmatics, according to Levinson (1983), is a functional viewpoint on language that looks at how non-linguistic and social aspects affect language patterns. Thus, effective communication consists not only of a shared perception of meaning in a social context.

Pragmatics, a subfield of linguistics, studies how people use language within different contexts. Pragmatics heavily relies on implicature that is, the ability of a speaker to mean something different than what they say. People sometimes hint or infer things instead of expressing everything clearly, the listener can determine the underlying meaning by relying on the circumstances and common sense. Saying, "It's

cold here,” for instance, could be a subtly asked directive to close a window. Implicature lets people express contexts without having to go to great lengths, so encouraging natural and effective communication.

Understanding conversational implicature helps people grasp the implied meanings behind what is said, improving communication and reducing misunderstandings. Levinson (1983) defines conversational implicature as how speakers typically indicate or imply information rather than express everything straight, depending on listeners to infer the intended meaning from context. Those who study conversational implicature will be able to identify the literal meaning of words and the speaker’s actual intentions and often hidden messages in everyday conversation.

Generalized and particularized conversational implicature are two forms of conversational implicature split. Generalized conversational implicature refers to the non-explicit meaning that results from default in any environment, According Grice in (Daniel 2022 et al.) more precisely, these kinds of implicatures are inferable without reference to any specific context and are either not or merely marginally dependent on context. Conversely, particularized conversational implicature depends on the context. These are conclusions derived from the interlocutor information in a very particular setting during a conversation that helps one to grasp the topic of discussion.

Conversational implicature in the Netflix series “Sex Education” is investigated in this paper. Among the most essential concepts in pragmatics is conversational implicature (hereafter referred to as implicature for brevity, although differences from other forms of implicature will be introduced later). There are various reasons why the idea is so prominent in modern pragmatic theory. A classic example of the nature and effectiveness of pragmatics explanations of linguistic occurrences is impliedness. Implicature seems to offer linguistically relevant rather practical explanations for language events

Many kinds of literature can take advantage of conversational implicature. Movies, Series, and music all use conversational implicature, most often present in formal and casual discourse between speakers and hearers who understand each other’s background and expressed intentions. The researcher is concerned with conversational series focused primarily on the series Netflix “Sex Education” episode 5, season 1. Studying how meaning is passed in teenage encounters outside of literal words can benefit much from the discourse’s rich conversational implicature, indirect language, and social subtext.

The use of conversational implicature in the Netflix series Sex Education will be investigated in this paper. The show features a range of presentations and interactions with suggested meaning that transcend the exact words spoken. The source of this study was sex education since its language is realistic and pertinent, reflecting everyday interactions between teenagers and adults. Moreover, the show offers challenging situations in which people convey indirect meanings, hints, and suggestions, which makes It an excellent topic for investigating conversational dynamics in natural life social interactions. This drives the researcher to examine how conversational implicature shows and works in the series. This study will identify and assess several functions of conversational implicature to help clarify how they support efficient communication in sex education programs.

Levinson (1983) stresses that understanding the link between language and circumstance depends on pragmatics, especially implicature. He argues that as implicature closes the distance between what is said and what is intended, it is indispensable for producing meaning in communication. Pragmatics addresses not just language’s structure but also how speakers and listeners negotiate meaning in real-time. Focusing on conversational implicature helps researchers understand speakers strategies to convey more information, control politeness, and negotiate social relationships. Moreover, Levinson (1983) notes that conversational implicature is a good instrument for quickly reaching communication objectives. Using common knowledge and contextual cues to cover gaps helps speakers be more basic with their words. This efficiency is critical when sensitivity and simplicity are greatly prized in natural communication. In Sex Education, conversational implicatures reflects the complexities of adolescent communication in which much is left unsaid but understood by implication, tone, and common experience.

Given the incredible complexity mentioned above, entering this field of study offers an academically intriguing chance to look at conversational implicature. This paper looks at how conversational implicature is used in the framework of a sex education series. “Conversational Implicature in Netflix Sex Education Series: A Pragmatics Study” is a paper investigating conversational implicature depending on kinds and purposes.

Pragmatics is the study of languages, both natural and artificial, that contain indexical or deictic terms, and this usage was explicitly adopted by Kalish (1967), and most influentially by Montague (1968). Pragmatics focuses on the relationship between language and its use in certain situations, including social factors, culture, and interactions between speakers and hearer. While Suryadi (2019) stated that pragmatics is dealing with semantics study whether both of them is a study about meaning. Pragmatics is a part of linguistics that looks at how language is used and the situations in which it is used. Pragmatics studies how the setting, the people involved, and the intentions behind what is said affect the meaning of words and phrases. According to Levinson (1983) pragmatics deals with those aspects of language that are crucial for understanding language as a system, especially in relation to meaning and communication. Pragmatics is also very interested in the connection between language and the people who use it. It looks at things like the identities and roles of the people involved, what they already know, and the order in which they say things in a discussion. Levinson stresses that is important for understanding how language works in real life, which includes both general rules and cultural differences in how people communicate.

According to Levinson (1983) implicature is an important idea that helps us understand how people might say more than what they mean when they speak. Levinson says that implicature clearly explains how it is possible to mean more than what is literally spoken or more than what the usual meaning of the words employed would suggest. This means that people often expect listeners to pick up on extra, intended meanings that aren't immediately stated in the words themselves when they talk to each other. His notion closely resembles Grice's broader theory of non-natural meaning. Which says that for communication to work, the listener must understand what the speaker means. According to Levinson (1983) implicature theory is where this vague idea of speaker intention becomes clear. Its shows how listener can figure out what the speaker meant by the words they used, even when using explicit language would be too much or uncomfortable. In other words, implicature fills in the blanks between what is spoken and what is meant, making communication more rich and complex. Doing this shows how vital shared assumptions and cooperative principles are in everyday language use. These things make communication both quick and adaptable.

Stephen C. Levinson's Pragmatics (1983) allocates a significant section to the notion of conversational implicature, predominantly derived from H.P Grice's work. Levinson posits implicature as a fundamental concept for comprehending how speakers convey meaning beyond literal statements. Levinson elucidates that conversational implicature emerge from the interaction between the Cooperative principle and its associated Maxims of Conversations (Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner). Speakers are typically anticipated to comply with these maxims, and when they seemingly contravene them, listeners deduce supplementary meanings to uphold the presumption that the speakers remains cooperative.

According to Levinson (1983) identified two types of conversational implicature. Generalized conversational implicature refers to the inferred meanings that commonly come from a statement in most everyday context, with no need for particular or distinctive contextual knowledge. These implicature are "Generalized" since they come from general expectations for conversations, not specific things about particular situation. According to Levinson (1983), one of the most common types of generalized conversational implicature is related to the maxim of quantity, which states that speakers should be as informative as required, but not more so. For instance, if someone says "some of the students passed the exam," the usual inference is that not all of the students passed. This interpretation does not rely on any specific prior information; instead, it is predicated on the presumption that the speaker would have indicated that all the students had passed if they were aware of it. So, until there is proof to the contrary, the term "some" usually means "some but not all."

Particularized conversational implicature is heavily reliant on the context in which the speech occurs. These implicatures occur only when the speaker and listener share specific background information or situational clues. Accordingly, while generic conversational implicature works in a variety of context, particularized conversational implicature requires the presence of shared knowledge or situational elements

to transmit the intended meaning. Because particularized conversational implicature rely so much on the context at the time, the person who hears them often has to make specific inferences based on what they know or think is true in that scenario. According to Levinson (1983) explains that these implicature arise when the literal meaning of an utterance, combined with the context and shared background knowledge, leads the listener to a conclusion that is not explicitly stated. The process relies on the cooperative principle and Grice's conversational maxims, especially when a speaker appears to flout a maxim, prompting the hearer to search for an additional, contextually relevant meaning. For example, if two colleagues are talking during a lunch break and one says, "There's a police car outside the boss's office," the implicature might be that something unusual or problematic is happening, but this meaning is only accessible if both share knowledge about the workplace and the rarity of police presence. Without this context, the utterance would not carry the same implicature. Levinson (1983) notes that this context sensitivity makes particularized conversational implicature a powerful tool in communication, allowing speakers to convey complex or sensitive meanings indirectly, relying on the listener's ability to interpret the intended message through shared situational knowledge.

According to Levinson (1983), the function of conversational implicature is to account for what a speaker can imply, suggest, or meaning, as distinct from what the speaker literally says, and it is one of the central mechanisms by which indirectness and economy are achieved in language use (Levinson 1983). Thus, conversational implicature enables speakers to communicate efficiently and contextually, relying on shared conversational principles for interpretation (Levinson 1983). Beyond enabling indirectness and economy in language, conversational implicature serves several important communicative functions. Levinson (1983) notes that conversational implicature allows speaker to convey meaning that go beyond the literal content of their utterances, making communication more flexible, efficient, and contextually appropriate. This mechanism is essential for expressing attitudes, intentions, and social nuances without stating them explicitly.

Sex Education is a Netflix series about teens and adults in the fictional town of Moordale, with the main character being Otis Milburn, a high school student whose mother works as a sex therapist. The series delves into a wide range of personal and social topics, including sexuality, relationships, and identity. Otis and his classmate Maeve established an underground sex therapy clinic at school to assist their peers with sexual and emotional concerns. Sex Education's stories offer a wide cast of people with varying origins and obstacles, such as Eric, the kid of Ghanaian Nigerian immigrants who battles with his sexual orientation, and Adam, who is subjected to internal conflict and bullying. The show is noted for taking an open and realistic approach to themes that are frequently considered taboo, such as teen sexuality, sexual orientation, mental health, and family dynamics. Sex Education is not only entertaining, but it also teaches the value of thorough Sex Education in partnerships. The show illustrates how teenagers come to understand themselves and others via complicated and colourful social interactions.

To elaborate, the series is notable for its complex depiction of teenage experiences, highlighting the difficulties of forming an identity and forming relationships with others. It highlights the intersections of race, culture, and sexuality while addressing the difficulties young people encounter in balancing peer pressure, family dynamics, and cultural expectations. The individuals varied upbringings and individual hardships add depth to the story, which encourages viewers to feel empathy and awareness. Additionally, the show uses empathy and humour to destigmatize discussions about sex and mental health, encouraging a more candid discourse in real life. In addition to providing entertainment, Sex Education acts as a catalyst for crucial conversations about consent, communication, and self-acceptance in today's young culture by fusing realistic stories with instructional components.

The analysis employs a qualitative descriptive methodology, utilizing Stephen Levinson's Pragmatics (1983) as a theoretical framework to analyse conversational implicatures in the Netflix series Sex Education. According to Levinson (1983), pragmatics primarily pertains to "those aspects of language use that are crucial to an understanding of language as a system, and especially to an understand of meaning". This method effectively examines the subtle ways character in Sex Education convey meaning implicitly, transcending the literal interpretations of their statements. The data for this research will involve transcribing relevant dialogue from Season 1 Episode 5, in order to capture the sequential nature of the conversations.

Data and analysis found then were purposed to answer research questions as mentioned below:

1. What are the types of conversational implicature in Sex Education Netflix Series?
2. What are the Functions of Conversational Implicature in Sex Education Netflix Series?

2. Method

Based on the problem, the researcher uses a qualitative method to analyse the data. The qualitative study examines conversational implicature in Season 1 Episode 5 of Netflix Sex Education series. This methodological framework combines thematic and analysis to capture conversational implicature in Season 1 Episode 5 of the series Sex Education. The sections below describe the research approach, data collection methods, analysis process, and ethical considerations.

According to Cresswell (2013) Qualitative research methods are used to describe, investigate, and comprehend the significance that individuals or groups place on social or humanitarian issues. The procedure entails asking questions, gathering particular data from participants, analysing data inductively from specific to broader topics, and interpreting the result. The final report is adaptable, and the researcher should take an inductive method, focussing on individual meaning and being able to interpret the problem's complexity.

3. Result and Discussions

To answer the research questions, the analysis applies Grice's theory of conversational implicature, as developed by Yule (1996) and Levinson (1983), to classify the types and purposes of conversational implicature discovered in the Netflix series Sex Education. This research examines two types of conversational implicature, generalized and particularized, and determines their communication purpose, including economy of expression, contextual adaptation, and social acceptability. The data analysed are limited to conversations from Season 1 Episode 5, which clearly indicate conversational implicature within the series social and cultural setting. Based on the data collected, a total of 21 data of conversational implicature were identified in the episode. Of these, 12 data (57%) were classified as generalized conversational implicature, where the implied meaning can be understood without specific contextual knowledge. Furthermore, 9 data (43%) were classified as particularized conversational implicature, where the implied meaning depends heavily on the context and shared background knowledge between the characters. The analysis found that the most frequent functions of conversational implicature was economy of expression, which allows speakers to transmit more meaning with fewer words, accounting for 10 data (48%). This was followed by contextual adaptation, which occurred 6 times (29%), in which speakers alter their inferred meanings to the individual situation or connection. The role of social appropriateness was discovered in 5 cases (25%). Indicating the usage of implicature to maintain politeness, humour, or indirectness in teenage interactions.

3.1 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Data 1

MAEVE: "I'm not the meet the parents type."

JACKSON: "Cool. *We'll just have sex in the back of my car forever*"

(Timestamp 00:01:51 – 00:01:58)

Analysis:

Jackson and Maeve are having conversations in the park about their relationship and Jackson's request that Maeve meet his parents.

Jackson response, "Cool. We'll just have sex in the back of my car forever" carries a generalized implicature. The literal meaning is not that he truly wants to have sex in the car forever, but rather he's implying that Maeve never meets his parents, their relationship will never progress beyond its current, casual stage, the implicature is easily understood without any special context.

This data demonstrates several functions of conversational implicature. First, it exhibits indirectness, in which speaker transmits a message without overtly articulating it, allowing for complexity and nuance in communication. Second, it demonstrates how speakers can express more than just the literal meaning of their words, expanding the conversation by implying attitudes or social implications. Third, it demonstrates communication efficiency by allowing speakers to explain complicated ideas succinctly and without lengthy explanations.

3.2 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Data 2

MAEVE: "What would you wear to meet your boyfriend's parents for the first time?"

AIMEE: "*Whatever you do, do not dress like you*"

(Timestamp 00:08:22 – 00:08:28)

Analysis:

Maeve asked Aimee what she should wear to her first dinner with Jackson's parents, as Jackson asked for it earlier in the park offered Maeve to meet her parents.

Aimee advises Maeve that her daily style is unsuitable for meeting parents. This conversation carries a generalized conversational implicature. The implicature is that Maeve should dress more correctly, however this is never explicitly expressed. The comedy and wisdom are obvious to anyone who is conversant with social expectations.

This conversation highlights several key functions of conversational implicature. First, it demonstrates indirectness, which allows for subtlety and deeper meaning in everyday encounters by having the speaker transmit a message without saying it directly. Second, it demonstrates how speakers convey meaning beyond just the words they use, exposing the underlying attitude or intention. Third, it highlights the effectiveness of communication by allowing the speaker to convey intricate social knowledge rapidly and clearly without needing to elaborate.

3.3 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Data 3

STEVE: "I'm-I'm Steve. I'm new at school"

AIMEE: "*This isn't actually a study group. We smoke weed and bitch about people*"

(Timestamp 00:23:08 – 00:23:14)

Analysis:

Steve arrived to Aimee's house since ruby invited her pals at campus to a study group at Aimee's house.

Aimee response, "This isn't actually a study group. We smoke weed and bitch about people". Carries a generalized implicature. This means that most listeners may easily understand the inferred meaning of her speech without requiring any further background knowledge or context. In this scenario, Aimee is subtly notifying Steve that the group's true goal is not academic work, but rather socializing and chatting. The implicature is clear, the

name “study group” is really a cover, and anyone knowledgeable with conversational standards can deduce the group’s true activities from her statement.

This conversation highlights functions of conversational implicature. First, it demonstrates indirectness, in which the speakers transmits a message without explicitly articulating it, allowing for nuance and layered meaning in everyday conversation. Second, it demonstrates how speakers communicate beyond the exact words, emphasising the genuine purpose or attitude underlying the statement. Third, it emphasises communication efficiency by allowing the speaker to transmit complicated social knowledge quickly and without lengthy explanations.

3.4 Generalized Conversational Implicature

Data 4

SOMEONE: “Are you all right, mate? You’re bleeding.

ERIC: “Yeah”

SOMEONE: “Here, sit down.”

ERIC: “Yeah, I’m okay. Um... I’m okay. Heh heh. I’m okay.”

SOMEONE: “Sit down”

ERIC: “Yeah. Uh, I just *I just need to use somebody’s phone.*”

(Timestamp 00:33:45 – 00:34:02)

Analysis:

Eric arrived at the night market with a battered condition because previously when walking alone at night after returning from the party he was beaten by someone unknown because the person did not like what Eric was wearing.

The utterance “I just need to use somebody’s phone” represents a generalized conversational implicature. This sort of implicature happens when listeners may deduce the suggested meaning from most ordinary circumstances, without requiring specific background knowledge or unique situational signals. In this case, Eric does not specify why he needs the phone, but the listener can conclude that he is likely in need of assistance, wants to call someone, or is dealing with an urgent matter common assumptions in similar situations. The inference is based on generic conversational norms and expectations rather than highly detailed contextual information.

The functions of this broad conversational implicature is to achieve economy of speech and facilitate effective communication. Eric avoids elaborating on his injury or emotional state by simply expressing that he has to use someone's phone, minimizing self-disclosure while preserving social appropriateness. This indirectness enables him to express a desire for help without directly declaring fragility, a common tactic in teenage encounters. The utterance achieves its communicative goal succinctly, relying on the listener’s ability to fill in the gaps using general background knowledge.

3.5 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Data 5

OTIS: “How about going to see Hedwig and the Angry Inch tonight?”

ERIC: “Yeah! Ha ha. Aw”

OTIS: “Happy Birthday”

ERIC: “*No. I thought you forgot our tradition*”

(Timestamp 00:02:54 – 00:03:05)

Analysis:

Eric and Otis just gotten on college and were rushing to class, but on the way, Otis surprised Eric to attend the concert as a birthday gift.

Suggestion is more than just going to a concert, it's just about a special ritual Eric and Otis have. The true meaning is only accessible because of the specific shared history and context between Otis and Eric. Otis does not directly say, "I remember and value our birthday tradition" but Eric understand this through the indirect reference to the concert, which is meaningful only in their context. The implicature is very context dependent, resulting in a particularized conversational implicature.

The conversations found functions indirectness to allow for complexity and personal significance in the conversation by expressing a deeper message without saying it directly. However, context awareness means that knowing the precise circumstance and Otis's shared experiences is necessary to fully comprehend Eric's message. The actual meaning would be obscured without this background information.

3.6 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Data 6

RUBY: "It's my vagina. It's mine, okay? And I need your help. You and that weird sex kid who looks like a Victorian ghost"

MAEVE: "You told everyone it was my vagina. You're a horrible person. Why I should help you?"

(Timestamp 00:04:01 – 00:04:15)

Analysis:

Maeve and Ruby at toilet campus when Maeve hiding for a smoke, Ruby appears, busting down the bathroom door and pleading for assistance, because Ruby's vagina photo circulated throughout college, and no one knew who shared it, culminating in a university controversy.

Ruby is swallowing her pride and reaching out to people she would not typically approach, indicating her desperation and the gravity of the situation. This is not directly mentioned it is understood in light of their connections and the conditions leading up to this point. The conversation is an particularized conversational implicature because the full meaning of Ruby's plea is only accessible to those who understand the background, the photo scandal, her usual social dynamics, and her relationship with Maeve. Ruby's desperation and vulnerability are not stated outright but are inferred from her actions and words in this specific context. This allows for nuanced communication that conveys emotional depth and social complexity without explicit statements.

The functions is indirectness that ruby to convey her emotions and circumstances without using direct language. Context sensitivity on the other hand, makes the conversation richer and more significant by limiting its full meaning to people who are familiar with the relationships and history.

3.7 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Data 7

MAEVE: "Who'd you send it to?"

RUBY: "Tom Baker"

MAEVE: "Warhammer Tom?"

MAEVE: "Ah. (laughing)"

RUBY: "Heh heh. Oh, my god"

(Timestamp 00:04:52 – 00:05:03)

Analysis:

Maeve and Ruby at toilet campus after Ruby ask for help to Maeve to find who spread the photo, Maeve asks Ruby who she sent her vagina photo to.

The implied meaning (surprise/amusement that Ruby submitted the photo to “Warhammer Tom”) is contextualized by Tom’s identify and reputation within the group. Without such context, the implicature would be unclear. The humour and surprise in Maeve’s reaction only make sense if the listener understand who Tom is. This conversation is an particularized implicature because the true meaning is not in the literal words but in the shared knowledge and social context between the speakers. This allows Maeve and Ruby to communicate amusement and surprise without explaining everything explicitly, showing how conversational implicature works in real, context rich interactions.

The functions in this conversation is indirectness here allows Maeve and Ruby to express their feelings without explicitly saying everything. Enhancing the conversation’s natural flow and interest. Conversely, context sensitivity highlights the significance of background information in everyday communication by requiring familiarity with the individuals and circumstance in order to fully comprehend the message.

3.8 Particularized Conversational Implicature

Data 8

SOMEBODY: “Excuse me, miss. Want a lift?”

ERIC: “Um, no, thank you.”

SOMEBODY: “Look at him. *Have you got a penis, Miss?. Go on, show us your dick.*”

(Timestamp 00:31:32 – 00:31:46)

Analysis:

Eric was walking alone after returning from the party, still dressed in women’s clothing, and then unknown person approached him in a car.

The utterance “Have you got a penis, Miss? Is an example of a particularized conversational implicature that relies heavily on contextual understanding. Spoken in response to a female figure discussing male related issues, the speaker uses the questions sarcastically to imply that the woman lacks authority or credibility because he is not a woman. The implied meaning cannot be found in the literal words, instead, it must be inferred from shared knowledge of gender dynamics and the speakers dismissive tone. This implicature is only accessible if the listener understands the context, which includes the characters social relationships and the sensitive nature of the subject under discussion.

The speaker uses indirect language to challenge and undermine the man’s authority rather than making a direct accusation, allowing him to express hostility or disagreement in a socially charged context. By breaking politeness and relevance rules, the speakers invites the listener to infer a deeper critique of gender and expertise.

4. Conclusion

This research found that conversational implicature is important in the conversations of the Netflix series “Sex Education,” especially in Season 1 Episode 5. Qualitative investigation revealed two basic categories of conversational implicature, generalized and particularized. Generalized conversational implicature, which requires no special contextual knowledge, was discovered to be more common accounting for 57% of data. Meanwhile, 43% of the case involved particularized conversational implicature, which is based on common history or context.

The research also revealed that the functions of conversational implicature in the series include economy of expression, contextual adaptation, and social appropriateness. Contextual adaptability and social appropriateness also played important role, allowing their language to tailor their language to certain contexts while remaining courteous or indirect in their interactions. Overall, the research emphasizes how conversational implicature enhance character communication, mirroring the intricacies of real life adolescent and adult interactions. The finding highlight the importance of comprehending suggest meaning in regular discourse, which not only improves communication efficiency but also assists in navigating the social interactions and cultural norms shown in the series.

References

- Agsa, Julio, and Ambalegin Ambalegin. 2022. "CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN 'CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE' MOVIE." *IdeBahasa* 4 (1): 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.37296/idebahasa.v4i1.80>.
- Akmal, Saiful, and Desy Ulfa Yana. 2020. "Conversational Implicature Analysis in 'Kingdom of Heaven' Movie Script by William Monahan." *Buletin Al-Turas* 26 (2): 335–50. <https://doi.org/10.15408/bat.v26i2.15356>.
- Ananda, Lasriani, Harta Sitanggang, and Neil Amstronng. 2020. "Implicature in Courageous Movie Script" 5 (2).
- Chen, Jie. 2020. "A Study of Conversational Implicature in the Movie 'Flipped' Based On Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle." *International Journal of Social Science and Economics Invention* 6 (09). <https://doi.org/10.23958/ijsssei/vol06-i09/229>.
- George, Elizabeth Jasmi, and Radhika Mamidi. 2020. "Conversational Implicatures in English Dialogue: Annotated Dataset." *Procedia Computer Science* 171:2316–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2020.04.251>.
- Hakim Yassi, Abdul. 2021. "The Types of Conversational Implicature in 'Gifted' Movie." *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities* 4:2021. <https://doi.org/10.34050/elsjish.v4i4.18369>.
- Hamsah, Silvana, La Aso, and Ela Martisa. 2023. "Analysis of Conversational Implicature in 'Burnt' Movie Directed by John Wells." *ELITE: Journal of English Language and Literature* 7 (2): 94–106. <https://doi.org/10.33772/elite.v7i2.1807>.
- Immanuel, Ivan, and Tri Wahyu Retno Ningsih. 2023. "CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE AND FLOUTING MAXIMS IN SHANG-CHI AND THE LEGENDS OF THE TEN RINGS MOVIE." *Journal of Language and Literature* 11 (1): 82–99. <https://doi.org/10.35760/jll.2023.v11i1.8316>.
- Levinson, Stephen C.. 20131983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mahira Putriayu, Belinda, and Ernie D Ayu Imperiani. 2022. "A Conversational Implicature Analysis on the Split Movie." Vol. 10. <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/psg/article/view/50938>.
- Maya Juliana Putri, Shafira, and Ervina CM Simatupang. n.d. "Conversational Implicature on Voice Character Dialogue in Genshin Impact." <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v5i3.5882>.

- Natasya, Siti, Febrri Rhamadani, M Bahri Arifin, and Ririn Setyowati. 2022. "THE STUDY OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN A STAR IS BORN MOVIE." Vol. 6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v6i2.5418>
- Pinta, Ines Seri, Uli Butar Butar, and Muhammad Natsir. n.d. "AN ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN THE INTERVIEW MOVIE." <https://doi.org/10.24114/jalu.v5i2.6429>
- Prastyaningsih, Eka, and Ratri Harida. n.d. "THE ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN NEW MOON MOVIE." <https://jurnal.stkipgriponorogo.ac.id/index.php/Salience/article/view/120>
- Puspitasari, Candra, Abdurachman Faridi, and Sri Wahyuni. 2022. "Conversational Implicature to Hide Meaning in the Dialogue Script of Alice Through the Looking Glass." *English Education Journal* 12 (2): 274–83. <https://doi.org/10.15294/ej.v12i2.58047>.
- "Pragmatics (George Yule) (Z-Library)." n.d.
- SARI, PUSPITA, and ANNE JULITZA LITBAGAY. 2019. "Implicature in the Dialogue of 500 Days of Summer Movie by Marc Webb: The Study of Pragmatics." *English Journal Literacy Utama* 3 (1): 35–39. <https://doi.org/10.33197/ejlitama.vol3.iss1.2019.32>.
- Sari, Nia Yunita, S S Lisetyoariyanti, and M Pd. n.d. "Conversational Implicature in Big Momma's House 1 Movie 1 Conversational Implicature in Big Momma's House 1 Movie." <https://doi.org/10.26740/lh.v7n1.p%25p>
- Sari Lubis, Indah. 2021. "CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN IN THE HEART OF THE SEA MOVIE." Vol. 5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v5i2.3380>
- Sarsono, Sarsono, Abdulloh Abdulloh, Ikhwan Muslim, Slamet Basuki, and Delvina Silaban. 2025. "A Conversational Implicature Analysis in the Movie 'Bird Box' Directed by Susanne Bier." *JELL (Journal of English Language and Literature) STIBA-IEC Jakarta* 10 (01): 225–38. <https://doi.org/10.37110/jell.v10i01.284>.
- Sili, Surya, and Ririn Setyowati. n.d. "AN ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE ON 'JUMANJI: WELCOME TO THE JUNGLE' FILM." Vol. 4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30872/jbssb.v4i3.3087>
- Sudrajat, Muhamad Donny, Eline Rozaliya Winarto, and Hanif Nurcholish Adiantika. 2024. "Conversational Implicature Analysis on Fast Five Movie." *JEPAL (Journal of English Pedagogy and Applied Linguistics)* 5 (1): 110–23. <https://doi.org/10.32627/jepal.v5i1.1048>.
- Tauchid, Ahmad, Fina Ainur Rosyita, and Deni Ramadhan. 2023. "Conversational Implicature in Raya and The Last Dragon Movie Directed by Don Hall and Carloz López Estrada." *English Education and Literature Journal (E-Jou)* 3 (01): 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.53863/ejou.v3i01.441>.
- Ye, Ya. 2022. "Interpretation of Conversational Implicature in the Film Green Book From the Perspective of the Cooperative Principle." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 12 (5): 943–47. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1205.15>.