Muhammad Iqbal Ramdhani
Shynta Amalia

Pocket Book of Pragmatics

Pocket Book
of Pragmatics

Muhammad Iqbal Ramdhani, Shynta Amalia

Pocket Book of Pragmatics

Muhammad Iqbal Ramdhani, Shynta Amalia

@Hak cipta dilindungi Undang-Undang

Preface

Pragmatics is an essential component of language studies, and it plays a crucial role in effective communication. This pocketbook is specifically designed for students and language learners who wish to deepen their understanding of language studies, including the study of pragmatics. By using this book as a reference, readers can enhance their confidence and ability to confront language challenges in different contexts.

Anxiety and difficulty in understanding language, especially in cross-cultural interactions, are common challenges that students and language learners face. Through the study of pragmatics, readers can gain a better understanding of how language is used in social contexts and how to appropriately use language to achieve effective communication. The authors of this book recognized the need for a simplified approach to linguistics and pragmatics to help readers comprehend complex theories easily.

Despite acknowledging that there may be flaws in the composition of the book, the authors hope that readers will offer recommendations and criticisms that will help improve the book in the future. The authors are grateful to all those who contributed to the successful completion of this work, and they believe that this pocketbook will be an invaluable contribution to the field of language's body of knowledge.

Muhammad Iqbal Ramdhani
Shynta Amalia

Contents

1 Introduction to Pragmatics

Definition and Scope of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics that examines the use of language in context and how speakers use language to convey meaning beyond the literal interpretation of words. It encompasses the social, cultural, and cognitive factors that contribute to language use, including the roles of speaker and listener, the purpose of the communication, and the situational context.

Pragmatics goes beyond the grammatical structure of language to consider how people use language in a variety of contexts, from everyday conversation to literature and media. One central concept in pragmatics is implicature, which refers to the meaning that is implied by the speaker but not explicitly stated. For example, if someone says **"I'm hungry**," the implicature may be that they want to eat, even though they didn't directly state that.

Another important concept in pragmatics is presupposition, which refers to the assumptions or beliefs that a speaker assumes the listener shares in a particular context. For instance, if someone says **"I'm going to the store**," the presupposition may be that the listener knows which store is being referred to and why the speaker is going there.

Pragmatics also examines the ways in which language use can vary across cultures and social groups, as well as the role of nonverbal communication in conveying meaning. For example, in some cultures, indirect communication may be preferred, while in others, direct communication is more common.

Overall, pragmatics offers insights into the complex nature of language use and the ways in which meaning is constructed

and interpreted in context. It has applications in fields such as language teaching, cross-cultural communication, and the analysis of discourse.

The following are some definitions of pragmatics from experts in the field:

1. According to **Deborah Schiffrin** (1994), pragmatics is the study of how users of linguistic forms and their relationships are interconnected.

2. **J. L. Austin** (1962) defines pragmatics as the study of language use in social contexts and how people interpret meaning through language.

3. **Yael Maschler** (2013) characterizes pragmatics as the study of language use in context and the construction and interpretation of meaning.

4. **Klaus P. Schneider and Anne Barron** (2014) describe pragmatics as the study of the relationship between language forms used by speakers and the social and cognitive contexts in which they are used to convey meaning.

5. According to **Yule** (1996), pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader) in a particular context of use.

6. **Verschureen** (1999) defines pragmatics as the study of how language is used in context, including the social and cultural factors that influence communication.

7. **Levinson** (1983) defines pragmatics is the study of how people use language in context, and how they use context to interpret what others mean.

These definitions emphasize the significance of context and social interaction in language use and meaning construction. By investigating language use in real-world situations, pragmatics

provides insights into how people communicate effectively and how meaning is conveyed and interpreted through language.

Importance of Pragmatics in Communication

Pragmatics is a crucial aspect of communication because it enables speakers to convey meaning beyond the literal interpretation of words. By considering the social, cultural, and cognitive factors that contribute to language use, pragmatics provides insights into how speakers use language to achieve specific goals, establish and maintain relationships, and navigate complex social interactions.

One key area where pragmatics is important is in the interpretation of implicature, which refers to the meaning that is implied but not explicitly stated by the speaker. For instance, if someone says "**I'm not very good at math**," the implicature may be that they are seeking help or assistance. In this way, pragmatics helps speakers to understand the underlying meaning of a message, which can be critical for effective communication.

Another important aspect of pragmatics is the consideration of context. Speakers adjust their language use based on the situation and the relationship they have with the listener. For example, a person may use more formal language in a business meeting than they would with friends. Understanding the context of communication is important because it can affect how a message is received and interpreted by the listener.

Pragmatics also plays a role in cross-cultural communication. Different cultures may have different expectations for how language is used in social interactions, and understanding these cultural norms is essential for effective communication. For example, in some cultures, it may be considered impolite to say no directly, so a speaker may use indirect language to convey refusal.

Overall, pragmatics is important for effective communication because it provides insights into how speakers use language to convey meaning, establish relationships, and navigate social interactions. By understanding the social, cultural, and cognitive factors that contribute to language use, speakers can communicate more effectively and avoid miscommunication.

Historical Overview of Pragmatics

Pragmatics as a field of study with a rich and diverse history that can be traced back to the early works of philosophers such as Aristotle, who discussed the role of context and intention in language use. However, it was not until the mid-twentieth century that pragmatics began to emerge as a distinct field of study within linguistics.

One of the key figures in the development of pragmatics was philosopher and linguist Paul Grice, who introduced the concept of implicature as a way of explaining how speakers convey meaning beyond the literal interpretation of words. Grice's work laid the foundation for the study of pragmatics as a distinct field within linguistics, and his ideas continue to influence research in the field to this day.

In the 1970s, linguists such as John Searle and Herbert H. Clark began to develop theories of speech acts, which focused on the communicative function of language and how speakers use language to perform actions such as making requests or giving orders. This work helped to establish pragmatics as a central area of study within linguistics.

The development of pragmatics as a field of study was also shaped by the rise of functional linguistics in the 1960s and 1970s. Functional linguists, such as Michael Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan, emphasized the importance of context and language use in understanding the structure and meaning of language. Their ideas helped to bridge the gap between formal and functional

approaches to linguistics and provided a framework for analyzing language use in context.

Another important area of development in pragmatics was the study of deixis, which refers to the use of linguistic expressions to point to specific entities in the context of communication. Linguists such as Roman Jakobson and Karl Bühler were early pioneers in this area, and their work laid the foundation for later research on deixis and related topics such as anaphora and reference.

The study of politeness and face-saving behavior also emerged as an important area of research in pragmatics in the 1970s and 1980s. Researchers such as Erving Goffman and Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson introduced the concept of face as a way of explaining how individuals use language to negotiate social relationships and avoid conflict.

Today, pragmatics is a vibrant and dynamic field of study that continues to push the boundaries of our understanding of language use and communication. The historical development of pragmatics has been shaped by a wide range of factors, including the work of influential thinkers in linguistics, philosophy, and related fields, as well as broader social and cultural trends. The field continues to evolve and expand, with researchers exploring new areas of inquiry and developing new methods and approaches for understanding the complex nature of language use and communication.

2 Context in Pragmatics

Types of Contexts

Context is a vital aspect of communication and is particularly significant in the field of pragmatics. In pragmatics, context encompasses several factors that surround a communicative event, including the physical environment, social relationships, cultural norms, and prior knowledge and experience of the speakers. These factors contribute to the interpretation and understanding of language use, and a deep understanding of the different types of context is essential for effective communication.

One of the key types of context in pragmatics is linguistic context. It includes the words, sentences, and discourse surrounding an utterance and impacts its meaning and interpretation. Speakers often rely on linguistic context to convey complex or ambiguous meanings.

Situational context is another important type of context in pragmatics. It encompasses the physical and social environment in which a communicative event takes place and affects the meaning and interpretation of an utterance. Speakers often tailor their language use to the specific situational context in which they find themselves.

Cultural context is also a crucial type of context in pragmatics. It includes the shared values, beliefs, and customs of a particular group or society and impacts the meaning and interpretation of language use. Speakers often rely on cultural norms and expectations to convey meaning and negotiate social relationships.

Finally, cognitive context is another essential type of context in pragmatics. It encompasses the mental states and processes of the speakers involved in a communicative event, impacting the meaning and interpretation of language use. Speakers often use

their own mental states and processes to infer meaning and interpret the intentions of other speakers.

Understanding the different types of context in pragmatics is essential for effective communication. By paying close attention to linguistic, situational, cultural, and cognitive context, speakers can enhance their ability to communicate effectively and avoid misunderstandings. For example, in a conversation between two coworkers discussing a project, the different types of context are evident in the physical environment, the linguistic context, the social context, and the cognitive context, all of which play a crucial role in shaping the meaning of the conversation and influencing how participants interpret and respond to each other's messages.

Contextual Effects on Meaning

Contextual effects on meaning refer to the ways in which the interpretation of language is influenced by the context in which it is used. Pragmatics, as a field of study, is concerned with understanding how context affects meaning and how speakers use language in specific contexts to convey intended meanings.

One way in which contextual effects on meaning can be observed is through the use of conversational implicature. Conversational implicature refers to the implied meaning that arises from a speaker's use of language in a particular context. For example, if someone says **"I'm really thirsty"** while standing in front of a water fountain, the conversational implicature is that they want to drink from the fountain. The meaning of the statement is influenced by the context in which it was uttered.

Another way in which contextual effects on meaning can be observed is through deixis. Deixis refers to the use of language to point to specific entities or locations in the context of communication. For example, if someone says **"I am going to the store**," the meaning of the sentence depends on who the speaker is and where they are located in relation to the store.

Contextual effects on meaning can also be observed through presupposition. Presupposition refers to the implicit assumptions that underlie a speaker's use of language. For example, if someone says **"I'm sorry your dog died**," the presupposition is that the person being addressed had a dog that died. The meaning of the statement is influenced by the contextual assumption that the listener had a dog.

In addition to these examples, contextual effects on meaning can be observed in many other areas of language use, including politeness, implicature, and reference resolution. Overall, the study of contextual effects on meaning is an important area of research within pragmatics, as it helps us to understand how language is used in specific situations and how meaning is constructed through interaction.

Another example of contextual effects on meaning is demonstrated in the simple sentence: **"I didn't say she stole my money."** This sentence can have different meanings depending on the emphasis placed on different words in the sentence. For example, **"I didn't say she stole my money"** (someone else did) or "I didn't say she stole my money" (I wrote it). In each of these interpretations, the meaning of the sentence is influenced by the context in which it is uttered.

Contextual effects can also be seen in non-verbal communication, such as facial expressions, gestures, and tone of voice. For example, when someone says **"I'm fine"** with a flat tone of voice and a sad facial expression, the context indicates that they may not actually be fine. Sarcasm and irony also rely on the context to convey the opposite of what is being said.

Overall, the meaning of language is not solely determined by the words themselves, but also by the context in which they are used. Understanding the contextual effects on meaning is important for effective communication and interpretation of language. As such, it is crucial for speakers and listeners to be

aware of the role that context plays in shaping the meaning of language in order to communicate effectively.

The Cooperative Principle and Grice's Maxims

The Cooperative Principle, proposed by philosopher H. Paul Grice, is a fundamental concept in pragmatics that refers to the assumption that speakers and listeners engage in cooperative communication to achieve mutual understanding. In communication, speakers should make their contribution relevant to the conversation, truthful, informative, and clear. This principle assumes that speakers are cooperative and have a shared goal of understanding and being understood. The Cooperative Principle is based on four maxims: the maxim of quantity, the maxim of quality, the maxim of relevance, and the maxim of manner.

1. **The maxim of quantity** requires speakers to provide the right amount of information needed for the listener to understand the message, without providing too much or too little information.

   > **Example 1**
   >
   > If a friend asks how your day was, a brief response such as **"It was good"** would be sufficient, while a lengthy, detailed response might be unnecessary and even off-putting. Similarly, if a speaker violates the maxim of quantity by providing insufficient information, the listener may become confused and unable to understand the message.

2. **The maxim of quality** requires speakers to provide information that is truthful and supported by evidence. Speakers should not say things they believe to be false, nor should they say things for which they lack adequate evidence.

> **Example 2**
>
> If a colleague asks if you completed a task, it would be inappropriate to say "**yes**" if you have not completed it. If a speaker violates the maxim of quality by providing false information, the listener may become distrustful and less likely to believe future statements from the same speaker.

3. **The maxim of relevance** requires speakers to provide information that is relevant to the current topic of conversation. Irrelevant information can distract from the main point and may hinder mutual understanding.

> **Example 3**
>
> If a group is discussing a project, it would be irrelevant to bring up a personal story that has no connection to the topic at hand. If a speaker violates the maxim of relevance by providing **irrelevant information**, the listener may become **confused** and **lose track** of **the main point** of the conversation.

4. **The maxim of manner** requires speakers to use clear and unambiguous language, avoiding obscurity and ambiguity. This maxim also includes being brief and orderly, avoiding unnecessary complexity or disorder.

> **Example 4**
>
> Using excessively complex vocabulary or lengthy sentences can make it difficult for the listener to understand the message. If a speaker violates the maxim of manner by using unclear language or being unnecessarily complex, the listener may become frustrated and unable to understand the message.

To further illustrate how the violation of Grice's Maxims can lead to miscommunication, let's consider another example:

> **Example 5**
>
> Person 1: **"What time are you going to the party tonight**?"
>
> Person 2: **"I'm not sure, maybe around 9 or 10**."

In this conversation (example 5), Person 2 violates the maxim of quantity by providing too much information. Their response is not specific enough and leaves Person 1 uncertain about when to expect them at the party. This could lead to confusion and misunderstandings about when they should meet up or when the party will be in full swing.

In another scenario:

> **Example 6**
>
> Person 1: **"Do you know where the nearest gas station is**?"
>
> Person 2: **"My uncle has a farm nearby**."

In this conversation (example 6), Person 2 violates the maxim of relevance by providing irrelevant information. Their response does not answer the question and may confuse Person 1, who was looking for directions to the gas station.

These examples highlight the importance of following Grice's Maxims in everyday communication to achieve mutual understanding and avoid misunderstandings. By adhering to these principles, speakers can communicate more effectively, ensure their message is received as intended, and avoid potential breakdowns in communication.

3 Speech Acts

Definition and Types of Speech Acts

Speech acts are the basic units of communication, and they refer to the intended meaning behind what a speaker says. According to Austin (1962), speech acts are "utterances that serve a function in communication, where that function involves a speaker's intention and the effect that the utterance has on the listener" (p. 96). In other words, speech acts are the actions that speakers perform when they use language.

There are several different types of speech acts that speakers can use, including locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. Locutionary acts refer to the literal meaning of what is said, while illocutionary acts are the intended meaning behind the utterance, such as making a request or giving an order. Perlocutionary acts are the effects that the speech act has on the listener, such as convincing someone to do something or making them feel a certain way.

Furthermore, speech acts can be direct or indirect. Direct speech acts are explicit and straightforward, such as making a statement or asking a question. Indirect speech acts, on the other hand, are more subtle and rely on contextual cues and social norms to convey meaning. For example, when someone says "**It's cold in here**," they may be indirectly asking someone to close the window.

Understanding the different types of speech acts is essential for effective communication, as it allows speakers to convey their intentions and listeners to understand them. By recognizing the illocutionary force behind an utterance, listeners can respond appropriately and avoid misunderstandings. This is especially important in cross-cultural communication, where different

cultures may have different norms and expectations around speech acts.

In conclusion, speech acts are the building blocks of communication, and understanding the different types of speech acts is crucial for effective and efficient communication. By recognizing the intended meaning behind an utterance, listeners can respond appropriately, leading to successful communication.

Austin's Speech Act Theory

John Austin was a philosopher of language who developed the Speech Act Theory in the 1950s and 1960s, which focuses on how language is used to perform actions, rather than just convey information. According to Austin, when we speak, we not only convey information, but we also perform actions through our words. These actions are known as speech acts, and they can be categorized into three types: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts.

1. **Locutionary acts** refer to the act of producing meaningful words or sentences that convey information.

   > **Example 1**
   >
   > Speaker: "It's raining outside."

   In example 1, the speaker's utterance is a locutionary act. It's a straightforward statement that conveys a piece of information to the listener, namely that it's currently raining outside. The speaker's intention is to inform the listener of this fact, and the listener's understanding of the statement is based on the conventional meaning of the words used by the speaker. The locutionary act is complete once the words have been spoken, regardless of the listener's response or whether any other communicative goals are achieved.

2. **Illocutionary acts** refer to the act of using language to perform a specific function or intention. These can include making requests, giving orders, making promises, and expressing gratitude, among others.

> **Example 2**
>
> Speaker A: Can you pass me the salt, please?
> Speaker B: **Sure, here you go.**

In example 2, the locutionary act is the request for the salt ("Can you pass me the salt, please?"). The illocutionary act, however, is the intention or effect of the request, which is to get Speaker B to pass the salt. The illocutionary force of this utterance is a request.

It's important to note that illocutionary acts are not always explicitly stated, but can be inferred from the context and the speaker's intentions.

3. **Perlocutionary acts** refer to the act of producing an effect on the listener through the use of language. This can include persuading someone to do something, inspiring them to take action, or causing them to feel a certain way. For example, when a motivational speaker says "**Believe in yourself and you can accomplish anything,**" they are performing a perlocutionary act, inspiring their audience to feel motivated and empowered.

> **Example 3**
>
> Speaker: Have you considered trying **meditation or yoga** to help with your stress levels?
> Listener: Actually, I haven't. Do you think it could help?
> Speaker: Absolutely! I've found it to be really beneficial for managing my own stress. **I can even send you some resources to get started if you're interested.**
> Listener: **That would be great, thank you so much**.

In example 3 above, the speaker's perlocutionary act is to offer resources for the listener to manage their stress through meditation or yoga. The intended effect is to persuade the listener to consider these options as a solution to their stress levels. The perlocutionary act here is successful as the listener expresses interest in receiving the resources. The speaker's words have a positive effect on the listener's behavior, showing the successful accomplishment of the perlocutionary act.

Austin's Speech Act Theory has had a significant impact on the field of linguistics and has been widely applied in various fields, including philosophy, psychology, and communication studies. It has been used to understand how language can be used to manipulate or persuade others, as well as how language can be used to create social and cultural norms. By recognizing the different types of speech acts and their functions, we can better understand the power and impact of language in our everyday lives.

Searle's Classification of Speech Acts

Searle's Classification of Speech Acts and Austin's Speech Act Theory share a common foundation in their recognition of the role of language in social interactions. Both theories highlight the significance of context, intention, and action in determining the meaning and purpose of language use.

However, the differences between the two theories lie in their focus and scope. Austin's theory primarily focuses on the performative aspect of language and the role of context in shaping the meaning of speech acts. He highlighted the ways in which language can be used to perform actions, such as making a promise, giving a warning, or naming someone.

Searle's theory, on the other hand, offers a more comprehensive framework for categorizing speech acts based on their illocutionary force. He identified five distinct categories of

illocutionary acts, each with its own set of intended meanings and effects.

By categorizing speech acts in this way, Searle provided a more systematic way of understanding the variety of ways in which language is used to accomplish different goals in social interactions. He emphasized the ways in which language can be used to bring about changes in the world, such as making a promise, giving a command, or declaring something to be true. Austin and Searle differ in their approaches to speech act theory, both highlight the importance of language as a tool for social action and the need for a nuanced understanding of the ways in which language is used to accomplish different goals in social interactions.

As mentioned earlier, Searle identified five main types of illocutionary acts: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations.

1. **Assertives** are speech acts that aim to convey a proposition, such as making a claim, stating a fact, or expressing an opinion. The illocutionary force of assertive speech acts is to assert, claim, or state something. Examples of assertive speech acts include "**The Earth is round**," "**I think the movie was good**," or "**The restaurant has excellent reviews**."

2. **Directives** are speech acts that aim to get the hearer to do something, such as making a request, giving an order, or asking a question. The illocutionary force of directive speech acts is to direct or command the hearer to do something. Examples of directive speech acts include "**Please pass me the salt**," "**Close the window**," or "**What time is the meeting?**"

3. **Commissives** are speech acts that commit the speaker to a future course of action, such as making a promise, offering a guarantee, or making a threat. The illocutionary force of

commissive speech acts is to commit the speaker to a future course of action. Examples of commissive speech acts include "**I promise to be there on time**," "**I guarantee your satisfaction**," or "**I'll make sure you regret this**."

4. **Expressives** are speech acts that express a psychological state or attitude, such as making an apology, expressing gratitude, or congratulating someone. The illocutionary force of expressive speech acts is to express a psychological state or attitude. Examples of expressive speech acts include "**I'm sorry for your loss**," "**Thank you for your help**," or "**Congratulations on your graduation**."

5. **Declarations** are speech acts that bring about a new state of affairs, such as declaring war, pronouncing someone married, or firing an employee. The illocutionary force of declarative speech acts is to bring about a new state of affairs. Examples of declarative speech acts include "**I now pronounce you husband and wife**," "**I declare this meeting adjourned**," or "**I hereby sentence you to ten years in prison**."

While Austin's approach to speech act theory focused on the performativity of language and the context in which speech acts are performed, Searle's classification of speech acts focused more on the illocutionary force of speech acts and how they function to accomplish different goals in communication.

Overall, understanding the different types of illocutionary acts identified by Searle can help us better understand how language is used to accomplish different goals in communication, and how the illocutionary force of speech acts contributes to the intended meaning and purpose of an utterance.

4 Reference and Inference

Definition of Reference

In pragmatics, reference refers to the process of using language to identify and specify a particular object or entity in the world. It involves linking words or phrases in a sentence to a specific referent in the context, which can include people, objects, events, or ideas. For example, the word "**cat**" in the sentence "**I saw a cat on the fence**" refers to a specific animal that the speaker saw.

Reference is a crucial aspect of language use, as it allows speakers and listeners to share a common understanding of the meaning of words and phrases. However, reference can also be a source of ambiguity and misunderstanding, particularly when there are multiple possible referents in the context or when there is a lack of shared knowledge between the speaker and listener.

To avoid confusion and ensure effective communication, speakers often use various reference strategies to clarify the intended referent. These strategies may include using definite and indefinite articles, demonstratives, and other types of referring expressions. For example, a speaker might use the phrase "**the blue car**" instead of "**a blue car**" to refer to a specific car that is already known or has been previously mentioned in the conversation.

Overall, reference is an essential component of pragmatic competence, and it plays a critical role in shaping our interactions and relationships with others. By understanding the principles of reference, we can better navigate the complex social world of language use and communicate effectively with those around us.

Types of Reference

Reference in pragmatics can take various forms, and different types of reference serve different communicative purposes. The following are the main types of reference in pragmatics:

1. **Anaphoric reference**: Anaphoric reference is a type of reference where a word or phrase refers back to something that has already been mentioned in the discourse.

> **Example 1**
>
> The sentence "**John went to the store, and he bought some milk**," the pronoun "he" refers back to John, who was previously mentioned in the sentence.

2. **Cataphoric reference**: Cataphoric reference is a type of reference where a word or phrase refers forward to something that will be mentioned later in the discourse.

> **Example 2**
>
> The sentence "**She was hungry, so Mary ate an apple**," the pronoun "**she**" refers forward to Mary, who will be introduced in the next clause.

3. **Exophoric reference**: Exophoric reference is a type of reference where a word or phrase refers to something in the extralinguistic context, such as the physical environment, the speaker or the addressee, or the cultural background of the speakers.

> **Example 3**
>
> The sentence "**That's a beautiful car**," the word "that" refers to a car that is physically present in the environment.

4. **Endophoric reference**: Endophoric reference is a type of reference where a word or phrase refers to something that is part of the linguistic context, such as a previously mentioned word, a word in the same sentence, or a word in a previous sentence.

> **Example 4**
>
> The sentence "**John ate an apple, and he enjoyed it**," the pronoun "**it**" refers to the previously mentioned apple.

5. **Deictic reference**: Deictic reference is a type of reference where a word or phrase takes on meaning based on the context of the speaker and the addressee, such as the time, the location, or the social status of the participants.

> **Example 5**
>
> The sentence "**I'll see you tomorrow**," the word "**tomorrow**" takes on meaning based on the temporal context of the speaker and the addressee.

Overall, the types of reference in pragmatics play a crucial role in enabling effective communication and conveying meaning in discourse. By understanding the different types of reference, we can better comprehend the intended meaning of a speaker and participate more effectively in conversations.

Inference and Implicature

Inference and implicature are two important concepts in pragmatics that are essential for understanding the meaning of utterances in context. Inference involves deriving meaning from what is said based on background knowledge and the context of the conversation, while implicature refers to the meaning that is implied or suggested by what is said, beyond its literal or surface meaning.

Implicature is a particularly fascinating aspect of pragmatics because it allows speakers to convey complex meanings with brevity and economy. There are two main types of implicature:

conventional implicature and conversational implicature. Conventional implicature is associated with specific words or phrases that have an inherent meaning beyond their literal meaning. For example, the word "but" implies a contrast between two ideas or clauses. In contrast, conversational implicature is based on the context of the conversation and the shared assumptions of the speakers.

The cooperative principle, proposed by philosopher H.P. Grice, is a key framework for understanding conversational implicature. According to this principle, speakers are expected to make contributions that are informative, truthful, relevant, and clear. If a speaker violates one of these principles, the listener may infer an implicature based on the assumption that the speaker has a reason for doing so.

1. **Conversational implicature** can be further divided into two subtypes: generalized implicature and particularized implicature. Generalized implicature involves assumptions that are based on general principles of conversation, such as the maxim of relevance or the maxim of quantity. For example, if someone asks "**Do you have the time**?" the speaker is not only asking for the time, but also implying that they need to know the time for a specific reason.

2. **Particularized implicature**, on the other hand, involves assumptions that are based on specific contextual factors, such as the speaker's tone of voice or body language. For example, if a friend says "**You look tired**," they may be implying that you should take a break or get some rest, based on the assumption that they care about your well-being.

Implicature can also be conveyed through indirect speech acts, where the speaker's intended meaning is conveyed through an indirect statement. For example, if someone says "I wonder if you could pass the salt," the speaker is not really wondering, but is actually making a request.

In summary, inference and implicature are two essential concepts in pragmatics that help us to understand the intended meaning of an utterance beyond its literal or surface meaning. Implicature is a particularly fascinating aspect of pragmatics because it allows speakers to convey complex meanings with brevity and economy, and it can be conveyed through various means such as conventional implicature, conversational implicature, and indirect speech acts. By understanding these concepts and their various types and subtypes, listeners can effectively infer the intended meaning of an utterance and engage in more effective communication.

5 Presupposition and Entailment

Definition and Types of Presupposition

Presupposition is a fundamental concept in pragmatics, referring to the assumption that a speaker makes about the shared knowledge or beliefs between themselves and their audience. It is the idea that a speaker assumes a certain piece of information to be true and expects the listener to also accept it as true. Presupposition is essential for communication, as it allows speakers to make assumptions about what their listeners know or believe, and tailor their messages accordingly.

There are several types of presupposition, including lexical presupposition, structural presupposition, and pragmatic presupposition. Lexical presupposition involves the use of certain words or expressions that carry a presupposed meaning. For example, the word "**again**" presupposes that an action has occurred at least once before. Consider the sentence, "John stopped smoking again." The word "again" presupposes that John had previously stopped smoking and then started again.

Structural presupposition, on the other hand, involves the grammatical structure of a sentence or utterance, which can also carry presupposed meaning. For example, the sentence "The king of France is bald" presupposes that there is a king of France, even though there is currently no such person.

Pragmatic presupposition involves the speaker's intended meaning and their assumptions about what the listener knows or believes. It can be conveyed through various means, such as through indirect speech acts or conversational implicatures. For example, if someone says "**I need to cancel my plans tonight**," the pragmatic presupposition may be that they had previously made plans.

Presupposition is also closely related to the concept of entailment, which refers to the logical relationship between two statements. Entailment occurs when the truth of one statement necessitates the truth of another statement. For example, the statement "John has a sister" entails that there is at least one person who is John's sister.

Presupposition is an important aspect of communication because it allows speakers to make assumptions about their listeners' knowledge and beliefs, and tailor their messages accordingly. By understanding the different types of presupposition and how they are conveyed, listeners can better infer the intended meaning of an utterance.

In summary, presupposition is the assumption that a speaker makes about the shared knowledge or beliefs between themselves and their audience. It can be conveyed through lexical, structural, and pragmatic means, and is closely related to the concept of entailment. By understanding presupposition, speakers can make their messages more effective and efficient, and listeners can better infer the intended meaning of an utterance.

Entailment and Presupposition

Entailment and presupposition are important concepts in pragmatics that help us to understand how speakers convey meaning beyond the literal meaning of their words. These concepts are closely related and often work together to create meaning in language.

Entailment refers to the logical relationship between two propositions, where the truth of one proposition necessarily implies the truth of the other. For example, if we say "**Mary owns a car,**" it necessarily entails "There is a car that Mary owns." In this case, the truth of the first proposition implies the truth of the second proposition.

Presupposition, on the other hand, refers to the background assumptions or beliefs that speakers hold and convey through their language. These assumptions are often implied rather than explicitly stated and are essential for understanding the meaning of an utterance. For example, if someone says **"I'm sorry I'm late**," the presupposition may be that they were expected to arrive at a certain time and did not arrive on time.

Presuppositions can be categorized into different types, including existential presuppositions, lexical presuppositions, structural presuppositions, and nonverbal presuppositions.

1. **Existential presuppositions** refer to the assumption that something exists or is true.

Example 1

If someone says **"John stopped eating meat**," the presupposition is that John used to eat meat in the past.

Example 2

Speaker A: "I need to return the book to the library."
Speaker B: "Which book?"

In the example 2, Speaker A presupposes **the existence of a book** that they borrowed from the library, while Speaker B's question presupposes **the existence of a set of books** from which Speaker A borrowed one. Both speakers assume that the book and the library exist, which is the existential presupposition in this conversation.

Existential presupposition can be challenging to identify because it is often implicit in the speaker's utterances. It is assumed that the speaker and the listener share common

knowledge about the world, and the speaker relies on this shared knowledge to convey their message. When the presupposition is not met, it can result in confusion or misunderstanding.

2. **Lexical presuppositions** involve the presupposition associated with specific words or phrases that have an inherent meaning beyond their literal meaning.

> **Example 3**
>
> **"Stop"**
>
> The word stop on example 3 above presupposes that action was happening before and the ceased

> **Example 4**
>
> "John's dog ran away **again**, so he had to buy a new one."

The word "**again**" above (example 4) is a lexical item that carries a presupposition. The presupposition is that John's dog has run away before. The sentence implies that John has owned a dog that ran away at least once in the past. If the presupposition is not true, the sentence is semantically odd or requires more explanation. Another example can be seen on the following example below.

> **Example 5**
>
> "I am **no longer** a vegetarian."

In the sentence (example 5), the lexical item **"no longer"** carries a presupposition. The presupposition is that the speaker was previously a vegetarian. The sentence implies that there has been a change in the speaker's diet. In those examples, the presuppositions are implicit and are not directly stated in the sentences but can be inferred from the meanings of the words used.

3. **Structural presuppositions** refer to the presupposition that arises from the grammatical structure of a sentence.

Example 6

"**John regrets that he ate too much.**"

The example 6 above presupposes that John did, in fact, eat too much.

4. **Nonverbal presuppositions** refer to the presupposition that arises from nonverbal communication, such as tone of voice or body language.

Example 7

"**I'm happy for you.**"

For example 7, if someone says "**I'm happy for you**," but says it with a sarcastic tone, the presupposition is that they are not actually happy for the other person.

Overall, entailment and presupposition are crucial concepts in pragmatics for understanding how speakers convey meaning beyond the literal meaning of their words. They work together to create a complex web of meaning that allows for effective

communication between speakers and listeners. By understanding the types of presuppositions and the relationships between propositions in a sentence, listeners can better understand the intended meaning of an utterance.

Projection of Presupposition

Projection of presupposition is an important concept in pragmatics that refers to the extent to which presuppositions are carried over from one sentence to another. In other words, it describes how presuppositions can be inherited or transferred from one sentence to the next, and how they can affect the interpretation of subsequent sentences.

There are two main types of projection: upward projection and downward projection. Upward projection occurs when the presupposition of a sentence is inherited by the embedding sentence.

Example 8

"John stopped smoking."

This sentence on example 8 presupposes that John used to smoke in the past. If we embed this sentence in another sentence, such as **"I'm glad that John stopped smoking**," the presupposition of the first sentence (that John used to smoke) is carried over to the embedding sentence (that John used to smoke, but now he has stopped).

Downward projection, on the other hand, occurs when the presupposition of a sentence is carried over to its subordinates.

> **Example 9**
>
> **'Mary regrets selling her car**."
>
> The sentence on example 9 presupposes that Mary sold her car. If we add a subordinate clause, such as "**Mary regrets that she sold her car because she needs it now**," the presupposition of the main sentence (that Mary sold her car) is carried over to the subordinate clause (that Mary sold her car and now she needs it).

Projection of presupposition can also be affected by certain linguistic operators, such as negation and modal verbs. Negation can block the presupposition of a sentence from being projected. For example, the sentence "**John doesn't have a car anymore**" presupposes that John used to have a car, but this presupposition is blocked by the negation "**doesn't.**" Modal verbs, on the other hand, can strengthen or weaken the projection of presuppositions. For example, the sentence "**John might have stopped smoking**" weakens the presupposition that John used to smoke, whereas the sentence "**John must have stopped smoking**" strengthens the presupposition that John used to smoke.

Overall, understanding projection of presupposition is essential for interpreting meaning in discourse. It allows us to understand how presuppositions are carried over from one sentence to the next and how they can affect the interpretation of subsequent sentences. By paying attention to linguistic operators and the context of the discourse, we can better understand the projection of presuppositions and how they contribute to meaning.

6 **Politeness**

Definition and Types of Politeness

Politeness is a crucial aspect of communication that plays a vital role in social interaction. It refers to the use of language to demonstrate respect, consideration, and deference towards others. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), politeness can be defined as the means used to show awareness and appreciation of another person's face. Face, in this context, refers to the positive social value a person claims for themselves in a particular interaction.

There are two main types of politeness: positive politeness and negative politeness. Positive politeness is used to show friendliness and build rapport with others. It involves the use of language that expresses concern, empathy, and interest in the other person's well-being. For example, a speaker might say, **"I hope you're doing well"** or **"How have you been**?" as a way to show positive politeness.

Negative politeness, on the other hand, is used to avoid threatening the other person's face. It involves the use of language that is more indirect and tentative, such as hedging or apologizing. For example, a speaker might say, **"I'm sorry to bother you, but..."** or **"Would it be okay if I asked you a question**?" as a way to show negative politeness.

Overall, understanding the different types of politeness and how to use them appropriately is crucial for effective communication in various social contexts. By using language that shows respect, consideration, and deference towards others, we can minimize misunderstandings and promote positive social interactions.

Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory

Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory is a well-established theory in pragmatics that highlights the importance of politeness in communication. The theory identifies two types of face: **positive** and **negative**, and explains how speakers use different strategies to maintain face during communication. The four main politeness strategies identified by the theory are bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record. These strategies are used by speakers to mitigate face-threatening acts, such as making requests, giving orders, or disagreeing with someone.

One of the key features of Politeness Theory is the importance of understanding face-threatening acts, which refer to communicative acts that threaten one's positive or negative face. Different politeness strategies are employed depending on factors such as the degree of imposition involved, the social distance between speakers, and the perceived power dynamics of the interaction.

1. The first strategy, **bald on-record**, involves being direct and straightforward in communication without any attempt to mitigate a threat to face. This strategy is typically used in situations where the cost of not being direct outweighs any potential threat to face.

    > **Example 1**
    >
    > A teacher might use bald on-record language to discipline a student who has misbehaved: "**Stop talking right now**!"

2. The second strategy, **positive politeness**, involves the use of language that emphasizes friendliness and rapport between speakers. This strategy can be used to maintain positive

social relationships while still addressing a potential threat to face.

> **Example 2**
>
> If someone is running late for a meeting, the other person might say "**Take your time**!" to show understanding and friendliness.

3. The third strategy, **negative politeness**, involves the use of language that is deferential and shows respect for the other person's autonomy. This strategy is typically used in situations where the speaker is making a request or imposing on the other person in some way.

> **Example 3**
>
> A person might say "**Would it be possible for you to close the window**?" to show respect for the other person's space.

4. The last strategy, **off-record strategy**, the speaker hints at or suggests a request or criticism rather than stating it directly. The speaker assumes that the listener can infer the intended meaning without the need for a direct request or criticism, which helps to mitigate any potential threat to the listener's face. This strategy is often used in situations where there is a high degree of social distance between the speakers, or where the speaker lacks the power to make a direct request or criticism.

> **Example 4**
>
> When a person says "**It's cold in here**" to suggest that they would like the window closed, rather than making a direct request to close the window. The listener can infer from the statement that the speaker would like the window to be closed without the need for a direct request, which helps to maintain the positive face of both speakers.

Overall, Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory offers insights into the complex ways that language is used to maintain social relationships. By understanding these different politeness strategies, speakers can better navigate communication in different situations to achieve their communicative goals while still maintaining positive social relationships.

Cross-cultural Variations in Politeness

Cross-cultural variations in politeness are an important area of study within the field of pragmatics. While Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory provides a framework for understanding the role of politeness in communication, it has been criticized for its Western cultural bias and its emphasis on individualistic cultures. As such, researchers have investigated how politeness norms and strategies vary across different cultures.

One approach to understanding cross-cultural variations in politeness is to examine the concept of face, which is central to Politeness Theory. While face is a universal concept, the way it is conceptualized and valued can vary across cultures. For example, in individualistic cultures like the United States, positive face is often emphasized, and compliments and expressions of admiration are seen as positive politeness strategies. In collectivistic cultures like Japan, on the other hand, negative face is often emphasized, and speakers may use indirect language and hedges to avoid imposing on others.

Another factor that can influence politeness norms and strategies is the degree of power distance between speakers. In high power distance cultures, where there is a significant power imbalance between speakers, speakers may use more deferential language and show greater respect for authority figures. In low power distance cultures, on the other hand, speakers may use more direct language and be more likely to challenge authority.

For example, research has shown that speakers of East Asian languages like Mandarin and Japanese tend to use more indirect language and rely heavily on context and nonverbal cues to convey meaning. In contrast, speakers of European languages like English and German tend to use more direct language and place less emphasis on contextual factors.

Another example is the difference between politeness norms in the United States and Latin America. In the United States, direct language and straightforward communication are often valued, and politeness strategies like compliments and positive politeness are commonly used. In Latin America, however, indirect language and circumlocution are often preferred, and speakers may use more negative politeness strategies like apologies and hedges to avoid imposing on others.

Overall, cross-cultural variations in politeness reflect the different values and norms that exist in different cultures. By understanding these variations, we can better navigate communication with people from different cultural backgrounds and avoid misunderstandings.

7 Discourse Analysis

Definition and Scope of Discourse Analysis

Discourse Analysis (DA) is a broad field of study that involves the systematic analysis of spoken or written communication in its social context. It aims to understand how language is used in different contexts to construct meanings, negotiate social relationships, and create identities. DA can be applied to a range of communication forms, including conversations, interviews, speeches, texts, and social media posts. It draws on theories from linguistics, sociology, psychology, anthropology, and communication studies to provide insights into the complex ways in which language is used to create and sustain social reality.

One of the key features of DA is its focus on the social and cultural context of communication. It recognizes that language is not simply a neutral tool for conveying meaning but is deeply embedded in cultural and social structures. Therefore, to fully understand the meaning of a communicative act, it is necessary to consider the cultural, social, and historical context in which it is produced and interpreted. This approach is sometimes referred to as "contextualized analysis," and it emphasizes the importance of understanding the cultural norms, values, and beliefs that shape communication.

Another important aspect of DA is its emphasis on the role of power and ideology in communication. It recognizes that communication is not a neutral process but is shaped by power relations and the interests of different social groups. Therefore, DA seeks to uncover how language is used to maintain or challenge power relations and to promote or resist dominant ideologies. This approach is sometimes referred to as "critical discourse analysis," and it emphasizes the importance of analyzing the discursive practices that support or challenge social inequality.

An example of how DA can be used to analyze communication is the study of political speeches. By analyzing the language and rhetorical strategies used in political speeches, DA can provide insights into how political leaders construct their identities, appeal to their audiences, and mobilize support. It can also reveal how political ideologies are communicated and contested through language and how political discourse reflects and reinforces power relations.

In conclusion, Discourse Analysis is a multifaceted field of study that involves the systematic analysis of communication in its social and cultural context. It emphasizes the importance of context and power in shaping communication and provides insights into how language is used to create meaning, construct identities, and negotiate social relationships. By using DA to analyze different types of communication, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of the complex ways in which language is used to shape social reality.

Cohesion and Coherence

Cohesion and coherence are two key concepts in discourse analysis, which is the study of how language is used in social contexts. Cohesion refers to the ways in which the components of a text are connected and organized, while coherence refers to the overall sense and meaning that emerges from those connections.

Cohesion is achieved through the use of cohesive devices such as pronouns, conjunctions, and lexical items that create links between sentences and paragraphs. These devices help to signal the relationships between ideas and help the reader or listener to follow the flow of the text. For example, the use of pronouns like **"he"** or **"she"** to refer back to a previously mentioned person or thing creates a cohesive link between two sentences or clauses.

Coherence, on the other hand, is achieved through the use of discourse markers, logical organization, and the selection of

relevant information. Discourse markers are words or phrases that help to signal the relationships between ideas, such as **"however**," **"nevertheless**," or **"as a result**." Logical organization refers to the way that ideas are arranged and connected within a text, such as the use of headings or subheadings to structure a written document.

Together, cohesion and coherence help to create a sense of unity and purpose in a text, making it easier for the reader or listener to understand and interpret the message being conveyed. Effective use of cohesion and coherence is essential in all forms of communication, including written and spoken language.

For example, in a news article about a recent political event, cohesive devices such as pronouns and conjunctions help to link the various ideas presented in the text. Discourse markers and logical organization help to guide the reader through the key points of the story and provide a clear understanding of the events being reported.

In conclusion, cohesion and coherence are fundamental concepts in discourse analysis, as they help to create meaning and structure in language. Effective use of these concepts can improve communication and aid in the interpretation of written and spoken texts.

Discourse Markers and Their Functions

Discourse markers are words or phrases that signal the relationships between different parts of a discourse or conversation. They are used to connect ideas, indicate shifts in topic or speaker, express attitudes, and provide structure to a text or conversation. Discourse markers are particularly important in spoken language, where they help to maintain coherence and facilitate understanding.

Discourse markers can be categorized into several types based on their functions in discourse. Some common types include additive, adversative, causal, temporal, and inferential discourse markers.

1. **Additive** discourse markers are used to add information that is related to the previous information. Examples of additive discourse markers include "**and**," "**also**," "**furthermore**," "**moreover**," "**in addition**," and "**as well**." For example, "I love pizza, **and** I also love pasta" or "She is a talented musician. **Furthermore**, she is also an accomplished artist."

2. **Adversative** discourse markers are used to show a contrast or opposition between two ideas. Examples of adversative discourse markers include "**but**," "**however**," "**yet**," "**on the other hand**," and "nevertheless." For example, "I love pizza, **but** I don't like pasta" or "She is a talented musician. **However**, she struggles with public speaking."

3. **Causal** discourse markers are used to show a cause-and-effect relationship between two ideas. Examples of causal discourse markers include "**because**," "**since**," "**due to**," "**as a result**," and "**therefore**." For example, "I didn't go to the party **because** I was feeling sick" or "She studied hard, **therefore** she got good grades."

4. **Temporal** discourse markers are used to show a sequence of events or to indicate time. Examples of temporal discourse markers include "**firstly**," "**secondly**," "**then**," "**finally**," "**afterwards**," and "**subsequently**." For example, "**Firstly**, we need to gather all the necessary materials. **Then**, we can start the project."

5. **Inferential** discourse markers are used to indicate a speaker's interpretation of a situation or to make an inference based on the given information. Examples of inferential discourse markers include "**apparently**," "**presumably**," "**in other words**," "**that is to say**," and "**in fact**." For example,

"**Apparently**, the meeting has been postponed" or "**In other words**, we need to work harder to achieve our goals."

Discourse markers play an important role in facilitating communication and ensuring coherence in a discourse or conversation. They help to signal the relationships between different parts of a text or conversation, and they provide a structure that allows speakers to convey their intended meaning effectively. By using discourse markers, speakers can create a clear and cohesive narrative that is easy to follow and understand.

For example, consider the following passage:

"I love to travel. However, I find it difficult to do so with my young children. Nevertheless, I believe that travel is an important part of their education. Therefore, I try to plan at least one family trip each year."

In this passage, the discourse markers "however" and "nevertheless" signal a contrast or opposition between the speaker's love of travel and the difficulties of traveling with young children. The marker "therefore" signals a conclusion or inference drawn by the speaker, that family travel is important and worth the effort.

In conclusion, discourse markers play a crucial role in creating coherence and facilitating communication in a discourse or conversation. They provide a structure that allows speakers to convey their intended meaning effectively and ensure that the listener can follow and understand the discourse. Discourse markers are an important aspect of discourse analysis, and researchers have extensively studied their functions and effects on communication.

8 Pragmatics and Language Teaching

Implications of Pragmatics for Language Teaching

Pragmatics is the study of how language is used in social contexts, taking into account the speaker's intentions, the listener's interpretations, and the social context in which the communication occurs. Pragmatics has important implications for language teaching, as it can help teachers better understand the ways in which language is used in real-world situations, and how to help their students develop communicative competence.

One implication of pragmatics for language teaching is the need to focus on the use of language in context, rather than just teaching isolated grammar and vocabulary rules. This involves teaching students how to use language appropriately in different situations and with different interlocutors, taking into account factors such as the social status of the interlocutors, the formality of the situation, and the communicative goals of the participants.

For example, a teacher might teach students how to make requests in different contexts, such as making a request in a formal email versus making a request to a friend. In a formal email, it might be more appropriate to use indirect language and to show deference to the recipient's status, while in a conversation with a friend, more direct and informal language might be used.

Another implication of pragmatics for language teaching is the need to teach students the cultural norms and expectations that underlie communication in different cultures. This involves helping students understand the cultural context in which the language is used, including the values, beliefs, and customs of the culture.

Another example, a teacher might teach students about the use of honorifics in Japanese language, which reflect the social status of the speaker and the listener. Or, a teacher might teach students about the importance of indirectness in communication in some cultures, such as in many Asian cultures where direct confrontation is avoided.

Overall, the implications of pragmatics for language teaching emphasize the importance of teaching language in context, and helping students develop the ability to use language appropriately in different situations and with different interlocutors. By incorporating pragmatic considerations into language teaching, teachers can help their students develop communicative competence and become more effective communicators in a variety of real-world contexts.

Teaching Pragmatics Explicitly

Pragmatics is a crucial aspect of language use that refers to the way language is used in social contexts. It involves understanding how to use language appropriately in different situations, taking into account factors such as cultural norms, context, and the speaker's intentions. Explicit teaching of pragmatics involves teaching these social and cultural rules of language use directly to students, rather than assuming that they will acquire them through exposure to language in context.

Explicit teaching of pragmatics can be beneficial for language learners, particularly those learning a second language or those from different cultural backgrounds. It can help learners to understand and navigate the complexities of social interactions and to use language appropriately in different situations. This can improve their communication skills and make them more effective and confident communicators.

Explicit teaching of pragmatics can be done through a variety of methods, such as using authentic materials, role-playing, and explicit instruction on language use in different contexts. For example, teachers can use real-life situations or scenarios to help students understand how to use language appropriately in different contexts. Role-playing activities can be particularly useful, as they allow students to practice using language in a safe and supportive environment.

In addition to these teaching methods, teachers can also provide explicit instruction on language use in different contexts. This can involve teaching specific language functions, such as requesting, apologizing, or making suggestions, and the language and cultural norms associated with them. Teachers can also provide feedback and correction on students' language use, highlighting areas where they may need to improve their pragmatic competence.

Overall, explicit teaching of pragmatics can be a valuable tool for language teachers, helping to improve their students' communication skills and their ability to use language appropriately in different situations. By incorporating pragmatic instruction into their teaching, teachers can help to create more effective and confident communicators.

Intercultural Communication and Pragmatics

Intercultural communication refers to communication between individuals or groups from different cultural backgrounds. It involves the exchange of messages that are influenced by cultural beliefs, values, and norms, which can lead to misunderstandings, misinterpretations, and communication breakdowns. Pragmatics, on the other hand, is concerned with the study of how people use language in context to achieve their communicative goals.

The study of pragmatics is essential in intercultural communication as it provides insight into how people from different cultures use language to convey meaning and express

social relations. For instance, different cultures may have different norms and values regarding politeness, directness, and indirectness. Therefore, understanding the pragmatic norms of different cultures is essential for effective intercultural communication.

Besides, pragmatic competence is very essential for successful intercultural communication, which includes the ability to use appropriate discourse markers, politeness strategies, and indirectness. Teaching pragmatics explicitly can help learners develop pragmatic competence and enhance their intercultural communication skills. Explicit teaching of pragmatics involves raising learners' awareness of pragmatic features and providing them with opportunities to practice using these features in context.

Intercultural communication and pragmatics are interrelated as they both involve the study of language use in context. Understanding the pragmatic norms of different cultures is crucial for effective intercultural communication. Teaching pragmatics explicitly can enhance learners' pragmatic competence and improve their intercultural communication skills.

9 Research Methods in Pragmatics

Experimental Method in Pragmatics

Experimental methods in pragmatics involve the use of empirical data to investigate the nature of language use in context. This approach typically involves the manipulation of specific pragmatic variables in order to determine their impact on speakers' interpretation and production of language. Experimental methods in pragmatics have been used to investigate a range of pragmatic phenomena, including implicature, presupposition, and indirect speech acts, among others.

One common experimental technique in pragmatics is the use of judgment tasks, in which participants are presented with various linguistic stimuli and asked to make judgments about their meaning or appropriateness in context. For example, a study might present participants with a sentence containing an indirect speech act, such as "Can you pass the salt?", and ask them to judge whether the request was polite or impolite.

Another common experimental technique is the use of production tasks, in which participants are asked to produce language in response to specific communicative situations. For example, a study might ask participants to produce a request for help in a specific social context, such as asking for directions in a foreign country.

Experimental methods in pragmatics have the potential to provide valuable insights into the nature of language use in context and to inform language teaching and learning practices. By identifying specific pragmatic variables that impact language use and interpretation, experimental studies can help teachers design more effective language instruction that prepares learners

to communicate effectively in a range of social and cultural contexts.

Corpus-based Approaches to Pragmatics

Corpus-based approaches to pragmatics refer to the use of large electronic databases of naturally occurring language, known as corpora, to study the use of language in context. The use of corpora in pragmatics research has gained popularity over the years, as it allows researchers to examine language use in a more naturalistic setting and to identify patterns and regularities in language use.

One advantage of corpus-based approaches to pragmatics is that they provide a rich source of data that can be used to examine a wide range of linguistic phenomena. For example, researchers can use corpora to study the use of particular words or phrases in context, to investigate the frequency and distribution of different speech acts, and to analyze the way that speakers use language to achieve particular communicative goals.

Another advantage of corpus-based approaches is that they allow researchers to examine language use in a more systematic and rigorous way than is possible with traditional methods of data collection. For example, corpus-based studies can use statistical techniques to identify patterns and regularities in language use, and can also be used to test hypotheses about the use of language in context.

One example of corpus-based research in pragmatics is a study by Blakemore and Carston (2005) which used a corpus of newspaper articles to investigate the use of metaphorical language in political discourse. The study found that metaphorical language was used extensively in political discourse, and that different metaphors were used to convey different aspects of political ideology and policy.

Overall, corpus-based approaches to pragmatics offer a powerful tool for investigating the use of language in context and for identifying patterns and regularities in language use. As such, they have the potential to contribute significantly to our understanding of how language is used in social interaction, and to inform the development of language teaching materials and language policy.

Data Collection & Analysis in Pragmatics Research

Data collection and analysis are essential components of pragmatics research, as they provide the empirical evidence necessary to test theoretical claims about language use and meaning in context. Pragmatics research often involves the use of a variety of data collection methods, including interviews, surveys, naturalistic observations, and experimental designs. The choice of method depends on the research question, the type of data required, and the practical constraints of the study.

One commonly used method in pragmatics research is the use of conversation analysis, which involves the detailed examination of naturally occurring talk-in-interaction to identify patterns of communication and social action. For example, a conversation analyst might study how speakers use repair strategies (e.g., clarification requests, repetitions) to manage problems in communication and maintain mutual understanding in conversation.

Another method used in pragmatics research is the use of corpus analysis (mentioned previously), which involves the study of large electronic databases of spoken or written language. Corpus analysis can be used to identify patterns of language use and variation across different contexts, as well as to test hypotheses about the relationship between language use and social factors such as gender, age, and culture. For example, a corpus analysis might investigate how the use of discourse

markers (e.g., "like," "you know") varies across different speech communities and contexts.

In addition to data collection, pragmatics researchers also use a variety of methods to analyze their data, including statistical analysis, discourse analysis, and qualitative analysis. Statistical analysis can be used to identify patterns and relationships in large datasets, while discourse analysis and qualitative analysis are used to identify and interpret patterns of language use and social action in context.

Data collection and analysis are crucial components of pragmatics research, as they enable researchers to test theoretical claims and advance our understanding of how language is used in social interaction. By using a variety of methods to collect and analyze data, pragmatics researchers can gain a rich and nuanced understanding of the complex ways in which language is used to convey meaning and achieve social goals.

10 Conclusion

Future Direction for Research in Pragmatics

Pragmatics, as a field of study, is continually evolving and expanding, with new avenues of research constantly emerging. One of the most promising directions for future research in pragmatics is the integration of interdisciplinary approaches. By combining insights and methodologies from fields such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, and computer science, researchers can gain a more comprehensive understanding of how language use operates in different contexts.

Another promising area of research is the exploration of new technologies for data collection and analysis. With the rise of natural language processing and machine learning techniques, researchers can more efficiently analyze large amounts of data and gain insights into patterns of language use that were previously impossible to detect.

Additionally, there is a growing interest in the study of pragmatics in multilingual and multicultural contexts. As global communication becomes increasingly important, understanding how different cultures and languages shape communication and understanding is crucial.

Conclusively, there is a need for more research on the intersection between pragmatics and social justice issues. By examining how language use can contribute to social inequality and marginalization, researchers can develop interventions and strategies to promote more inclusive and equitable communication practices.

Generally, the future of pragmatics research is exciting and holds great potential for advancing our understanding of how language is used in social interaction. By incorporating interdisciplinary approaches, utilizing new technologies,

exploring multilingual and multicultural contexts, and addressing social justice issues, researchers can continue to make important contributions to the field.

The Importance of Pragmatics in Everyday Communication

Effective communication in everyday life depends on our ability to understand the intended meaning behind the words and to use language appropriately in different situations. This ability is what Pragmatics studies. Without an understanding of pragmatics, miscommunications and misunderstandings are more likely to occur.

One important aspect of pragmatics is the ability to interpret indirect speech acts. Indirect speech acts are common in everyday communication and involve using language to convey a meaning that is different from the literal interpretation of the words. For example, saying **"It's cold in here"** could be an indirect way of asking someone to close the window. Without an understanding of indirect speech acts, one might take the statement at face value and not realize that action is expected.

Another crucial aspect of pragmatics is the ability to understand and use different speech registers appropriately. Speech registers refer to the different levels of formality in language use and are important in determining appropriate behavior in different social situations. For instance, the language used in a job interview is likely to be more formal and professional than the language used in a conversation with friends.

Pragmatics also involves understanding and using politeness strategies, which are critical for maintaining positive social relationships. Politeness strategies include using indirect requests, offering apologies, and using honorifics to show respect

to others. Without the use of appropriate politeness strategies, communication can break down, and relationships can suffer.

In conclusion, pragmatics is a vital aspect of everyday communication. Understanding the intended meaning behind words, using appropriate speech registers, interpreting indirect speech acts, and using politeness strategies all contribute to effective communication and maintaining positive social relationships. By improving our understanding of pragmatics, we can enhance our communication skills and build stronger connections with others.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford University Press.

Blakemore, D., & Carston, R. (2005). The pragmatics of sentential co-ordination with and. Language and Cognitive Processes, 20(2), 141-173.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies. Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. Harvard University Press.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). Language as social semiotic. London: Edward Arnold.

Jakobson, R. (1957). Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb. In R. Jakobson (Ed.), Selected Writings: Word and Language (pp. 130-147). The Hague: Mouton.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maschler, Y. (2013). Pragmatics. In The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis, ed. Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog. Oxford University Press.

Mey, J. L. (1993). Pragmatics: An Introduction. Blackwell Publishers.

Mey, J. L. (2001). Pragmatics: An introduction (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Schiffrin, D. (1994). Approaches to Discourse. Blackwell Publishers.

Schneider, K. P., & Barron, A. (2014). Pragmatics. In The Handbook of Linguistics, ed. Keith Allan. Wiley-Blackwell.

Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, J. (1991). Corpus, concordance, collocation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Verschueren, J. (1999). Understanding Pragmatics. Arnold Publishers.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.

About The Authors

Muhammad Iqbal Ramdhani is currently Senior Lecturer of Literature Department at Universitas Bina Darma. He received his M.Pd. from Sriwijaya University and has taught courses in linguistics, literature, statistics to undergraduate students at Universitas Bina Darma. He is a former of head of language laboratory (language centre), head of cooperation department, and director of office of international affair. He actively writes books, academic papers for conferences, journal articles, and other works. His teaching and research interests include linguistics, literary criticism, cultural studies, and ICT in education.

Shynta Amalia is currently Senior Lecturer in Education Department at Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah Palembang. She received her M.Pd. from Sriwijaya University and has taught courses in syntax, sociolinguistics, teaching English as a foreign language methodology, and teaching and learning evaluation to undergraduate students at Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Fatah. She had previously managed national and international conferences. She received some academic grants from the Indonesian Ministry of Religious Affairs. These grants included basic research assistance for study programs, scholarships for the Foreign Advanced Study Preparation Program (PPSL), and overseas doctoral scholarships from the Indonesia Bangkit Scholarship Program (BIB), which is a joint program with the Education Fund Management Institution, Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia. She actively writes books, academic papers for conferences, journal articles, and other works. Her teaching and research interests include teacher education and professional development, linguistics, ELT methodology and teaching approach, and teaching young learners.