Exploring Pragmatics: Uncovering the Layers of Language and Meaning

Dr. Nagamurali Eragamreddy

English Language Unit, Preparatory Studies Center, University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Salalah, Sultanate of Oman

ABSTRACT: The dynamic interaction of pragmatics, semantics, and culture in language understanding and communication is examined in this narrative review. The review emphasizes how pragmatics and semantics provide complementary viewpoints on language meaning, drawing on current findings in linguistics and communication studies. Semantics concentrates on the exact meanings of words, but pragmatics takes speaker intent and context into account. Comprehending both improves meaning interpretation and communication. The research also highlights how culture influences, how language is used and understood, especially when it comes to nonverbal cues like humor and manners. Language is used to communicate and understand emotions, and this is influenced by cultural quirks. The results highlight how crucial it is to take cultural background, emotional expression, and context into account when developing language instruction and communication approaches. The study ends with recommendations for future research, such as cross-cultural comparison studies, language change monitoring longitudinal studies, and examinations of how language usage is affected by digital platforms. This review advances pragmatics knowledge, which leads to more successful communication techniques in a variety of settings.

KEYWORDS: Pragmatics, semantics, culture, language, communication.

INTRODUCTION

Background

A subfield of linguistics known as pragmatics examines how a message's meaning might change depending on the environment in which it is given. It focuses on how speakers modify their language usage in specific social and cultural contexts to meet their communication objectives (Verschueren, 1999). Rather than the meaning of words themselves, semantics, which is the study of meaning at the word and sentence levels, pragmatics deals with non-literal elements of meaning, such as presuppositions, inferred meanings, and speech acts (Levinson, 1983). Pragmatics aims to understand how speakers can manage the complexity of communication, all while keeping track of prosodic features, facial gestures, and normative standards as they do so. One of the basic ideas in Pragmatics is what Grice (1975) called 'implicit meaning' — the meaning that is inferred in conversation that arises when speakers simultaneously communicate implicitly. For example, even if they are not stated clearly, there may be an unspoken expectation that if someone says, "It's hot in here," they have signed their intention that the temperature needs to be altered. Furthermore, pragmatics investigates how language users can circumvent the very clear purpose of the Gricean maxims and create a form of interaction that is more than merely effective. This concerns how language users employ politeness techniques to maintain social harmony during communication (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Speakers could, for example, use hedging statements or employ an indirect speech action to make their utterances less impactful.

Pragmatics is useful in domains including artificial intelligence, intercultural communication, and language instruction. When teaching language, a grasp of pragmatics aids students in using language correctly in various situations, such as determining whether to use formal or informal language. Pragmatics is used in intercultural communication to clarify misconceptions caused by cultural variations in communication methods. Pragmatics provides insights that artificial intelligence researchers use to build natural language processing systems that can comprehend and produce language that is similar to that of humans (Jurafsky & Martin, 2019).

Statement of the Problem

Understanding the language and meaning levels of pragmatics is essential for efficient communication in a range of contexts. Pragmatics is the study of how language users infer meaning from context, which includes social norms, tone, and gesture (Levinson, 1983). However, more study into these levels is necessary to completely comprehend the nuances of language usage and meaning generation. One of the primary challenges to investigating these levels is the changing character of language and

communication. Since language is continually evolving, word meanings can change in reaction to societal and cultural developments (Yule, 1996). For academics and professionals who wish to understand and teach pragmatics effectively, this poses a challenge. Additionally, cultural differences have a significant impact on how language is used and perceived.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), what is seen as suitable or courteous in one culture may not be in another. This variation in culture highlights the necessity for a comprehensive understanding of language and meaning and adds another level of complexity to the study of pragmatics. Furthermore, pragmatics plays a critical role in language instruction and acquisition. Communication breakdowns and misconceptions result from language learners' frequent inability to appreciate the subtleties of pragmatics (Kasper & Rose, 2003). It is necessary to create educational procedures that help students traverse the complex vocabulary and meaning of pragmatics. Aiming to offer insights that help improve cross-cultural communication and influence language teaching techniques, this paper investigates the layers of language and meaning in pragmatics in light of these difficulties.

Significance

It is important to investigate the linguistic and meaning layers in pragmatics for several reasons. First of all, being aware of these levels enables more successful communication in a variety of contexts. People can negotiate cultural differences and prevent misunderstandings by grasping the intricacies of language usage and meaning creation (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Second, exploring these levels offers information that can improve language instruction methods. Teachers can create instructional plans that support students in understanding pragmatics, which will improve their ability to communicate (Kasper & Rose, 2003). Furthermore, researching the linguistic and semantic nuances in pragmatics advances our knowledge of language and human communication in general. It clarifies how language is employed to communicate social, cultural, and emotional clues in addition to concrete facts (Levinson, 1983). In general, delving into these levels is critical to promoting efficient communication, refining methods of teaching languages, and expanding our understanding of language and communication processes.

Objectives

1. To delve deeply into the extensive levels of language use and meaning construction in pragmatics, to provide an understanding of how we use language to convey meaning that extends beyond literal words.
2. To explore how cultural differences may lead to considerable variability in language use and meaning interpretation in pragmatics, and the importance of considering cultural context in communication.
3. To investigate how pragmatics can be used to teach language is also a topic of the course, refocusing second-language teaching in terms of communicative competence in various sociocultural contexts.

Research Questions

1. How do we interpret and infer meaning in context in using language?
2. In what ways does cultural variability influence language use and meaning interpretation in pragmatics?
3. How can an understanding of pragmatics be used to teach language?

METHODOLOGY

Approach

A narrative technique was used in this review to examine the pragmatics' levels of language and meaning. This method provides a deep grasp of the subject matter by enabling a thorough analysis of several research and viewpoints on the issue.

Databases and Sources

To ensure that the results were current and relevant, the literature search was limited to studies that had been published in the previous ten years. The researcher looked through several databases, including PubMed, Google Scholar, and pertinent linguistics and communication academic periodicals. To find more pertinent research, the references from important journals were also examined.

Search Strategies

Boolean operators were used in search techniques to integrate linguistic, pragmatic, and meaning-related terms. To guarantee that the results were pertinent to the investigation of the layers of language and meaning in pragmatics, the search phrases were customized to the review's particular topic.

Selection Criteria

Several criteria, including publication type, technique, and relevance to the study issue, were taken into consideration while choosing which articles to include in this review. Peer-reviewed research that made a direct contribution to the comprehension of language, meaning, and pragmatics were the only ones that were considered. Research that didn't fit these requirements was not included.

Justification of Selection Criteria

To guarantee that the studies included in the review were of the highest caliber and closely related to the research issue, the selection criteria were selected. The goal of this study is to present a thorough and up-to-date overview of the layers of language and meaning in pragmatics by concentrating on recent research that has been published in respected publications.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF PRAGMATICS

Overview of Pragmatics as a Linguistic Field

Have you ever wondered why a simple "It's cold here" may occasionally be misconstrued as a less-than-subtle indication to shut the window? That falls under the fascinating field of pragmatics, which studies the "why" and "how" of human language. It investigates how context affects communication in addition to word meaning (Carston, 2016). Consider pragmatics to be the link between language and reality. Current research published in prestigious publications emphasizes how dynamic it is. For example, Huang's research (2020) examines how cultural background affects people's interpretations of sarcasm and suggests that shared experiences are important for meaning interpretation. Similarly, Mazzone (2018) explores the pragmatics of digital communication, demonstrating how acronyms and emoticons serve as digital equivalents of contextual cues. Pragmatics teaches us how to examine these many facets and improve our communication skills. It clarifies how social contexts and implicit motives affect the things we say and how we express them. So keep in mind that, because of the power of pragmatics, the next time you say something seemingly straightforward, there may be a lot more going on behind the surface!

Concepts and Theories of Language and Meaning in Pragmatics

Speech acts are verbal interactions that occur in the real world, focusing on actual situations in communication. British philosopher John Langshaw Austin introduced the idea of speech acts, which guide the use of language. There are two major verbs in speech acts: performative and constative. Constative verbs describe reality, while performative verbs achieve interaction goals. The most suitable verb for speech acts is 'promise', which indicates sincere intention. Speech acts theory explains promises, apologies, and threats that will happen in the future (Eragamreddy, 2021). Searle (1979) established speech acts in his elaboration of Austin's work. Speech actions can be divided into three categories: illocutionary, perlocutionary, and locutionary. Producing meaningful utterances, such as communicating the truth or the situation as it is, is known as a locutionary act. In illocutionary acts, the speaker uses performative verbs to express intentions within the sentence. Perlocutionary acts are the act of having a specific impact on the listener and others when a speaker makes an utterance. They discuss the effect of the listener after hearing the speaker's utterance, sometimes with implicit or explicit meanings.

Because implicatures arise from the presumptions of helpfulness, they have certain distinguishing characteristics that set them apart from entailments and presuppositions in a distinctive and quantifiable way (Portner, 2005). Implicatures are distinguished from other types of inference by some shared characteristics that are considered to be an assessment of their identity (Eragamreddy, 2022). Implicatures provide four basic purposes, according to a pragmatic study by Levinson (1991). The implicatures serve as a useful explanation, link clauses with related word patterns, streamline the semantic explanation from different clause connections, clarify a variety of disconnected indicators, provide a succinct and clear interpretation of the probability and help understand communications. Conventional implicature and conversational implicature are the two categories of implicatures that Grice (1975) distinguished. Conventional implicatures are dependent on the context of the utterance and refer to the usual implications of lexical objects in speech, such as conjunctions. They need previous knowledge and expertise and are traditional, non-calculable, detachable, and non-cancellable. Conversely, conversational implicatures are not dependent on linguistic meaning; rather, they are based on conversational norms and presumptions. They can be particularized or generalized according to the situation and have no basic connection to any specific utterance. Both kinds of implicatures need comprehension and prior knowledge (Eragamredy, 2022).

Pragmatics goes beyond words! It explores how speakers use language in context to convey not just facts, but also social cues and emotions. Pragmatics studies how language users use language to accomplish a variety of objectives and results, as well as how they interpret and infer meaning based on contextual elements including tone, gesture, and social conventions. Pragmatics offers important insights into human communication and helps us comprehend how language affects our social interactions and relationships by revealing the underlying meanings and intentions behind language usage. In addition, pragmatics is essential to language learning and instruction because it fosters communicative competence and an understanding of the subtleties of language usage in many circumstances (Dey, 2023).

To preserve one's own and other people's dignity, politeness is crucial. On-record "politeness, negative politeness, positive politeness", and "off-record politeness" are the four categories into which they are separated. These techniques are employed to show consideration, underline how valuable the other person's time is, voice worries, and offer an apology for interfering. Situations and compensation are two factors that influence the application of politeness strategies. Priority considerations lead speakers to employ particular politeness strategies in return for advantages, whereas situational factors include sociological elements like social distance, proportionate authority, and imposing rank (Hutahaean, et al., 2021). The application of the politeness approach is influenced by several things. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), two factors—compensation and situations—influence a speaker's decision to employ politeness methods. The speaker uses a certain politeness strategy in return for certain advantages due to priori variables. Sociological factors like imposition rank (R), social distance (D), and proportionate power (P) are all included in the context of circumstances. The propensity for individuals to show greater respect to those who have more authority over them is known as relative power (P). The combination of emotional variables (status, age, sex, level of closeness, etc.) is known as social distance (D). The rank of imposition (R) addresses the level of disruption specified in the face-threatening act.

Dan Sperber and Debbie Wilson created relevance theory, a psychological communication theory, to explain how people understand one another (Sperber and Wilson in Gauché,2017). Information that connects with prior knowledge to enhance a general representation of the world is referred to as relevant communication. When both speakers and listeners are knowledgeable about the subject and context, relevant communication takes place. The two main tenets of the theory are cognitive communication as an inference process and communication as a cognitive activity (Sperber & Wilson (2012).

Language use and everyday interactions are influenced by the interdependence between culture and communication. The basis of communication is culture, which establishes who is speaking to whom, what is being said, and where. It encodes the meaning of communications as well as the prerequisites for sending, receiving, and understanding them. Every facet of human existence is influenced by culture, including norms, laws, traditions, conventions, and nonverbal cues. Language is a reflection of culture, but it is also constrained by it. According to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, language is a trained style of thinking and doing that influences perception and cognitive processes. Because language mixes with culture and shapes social identity through lexicon, accents, and other communication techniques, it is a crucial tool for comprehending social life. Experts describe the intimate link between language and culture as being like a coin, with language on one side and culture on the other. The two are inseparable (Rabiah, 2018).

LAYERS OF LANGUAGE AND MEANING IN PRAGMATICS
Semantics vs. Pragmatics: Understanding the Difference
While pragmatics and semantics are equally important to our comprehension of language, they take different approaches to meaning. According to Evans and Green (2018), understanding a word or sentence's fundamental, dictionary-like meaning is the focus of semantics and the sense that they naturally have in a language system. Consider a dictionary: it offers the essential definitions of words without regard to their context. A "book" is a collection of printed or written pages that are tied together along one edge and are used for writing or reading. Books usually include a cover to safeguard them. Conversely, pragmatics goes beyond this, taking into account the environment in which language is employed to ascertain the intended meaning (Verschueren & Östman, 2022). It recognizes that communication is a dynamic process that is influenced by a variety of elements, including the objective of the speaker, the background knowledge of the listener, and the external environment.

Saying "It's cold here" in a structure with extensive insulation comes to mind. The use of pragmatics enables us to see that the speaker may be asking—rather than merely reporting—that someone changes the temperature. Stated differently, semantics

provides us with the specific word meanings and forms that comprise language. As the architect, pragmatics puts those pieces together while taking the surroundings into account to create a coherent message (Levinson, 2013). Gaining knowledge of pragmatics and semantics helps us become more proficient language users. While pragmatics aids in the interpretation of words' subtleties and intended messages in certain contexts, semantics provides us with the fundamental meaning of words (Silva & Mey, 2021).

Context and Language Use: How Context Shapes Meaning

Language is like a fascinating chameleon; its meaning changes depending on the situation it's utilized in all the time (Verschueren & Östman, 2022). Think of the straightforward question, "Can you pass the salt?" This probably refers to the saltshaker on the table in a restaurant. Nonetheless, it might be a request to give up someone's seat during a sporting event (Verschueren, & Östman, 2022). The surrounding environment and social signals, or context, are important factors in influencing our interpretation of language. Say a politician says in a news piece, "We need a strong leader." In the absence of additional context, the meaning is still unclear. Silva and Mey (2021) argue that pragmatics, the study of how context affects meaning, aids in our comprehension of the speaker's intention. It may be clear from the political environment or the leader's agenda whether they are supporting experience, decisiveness, or some other attribute.

Another factor influencing linguistic formality is context. Slang and contractions may be used in a casual discussion with friends, but a business meeting would probably use a more official register (Kramsch, 2014). By being aware of these contextual changes, we may modify our language accordingly and prevent miscommunication. Social norms are also relevant. Most cultures believe it is courteous to say "hello" to strangers, however shouting it in a library would not be suitable (Duranti et al., 2014). By being aware of these social cues, we can communicate successfully in a variety of settings. To sum up, context is a potent filter that shapes our understanding of words and promotes effective communication. Understanding how context affects language usage helps us become more adaptable and sophisticated language users.

Sociocultural Factors in Pragmatics: Influence of Culture on Communication

Taking into account the influence of culture adds a new layer to pragmatics, the study of how context affects meaning (Culpeper, 2016). Different cultural norms, values, and beliefs influence how we talk and understand what other people say (Aslamovna, 2023). A straightforward request might be viewed as impolite in one culture and friendly in another, whether you were to ask a coworker for assistance with a task, you may ask them directly, "can you do this?" in a North American setting, but in an East Asian culture, you would ask more subtly, "I was wondering if..." (House, 2006). Comedy also has a significant cultural component. Sarcasm and jokes frequently rely on common cultural references, and what one culture deems funny may not be understood by another (Mohebbi, 2023). It is easier to avoid accidentally upsetting someone or failing to see the intended comedy when we are aware of these cultural quirks. Additionally, important is nonverbal communication. Cultural differences may be expressed through body language, gestures, and eye contact (Zhi-peng, 2014). A raised eyebrow might be seen as approbation in one culture but perplexity in another. Understanding these differences enables us to communicate more successfully with people throughout the world. Understanding how sociocultural elements affect pragmatics might help us become more perceptive and flexible communicators. To facilitate a deeper and more meaningful exchange of ideas, we work to bridge cultural divides and learn to respect the diversity of communication techniques.

Emotional and Expressive Aspects of Language: The Role of Emotions in Communication

In addition to being a useful tool for conveying information, language may also be used effectively to communicate emotions (Gross, 2015). The words we use, the way we compose phrases and even the tone of our voice may all give away our emotional state (Cîrneanu et al., 2023). Imagine receiving an email with the Subject in capital letters: IMPORTANT MEETING NOTICE - ACTION REQUIRED. Even before you read the letter, this probably suggests a sense of urgency or even fear on the sender's behalf (Danesi, 2021). It is possible to communicate emotions indirectly in addition to directly. For instance, sarcasm can be employed in a lighthearted manner to express anger or displeasure (Lee, 2023). Comprehending these subtleties enables us to interpret the emotional undertone of someone's speech and react suitably. Culture can have an impact on how we use language to communicate our feelings. While some cultures respect stoicism and emotional regulation, others promote the free and direct expression of emotions (Hwang & Matsumoto,2015). By being aware of these cultural differences, we may communicate with greater compassion and avoid misreading emotional signs. Being aware of how emotions affect language makes us better

communicators. We may effectively express our feelings as well as better understand the emotional undertones of the messages we get from others.

Pragmatic Markers and Discourse: How Pragmatic Cues Shape Discourse Structure

The study of pragmatics, or how context shapes meaning, has additional dimensions when we take into account the effect of culture (Kramsch, 2014). Different cultures have different social norms, values, and beliefs that influence how we communicate as well as how we understand what other people are saying (Zheng & Gao, 2019). For example, a simple request in one culture might be considered impolite in another. Consider asking a coworker to assist you with a task. In North America, a direct question like "Can you do this?" could be appropriate, while in East Asian culture, a more subtle approach tempered with words like "I was wondering if..." might be recommended (House, 2006). Comedy also has a significant cultural component. Sarcasm and jokes frequently rely on common cultural references, and what one culture deems funny may not make sense to another (Ting-Toomey, 2018). By being aware of these cultural quirks, we can prevent inadvertently upsetting someone or failing to get the intended comedy. Cultural differences might influence the meaning of nonverbal communication, which is equally important (Zhi-peng, 2014). Depending on the cultural setting, body language, gestures, and eye contact may all express various meanings. In one culture, a raised eyebrow may imply disapproval, whereas in another, it could mean perplexity (Anderson, 2023). Understanding these differences enables us to communicate more successfully with people throughout the world. Understanding how sociocultural elements affect pragmatics might help us become more perceptive and flexible communicators. To have deeper and more meaningful connections, we work to bridge cultural divides and learn to respect the diversity of communication techniques.

FINDINGS

Evans and Green (2018) examine pragmatics and semantics and emphasize how they play different but complementary roles in language comprehension. Whereas pragmatics takes into account the context and purpose of language usage, semantics concentrates on the literal meanings of words and phrases as found in dictionaries. The dynamic aspect of communication, which is impacted by several variables including speaker purpose and listener background, is acknowledged by pragmatics. Comprehending both pragmatics and semantics improves our ability to communicate coherently and decipher nuanced meanings. While pragmatics places word meanings in context to provide meaningful communication, semantics gives the fundamental meanings of words (Levinson, 2013; Silva & Mey, 2021.; Verschueren & Östman, 2022). Verschueren and Östman (2022) highlight how the context of a language may change its meaning significantly, using the example of words like "Can you pass the salt?" to highlight this point. Silva and Mey (2021) note that pragmatics, which studies how context affects meaning, aids in our understanding of these changes. Language usage and interpretation are influenced by social and environmental signals found in context, such as social standards and the formality of language. By being aware of these contextual elements, we may modify how we use language to improve communication and prevent misunderstandings (Kramsch, 2014; Duranti et al., 2014). This awareness of context emphasizes the changing character of language and is essential for nuanced and successful communication (Verschueren & Östman, 2022).

According to Culpeper (2016), pragmatics are shaped by culture, which affects communication norms and interpretations. Language usage and interpretation are impacted by cultural variations, which include different perspectives on humor and politeness (Aslamovna, 2023; House, 2006; Mohebbi, 2023). These variations also apply to nonverbal communication, since body language and gestures can have various interpretations (Zhi-peng, 2014). Understanding cultural quirks improves communication by preventing miscommunication and encouraging tolerance for different communication modalities. By recognizing how pragmatics and culture interact, we may better negotiate cultural differences and foster inclusive, meaningful communication (Culpeper, 2016). Gross (2015) and Cîrneanu et al., (2023) both highlight how language uses words, sentences, and tone to express emotions. Emotions may be expressed through communication either directly—as in the case of urgent email subjects—or indirectly—as in the case of sarcasm (Lee, 2023). Emotional expression is influenced by cultural norms; certain cultures value emotional restraint, while others promote free communication (Hwang & Matsumoto, 2015). Accurately expressing and interpreting emotions is made possible by our improved understanding of these subtleties in emotional communication. Understanding the emotional component of language improves our capacity for empathy and connection, which improves communication (Gross, 2015; Cîrneanu et al., 2023; Danesi, 2021).

According to Kramsch (2014), pragmatics is shaped by culture, which also affects communication norms and interpretations. Language usage and understanding are impacted by cultural variations, which also influence humor and politeness techniques (Zheng & Gao, 2019; House, 2006; Ting-Toomey, 2018). These variations also apply to nonverbal communication, since various interpretations may be inferred from gestures and body language (Zhi-peng, 2014). Understanding cultural quirks improves communication by preventing miscommunication and encouraging tolerance for different communication modalities. By recognizing how pragmatics and culture interact, we may better negotiate cultural differences and foster inclusive, meaningful communication (Kramsch, 2014). The researcher investigates two important domains in the present study of language meaning: pragmatics and semantics. Although they are both necessary to comprehend communication, they take different stances when it comes to meaning.

Our capacity for efficient communication is largely dependent on both pragmatics and semantics. While pragmatics assists us in understanding the intended message by interpreting words in context, semantics provides us with the fundamental meanings of words, which are the building blocks of language (Evans and Green 2018; Silva & Mey, 2021). Verschueren and Östman (2022) assert that depending on the circumstances, words and sentences can have several interpretations. For instance, depending on the context, asking "can you pass the salt?" might indicate several meanings. A simple query like "can you pass the salt?" might indicate several things depending on the situation (Verschueren & Östman, 2022). According to Evans and Green (2018), finding the fundamental, non-figurative meaning that words and phrases transmit is the main goal of the study of semantics and the sense that they naturally have inside a language system. Similar to a dictionary, it offers essential meanings without regard to context. Conversely, pragmatics looks at the environment of language usage to determine the intended meaning (Verschueren & Östman, 2022). It takes into account the listener's prior knowledge, the speaker's intention, and the external context (Levinson, 2013).

Studies show that context is a recurring topic. It functions as a filter, affecting the formality of our register and how we understand language (Kramsch, 2014; Duranti et al., 2014). Communication may be efficiently navigated when we are aware of social norms and cultural clues (Duranti et al., 2014). According to Culpeper (2016), culture has a big influence on how we communicate and understand meaning. In many cultures, making direct demands might be viewed as impolite (House, 2006). A common cultural reference is essential to humor because different cultures perceive nonverbal cues like gestures differently (Mohebbi, 2023; Zhi-peng, 2014). Acknowledging these distinctions encourages more flexible and compassionate communication (Culpeper, 2016). According to Gross (2015), language is an effective means of communicating feelings. Emotional states can be revealed through language structure, word choice, and voice tone (Cîrneanu et al., 2023). More sympathetic communication is facilitated by having an understanding of the emotional undertones of others' statements (Lee, 2023). Finally, pragmatics and semantics provide complementary viewpoints on the meaning of language. Pragmatics aids in navigating many levels of context and cultural quirks to get at the desired message, whereas semantics provide the fundamental definitions. By identifying these patterns, we may develop into more skilled and versatile communicators and build stronger relationships across contexts and cultures.

DISCUSSION

The literature's conclusions draw attention to several important issues that are pertinent to the goals and queries of the study. Semantics and pragmatics are crucial for comprehending how language expresses meaning in addition to words. While pragmatics interprets meaning by taking into account the speaker's purpose and the listener's prior knowledge, semantics gives the fundamental meanings of words (Evans and Green 2018; Verschueren & Östman, 2022). This demonstrates how crucial context is to the development of meaning in language. There are considerable cultural differences in pragmatic language use and interpretation. Communication styles and comprehension are impacted by the norms, values, and beliefs of many cultures (Culpeper, 2016; Zheng & Gao, 2019). For instance, different cultures may have different approaches to comedy and politeness (House, 2006; Mohebbi, 2023). Effective communication and language instruction in a variety of sociocultural situations depends on an understanding of cultural diversity. By emphasizing communicative ability in a range of sociocultural situations, pragmatics may be used to teach language. Language instructors may assist students in gaining the ability to comprehend and generate language effectively in a variety of contexts by having a thorough grasp of how context changes meaning (Kramsch, 2014; Durantiet al., 2014). This method places a strong emphasis on the value of cultural sensitivity and understanding in language instruction.

The literature places a strong emphasis on the dynamic character of language and the significance of context for meaning interpretation and inference. Understanding these subtleties is crucial for efficient communication since words and phrases can have numerous meanings depending on the situation (Verschueren,& Östman, 2022). A foundation for comprehending how context affects meaning and communication is provided by pragmatics. The results point to the necessity of comprehending pragmatics for reading and deducing meaning from context, particularly in cross-cultural communication. Language learners can speak more successfully and teachers can create language teaching strategies that support communicative competence in a variety of sociocultural contexts by taking cultural variations and context into account.

Implications

These results have important implications for pragmatics theory and application. The focus on context improves our comprehension of how language usage results in the dynamic production of meaning (Gross, 2015). Moreover, studies on cultural differences (Culpeper, 2016) emphasize how important it is to incorporate sociocultural elements into pragmatic theories (Zheng & Gao, 2019). This makes it possible to comprehend how cultural norms and values influence communication in a more complex way (Ting-Toomey, 2018). According to Kramsch (2014), pragmatics may be an effective teaching technique for languages. Teachers may prepare students to effectively navigate a variety of communication contexts by encouraging knowledge of contextual elements and cultural variances (Duranti et al., 2014). This entails appreciating the significance of nonverbal cues (Zhi-peng, 2014) and vocal expression of emotion (Cîrneanu et al., 2023). Ultimately, these results support a broader interpretation of pragmatics that highlights the interaction of culture, environment, and meaning-making in communication.

Limitations

In the domains of pragmatics and semantics in particular, the works examined in this analysis offer important insights into the intricacies of language usage and meaning production. Nonetheless, there are a few restrictions to take into account. These are: although some research (Culpeper, 2016; Zheng & Zheng & Gao, 2019) recognizes the impact of culture on language use and meaning interpretation, cultural analysis frequently lacks depth. Given the complexity and diversity of cultural variations, future studies should aim to offer a more thorough knowledge of how culture affects communication. A lot of research concentrates on particular linguistic or cultural contexts, which might restrict how broadly applicable the results can be. To guarantee that results are relevant to a variety of demographics, future studies must take a broader range of language and cultural backgrounds into account. Self-report measures and small sample numbers are used in certain research, which might lead to bias or reduce the dependability of the results. To increase the validity of the findings, future research should aim to employ more rigorous approaches, such as longitudinal studies or experimental designs. Although spoken language is given priority in the study, nonverbal signs like body language also require greater attention to properly comprehend communication (Zhi-peng, 2014). The application of many research conclusions to different temporal or geographical settings may be limited by their emphasis on Western or current cultural environments. To guarantee that study findings apply to all cultures and historical periods, future investigations have to aim to incorporate a wider variety of circumstances.

Suggestions for Future Research

To better understand how cultural norms and values affect language usage and meaning interpretation, conducting comparative research across cultural boundaries (Zheng & Gao, 2019) is required. Future studies ought to examine communication from a broader perspective. Studies that follow language and meaning changes in tandem with social influences are known as longitudinal studies (Duranti et al., 2014) are also needed to investigate. Further insights can be obtained by examining the relationships between spoken words, gestures, and expressions (Zhi-peng, 2014). Finally, it is critical to investigate how language usage in the digital era is shaped by digital platforms such as social media (Cîrneanu et al., 2023). Research how children and adolescents acquire pragmatic skills, looking at how socialization and education shape these abilities (Gross, 2015) is also needed to investigate. By extending our knowledge of pragmatics and its function in language and meaning production, these recommendations can help us develop more effective communication techniques for a variety of situations.

CONCLUSION

The primary conclusions imply that while pragmatics and semantics have different functions in language understanding, they complement each other. Semantics concentrates on literal meanings, but pragmatics takes context and intention into account.

Comprehending both improves meaning interpretation and communication. Language meaning is greatly influenced by context, and communication conventions and interpretations are shaped by culture. Language is a tool used to express emotions, and language is shaped by cultural conventions. Understanding these components highlights the dynamic nature of language and enhances communication. The significance of environment and culture in pragmatic theories is highlighted by these findings, which have theoretical ramifications. For successful cross-cultural communication, they recommend instructional approaches that take into account context, culture, nonverbal clues, and emotional expression. Through cross-cultural pragmatic studies, future studies could examine how cultural norms and values affect language use and meaning interpretation. Studies with a longitudinal design can shed light on how language and meaning change over time in response to social factors. To further understand communication dynamics, studies could also examine the interactions between spoken words, gestures, and expressions. Finally, examining the impact of digital platforms such as social media on language usage in the digital age may offer important new perspectives on modern communication styles.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, K. A. (2023) Nonverbal communication as a mediator of intercultural communication in English as a second language classrooms, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 1-3.
2. Aslamovna, B. S. (2023). Social values and social norms. PERIODICA: *Journal of Modern Philosophy, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 24, 61-65.
1. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Carston, R. (2016). Linguistic conventions and the role of pragmatics. *Mind & Language*, *31*(5), 612-624.
3. Cîrneanu, A. L., Popescu, D., & Iordache, D. (2023). New trends in emotion recognition using image analysis by neural networks, a systematic review. *Sensors, 23*(16), 7092. https://doi.org/10.3390/s23167092
4. Culpeper, J. (2016). Impoliteness strategies. In A. Capone., & J. L. Mey (Eds) *Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society* (pp 421-445). Springer.
5. Danesi, M. (2021). *Linguistic relativity today: Language, mind, society, and the foundations of linguistic anthropology*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003001669
6. Dey, M. D. (2023). Four main characteristics of English pragmatics. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, *26*(2), 510-519. http://dx.doi.org/10.24071/llt.v26i2.6202
7. Duranti, A., Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (Eds.). (2014). *The handbook of language socialization*. John Wiley & Sons.
8. Eragamreddy, E. (2021). A semantic study of speech acts in pragmatic inferences. ELC *Research Gate, 2*, 47-53.
9. Eragamreddy, E. (2022). A semantic study of implicatures. ELC *Research Gate, 3*, 41-51.
10. Evans, V., & Green, M. (2018). *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315864327
11. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
12. Gauché, A. M. (2017). *A relevance theoretic analysis of selected South African English pragmatic markers and their cultural significance*. Stellenbosch University Huang,
13. Gross, J. J. (2015). Emotion regulation: Current status and future prospects. *Psychological Inquiry*, *26(*1), 1-26. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2014.940781
14. House, J. (2006). Text and context in translation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(3), 338-358.
15. Huang, Y.(ed.) (2016). *The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199697960.001.0001
16. Hutahaean, D. T., Herman, H., & Girsang, A. F. F. (2021). An Analysis of politeness strategies found in Pesbukers variety show. *Wanastra: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, *13*(1), 39-46. https://doi.org/10.31294/w.v12i1
17. Hwang, H., Matsumoto, D. (2015). Evidence for the Universality of Facial Expressions of Emotion. In: Mandal, M., Awasthi, A. (Eds) *Understanding facial expressions in communication*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-81-322-1934-7_3
18. Jurafsky, D., & Martin, J. H. (2019*). Speech and language processing* (3rd ed.). Pearson.
19. Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2003). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Blackwell Publishers.

20. Kramsch, C. (2014). Language and culture in second language learning. In F. Sharifian (Eds) *The Routledge handbook of language and culture* (pp. 403-416). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315793993

21. Lee, E. H. (2023). *An introduction to lexical semantics: A formal approach to word meaning and its composition*. Routledge

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

23. Levinson, S. C. (1991). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

24. Levinson, S. C. (2013). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

25. Mazzone, M. (2018). *Cognitive pragmatics: Mindreading, inferences, consciousness* (Vol. 20). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

26. Mohebbi, A. (2023). The use of cultural conceptualisations as a translation strategy for culture specific jokes and humorous discourse: A remedy for a malady? *Ampersand*, *11*, 100150.

27. Portner, P.(2005). *What is meaning?: Fundamentals of formal semantics.* Blackwell.

28. Rabiah, S. (2018, November 19). *Language as a tool for communication and cultural reality discloser*. https://doi.org/10.31227/osf.io/nw94m

29. Sartika, L. A., & Pranoto, B. E. (2021). Analysis of humor in the Big Bang theory by using relevance theory: A pragmatic study. *Linguistics and Literature Journal*, *2*(1), 1-7. http://dx.doi.org/10.33365/llj.v2i1.292

30. Searle, J.R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.

31. Silva, D. N., & Mey, J. L. (2021). Introduction: The ability to form and transform in pragmatics. In *The Pragmatics of Adaptability* (pp. 1-23). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.319.int

32. Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (2012). *Introduction: Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

33. Ting-Toomey, S., & Dorjee, T. (2018). *Communicating across cultures*. Guilford Publications.

34. Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

35. Verschueren, J., & Östman, J. O. (2022). *Handbook of pragmatics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company

36. Zheng, X., Gao, Y. (2019). Promoting intercultural competence in English language teaching: A productive bilingualism perspective. In X. Gao, (Eds) *Second handbook of English language teaching*. Springer International Handbooks of Education. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02899-2_11

37. Zhi-peng, R. (2014). Body language in different cultures. *US-China Foreign Language*, *12*(12), 1029-1033.