



---

# PRAGMATICS IN LANGUAGE LEARNING: TEACHING CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE IN ENGLISH

Mamirova M. M.

Student, Chirchik State Pedagogical University

[mashxuramamirova012@gmail.com](mailto:mashxuramamirova012@gmail.com)

---

## Abstract

Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics that focuses on the study of how speakers use language to convey meaning beyond the literal interpretation of words. It examines the context in which language is used, the speaker's intentions, and the listener's inferences. Pragmatics is concerned with the study of conversational implicatures, presuppositions, speech acts, and other aspects of language use that go beyond the literal meaning of words. The theory of pragmatics in languages is an important area of study that helps us understand how language is used in social interactions. It has applications in various fields such as education, psychology, and communication studies. By studying pragmatics, we can gain insights into how people use language to convey meaning, how they interpret meaning, and how they make inferences based on contextual cues.

**Keywords:** Pragmatics, culture of the country, inner meanings of words, crosscultural, principles of politeness.

## Introduction

Pragmatics is a new branch of linguistics that examines the process of speech, taking into account the social activity of the speaker, the communicative intent of the participants, and the impact of the speech situation. The term "pragmatics" comes from the Greek word "pragmos," meaning "action," and it studies the functional use of linguistic symbols in speech. The study of pragmatics is considered a branch of semiotics, and it was introduced by Ch.I. Morris in the 1930s. Pragmatics is concerned with the real expression of the speaker's social



activity in speech and includes both verbal and nonverbal communication. The verbal aspect refers to the words chosen and how they are interpreted, while the nonverbal aspect includes body language, tone of voice, facial expressions, and appearance. The formation of interest in pragmatics as a separate branch of linguistics raises several issues, including the need to define its initial boundaries. Linguistic pragmatics focuses on how people express their social activity through speech, which raises various issues about how it should be studied. Some believe that pragmatics can only be understood as a distinct field of linguistics if it is separated from other areas and its research is limited. Defining the boundaries of pragmatics is also crucial, and V.V. Petrov's thesis on speech activity and language provides a linguistic basis for this. While a person may have semantic knowledge, it is not enough to fully understand speech, thought, and expression. Understanding the various semantic sciences of language and being able to choose and express them appropriately is also necessary. Linguistic pragmatics studies both verbal and nonverbal communication elements, as humans use both to express their ideas and thoughts. Pragmatics is the study of how meaning is conveyed through communication, which includes both verbal and nonverbal elements. Verbal communication involves the use of words to express ourselves, both in spoken and written form. The words we choose and how they are interpreted play a crucial role in verbal communication. On the other hand, nonverbal communication refers to the messages we convey without using words. This includes body language, tone of voice, facial expressions, and appearance. For instance, when you see a friend and shake their hand, it can signal to them that you want to stop or greet them. Nonverbal communication can add depth and nuance to verbal communication and is an important aspect of pragmatics.

### **Methods and investigations**

Pragmatics is a new area of linguistics that focuses on language and speech in relation to human speech activity. Unlike structural linguistics, which mainly examines the formal structure of language, pragmatics seeks to understand how language is used in communication. This field has its own logical, philosophical, and linguistic interpretation. According to linguist J. Layons, pragmatics is the act of using linguistic units appropriate for communication purposes when speaking



to a listener. While mainly studied by European scientists, the importance of pragmatics stems from the fact that misunderstandings often occur in the communication process.

For example:

Question : Would you like a cup of coffee ?

Answer : I usually drink coffee every morning, which helps me stay awake all day. As you see, there is no any answers such as "yes" or "no" . However we can guess the reply from the content of the conversation . In Eastern countries, the ability to understand the situation is much more developed, which can be caused by a number of factors.

For instance :

1. Culture of the country
2. Respect for adults
3. Inner meanings of word

In linguistics, sometime one discipline is interlinked with another field within linguistics or is spread across a number of fields. As semantics covers a range of different levels like grammar, syntax and lexicon. In the same way, pragmatics covers different subgroups like pragmalinguistics sociopragmatics and, applied pragmatics. Pragmatics also interfaces with intradisciplinary branches like semantics and sociolinguistics. Pragmatics goes beyond the study of the grammatical structure of language and considers how language is used in social contexts to convey meaning. It investigates the ways in which speakers use language to achieve their communicative goals, such as persuading, informing, or entertaining others. Additionally, pragmatics studies how language use is shaped by social factors such as culture, power, and gender. Moreover, cross-cultural pragmatics involves comparing and contrasting the way language is used in different cultures. The East-West debate in pragmatics refers to the contrast between the way language is used in Eastern cultures, such as those in Asia, and Western cultures, such as those in Europe and North America. This debate arises from the observation that there are significant differences in the way people from these cultures use language in communication. These differences can be attributed to various factors, including social norms, values, and cultural traditions. It is important for researchers to be aware of these differences in order to facilitate



effective communication and avoid misunderstandings. The East-West debate is also the product of research work on pragmatics in general. Language philosophers Austin and his students Searle and Grice have turned pragmatism into a field of vital research since the 1960s. Their theories, especially the theories of speech act and conversation implication, led to Lich's principle of politeness and Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness. These works, which are language theories, are designed to cover the use of language in all cultures. The pragmatic aspects of language, which have attracted the attention of researchers in recent years, require the translator to be aware of many other disciplines and cultures in addition to in-depth linguistic knowledge. Appropriate use of pragmatic means in translation serves to convey the full meaning of the original. Cultural misunderstanding occurs when something has different meanings in two cultures. For instance, the phrase "I'll knock you up in the evening." Of course this may sound weird if you hear this phrase from your close friends. It means "I'll knock on your door in the evening." This example, of a dialect difference in the which means of "knock you up" between British and American English, illustrates the complications that can occur from a cultural misunderstanding. It can also lead to various conflicts. Sometimes misunderstandings are resolved, and some can be exacerbated.

### **Types of Pragmatics**

According to Chapman (2005:11), Pragmatics is divided into theoretical pragmatics and social pragmatics. Theoretical pragmatics concentrates on the analysis of particular aspects of meaning and how these might be explained within more general formal accounts of language use. It has a connection with applied linguistics. Social pragmatics studies relationship between language use and different sociocultural factors. In one word, we can describe it as sociopragmatics.

### **Difference between Pragmatics and Semantics**

Both, pragmatics and semantics are intradisciplinary branches of linguistics that study language. Semantics concerns the relations between signs and the objects they signify. It refers to the literal meaning of a language, while Pragmatics does not focus on literal meanings of a language, but how users interpret their



utterances in a specific social context. In simple words, semantics is the study of literal meaning in language that can be applied to a single word or entire texts. On the other hand, Pragmatics generally concerns with the use of language in social contexts and the ways user produce and comprehend. Morris explained that pragmatics is different from semantics, which concerns the relations between signs and the objects they signify. Semantics refers to the specific meaning of language; pragmatics involves all the social cues that accompany language. Pragmatics focuses not on what people say but how they say it and how others interpret their utterances in social contexts, says Geoffrey Finch in "Linguistic Terms and Concepts." Utterances are literally the units of sound you make when you talk, but the signs that accompany those utterances give the sounds their true meaning.

### **Pragmatics in Action**

The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA) gives two examples of how pragmatics influences language and its interpretation. In the first, ASHA notes: "You invited your friend over for dinner. Your child sees your friend reach for some cookies and says, 'Better not take those, or you'll get even bigger.' You can't believe your child could be so rude."

In a literal sense, the daughter is simply saying that eating cookies can make you gain weight. But due to the social context, the mother interprets that sentence to mean that her daughter is calling her friend fat. The first sentence in this explanation refers to the semantics—the literal meaning of the sentence. The second and third refer to the pragmatics, the actual meaning of the words as interpreted by a listener based on social context.

In another example, ASHA notes:

"You talk with a neighbor about his new car. He has trouble staying on topic and starts talking about his favorite TV show. He doesn't look at you when you talk and doesn't laugh at your jokes. He keeps talking, even when you look at your watch and say, 'Wow. It's getting late.' You finally leave, thinking about how hard it is to talk with him." In this scenario, the speaker is just talking about a new car and his favorite TV show. But the listener interprets the signs the speaker is using—not looking at the listener and not laughing at his jokes—as the speaker





being unaware of the listener's views (let alone his presence) and monopolizing his time. You've likely been in this kind of situation before, where the speaker is talking about perfectly reasonable, simple subjects but is unaware of your presence and your need to escape. While the speaker sees the talk as a simple sharing of information (the semantics), you see it as a rude monopolization of your time (the pragmatics). Pragmatics has proved helpful in working with children with autism. Beverly Vicker, a speech and language pathologist writing on the Autism Support Network website, notes that many children with autism find it difficult to pick up on what she and other autism theorists describe as "social pragmatics," which refers to: "...the ability to effectively use and adjust communication messages for a variety of purposes with an array of communication partners within diverse circumstances." When educators, speech pathologists, and other interventionists teach these explicit communication skills, or social pragmatics, to children with autism spectrum disorder, the results are often profound and can have a big impact in improving their conversational interaction skills.

Pragmatics was a reaction to structuralist linguistics as outlined by Ferdinand de Saussure. In many cases, it expanded upon his idea that language has an analyzable structure, composed of parts that can be defined in relation to others. Pragmatics first engaged only in synchronic study, as opposed to examining the historical development of language. However, it rejected the notion that all meaning comes from signs existing purely in the abstract space of langue. Meanwhile, historical pragmatics has also come into being. The field did not gain linguists' attention until the 1970s, when two different schools emerged: the Anglo-American pragmatic thought and the European continental pragmatic thought (also called the perspective view).

### **Importance of Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is the "meaning minus semantics," says Frank Brisard in his essay "Introduction: Meaning and Use in Grammar," published in "Grammar, Meaning and Pragmatics." Semantics, as noted, refers to the literal meaning of a spoken utterance. Grammar, Brisard says, involves the rules defining how the language is put together. Pragmatics takes context into account to complement the



contributions that semantics and grammar make to meaning, he says. David Lodge, writing in the *Paradise News*, says that pragmatics gives humans "a fuller, deeper, and generally more reasonable account of human language behavior." Without pragmatics, there is often no understanding of what language actually means, or what a person truly means when she is speaking. The context—the social signs, body language, and tone of voice (the pragmatics)—is what makes utterances clear or unclear to the speaker

### **Pragmatics Examples**

#### **1. Sarcasm**

In sarcasm, the intended meaning of the speaker is often the opposite of the literal meaning of their words. For instance, if it's raining heavily and someone says, "Great weather, isn't it?" they don't actually mean the weather is pleasant and her listeners. Rather, they're implying that the weather is terrible (Levinson, 2000; Levinson, 2013). The listener understands this inversion not from the words themselves but from the context (the fact it's raining), as well as the speaker's tone of voice and possibly their facial expressions or body language. Here, pragmatics enables us to interpret sarcasm correctly.

#### **2. Irony**

Irony, like sarcasm, involves a divergence between the literal and intended meanings, but it's often used to highlight contradictions or incongruities. Consider a habitual procrastinator who announces, "I'll start my project right away." If we know this person's history of putting things off, we might interpret their statement as ironic. They say they'll start immediately, but we understand, based on our knowledge of their usual behavior, that they probably won't. Pragmatics allows us to make these kinds of interpretations based on our shared background knowledge about the speaker (Kecskes, 2020; Sperber & Wilson, 1995).

#### **3. Implications**

Implications, or implicature, refers to what the speaker suggests or implies, as opposed to what they directly express. For example, if someone in a room says, "It's cold in here," they could be implying that they want the window closed or the heating turned up. They haven't explicitly stated this request, but the context and our understanding of social norms (e.g., that people typically want to be



---

warm) lead us to this interpretation (Kecskes, 2020). Again, pragmatics helps us navigate these unstated meanings in conversation.

#### 4. Deixis

Deictic expressions are words or phrases whose meanings depend on the context in which they're used (Stapleton, 2017). Consider a statement like, "I'll meet you there at five." Without context, we wouldn't know what "there" refers to, nor whether "five" means five in the morning or evening. If we've been discussing a particular café and we typically meet in the evenings, we can use that information to interpret the meaning accurately. There are four types of deixis, and each requires context to understand the message:

**Personal Deixis:** Referring to language that identifies the participants in a conversation without directly naming them. For example, if you read a diary you found and the writer refers to themselves as "I", you'd need more context to understand who that person actually is – "I" alone doesn't help.

**Temporal Deixis:** Involves words and expressions that locate events or states in time relative to the moment of speaking. For example, if you watch a movie where a prophet claims, "The world will end in 3 years", but you don't know when the movie was filmed, you'll be none the wiser about when the world will end.

**Spatial Deixis:** This deals with the spatial location of an object or person relative to the speaker. Example: If someone says, "The cat is over there," "there" indicates a location relative to the speaker's current position. But, you need to know the speaker's current position for it to make any sense to you.

**Discourse Deixis:** Discourse deixis refers to words or expressions that make reference to another part of the conversation, either earlier or later. For, example, when someone says, "As I said earlier, we should invest more in technology," the phrase "as I said earlier" points to a previous part of the conversation. You would need to have been present for that earlier part to get the full context (Stapleton, 2017). Deixis highlights how pragmatics involves tying language to the specifics of the situation.

#### 5. Politeness

Pragmatic understanding also includes recognizing degrees of politeness in language, which can vary depending on social context, relationship between speakers, cultural norms, and more. For example, in a formal setting or when





---

speaking with a superior, instead of saying, “Give me the report,” one might say, “Could you please pass me the report?” This isn’t just about being less direct – it’s about showing respect, maintaining social harmony, and adhering to the norm of politeness in the given context (Mills, 2011).

#### **6. Metaphors**

Metaphors are a way of expressing one thing in terms of another, often to enhance understanding or create a vivid image. If someone says, “Time is a thief,” they don’t mean this literally. Rather, they’re conveying the idea that time can pass quickly and unexpectedly, much like a thief might operate. Pragmatics allows us to make sense of metaphors by connecting language with our wider knowledge of the world.

#### **7. Indirect speech acts**

An indirect speech act is where the structure of the sentence doesn’t match the speaker’s actual intention (Crystal, 2008).

#### **8. Euphemisms**

Euphemisms are softer or less direct ways of expressing something that may be unpleasant, sensitive, or taboo. Recognizing this indirectness is a pragmatic skill, as it involves understanding how people often try to mitigate potentially upsetting or offensive messages.

### **Conclusion**

Learning and teaching a new language can be a daunting task, as each language has its own unique structure, grammatical patterns, and forms of speech. In addition, words used in each language have their own internal and external meanings, which can be difficult to grasp for non-native speakers. Furthermore, only native speakers of a language can fully understand the nuances and connotations of words and phrases. In conclusion, learning and teaching a new language can be challenging, but it is also a rewarding experience that can broaden your horizons and open up new opportunities. By embracing the challenges and persevering through the difficulties, you can gain a deeper understanding of different cultures and ways of life.



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,  
Education, and Pedagogy***

**ISSN (E):** 3067-7874

**Volume** 01, **Issue** 03, June, 2025

**Website:** [usajournals.org](http://usajournals.org)

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution  
4.0 International License.***

---

**REFERENCES**

1. Carter, K. (1990a) Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W.R. Houston (ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education, (pp. 291-310). New York: Macmillan.
2. Carter, K. (1990b) Meaning and metaphor: Case knowledge in teaching. Theory into Practice, 29(2), 109-115.
3. Cazden, C.B. (1986) Classroom discourse. In M.C. Wittrock (ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 432-463). New York: Macmillan.
4. Clark, C.M. & P.L. Peterson. (1986) Teachers' thought processes. In M.C. Wittrock (ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.) (pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillan.
5. Elbaz, F. (1983) Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge. New York: Nichols publishing.
6. Fransella, F. & J. Bannister. (1977) A manual for repertory grid technique. London: Academic Press.