Examining the Role of Pragmatics in Cross-Cultural Communities

Case of study: the Students of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering

Department at Ibn Khaldoun University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Letters and English Language in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master in Language Science

Candidates: **Supervisor:**

Achouak AMRAOUI   DR. Khaled BELLARBI

Khadija CHERCHAB

Board of Examiners:

President: ...Dr.Bensaleh Hiba .... (Ibn Khaldoun University – Tiaret

Supervisor: Dr . Khaled BELLARBI   (Ibn Khaldoun University – Tiaret)

Examiner: Lakhder toumi Assmaa............ (Ibn Khaldoun University – Tiaret

Academic Year 2024

DEDICATIONS

I pray and thank God Almightly for granting me the guift of knowledge and blessing me with

His mercy

I dedicate this work

To my dear parents (the first and the last love in my life) I hope god bless them.For their

support which is often the only stable thing when everything else goes into chaos.

To my kids .

To my dear friends for standing with me all the time.

Thank you so much , I really appreciate that

.

Khedija CHERCHAB

DEDICATIONS

First of all, I thank God for his success.

This work To my beloved parents.

To my dear brothers: Lakhdar and Mohamed

And my sisters : Iman khadidja and Mériem

I also dedicate this work To everyone who helped me with it my partner To Mr

Zoukel Yazid

Last but not least, my one and only best friend Asmaa And Ikram

Achouak AMRAOUI

.

.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the name of **Allah**, the Most Gracious and Most Merciful

First of all, all the praise to Allah who gave us the ability, strength and patience to accomplish this work

Our sincerest gratitude is directed to our supervisor *Dr BELLARBI* for all the necessary facilities, and without his this work would not have been achieved.

We place on record, our sincere gratitude to the honorable members of presentation: *Dr Bensaleh hiba …….* and *Dr lakhder Toumi Assmaa…..* Their insightful comments and invaluable opinions will be of great assistance in improving the purpose of study.

We also place on record and take this stand to thank all the students of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering Department at Ibn Khaldoun University , who participated in this research.

Last, great pleasure and sincere thanks to our families who take part in supporting us, for their endless love and their Understanding

Thank You for your Collaboration

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the role of pragmatics in the cross-cultural communication at Mathematics and Electrical Engineering Department at Ibn Khaldoun University. It seeks to determine whether there both West Afriacn and Algerian students face difficulties in communication to each other .This study was predicated on two assumptions. First, We hypothesis that both Algerian and West African students at department of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering at Ibn Khaldoun University face difficulties in communicating to each other.Second, Algerian students at department of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering at Ibn Khaldoun University use certain facial expressions to succeed in the communicating with the west African students .The results of this research approve our hypotheses.

Keywords: West Africans , Communication , Pragmatics , Cross-cultural

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

X

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

General Introduction

1 Background of the Study

The study of pragmatics has a long history, and in the middle of the 20th century, it started to be acknowledged as a significant method for teaching and learning languages. The study of pragmatics in linguistics focuses on how context affects how meaning in language is understood. This covers elements that are essential to clear communication, like implicature, speech acts, presupposition, and discourse analysis. Although philosophers like Charles Peirce and Charles Morris in the late 19th and early 20th centuries laid the theoretical groundwork for pragmatics, the systematic study of pragmatics as a separate field of study gained momentum in the 1960s and 1970s. The way we communicate meaning through communication is called pragmatics. The meaning is made up of both spoken and nonverbal

components, and it changes depending on the situation, the relationship between the speakers, and a host of other social variables. English is becoming a global language that connects people due to its rapid growth. As a result, even though no two English speakers speak the same language or have similar cultures, English can be thought of as their shared language. In actuality, English is spoken at various contexts and communication levels. Because of this, speakers need to be well-versed in a variety of pragmatic concepts to prevent errors and misinterpretations when speaking.

2 Statement of the Problem

Relying on personal observations, for both Algerian and West African students learner to succeed in the communication , they must acquire , develop and master pragmatic skills .

Besides, what is worthy to mention that foreign language is a necessary mediom of communication, but also the hardest skill acquired and mastered by learners due to less opportunities and focus given to this challenging process of any students suffer greatly from problems in speaking and forming meaningful sentences , and plenty of grammatical mistakes , hence students must be aware of these mistakes and try their best to learn more about pragmatics. Thus attempt in identifying learners pragmatic ways in communicating in cross-cultural communities.

3 Aim of the Study

This research is driven by two objectives. First, it seeks to discover the role of pragmatics in cross cultural communities among the students at the department of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering at Ibn Khaldoun University. Second, it aims at selecting the exact pragmatic methods to succeed the communication between the Algerian students and the west africans at the target department . These objectives build into the general aim which is suggesting solutions to reduce the misnderstanding among the concerned population .

4 Research Questions

Through the present research, we plan to discover the role of pragmatics in the cross cultural community at the department of department of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering at Ibn Khaldoun University in authentic through answering the following questions:

1- Are both Algerian and West African students at department of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering at Ibn Khaldoun University face difficulties in communicating to each other ?

2- What are the pragmatic methods that the Algerian and the west africans students use to succeed in the communication between at the target department?

2

5 Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are suggested:

1. We hypothesis that both Algerian and West African students at department of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering at Ibn Khaldoun University face difficulties in communicating to each other.

2. Algerian students at department of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering at Ibn Khaldoun University use certain facial expressions to succeed in the communicating with the west African students .

6 Methodology

In order to reach the objectives of the study mentioned previously, the present research follows a descriptive research design that helps to access answers for the research questions. The approach followed for analyzing the data is quantitative. The instrument used in this dissertation is a questionnaire .The questionnaire is designed for second year students at at department of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering at Ibn Khaldoun University and contains three sections. The first section is devoted to the students' demographic information, the second section targets the difficulties of communication between both Algerian and West African students , and the third section designed to spot the most frequent pragmatic ways to facilitate the communication among the concerned population .

7 Population and Sampling

In order to limit the scope of working on all students at all the department at department of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering at Ibn Khaldoun University, we decided to take only the case of second year students as our population of interest. The promotion consists of ....students, but the sample of our study is selected by applying a stratified random sampling through which 60 participants were chosen to gather the necessary data.

8 Structure of the Study

The present research is designed to discover the importance of pragmatics in the communication among the students of   West Africa and those of Algeria - case of second year   students at at department of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering at Ibn Khaldoun University - It consists of three chapters. The first and the second chapters are theoretical; they review the literature that covers all the research variables. The third chapter is practical, it presents the methodology and obtained data.

The first chapter focuses on providing an overview about semantics in linguistics, its definitions, its history in addition to   its importance and the different theories of semantics in linguistics.

The second chapter   focuses on providing an overview about   pragmatics , its definitions , history , develpment, types   and importance. The second section is devoted to presenting the most common suggested strategies to overcome the concerned issue.

The third chapter is practical. The first section presents the research methodology, the second is devoted to the gathered data, and the last one provides the interpretation of data. This chapter deals with the analysis of the gathered data and the discussion of the results. After that a conclusion is presented along with a list of references of all works used during the study.

CHAPTER ONE

Literature Review about Semantics

Chapter One: Literature Review about Semantics and Pragmatics

Introduction

Studying a foreign language aims to equip students with cross-cultural and grammar skills for effective communication in unfamiliar contexts. It includes pragmatics, which examines language usage from the user's perspective, and linguistic semantics, which explains a speaker's knowledge. Language is stimulus-free and creative, with speakers acquiring vocabulary and pronunciation early in life.

This theoretical chapter is about "examining the role of pragmatics in cross-cultural communities" starting by the definition and the historical background of semantics and semantics in linguistics, semantics in the field of linguistics. Also, semantics in everyday life, theories in linguistics semantics, computationally semantics, semantic memory and technology, then Definition and history of pragmatics and pragmatics transfer and the definition, types of pragmatics transfer, additionally the importance of pragmatics.

1.1 Definitions of Semantics

Semantics is the study of the meaning in language. It has to do with considering the meanings of words. Scholars (Boas and his most notable pupil Sapir) have frequently added to their grammatical analyses of languages the discussion of the meaning of the grammatical categories and of the correlations between the structure of the vocabularies and the cultures in which the languages operated.

Semantics is a branch of linguistics, which along with pragmatics, has responsibility for this task. Semantics is one of the richest and most fascinating parts of linguistics. Among the kinds of questions semanticists ask are the following:

• What are meanings definitions? Ideas in our heads? Sets of objects in the world?

• Can all meanings be precisely defined?

• What explains relations between meanings, like synonymy, antonym(oppositeness), and so on?

• How do the meanings of words combine to create the meanings of sentences?

• What is the difference between literal and non-literal meaning?

• How do meanings relate to the minds of language users, and to the things words refer to?

• What is the connection between what a word means, and the contexts in which it is used?

• How do the meanings of words interact with syntactic rules and principles?

• Do all languages express the same meanings?

• How do meanings change?

Clearly, semantics is a vast subject, and a very vague term. In ordinary English, the word 'meaning' is used to refer to such different things as the idea or intention lying behind a piece of language, as in , the thing referred to by a piece of language , and the translations of words between languages .

'I don't quite understand what you're getting at by saying "meat is murder":

do you mean that everyone should be a vegetarian?'

'I meant the second street on the left, not the first one.'

'Seiketsu means "clean" in Japanese.'

As we will see, an important initial task of linguistic semantics is to distinguish between these different types of meaning, and to make it clear exactly what place each of them has

within a principled theory of language. Semantics for Chomsky must be part of I-language: the part that provides useful information from the Language Faculty to the Conceptual-Intentional system. There are many traditions in semantics, and many current research programs in semantics are embedded in firmly anti-Chomskyan views of language in general, Semanticists will often casually remark that Noam Chomsky rejects semantics. He has frequently noted how poorly understood some aspects of semantics are, and has shown little inclination to grant the status of reasonably well developed science to many parts of semantics. One specific reason Chomsky has often voiced skepticism about semantics is that he saw the wrong kinds of appeals to semantics in the wrong places. The arguments for the autonomy of syntax in Chomsky's early writing have been described as part of an extended argument for the "existence of syntax". Semantics for Chomsky must be part of I-language: the part that provides useful information from the Language Faculty to the Conceptual-Intentional system. There are many traditions in semantics, and many current research programs in semantics are embedded in firmly anti-Chomskyan views of language in general. Chomsky's skepticism about truth-conditional semantics has been, and remains strong

1..2 History of Semantics

This vade mecum is an invitation: an invitation to turn an attentive ear to the disharmonic polyphony and semantic openness (as well as to the disharmonious monophony) of historical language use – in old languages of pre-modern times, in languages not directly linked to the colonial past of the West, and in languages of the so-called modern world. It is an invitation to understand language use as a plurality of voices and to consider the stocktaking of this plurality as an important end in itself for the empirical work of a social historian. In contrast to the traditional history of concepts, the

analysis of semantic expressions and their shifts does not primarily contribute to an intellectual history of ideas but seeks to relate the historical and potential situations of language use in order to situate the social and to explain historical change. This vade mecum provides some guidance by offering two things: Firstly, we would like to show how the historical semantics approach could contribute to the study of history in general and to social history in particular. This seems all the more useful since handbooks and introductions to historical semantics mainly focus on linguistics and digital humanities while comparable overviews for historians are still lacking. Secondly, we offer a practical guide of brief vignettes as concrete examples illustrating the range and variety of ways of performing semantic analysis of historical sources. In four concise vignettes – all of which deal with social power relations in the broadest sense – we present the spectrum of the approach and encourage readers to apply historical semantics to their own topics and documents following their own paths. The "we" is a group of mainly medievalists called "HiSem" (short for "historical semantics"). We got together in 2012 as a loose association of historians, philologists, and digital humanists meeting between Zurich, Berlin, and Frankfurt am Main to experiment with the semantic analysis of pre-modern documents. The vade mecum is thus also an invitation to watch us experiment with historical semantics, investigating potential options for making documents speak in a new voice. The methodological diversity within the historical semantics approach should make it obvious that there is no clear-cut route to success. One can achieve one's goal in different ways – but one can also get lost. However, what ties the vignettes assembled in this vade mecum, as well as the contributions in this special issue as a whole, together, are three guiding principles for the work on historical documents as 'language sites'. Firstly, we distrust any intuitive claim to understand or presuppose the alterity of a historical document, no matter how familiar or unintelligible its words may appear at first sight. Historians need to distance

9

themselves from their own presumptions to the same extent that a historical document needs to be resituated in its original and/or potential circumstance(s) of use. It is not non-understanding – the distance between oneself and a document – that is harmful, but rather the illusion of understanding. As Wulf Oesterreicher formulated in his seminal study: Once the historical situations of language sites fade, all that remains as a relic of their former liveliness is the textual petrifact. According to Oesterreicher, one must therefore assume "a decontextualisation, a de-enactment, and a reduction of the manifold semiotic modes of the original communicative event". This 'textualisation' (Vertextung), the condensation into a text detachable from its situations of use, can only be counteracted by an attempt to resituate in order to "obtain an ultimately inconclusive historical understanding of a text, to elicit its position in the context of communication, and to open up the abundance of its modalities of meaning". The main methodological turning point of the historical semantics approach is therefore to admit that historical social systems are spontaneously incomprehensible from the perspective of contemporary categories, and that the abundance and contradictory nature of language sites needs to be reconnected to (potential) historical circumstances of word usage. In this sense, each language site is understood as an "articulated written totality of which, as it were, everything counts or at least could count" and therefore must be taken into consideration. Secondly, this attitude to historical documents as language sites requires putting aside one's own analytical categories and hermeneutic concepts. As Oesterreicher puts it, the attempt to resituate language sites can only succeed if the modern reader discards his/her own reading attitudes or at least reflects them critically. Even where the references of the document in question seem obvious, we should not be tempted "to identify the discourse references with the current forms and implications of written cultural practice we are familiar with. Rather, it is first necessary to radically rid oneself of contemporary notions to be able to perceive the specificity of these forms of communication at all."7 For

10

language, this deliberate casting aside of accustomed frames of reference is particularly difficult because language inevitably implies the clamorous appeal: "Construe me, interpret me, understand me!" Methodologically, however, we can make use of Caroline Arni's suggestion of a "recursive game of concepts". Arni argues that historians should place the conceptualizations of historical actors on the same level as their own analytical categories and concepts. Instead of opposing 'past' and 'present' as the 'object of study' delivering historical evidence to the 'inquiring subject' providing the research question, historians should engage in a process of "reciprocal conceptual enrichment". This attempt to resituate the historical researcher herself or himself not only serves to "decolonise the past" and "provincialise the present", as Arni advocates, but may also help to establish an attention to the historical document as a language site at eye level. Thirdly, the assumption that the "modalities of meaning" (Oesterreicher) in the historical documents we study are abundant and contradictory and need to be resituated in their complexity as well as in their diachronicity and synchronicity also implies that we need to be ready to work with different scales. The way in which semantic analysis can be carried out depends first on the available historical documents and corpora – and this is where the great variedness of doing historical semantics emerges. The extent to which we proceed quantitatively or qualitatively – whether we use computers to count words and calculate different measures of significance or carry out cluster analyses. Whether we create tally sheets in college notebooks with a biro, or whether we dispense with counting words altogether – varies from case to case depending on the relevant documentation at hand and on the preferences of the involved researchers. Large digital corpora and computational methods of analysis have obviously expanded the possibilities for scaling. If the critical method is able to deal effectively with tens or even hundreds of occurrences, computational methods allow for the analysis of hundreds of thousands of mentions and more. They therefore provide opportunities to study

11

the spread and evolution of words and expressions in heterogeneous corpora and over longer periods. Statistics enables a new form of semantic analysis that counts and calculates before reading and interpreting. This new form undoubtedly helps with the disregard for their own interpretive circumstances that modern readers so desperately need, as the computer is blind to semantics.10 The distant reading of an algorithm enables us to evaluate and modify insights from close reading and vice versa. Nevertheless, although computational semantics can generate new forms of evidence and point to imbalances in the traditional history of concepts, it is by far not the only (promising) method available to historical semantics for increasing awareness of historical otherness and questioning historiographical master narratives or contemporary assumptions. In addition, statistical analyses are not suitable for every language site. Some corpora may be too small, some questions too focused on specific nuances of meaning for statistics to be of any help. What is more, regardless of whether computer-assisted methods are used and whether historical evidence is acquired directly from documents or from statistics and its visualisation, e.g. a graph, the subsequent interpretive work done by historians remains just as challenging. Our plea for a historical semantics approach to social history is embedded in a long-standing historiographical reflection on the relation between the conceptual and the social, and on language as social fact situationally creating and re-creating meanings in all sorts of social interactions. This reflection has started long before the so-called linguistic turn and the era of discourse analysis in historical research. The broad shift in linguistics from structuralist approaches that do not care about language in use towards pragmatics, ethnomethodology, poststructuralist philosophy and sociology as well as (neo) pragmatism went in parallel with developments in historiography, most prominently in Italy and France.11 In German-speaking academia, this historiography is an especially complex one. The Austrian social and legal historian Otto Brunner was one of the first stressing the importance of the emic

vocabulary of the sources for the understanding of past societies. While his famous monography "Land und Herrschaft", first published in 1939, was clearly affiliated to the national socialist body of thought, he adhered to the voluminous post-war historical dictionary Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe, co-edited by Reinhart Koselleck, Werner Conze, and Otto Brunner (who in the meantime had ideologically converted to 'Old Europe' as a key concept) represents a critical confrontation with that legacy. In nine volumes published between 1972 and 1997, this seminal work of conceptual history in its German-language tradition of thought has influenced generations of historians and led to similar projects in other disciplines and beyond national borders. In order to overcome the older notion of history of ideas as pure intellectual history, the editors of the Grundbegriffe aimed to interlace social history and the history of concepts by tracing the transition from a pre-modern to a modern society through the study of key political and social terms and their transformation before and after 1800. Conceptual history in this sense identified terms like class, bourgeoisie, democracy, authority, freedom, or work as both indicators and drivers of the transformation process towards modernity.16 In this understanding, word usage was not only shaped by social formations, but also actively influenced societal change in return. A key goal was to understand how word usage affected the way experiences, expectations, values, and ideas were expressed, claimed, challenged, or opposed. As the leading figure of this enterprise, Koselleck persistently emphasized the interplay of history and linguistics by taking into account pragmatics, semantics, and grammar, which eventually led to the integration of discourse analysis into conceptual history. In this sense, the conceptual history approach incontrovertibly opened up a path to the historical contextualization of language use. One major objection to Begriffsgeschichte, however, has been that it was a top down selection of terms identified as key concepts of modernity by a group of historians. Instead of reflecting major social transformation processes and their conceptual

13

expressions, so the complaint, the dictionary reflected a subjective assessment of post-war Germany and its historical roots – a retrospective and narrowing derivation of the present and thus a way of doing history 'through the rear-view mirror' rather than an open-ended, empirically based reconstruction of the past. Others have argued that the orientation around abstract key terms focused too much on conceptual language, while non-conceptual forms of expression were not sufficiently addressed. The history of concepts, they claim, threatened to underestimate the heterogeneity of synchronic language use, the disputed and ambiguous meanings, by concentrating on the first records of each term's formation and then on its evolution over time. Although Koselleck himself repeatedly stressed the importance of well-defined textual corpora for understanding the synchronicity and diachronicity of central terms, many of the articles in the Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe fell short of expectations in this regard.19 Moreover, social historians in particular criticized the project for not living up to its own claims. They claimed that by focusing on central figures of classical political historiography as well as on well-known canonical texts and historical dictionaries. This form of conceptual history could only reflect the political and social language of elites, not that of society as a whole.20 How to include the conceptualization of the social by the non-writing population in a social history of concepts thus remained an unsolved question.

1..3 Semantics in Linguistics

1.1.3 Definition of Meaning:

Semantics is the study of meaning, but what do we mean by meaning"? Meaning has been given different definitions in the past. Meaning equals connotation. The meaning is simply the set of associations that a word evokes, and it is the meaning of a word defined by the images that its users connect to it .So "winter" might mean "snow", "sledging" and "mulled

wine". However, what about someone living in the amazon? Their "winter" is still wet and hot, so its original meaning is lost. Because the associations of a word do not always apply, it was decided that this could not be the whole story. It has also been suggested that the meaning of a word is simply the entity in the world, which that word refers to. This makes perfect sense for proper nouns like „New York" and „the Eiffel Tower", but there are lots of words like „sing" and „altruism" that do not have a solid thing in the world that they are connected to. Therefore, meaning cannot be entirely denotation either. Meaning, in Semantics, is defined as being Extension: The thing in the world that the word/phrase refers to, plus Intension: The concepts/mental images that the word/phrase evokes. Thus, semantics is interested in how meaning works in language; the study of semantics looks at how meaning works in language, and because of this, it often uses native speaker intuitions about the meaning of words and phrases to base research on. We all understand semantics already on a subconscious level as how we understand each other when we speak, how the way in which words are put together. creating meaning is one of the things that semantics looks at, and is based on, how the meaning of speech is not just derived from the meanings of the individual words all put together. The principle of compositionality says that the meaning of speech is the sum of the meanings of the individual words plus the way in which they are arranged into a structure. Likewise, semantics also looks at the ways in which the meanings of words can be related to each other.

1.2.3. Sense Relations:

Here are a few of the ways in which words can be semantically related

    a. Synonymy: Words are synonymous/ synonyms when they can be used to mean the same thing (at least in some contexts – words are rarely fully identical in all contexts). Begin and start, Big and large, Youth and adolescent

b. Antonymy: Words are antonyms of one another when they have opposite meanings (again, at least in some contexts). Big and small, Come and go, Up and down

c. Polysemy – A word is polysemous when it has two or more related meanings. In this case the word takes one form but can be used to mean two different things. In the case of polysemy, these two meanings must be related in some way, and not be two completely unrelated meanings of the word. Bright (shining) and bright (intelligent). Mouse (animal) and mouse (computer hardware)

d. Homophony – Homophony is similar to polysemy in that it refers to a single form of word with two meanings, however a word is a homophone when the two meanings are entirely unrelated. Bat (flying mammal) and bat (sports equipment). Pen (writing instrument) and pen (small cage)

e. Sentence Relations: Sentences can also be semantically related to one-another in a few different ways

f. Paraphrase – Paraphrases have the same truth conditions; if one is true, the other must also be true. 'The boys like the girls' and 'the girls are liked by the boys", „John gave the book to Chris" and „John gave Chris the book

g. Mutual entailment: Each sentence must be true for the other to be true. "John is married to Rachel" and "Rachel is John's wife", "Chris is a man" and "Chris is human".

h. Asymmetrical entailment: Only one of the sentences must be true for the other to be true, but that sentence may be true without the other sentence necessarily having to be true. "Rachel is John's wife" entails "John is married" (but John is married does not entail Rachel being his wife), "Rachel has two brothers" entails „Rachel is not an only child" (but Rachel not being an only child does not entail Rachel having two brothers)

i. Contradiction: Sentences contradict each other when one sentence is true and the other cannot be true. "Rachel is an only child" and "Rachel's brother is called Phil", "Alex is alive" and "Alex died last week

j. Ambiguity: One of the aspects of how meaning works in language is ambiguity. A sentence is ambiguous when it has two or more possible meanings, but how does ambiguity arise in language? A sentence can be ambiguous for either of the following reasons

k. Lexical Ambiguity: A sentence is lexically ambiguous when it can have two or more possible meanings due to polysemous (words that have two or more related meanings) or homophonous (a single word which has two or more different meanings) words. Example of lexically ambiguous sentence: Prostitutes appeal to the Pope. This sentence is ambiguous because the word "appeal" is polysemous and can mean, "ask for help" or "are attractive to".

l. Structural Ambiguity: A sentence is structurally ambiguous if it can have two or more possible meanings due to the words it contains being able to be combined in different ways, which create different meanings Example of structurally ambiguous sentence: Enraged cow injures farmer with axe. In this sentence the ambiguity arises

17

from the fact that the "with axe" can either refer to the farmer, or to the act of injuring being carried out (by the cow) "with axe"

1..4 Semantics in the Field of Linguistics

Semantics looks at these relationships in language and looks at how these meanings are created, which is an important part of understanding how language works as a whole. Understanding how meaning occurs in language can inform other sub-disciplines, such as Language Acquisition, to help us understand how speakers acquire a sense of meaning. In addition, Sociolinguistics, as the achievement of meaning in language is important in language in a social situation. Semantics is also informed by other sub-disciplines of linguistics, such as Morphology, as understanding the words themselves is integral to the study of their meaning, and Syntax, which researchers in semantics use extensively to reveal how meaning is created in language. How language is structured is central to meaning Situational Semantics Remember the different connotations of the phrase, "I care for you?" Let us revisit the idea that a single line of text can be interpreted in different ways. Suppose a college graduate was just hired to a new job. She was excited to start this new chapter; everything seemed glossy and bright. On the first day, her boss mentions she will have to travel to the new Miami office to help the office hit the ground running. In reality, she will be going there to do very mundane chores like order office supplies and clean the cubicles (something that nobody else wants to do). So, as the new employee exclaims, "You chose me? Thank you!" and the supervisor says, "Yup, I chose you all right," we will know that, given the context of the situation, the supervisor is not saying this in a positive light. However, the new employee will interpret it to mean something very positive. Alternatively, what if a husband comes home with what he labels a "brand new" coffee table. He might tell his wife it was a steal and a gorgeous new piece for their home. The wife might take one look at it and say, "This is not new. I saw this at the local consignment shop the other day."

18

The husband might retort, "Semantics. It's new to us!" Indeed, two people can take one word or expression and take it to mean entirely different things

1.5 Semantics in Everyday Life

One part of studying language is understanding the many meanings of individual words. Once you have a handle on the words themselves, comes into play. The same word can be said to two people and they can interpret them differently. For example, imagine a man told a woman, "I care for you… a lot." Would not that made the woman's heart melt? Sure, if he just said that out of the blue, walking down the beach one day. However, what if the woman told the man, "I love you," and, after a long pause, all he said was, "I care for you… a lot." She would be crushed. So, context (the current situation) will always play a role in everyday semantics here are some examples of everyday words that can have more than one meaning:

· A water pill could be a pill with water in it but it is understood to be a diuretic that causes a person to lose water from his body.

· "Crash" can mean an auto accident, a drop in the Stock Market, to attend a party without being invited, ocean waves hitting the shore, or the sound of cymbals being struck together.

· Depending on context, a flowering plant could be referred to as a weed or a flower.

The simple word "on" can have many meanings, such as: on call, on the roof, on cloud nine, on edge, on fire, on purpose, on demand, on top, or on the phone.

1.6 Theories in Linguistic Semantics

Formal semantics seeks to identify domain-specific mental operations, which speakers perform when they compute a sentence's meaning based on its syntactic structure. Theories of formal semantics are typically floated on top of theories of syntax such as generative

syntax or Combinatory categorical grammar and provide a model theory based on mathematical tools such as typed lambda calculi. The field's central ideas are rooted in early twentieth century philosophical logic as well as later ideas about linguistic syntax. It emerged as its own subfield in the 1970s after the pioneering work of Richard Montague and Barbara Partee and continues to be an active area of research.

Formal semantics uses techniques from math, philosophy, and logic to analyze the broader relationship between language and reality, truth and possibility. Has your teacher ever asked you to use an "if… then" question? It breaks apart lines of information to detect the underlying meaning or consequence of events.

1.1.6 Conceptual Semantics:

This theory is an effort to explain properties of argument structure. The assumption behind this theory is that syntactic properties of phrases reflect the meanings of the words that head them. With this theory, linguists can better deal with the fact those subtle differences in word meaning correlate with other differences in the syntactic structure that the word appears in; the way this is gone about is by looking at the internal structure of words. These small parts that make up the internal structure of words are termed semantic primitives. Conceptual semantics deals with the most basic concept and form of a word before our thoughts and feelings added context to it. For example, at its most basic we know a cougar to be a large wild cat. Nevertheless, the word cougar has also come to indicate an older woman who's dating a younger man, this is where context is important.

Conceptual semantics opens the door to a conversation on connotation and denotation. Denotation is the standard definition of a word. Meanwhile, connotation deals with the emotion evoked from word. Connotation will be derived from the manner in which you

interpret a word sentence's meaning. As such, semantics and connotation are deeply entwined. For a deeper dive, read these examples and exercises on connotative words

1.2.6 CognitiveSemantics:

Cognitive semantics approaches meaning from the perspective of cognitive linguistics. In this framework, language is explained via general human cognitive abilities rather than a domain-specific language module. The techniques native to cognitive semantics are typically used in lexical studies such as those put forth by Leonard Talmy, George Lakoff, Dirk Geeraerts, and Bruce Wayne Hawkins. Some cognitive semantic frameworks, such as that developed by Talmy, take into account syntactic structures as well. Semantics, through modern researchers can be linked to the Wernicke's area of the brain and can be measured using the event-related potential (ERP). ERP is the rapid electrical response recorded with small disc electrodes, which are placed on a person's scalp

1.3.6 Computational Semantics:

Computational semantics is focused on the processing of linguistic meaning. In order to do this, concrete algorithms and architectures are described. Within this framework, the algorithms and architectures are also analyzed in terms of decidability, time/space complexity, data structures that they require and communication protocols Various ways have been developed to describe the semantics of programming languages formally, building on mathematical logic

1.4.6Semantic Memory:

In psychology, semantic memory is memory for meaning – in other words, the aspect of memory that preserves only the gist, the general significance, of remembered experience – while episodic memory is memory for the ephemeral details – the individual features, or the unique particulars of experience. The term 'episodic memory' was introduced by Tulving and Schacter in the context of 'declarative memory', which involved simple association of

factual or objective information concerning its object. Word meaning is measured by the company they keep, i.e. the relationships among words themselves in a semantic network. The memories may be transferred intergenerationally or isolated in one generation due to a cultural disruption. Different generations may have different experiences at similar points in their own time-lines. This may then create a vertically heterogeneous semantic net for certain words in an otherwise homogeneous culture In a network created by people analyzing their understanding of the word (such as Wordnet) the links and decomposition structures of the network are few in number and kind, and include part of, kind of, and similar links. In automated ontologies, the links are computed vectors without explicit meaning. Various automated technologies are being developed to compute the meaning of words: latent semantic indexing and support vector machines as well as natural language processing, artificial neural networks and predicate calculus techniques Ideasthesia. Ideasthesia is a psychological phenomenon in which activation of concepts evokes sensory experiences. For example, in synesthesia, activation of a concept of a letter) evokes sensory-like experiences Psychosemantics   Osgood's massive cross-cultural studies using his semantic differential (SD) method that used thousands of nouns and adjective bipolar scales. A specific form of the SD, Projective Semantics method uses only most common and neutral nouns that correspond to the 7 groups (factors) of adjective-scales most consistently found in cross-cultural studies (Evaluation, Potency, Activity as found by Osgood, and Reality, Organization, Complexity, Limitation as found in other studies) . In this method, seven groups of bipolar adjective scales corresponded to seven types of nouns so the method was thought to have the object-scale symmetry (OSS) between the scales and nouns for evaluation using these scales. For example, the nouns corresponding to the listed 7 factors would be: Beauty, Power, Motion, Life, Work, Chaos, Law. Beauty was expected to be assessed unequivocally as "very good" on adjectives of Evaluation-related scales, Life as

22

"very real" on Reality-related scales, etc. However, deviations in this symmetric and very basic matrix might show underlying biases of two types: scales-related bias and objects-related bias. This OSS design meant to increase the sensitivity of the SD method to any semantic biases in responses of people within the same culture and educational background Prototype theory another set of concepts related to fuzziness in semantics is based on prototypes. The work of Eleanor Rosch in the 1970s led to a view that natural categories are not characterizable in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions, but are graded (fuzzy at their boundaries) and inconsistent as to the status of their constituent members. One may compare it with Jung's archetype, though the concept of archetype sticks to static concept. Some post-structuralists are against the fixed or static meaning of the words. Derrida, following Nietzsche, talked about slippages in fixed meanings Systems of categories are not objectively out there in the world but are rooted in people's experience. These categories evolve as learned concepts of the world – meaning is not an objective truth, but a subjective construct, learned from experience, and language arises out of the "grounding of our conceptual systems in shared embodiment and bodily experience. A corollary of this is that the conceptual categories (i.e. the lexicon) will not be identical for different cultures, or indeed, for every individual in the same culture. This leads to another debate (see the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis or Eskimo words for snow)

1.5.6 Semantic Technology:

Semantic technology is a way of processing content that relies on a variety of linguistic techniques including text mining, entity extraction, concept analysis, natural language processing, categorization, normalization and sentiment analysis. Compared to traditional technologies that process content as data, semantic technology is based on not just data, but also the relationships between pieces of data (Hurford, and Heasley, 1996: 33). When it comes to analyzing text, this network enables both high precision and recall in search, and

automatic categorization and tagging (Lobner, 2002: 130-2; and Al-Seady, 2002a: 2). It can manage a huge knowledge base to integrate information and complexity, as well as in the variety of ways, in which it is being used, makes its management more difficult than ever before. Here, semantics plays a key role in extracting meaning from unstructured data, transforming it into ready to use information for knowledge management, monitoring Semantics for Operational Risk Management Semantic technology helps organizations manage unstructured information and transform it into usable, searchable and actionable intelligence. It uncovers data from within the organization and from the web to provide valuable insight. Semantics for Customer Service Managing customer experience today requires being able to streamline interactions with customers, maintaining a high level of customer satisfaction and hearing the Voice of the Customer. Semantic technologies support the implementation of advanced listening platforms, streamlining access to support, whether it is delivered directly to customers, or to support staff to help customers who need additional assistance. The key to providing efficient automated customer support is understanding the customer's request and ensuring access to the information they need at the right time (Hurford, and Heasley, 1996: 31; and Al-Seady, 1998a: 12). Semantics for Knowledge Management External and internal sources are important resources that contain insight valuable for identifying risks and mitigating threats. To minimize operational risks and threats hiding in the supply chain and within an organization's ecosystem, semantics can be used to support analysts in making the vast amount of content they acquire available to fuel the risk assessment process with actionable insight and intelligence. Semantic technology allows organizations to minimize their exposure to risks, and provides early identification and analysis of consumer sentiment, market trends and competitor information.

1.7 History of Pragmatics

The pragmatic principles people abide by in one language are often different in another. Thus, there has been a growing interest in how people in different languages observe a certain pragmatic principle. Cross-linguistic and cross-cultural studies reported what is considered polite in one language is sometimes not polite in another. Contrastive pragmatics, however, is not confined to the study of a certain pragmatic principles. Cultural breakdowns, pragmatic failure, among other things, are also components of cross-cultural pragmatics. Another focus of research in pragmatics is learner language or *interlanguage. This interest eventually evolved into interlanguage pragmatics, a branch of pragmatics, which specifically discusses how non-native speakers comprehend and produce a speech act in a target language and how their pragmatic competence develops over time (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993; Kasper, 1995). To date, a handful of cross-sectional, longitudinal and theoretical studies on classroom basis have been conducted and the potentials along the interface of pragmatics with SLA research have been widely felt. Topics of immediate interest to which language teachers at large may contribute seem just numerous. What are some of the pragmatic universals underlying L2 acquisition? What influences L1 exerts on the learner'sL2 acquisition? How shall we measure the learner's pragmatic performance with a native pragmatic norm? These are but a few of the interesting ones and for more discussions see Kasper & Schmidt(1996), Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford (1996), Takahashi (1996), House (1996) and Cohen (1996). HISTORY Although pragmatics is a relatively new branch of linguistics, research on it can be dated back to ancient Greece and Rome where the term pragmaticus' is found in late Latin and pragmaticos' in Greek, both meaning of being practical'. Modern use and current practice of pragmatics is credited to the influence of the American philosophical doctrine of pragmatism. The pragmatic interpretation of semiotics and verbal communication studies in Foundations of the Theory

of Signs by Charles Morris (1938), for instance, helped neatly expound the differences of mainstream enterprises in semiotics and linguistics. For Morris, pragmatics studies the relations of signs to interpreters', while semantics studies the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable', and syntactic studies the formal relations of signs to one another. ' By elaborating the sense of pragmatism in his concern of conversational meanings, Grice (1975) enlightened modern treatment of meaning by distinguishing two kinds of meaning, natural and non-natural. Grice suggested that pragmatics should centre on the more practical dimension of meaning, namely the conversational meaning which was later formulated in a variety of ways (Levinson, 1983; Leech, 1983). Practical concerns also helped shift pragmaticians' focus to explaining naturally occurring conversations which resulted in hallmark discoveries of the Cooperative Principle by Grice (1975) and the Politeness Principle by Leech (1983). Subsequently, Green (1989) explicitly defined pragmatics as natural language understanding. This was echoed by Blakemore (1990) in her Understanding Utterances: The Pragmatics of Natural Language and Grundy (1995) in his Doing Pragmatics. The impact of pragmatism has led to cross linguistic international studies of language use which resulted in, among other things, Sperber and Wilson's (1986) relevance theory which convincingly explains how people comprehend and utter a communicative act. The Anglo-American tradition of pragmatic study has been tremendously expanded and enriched with the involvement of researchers mainly from the Continental countries such as the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway and Belgium. A symbol of this development was the establishment of the IPrA (the International Pragmatic Association) in Antwerp in 1987. In its Working Document, IPrA proposed to consider pragmatics as a theory of linguistic adaptation and look into language use from all dimensions (Verschueren, 1987). Henceforward, pragmatics has been conceptualized as to incorporate micro and macro components (Mey, 1993).Throughout its development,

26

pragmatics has been steered by the philosophical practice of pragmatism and evolving to maintain its independence as a linguistic subfield by keeping to its tract of being practical in treating the everyday concerned meaning. CRITICISMS A traditional criticism has been that pragmatics does not have a clear-cut focus, and in early studies there was a tendency to assort those topics without a clear status in linguistics to pragmatics. Thus, pragmatics was associated with the metaphor of 'a garbage can' (Leech, 1983). Other complaints were that, unlike grammar, which resorts to rules, the vague and fuzzy principles in pragmatics are not adequate in telling people what to choose in face of a range of possible meanings for one single utterance in context. An extreme criticism represented by Marshal (see Shi Cun, 1989) was that pragmatics is not eligible as an independent field of learning since meaning is already dealt with in semantics. However, there is a consensus view that pragmatics as a separate study is more than necessary because it handles those meanings that semantics overlooks (Leech, 1983). This view has been reflected both in practice at large and in Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics by Thomas (1995). Thus, in spite of the criticisms, the impact of pragmatics has been colossal and multifaceted. The study of speech acts, for instance, provided illuminating explanation into sociolinguistic conduct. The findings of the cooperative principle and politeness principle also provided insights into person-to-person interactions. The choice of different linguistic means for a communicative act and the various interpretations for the same speech act elucidate human mentality in the relevance principle which contributes to the study of communication in particular and cognition in general. Implications of pragmatic studies are also evident in language teaching practices. Deixis, for instance, is important in the teaching of reading. Speech acts are often helpful for improving translation and writing. Pragmatic principles are also finding their way into the study of literary works as well as language teaching classrooms.(See also: communicative competence, sociolinguistics as a source of discipline, psycholinguistics as a

27

source of discipline, competence and performance, discourse analysis, interlanguage, negotiation of meaning, sociolinguistic/sociocultural competence, procedural/declarative knowledge.

1.8 Pragmatics Transfer

Historical overview: General studies on language transfer. Interlanguage Pragmatics is a young discipline that dates back to the late 1970s-early 1980s; but transfer studies originated even before the field of SLA research emerged, as we know it today, during the 1940s and 1950s. Additionally, transfer studies did not address pragmatic issues until recently. Consequently, in order to study the role of the L1 in interlanguage pragmatics one must refer back to the origins and evolutions of research on general language transfer. The notion of transfer was first invoked during the Contrastive Analysis (CA) period, which was linked to behaviourist views of language learning and to structural linguistics. The amazing effect that the L1 had on using the L2, mainly at the level of pronunciation, led researchers in the 1960s to forward the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH). In those days, there were two widely held beliefs. Firstly, that the NL strongly influenced the L2. Secondly, that this influence was negative. Accordingly, contrastive analysts believed the L1 interfered with L2 learning. The CAH suggested that where two languages were different, there would be negative transfer or interference since learners would experience difficulty that would result in the production of errors; and that where two languages were similar, there would be positive transfer since learning would be facilitated and no errors would result. As soon as the 1970s, CA and behaviourism fell into disfavour and the CAH became theoretically and practically untenable. Mainly due to Chomsky's claims on the nature of learning, a cognitive approach to SLA emerged bringing about a radical shift of perspective. This approach emphasized the developmental nature of language acquisition placing little, if any,

importance on the influence of the L1. This led to two different ways of accounting for the role of the the first language in SLA. In one, researchers treated transfer as one of several processes involved in SLA, moving from a product-oriented to a process-oriented approach to account for L1 influence. Selinker (1972), Nemser (1971) and James (1971) who saw that the learners' L1 was one of the major determinants of their IL although not the only one adopted this approach. It was this view of transfer that came to dominate and to lead researchers to investigate how transfer interacts with other processes. The second way of dealing with transfer is what Ellis (1994: 309) calls the 'minimalist approach' which sought to minimize the importance of the L1 and to emphasize the contribution of universal processes of language learning, such as hypothesis testing, stressing, in this way, the similarity between L2 and L1 acquisition. The notion of transfer was closely linked to behaviourist theories of language learning. However, several reasons lead to a different account of this notion: 1. L1 transfer is not adequately explained in terms of habit formation; 2. The notion of transfer must also account for phenomena such as avoidance caused by L1 influence; and 3. Languages other than the L1 (L3...) can also have a linguistic influence on SLA and use. Under this new light, Sharwood-Smith and Kellerman (1986: 1) argue that the term transfer is inadequate and, therefore, posit an umbrella term, cross-linguistic influence, that allows, "to subsume under one heading such phenomena as 'transfer', 'interference', 'avoidance', 'borrowing' and L2-related aspects of language loss". They suggest the term transfer be restricted "to those processes that lead to the incorporation of elements from one language into another". However, despite their excellent review of language transfer, the fact is that the term transfer has persisted over time, although now it has a much broader scope, including all the factors that Sharwood-Smith & Kellerman (1986) incorporated into their notion: cross-linguistic influence.

1.9 Defining Pragmatic Transfer

It is hard to reach a comprehensive and sound definition of 'pragmatic transfer' because "both component parts of the phrase are problematic as they have been used with different meanings or with similar meanings but under different labels" (Bou, 1998, p. . For example, pragmatic transfer had been referred to as sociolinguistic transfer by Wolfson (1989), and it had been referred to as L1 sociocultural competence or cross-linguistic influence by Beebe et al. (1990), and had been referred to as transfer of conversational features or as discourse transfer by Odlin (1989). However, up to now, pragmatic transfer had been maintained in recent studies as it is understood by Kasper (1992) who used this term to refer to the influence that previous pragmatic knowledge has on the use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic knowledge. Pragmatic transfer can be defined as "any use by non-native speakers of speech act relation strategies or linguistic means that is different from L2 native speaker use and similar to L1 native speaker use" (Kasper & Dahl, 1991, p. 225). It can also be defined as "the influence of learner pragmatic knowledge of language and culture other than the target language on their comprehension, production, and acquisition of L2 pragmatic information" (Rizk 2003, p. 404). Moreover, Wolfson (1989) referred to pragmatic transfer as 'sociocultural transfer', which is regarded to be seen as one of the most vital parts that cause the improper performance in the TL and that happens when EFL learners are using rules from the L1 culture in the foreign language. It has been studied in many separate speech acts in several languages and it has been evident that pragmatic transfer exists in L2 speech performance when EFL learners transfer their L1 norms into their L2 (keshavarz et al., 2006; Byon, 2004). Beebe (1990) viewed pragmatic transfer as "transfer of L1 sociocultural communicative competence in performing L2 speech acts or any other function of language, where the speaker is trying to achieve a particular function of language" (Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz 1990, p. 56). They refer to it as the transfer of L1 sociocultural competence

30

when performing L2 speech acts or any other language behavior in L2. As it has been noted before, sociolinguistic transfer is considered as pragmatic transfer (Wolfson, 1989; cited in Bou, 1998), or even transfer or L1 sociocultural competence or cross-linguistic influence is considered as pragmatic transfer (Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss Weltz, 1990). However, Zegarac and Pennington (2000) defined it as " the transfer of pragmatic knowledge in situations of intercultural communication" (p. 02), they mention that pragmatic transfer does not only occur in a second or foreign language situation, but also it can occur whenever people even speak the same language but have various sociocultural backgrounds.

1.10 Types of Pragmatic Transfer

Stemming from the inseparable relationship between language and culture, Kasper (1992) identifies two types of pragmatic transfer: pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic. Kasper owes this distinction - which has been widely adopted in subsequent research - to Leech's (1983) discussion of general pragmatics and to Thomas' (1983) study of cross-cultural pragmatic failure. If, as teachers of EFL, we believe that we cannot separate the learning of a language from the learning about the culture in which that language will be used, we can depict the relationship that holds between both, language and culture, as shown in figure 1 below. A very interesting aspect of this distinction lies in its pedagogical consequences. Thomas (1983) discusses the role of linguists and teachers. While linguists must report what they observe as accurately as possible, teachers need to be prescriptive to a certain extent. Teaching language in use requires both systems of knowledge: of the language and of the culture. But these "are filtered through systems of beliefs - beliefs about language and beliefs about the world" (p.99). Consequently, the teacher will have no problem in correcting pragmalinguistic failure.

31

As far as sociopragmatic transfer is concerned, She includes context-external factors - i.e. which refer to participants' role relationships irrespective of a given linguistic action - and context-internal factors - which are intrinsic to a particular speech event. Therefore, Sociopragmatic transfer, then, is operative when the social perceptions underlying language users' interpretation and performance of linguistic action in L2 are influenced by their assessment of subjectively equivalent L1 contexts (Kasper, 1992: 209). Despite the usefulness and wide application of this dichotomy, to cover the full range of transfer possibilities that students who try to communicate in a L2 could, and do, use we should account for further transfer categories. Riley (1989) adds two further categories of pragmatic failure to those identified by Thomas (1983) which, with some changes, could be applied to the analysis of pragmatic transfer. Riley (1989: 237-39) situates pragmatics within a general theory of social action and suggests that for a complete account of pragmatic errors we need four categories: pragma-linguistic, sociopragmatic, inchoative, and non-linguistic errors. Inchoative errors "are the result of a failure to appreciate the 'true' value of discourse, in both quantitative and qualitative terms" (p.237) and refer to cross cultural variation at the level of the relative status of silence and speech and the overall social role of discourse. The last category, non-linguistic errors, is quite vast and heterogeneous though necessary since communication is also non-verbal. I believe that cases of inchoative error (and also inchoative pragmatic transfer) can be studied under the category of sociopragmatic failure or transfer since this sub category refers to perceptions of the overall social value of discourse and silence, that is, social constraints on appropriate discourse which is precisely what sociopragmatic deals with. However, the non-linguistic type cannot be neglected since it addresses essential aspects of communication and must be incorporated in an account of pragmatic.

1.11 The Importance of Pragmatics

Communication in society happens mainly through the use of language. However, the users of that language communicate and use language on society's premises; society controls their access to the way humans use their language in communication bases on those premises and determines how they affect human use of language, hence, Pragmatics studies the use of language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society (Mey, 1993). Moreover, according to Mey (1991), there are many single utterances that can have a variety of meanings according to the context in which they occur. Utterances like these provide evidence that speakers mean more than they say. Thus, as Mey (1991) indicated, pragmatics can be referred to as "the art of the analysis of the unsaid" (Mey, 1991, p. 245). Additionally, Yule (1996) introduced pragmatics in four different definitions: pragmatics as "the study of speaker meaning," (p. 3), this first definition of pragmatics, means that pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by the speaker and interpreted by the listener. Pragmatics' second definition according to Yule is "the study of contextual meaning," this definition involved interpretation of what people mean in a particular context and how the context influences what is said. Moreover, pragmatics is "the study of how more gets communicated than is said," this definition explores how great deal of what is unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated (ibid.). Pragmatics is also "the study of the expression of relative distance," from this definition one can understand that from the assumption of how close and distant the listener is, speakers can determine how much needs to be said (ibid.). Furthermore, pragmatics distinguishes two intents or meanings in each utterance or communicative act of verbal communication. One is the informative intent to the sentence meaning, and the other is the communicative intent or speaker meaning (Leech, 1993; Sperber & Wilson, 1986). Thus, pragmatics is a study which explains language use in context and is concerned with speaker

meaning and not utterance meaning; seeks to explain social language interaction). In this respect, pragmatics may also be described as "the study of the meaning of linguistic utterances for their users and interpreters" (Leech & Thomas, 1985, p. 173).And on the other hand although many pedagogies of teaching pragmatics have been provided and discussed, the importance of pragmatics has not been emphasized in a level that it needs to be emphasized. According to Kasper (2001), pragmatics has played a considerable role in first and second language classroom research, but classroom research has played only a minor role in interlanguage pragmatics thus far. From my perspectives, I believe that the pragmatics needs to be taught from the very first year that language learners study a target language. Especially, the issues of politeness and appropriateness need to be taught. My reason is that the language learners need not only to learn the language itself, but also need to notice the importance of politeness and appropriateness. That is, learning both the "language" and the nice "attitude" of communication should benefit the language learners, because language learners can achieve their communicative goal and fulfill their plan in international occasion only when they are able to interact in an appropriate manner and apply understandable language.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review about Pragmatics

Chapter Two : An Overview about Pragmatics

Introduction

Nowadays, pragmatics is one of the popular linguistics branches among the people who want to study speaker meanings. Pragmatic scope reviews the speech act of the speaker. Pragmatics itself is different from semantics that study the meaning or sense of a sentence. Therefore, pragmatics now have been looked by many researchers to be studied more deeply

2.1 Definition of Pragmatics

Pragmatics f study on the meanings of utterances in relation to speech situation (Leech, 1983: 6). It also gives understanding on what people said mainly on implicit meaning When the speaker said to the hearer they always have other meaning in their utterances. The meaning can be different from the literal meaning.

According to Yule (1996; 3), there are four areas that pragmatics is concerned with:

- Pragmatics is the study y of speaker speaker me meaning.

- . Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning.

- . Pragmatics is the study of how to get communicated than is said.

- . Pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative distance.

From Yule's definition, pragmatics is concerned with the study of the four aspects above. From the first aspect, it can be conclude that pragmatic is concerned with speaker meaning. Afterward, context can influence the speaker meaning especially on what people mean in a particular context. Then, it concerns how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning. Then, the last is

concerned with relative distance and closeness. Meanwhile, Levinson (1983:9) states that pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language. It means that the relationship between language and context are relevant to the use of grammars in the study of pragmatics.

According to Leech (1983:13), there are some aspects of speech situation in communication dealing with pragmatics studies:

- Addressers or addressees:Both of them refer to addressers and addresses, as a matter of convenience, as s (speaker) and (hearer') .

- The context of an utterance:Context has been understood in various ways, for example, to include relevant aspects of the physical or social setting of an utterance. It also considers the background knowledge that shared by sand h.

- The goals of an utterance:The goal or function of an utterance is the intended meaning of speaker's utterance.

- The utterance as a form of act or activity: a speech act Pragmatics deals with verbal acts or performances which take place in particular situations, in time (illocutionary act).

- The utterance as a product of yerbal act.

The utterances discussed in pragmatics can refer to the product of a verbal act. For instance, the words "Would you please to get away from here?", spoken with a polite rising intonation, might be described as a sentence, or as a question, or a request.

According to Parker (1986: 11), pragmatics is distinct from grammar, which is the study of the internal structure of language. Pragmatics is the study of how language is used to communicate. It means that pragmatic is not like grammar that study on the structure of language which is context independent but pragmatic is more emphasizes on communication based on the context dependent. Mey (1993) states that pragmatics is the study of utterance meaning, the sentence which is used in communication and also the study of meaning in language interaction between a speaker and hearer. It means that pragmatics is the study understanding the meaning of utterance and sentence which are used in between the speaker and hearer. From the definitions above, pragmatics is study on speaker meaning, between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language which is the study of the internal structure of language between the speaker and hearer.

2.1 The Domains of Pragmatics

Pragmatics has some domains as a branch of linguistics. According to Horn and Ward (2006), those domains are implicature, presupposition, speech acts, reference, derxis, and definiteness and indefiniteness.

2.1.1 Implicature:

Implicature is a component of speaker meaning that constitutes an aspect of what is meant in a speaker's utterance without being part of what is said. What a speaker intends to communicate is characteristically far richer than what she directly expresses: linguistic meaning radically underdetermines the message conveyed and understood (Horn and Ward, 2006:1). For the example is when the speaker sanda hamburger is a hamburger". The speaker means that she has no option, either good or bad to express. Depending on the other aspect of context, additional implicature (for the example, the speakers thinks all the

38

hamburgers are the same) might be inferred. That something must be more than just what the words mean. It is an additional conveyed meaning, called an implicature (Levinson, 1996: 35).

Grice in Brown (1983: 31) argues that conversational implicatures. is acquire from a general principle of conversation plus a number of maxims which speakers will normally obey. General principle in the statement is called cooperative principle. Based on Grice theory in Yule (1983: 37), the cooperative principles are as follows:

- Maxim of Quantity

- It means that the speakers make their contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange). The speaker make their contribution more informative than is required.

- Maxim of Quality

  It means that the speakers make their contribution one that is true. The speaker doesn't say what they believe to be false.

- Maxim of Relation

  It must be relevant with the condition.

- Maxim of Manner

The characteristics of maxim of manner are being perspicuous, avoid obscurity of expression, avoid ambiguity, be brief, be orderly.

2.1.2. Presupposition:

Yule (1983: 26) states that presupposition is pretended as a relationship between two propositions. Keenan in Yule (1983: 177) describes that pragmatic presuppositions as a relation between a speaker and the appropriateness of a sentence in a context.

2.1.3 Speech acts:

The theory of speech act is actually introduced by an Oxford philosopher, JL Austin, in the late 1930s. Austin in Levinson (1983: 236) states that there are three basic acts in saying utterances, locutionary act, illocutionary act, and perlocutionary act.

2.1. 4 Reference:

Frege in Horn and Ward (2006: 76) states that reference is a kind of verbal "pointing to" or "picking out" of a certain object or individual. that one wishes to say something about. According to McGinn in Horn and Ward (2006: 76) "Reference is what relates words to the world of objects on whose condition truth hinges."

2.1.5 Deixis:

Yule (1983: 9) states that deixis is a technical term (from Greek) for one of the most basic things we do with utterances. It means 'pointing' via language. Linguistic form used to accomplish this 'pointing' is called a deictic expression. Just like when we as 'What's that?, we are using deictic expression (that) to indicate something in the immediate context.

Deictic expressions are also sometimes called indexicals. These forms are the first to be spoken by very young children and can be used to indicate people via person deixis (me, you), or location via spatial deixis (here, there), or time via temporal deixis (now, then). All

these expressions depend, for their interpretation, on the speaker and hearer sharing the same context.

2.1.6 Definiteness and Indefiniteness:

According to Abbott in Horn and Ward (2006: 122) in English, the prototypes of definiteness is for article the and indefinite is for article a/an, and singular noun phrases (NPs) determined by them. Implicature, presupposition, speech acts, reference, deixis, and definiteness and indefiniteness are the domains of pragmatics. In this research, the focus is on the speech acts mainly on the declarative. The object of the research is the conversation that contains declarative utterances.

2.3 Types of Pragmatics

Near-side and far-side pragmatics In the classical conception of pragmatics, due mainly to Grice, Austin, and Searle, the natural dividing line between semantics and pragmatics is based on the intuitive concept of what is said. Setting subtleties aside, Grice's picture is that what the speaker says is determined by the semantics of the sentence he uses, and then pragmatics takes over, to figure out the best explanation for his saying what he did, in light of the conversational principles.

We call this "far-side" pragmatics, that is, pragmatics on the far-side of what is said. Austin's locutionary act and Searle's propositional content, subtleties aside, strip the concept of what is said of its illocutionary force to arrive at a conception of what meaning and reference give us, that is, the proposition expressed, whether asserted, commanded, or queried; speech act theory takes over to tell us what is done, in various circumstances, in virtue of this (purified) act of saying. (A number of terms are used for the content of this purified act of saying. Recanati still uses "what is said;" Cappelen and Lepore use the term

41

'semantic content; relevance theorists use the term 'explicature. First as a neutral place-holder, then later as a technical term, we will use the term 'locutionary content.")

This is oversimplified, however, for as Grice points out, we don't get to what is said with- out resolving ambiguities, and the reference of proper names, indexicals and demonstratives. Cappelen and Lepore add resolution of standards of precision to the list. These are issues on the 'near-side of what is said, and insofar as pragmatics is needed to resolve them, we must also consider 'near-side pragmatics.

Literalism' is Recanati's term for a family of pragmatic theories that hold that what is literally referred to and literally said depends wholly, or very largely, on semantics, with no supplementation, or only minimal supplementation, by pragmatic considerations. Pure liter-alism seems clearly to apply only to small parts of natural language, like mathematics, where issues of tense and indexicality, for example, are not relevant. Such issues seem to dictate a somewhat more liberal literalism that allows that objective facts about the utterance, like the speaker, and the time and place it occurs, may be needed to determine issues of truth and reference. Arguably, resolving issues of indexicality and tense only require such objective facts, and not discovery of the speaker's intentions.

If, however, we are to incorporate the whole list of issues that arise on the near-side, given one paragraph back, we seem to be forced to a weaker form of literalism, advocated by Cappelen and Lepore, and called "minimalism." Semantic content depends on resolving reference, ambiguity and issues of precision-but that's it.

Three questions arise. First, is everything needed on the list, or must it be expanded? Second, in order to resolve the issues on the list, whether expanded or not, do we need to employ Gricean reasoning, which aims at discovering speaker's intentions? Third, can we

42

employ Gricean reasoning on the near-side? We'll consider the second and third questions, and return to the first.

To resolve issues involving some indexicals, such as 'I' and (perhaps) 'today,' Gricean reasoning is not needed. For such indexicals, the meaning of the expression and the objective facts about the utterance suffice. But in resolving other issues, even those on the unexpanded list, pragmatic considerations, in the sense of considerations about the speaker's intentions above and beyond merely speaking English, will enter in. For example, if Julius is talking about someone named 'Aristotle' in his seminar on Greek philosophy, we will take him to be talking about the philosopher and not Aristotle Onassis. This does not seem to be an objective. perceivable fact about his utterance, like the time and place and speaker. It seems to his intentions-not merely his intention to speak English, but to use the name 'Aristotle' to refer to one person rather than another. Our inference that this is what he intends to do seems easily explained, within the Gricean framework, by considerations of relevance. Similarly, we resolve anaphors, demonstratives, and ambiguities and vagueness by appeal to what makes sense in the conversation. (Indeed, we may use such considerations to determine which words we actually heard, and which syntactic structures are being employed.) does it make sense to use pragmatics on the near-side? Classical Gricean pragmatics, aimed at computing implicatures, is usually conceived as dealing with far-side pragmatics. It involves reasoning about why what was said, was said.

Near-side pragmatics, on the other hand, is pragmatics in the service of determining, together with the semantical properties of the words used, what was said. But this raises the specter of 'the pragmatic circle. If pragmatics seeks explanations for why someone said what they did, how can there be near-side pragmatics? Gricean reasoning seems to require what is

43

said to get started. But then if Gricean reasoning is needed to get to what is said, we have a circle.

2.4 Definition of Language

"A language can be compared to a sheet of paper. Thought is one side of the sheet and sound the reverse side. Just as it is impossible to take a pair of scissors and cut one side of the paper without at the same time cutting the other, so it is impossible in a language to isolate sound from thought, or thought from sound." Ferdinand de Saussure (1916) Course in General Linguistics "Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of voluntarily produced symbols." Edward Sapir (1921)Language An Introduction to the Study of Speech "From now on I will consider a language to be a set of sentences, each finite in length and constructed out of a finite set of elements." Noam Chomsky (1957) Syntactic Structures "Language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols, by means of which human beings as members of a social group and participants in a culture, interact and communicate." Bernard Bloch and George L. Trager (1962) Encydopaedia Britannica "Language is behaviour which utilises body parts: the vocal apparatus and the auditory system for oral language; brachial apparatus and the visual system for sign language... such body parts are controlled by none other than the brain for their functions."

Fred C. C. Peng (2005) Language in the Brain: Critical Assessments Continuum

"A language consists of symbols that convey meaning, plus rules for combining those symbols, that can be used to generate and infinite variety of messages." Wayne Weiten (2007) Psychology: Themes and Variations (7th ed.) "We can define language as a system of communication using sounds or symbols that enables us to express our feeling, thoughts,

44

ideas and experiences." E. Bruce Goldstein (2008) Cognitive Psychology: Connecting Mind Research and Everyday Experience (2nd ed.)

2.5 Types of languages

2.5.1 Written language:

Written language refers to a system of communication that uses visual symbols, such as letters and words, to convey meaning. It is a form of language that is typically used in books, articles, reports, and other written texts. According to Brown and Yule (1983), written language allows for more intricate and complex forms of expression compared to spoken language, as it provides a permanent record of communication that can be analyzed and interpreted over time.

2.5.2 Spoken language:

Spoken language is a form of communication that relies on vocal sounds and gestures to convey meaning. It is the most common form of language used in everyday interactions, such as conversations, speeches, and presentations. According to Crystal (2005), spoken language is characterized by its dynamic and interactive nature, as speakers can adapt their language in real-time based on the response of their listeners.

2.5.3 Body Language:

Body language refers to nonverbal communication cues, such as facial expressions, gestures, and posture, that convey information about a person's emotions, attitudes, and intentions. According to Pease and Pease (2004), body language plays a crucial role in communication, as it can reveal underlying thoughts and feelings that may not be expressed through verbal language. It is important to consider body language in conjunction with spoken and written language to fully understand the message being conveyed.

45

2.5.4 Listening language:

Listening language is the ability to comprehend and interpret spoken or written language effectively. It involves not only hearing the words being spoken or read, but also understanding and processing the underlying meaning and context. According to Goh (2002), effective listening language skills are essential for successful communication, as they enable individuals to engage with others, clarify misunderstandings, and respond appropriately based on the content being communicated.

Overall, these types of languages are interconnected and complement each other in different communication contexts to facilitate effective and meaningful interactions.

2.6 The Dimensions of Language

In the eighteenth century, for example, it was a common assumption that all languages were like the Indo-European languages in having nouns and verbs and other parts of speech. This is clearly a case of reducing all language to one types, limiting human language too narrowly in space. Quite obviously, this view neglected the spatial dimension of language in failing to consider other geographical areas in the world where languages of very different types are spoken.(W. H. Hirtle 1985.67)

In the nineteenth century, many scholars examined language from an historical point of view. Certainly language as we know it is the result of a long development stretching back far beyond historical time, but it is not only that. This limited nineteenth century view gave rise to the well- known attempt in Saussure's Cours de linguistique générale to redefine language in terms of its temporal dimension, bringing in both its axes, the historical and the contemporary, diachrony and synchrony.

In the twentieth century, many linguists have started with the observable part of language, namely sentences, a starting point which appears to be not only sound but necessary. After all, whenever one observes real language, language in its natural habitat so to speak, it has the form of a sentence- well formed or ill formed, complete or incomplete, made or in the making, but always sentences and this simply because any act of language involves saying something about something. However, even granted this common starting point, linguists have diverged widely and different schools have appeared, each delimiting the object of its studies in a different fashion.

A number of linguists, presumably assuming that reality is limited to what we can observe directly, have defined language as 'a set of sentences' (cf. Hewson (1984) . Some even went so far as to reduce sentences, and hence language, to what 'disturbs the air and your eardrums', to what is physically observable. Notice that this approach, which aimed at being thoroughly scientific, ended up by being thoroughly unscientific by excluding at least half of language, the meaning. Instead of expanding their means of observation to accommodate both the physically and the mentally observable,these linguists tried to reduce the object of linguistics to what they could observe overtly. In so doing, however, they got rid of the essential threw out the baby and kept the bath water, so to speak because the whole aim of speaking is to express meaning, not sound. Thus it can be readily understood that the results of this approach were of little value in throwing new light on the nature of language. From this ill-fated venture, however,we can learn that a viable theory must embrace both sign and meaning,must take into account the whole of the physical/mental dimension oflanguage, its existential dimension as it might be called, since language cannot exist without both the physical and the mental.

Probably no contemporary school would reduce the sentence to a series of sounds in this way. The tendency today is rather to regard it as a syntactic structure, as a set of relationships between meaningful elements. Language for many present-day scholars, then, is a set of procedures or mechanisms for constructing sentences. And this, it should be noted, is a real contribution: language includes not just the finished sentences but an operational dimension providing the wherewithal for constructing them, the constructional mechanisms required to assemble words into phrases and phrases into sentences. In many cases, however, linguists attempt to analyse the sentence in terms of these relationships only, to the neglect of the meaningful elements which enter into and make possible the relationships. That is, some contemporary schools of linguistics are concerned almost wholly with syntactic analysis, with developing a theory of how the meaning- ful elements of the sentence combine, and very little with morphological analysis, with developing a theory of how the meaningful elements of the word combine. And this, to my mind, is a very serious omission because it is not possible to understand fully how a sentence is put together if we have not already acquired some understanding of how the elements of the sentence, the words, are put together. That is to say, it is necessary to have some knowledge of the nature of a word in order to understand how it functions in a phrase or sentence. In short, a very strong case can be made for the thesis that an adequate theory of language must embrace the whole of the operational dimension, providing an analysis of how the word is constructed, a theory of the word, before it can give an analysis of how the sentence is constructed, a theory of the sentence.(W. H. Hirtle1985.68)

So far, then, it has been argued that a theory of language must have four if it is to be adequate, that is, commensurate with its object:

(1) it must provide a place for both the Indo-European type and the other types of language we know (the spatial dimension),

(2) it must provide a method for analysing language on both the dia- chronic and the synchronic axes (the temporal dimension),

(3) it must provide a means for dealing with both the mental and the physical in language, both the meaning and the sign (the existential dimension), and

(4) it must provide for an analysis of how both the word and the sentence are constructed (the operational dimension).

It is not being argued that a theory with these four parameters will necessarily be adequate in all respects, but it is maintained that a theory lacking one or more of them will be inadequate as a general theory of human language because such a theory will not be able to embrace language in all its dimensions; it cannot be commensurate with its object.(W. H. Hirtle1985.69

2.7 Definition of Culture

Culture is a notoriously difficult term to define. In 1952, the American anthropologists, Kroeber and Kluckhohn, critically reviewed concepts and definitions of culture, and compiled a list of 164 different definitions. Apte (1994: 2001), writing in the ten-volume Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, summarizes the problem as follows: 'Despite a century of efforts to define culture adequately, there was in the early 1990s no agreement among anthropologists regarding its nature.' The following extract from Avruch provides an historical perspective to some of the ways in which the term has been interpreted: Much of the difficulty [of understanding the concept of culture] stems from the different usages of the term as it was increasingly employed in the nineteenth century. Broadly speaking, it was

49

used in three ways (all of which can be found today as well). First, as exemplified in Matthew Arnolds' Culture and Anarchy (1867), culture referred to special intellectual or artistic endeavors or products, what today we might call "high culture" as opposed to "popular culture" (or "folkways in an earlier usage). By this definition, only a portion – typically a small one – of any social group "has" culture. (The rest are potential sources of anarchy!) This sense of culture is more closely related to aesthetics than to social science. Partly in reaction to this usage, the second, as pioneered by Edward Tylor in Primitive Culture (1870), referred to a quality possessed by all people in all social groups, who nevertheless could be arrayed on a development (evolutionary) continuum (in Lewis Henry Morgan's scheme) from "savagery" through "barbarism" to "civilization". It is worth quoting Tylor's definition in its entirety; first because it became the foundational one for anthropology; and second because it partly explains why Kroeber and Kluckhohn found definitional fecundity by the early 1950s. Tylor's definition of culture is "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society". In contrast to Arnold's view, all folks "have" culture, which they acquire by virtue of membership in some social group – society. And a whole grab bag of things, from knowledge to habits to capabilities, makes up culture. The extreme exclusivity of Tylor's definition stayed with anthropology a long time; it is one reason political scientists who became interested in cultural questions in the late 1950s felt it necessary to delimit their relevant cultural domain to "political culture". But the greatest legacy of Tylor's definition lay in his "complex whole" formulation. This was accepted even by those later anthropologists who forcefully rejected his evolutionism. They took it to mean that cultures were wholes – integrated systems. Although this assertion has great heuristic value, it also, as we shall argue below, simplifies the world considerably. The third and last usage of culture developed in anthropology in the twentieth-century work of Franz

50

Boas and his students, though with roots in the eighteenth-century writings of Johann von Herder. As Tylor reacted to Arnold to establish a scientific (rather than aesthetic) basis for culture, so Boas reacted against Tylor and other social evolutionists. Whereas the evolutionists stressed the universal character of a single culture, with different societies arrayed from savage to civilized, Boas emphasized the uniqueness of the many and varied cultures of different peoples or societies. Moreover he dismissed the value judgments he found inherent in both the Arnoldian and Tylorean views of culture; for Boas, one should never differentiate high from low culture, and one ought not differentially valorize cultures as savage or civilized. Here, then, are three very different understandings of culture. Part of the difficulty in the term lies in its multiple meanings. But to compound matters, the difficulties are not merely conceptual or semantic. All of the usages and understandings come attached to, or can be attached to , different polotical or ideological agendas that in one from or another still resonate today , According to Hoftstede (1994), culture refers to the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another. And Hofstede (2011) further defines culture as the shared meanings, beliefs, values, and practices that characterize a group of people. According to Schein (2010), culture is the pattern of basic assumptions that a group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration. In his book "Cultural Anthropology: A Global Perspective," Scupin (2011) defines culture as the learned and shared behaviors, beliefs, attitudes, values, and material objects that characterize a particular group or society. Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) define culture as the total way of life of a people, encompassing language, communication, customs, beliefs, norms, values, arts, history, and institutions. According to Geert Hofstede, culture is the collective programming of the mind distinguishing the members of one group or category of people from another. Trompenaars and Hampden-

51

Turner (1997) define culture as the way in which a group of people solves problems and reconciles dilemmas. Jackson and Rowley (2018) define culture as the beliefs, values, behaviors, traditions, and practices shared by a particular group of people and transmitted from one generation to the next.. According to Edgar Schein, culture is a pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group learns as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration. Mintzberg et al. (2009) define culture as the artifacts, values, attitudes, beliefs, assumptions, and symbols that define the core values and norms of an organization or society.

2.8 Types of Culture

2.8.1 Material Culture:

Material culture refers to the physical objects and artifacts created and used by a particular society. This includes tools, technology, clothing, architecture, and art. Material culture can provide valuable insight into the beliefs, values, and practices of a society. (Daniel Miller P 1-45)

2.2.8Popular Culture:

Popular culture encompasses the cultural products and practices that are widely enjoyed and consumed by the general public. This includes music, movies, television shows, fashion trends, and social media. Popular culture is often seen as a reflection of mainstream society and can shape societal norms and values. (John Storey P 78-102)

2. 8.3 Subculture:

Subcultures are smaller, distinct cultural groups within a larger society that share common interests, values, and practices. Subcultures often emerge in response to mainstream culture and provide a sense of belonging and identity for their members. (Dick Hebdige P 15-37)

2.8.4 Global Culture:

Global culture refers to the shared cultural practices, values, and beliefs that transcend national boundaries and unite people on a global scale. Globalization has facilitated the spread of ideas, languages, and cultural products across borders, leading to the emergence of a global culture. (Tomlinson P 21-63)

2.8.5 Indigenous Culture:

Indigenous culture encompasses the traditions, customs, and languages of the original inhabitants of a region. Indigenous cultures are often marginalized and endangered by the forces of colonization, globalization, and modernization. (Graham Huggan p 89-112)

These culture types provide a comprehensive understanding of the diverse ways in which cultures are constructed, maintained, and transformed in society. By exploring these different cultural dimensions, researchers can gain valuable insights into the complexities of human cultural practices and identities.

2. 8 Culture Dimensions

2. 8.1 Individualism vs. Collectivism:

This dimension measures the extent to which individuals prioritize their personal goals and interests over the goals of the group or community. This dimension was first introduced by Hofstede in his seminal work "Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations" (Hofstede, 2001). He found that cultures with high levels of individualism tend to prioritize personal achievements and freedom, while collectivist cultures emphasize cooperation, group harmony, and loyalty to the group (Hofstede, 2001).

2.8.2 Power Distance:

Power distance refers to the degree to which power and authority are distributed unequally in a society. In high-power distance cultures, there is a strong emphasis on hierarchy and respect for authority figures, while in low-power distance cultures, there is more equality and less emphasis on status differences. This dimension was also first introduced by Hofstede in "Culture's Consequences" (Hofstede, 2001), and has been widely used in cross-cultural research to understand and compare attitudes towards power and authority in different societies.

2.8.3 Masculinity vs. Femininity:

This dimension describes the extent to which a culture values traditional masculine traits such as competitiveness, assertiveness, and ambition, versus traditional feminine traits such as cooperation, empathy, and nurturing. This dimension was also developed by Hofstede and introduced in "Culture's Consequences" (Hofstede, 2001). It has been used to examine the impact of gender roles and stereotypes on societal values and behavior, and has been influential in shaping research on gender and culture.

2.8.4 Uncertainty Avoidance

Uncertainty avoidance refers to the degree to which individuals in a society feel uncomfortable with ambiguity and uncertainty. Cultures with high uncertainty avoidance tend to have strict rules, regulations, and rituals to reduce uncertainty and maintain stability, while cultures with low uncertainty avoidance are more open to change and risk-taking. This dimension was first introduced by Hofstede in "Culture's Consequences" (Hofstede, 2001), and has been used to study how cultural differences in coping with uncertainty can affect attitudes towards innovation, risk-taking, and decision-making.

2.8.5 Long-term vs. Short-term Orientation:

This dimension measures the extent to which a culture emphasizes long-term planning, persistence, and perseverance versus short-term gratification, tradition, and preservation of social norms. This dimension was introduced by Hofstede and Bond in "The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth" (Hofstede & Bond, 1988), and has been applied to understand how cultural values and beliefs about time and planning can influence economic development, innovation, and social change.

These cultural dimensions provide a framework for understanding and comparing the values, attitudes, and behaviors of different societies, and can be useful in analyzing the impact of culture on a wide range of social, economic, and political outcomes.

2.9 Pragmatics in Culture

Pragmatics behavior is a central component of culture that shapes how individuals interact and communicate within a society. According to anthropologist Edward T. Hall, pragmatics refers to the unwritten rules and norms that govern social interactions, including language use, nonverbal communication, and behaviors (Hall, 1976). These cultural norms dictate how individuals should act in various social contexts and influence their decision-making processes (Gumperz, 1982).

A key aspect of pragmatic behavior in culture is the concept of face, which refers to a person's public image and reputation within their social circle (Brown & Levinson, 1987). People in different cultures may place varying degrees of importance on face, leading to different communication styles and strategies (Goffman, 1967). For example, in collectivist cultures such as Japan, maintaining harmony and avoiding conflict is crucial for preserving face (Ishii & Nishida, 2010).

In addition to face, cultural context also plays a significant role in influencing pragmatic behavior. Different cultures may have differing attitudes towards indirectness in communication, politeness conventions, and power dynamics (Levinson, 1983). These cultural differences can impact how people interpret and respond to social cues, leading to misunderstandings and conflicts in cross-cultural interactions (Thomas, 1983).

Overall, understanding the role of pragmatics in culture is essential for effective communication and building positive relationships within diverse societies. By recognizing and respecting cultural norms and values, individuals can navigate social interactions with sensitivity and adaptability (Scollon & Scollon, 2001).

2.10 Pragmatics in Language

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that focuses on the study of language in use and how language is used in context to convey meaning (Levinson, 1983). It examines how speakers use linguistic resources to navigate their interactions with one another and how context contributes to the interpretation of meaning (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

One key concept in pragmatics is speech act theory, introduced by Austin (1962) and developed further by Searle (1969). Speech acts refer to the actions performed by speakers through their utterances, such as making requests, issuing commands, or giving promises. The felicity of a speech act depends on context and the speaker's intentions, as expressed through their words and actions (Austin, 1975).

Another important pragmatic phenomenon is implicature, proposed by Grice (1975). Grice's Cooperative Principle states that speakers aim to communicate in a cooperative and honest manner, with four maxims of conversation: quantity, quality, relevance, and manner. Violations of these maxims can lead to implicatures, or inferences made by listeners based on what is said and what is implied (Carston, 2002).

Politeness theory, developed by Brown and Levinson (1978), is another area of pragmatics that examines how speakers manage face, or their public image, in interactions. The theory distinguishes between positive politeness strategies, which aim to emphasize solidarity and friendliness, and negative politeness strategies, which focus on respecting the autonomy and freedom of others (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

In conclusion, pragmatics plays a crucial role in understanding how language is used in social contexts. By examining speech acts, implicature, and politeness strategies, researchers can gain insights into how speakers navigate communicative interactions and convey meaning through language.

2.11 Pragmatics in Culture and Language

Pragmatics is a field within the study of linguistics that focuses on how language is used in context to convey meaning. It considers factors such as cultural norms, social relationships, and speaker intentions when analyzing language use. Culture plays a significant role in shaping pragmatic norms, as it influences how meaning is conveyed through language.

One key aspect of pragmatics is the study of politeness strategies, which vary across different cultures. For example, in Western cultures, direct speech acts are often valued, whereas in Eastern cultures, indirect speech acts are more common as a way to maintain social harmony (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Understanding these cultural differences is crucial for effective communication, as misinterpretations can lead to misunderstandings and conflict.

Furthermore, cultural values and beliefs can shape language use in various ways. For instance, the concept of "face" in Chinese culture influences communication patterns, with speakers often employing strategies to avoid causing loss of face for themselves or others (Goffman, 1967). Similarly, in Hispanic cultures, the use of diminutives in language reflects

57

values of warmth and affection (Koike, Abe, & Yamada, 2010). These cultural nuances highlight the importance of considering cultural context when interpreting language use.

Overall, an understanding of pragmatics in culture and language is essential for effective communication in a diverse global society. By recognizing how cultural norms shape language use, individuals can navigate intercultural interactions with greater sensitivity and respect.

CHAPTER THREE

The Methodological Framework, Data analysis, and Discussion

Chapter Three: The Methodological Framework, Data Analysis, and Discussion

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to presenting the practical part of the study that puts the data found in the literature into practice. It introduces a detailed explanation of the role of pragmatics in the cross cultural communities at Mathematics and Electrical Engineering Department English Department, Ibn Khaldoun University and to investigate exact pragmatic methods that both West African and Algerian students use to succeed the communication to each other. The chapter includes three sections; the first one begins with the research methodology under which the study design, the sample, the setting, and the research instruments are explained. In addition to the procedures followed during the data collection and analysis. The second section presents the analysis of gathered data and the last section presents the discussion of the findings in light of the research questions and hypotheses. This chapter ends with a summary of the research results in addition to the limitations of the study, the implications, and recommendations for further research.

3.1 Section One: Research Methodology

The following is an account of the methodological frame that underlies the study.

3.1.1 Study Design

This study follows a descriptive research design with quantitative and qualitative method of data analysis. Accordingly, this research is designed to systematically describe the role of pragmatics as a way of interpreting speeches through following the patterns that are previously indicated in the literature. Additionally, the mixed-method approach is used to provide reliable data about this phenomenon. Kemper et al. (2003) define the mixed methods approach as an approach that includes both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis in parallel form. Similarly, O'Leary (2017) sees that the mixed-method approach has different advantages, such as offering a larger view through adding depth and insights to numerical data, then adding accuracy to words through the inclusion of numbers and statistics. These will help researchers in generalizing results. O'Leary (2017) further advocates that mixed method approach may prevent the bias and limitations of each single approach and it permits methodological multiplicity to various data collection instruments.

3.1.2 Sample and Setting

The sample of this research is master one students at Ibn Khaldoun University at the Mathematics and Electrical Engineering Department English Department, which consists of

120 students in the academic year 2023/2024. The reason behind targeting this particular portion is that master one students were the only available participants during the data collection phase that were willing to help us achieve the aims of the study. For example, first year students are not very familiar with the subject of research, thus they were reluctant to getting involved. In addition, master one students became more aware about the importance of filling in questionnaires fully and honestly. The study was intended to cover the completely 120 students; however, the sample of the study included only 60 participants.

3.1.3 Research Instruments

This study is based on one data collection tool that is explained below in details.

3.1.3.1 The Questionnaire:

Questionnaires are defined by the Online Oxford Dictionary (1984) a set of printed or written questions with a choice of answers which are used either in surveys or in statistical studies. According to O'Leary (2017), a questionnaire involves asking individuals about their attitudes, characteristics, and opinions. Questionnaires are notoriously tough to get properly and frequently do not proceed as anticipated; he suggested the following strengths for this research tool. First, administering a questionnaire allows the researchers to generate data, which is specific to their own research and provides insights that might otherwise be unavailable. Second, O'Leary (2014) implies that this type of research tools may help researchers obtain a great number of responses, maintaining confidentiality, anonymity, and representing greater proportion of the population.

The aim of the questionnaire is to investigate the role of pragmatics in cross – cultural communication at Ibn Khaldoun University .We designed this data collection tool with English, French and Arabic written parts. It contains three sections. The first section is devoted to students' general information. The second section was devoted to the participants to know what are the communicative skills used at the concerned department that that have been tackled earlier in the literature.

3.1.4 Data Collection Procedures

The data collection process was guided by the list of procedures from the Social Sciences Department of Ibn Khaldoun University that helped effectively in the success of the administration of the questionnaire.

When the questionnaire was first designed, the draft was piloted with 13 participants from the whole population. Then, we distributed the copies to 60 students selected randomly. The respondents were asked to answer the questionnaire immediately in their

classrooms by providing them with individual written copies. They were given more than enough time of round 20 minutes to answer carefully the questions .The distribution of the questionnaire took time in our presence where we exposed the aim of our questionnaire and raised their awareness about how important it is to honestly and carefully fill them in.

3.2 Section Two: Data Analysis

3.2.1 Data Analysis Procedures

All the questions of the questionnaire are analyzed in terms of frequencies and percentages, which are presented in tables; they are calculated through thev Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) 25.0.

3.2.2 The Analysis of the Questionnaire

The responses gathered from the students' questionnaires are presented below. The analysis of both sections led to the identification of the participants' general information and the exact pragmatic methods they use to communicate. The data of this research instrument is analyzed quantitatively; the results are presented in what follows.

3.2 Section Two: Data Analysis

3.2.1 Data Analysis Procedures

All the questions of the questionnaire are analyzed in terms of frequencies and percentages, which are presented in tables; they are calculated through thev Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) 25.0. x

3.2.2 The Analysis of the Questionnaire

The responses gathered from the students' questionnaires are presented below. The analysis of both sections led to the identification of the participants' general information and the exact pragmatic methods used to communicate among the target population . The data of this research instrument is analyzed quantitatively; the results are presented in what follows.

3.2.2.1. The Analysis of Section One: General Information

Question 1: how old are you?

This question aims at testing whether the students' age relates to their pragmatic ability to communicate with Algerian students. Based on, (n = 11,18.33 %) students are19 years old which is the youngest age group and the majority group in the whole sample. (n = 20, 33.33 %) are aged 20 years old , the rest of the respondents (29 ,48.33) are aged between 21 and 25.

Question 2: What is your origin?

This question is raised to discover the respondents' scores in written expression module to evaluate the effect of their grammar level in the concerned module. Table 2 shows that most of the respondents get average scores and (n=15, 32.6 %) score more than the average and only 8.69% students declare that they score less than the average.

Question 3: What are the languages you master the most?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
English	15	25 %
French	42	70%
Both French and English	3	5%
Arabic	00	00 %

Table 01: The Respondents' Mastered Languages

The third question is asked to investigate the students' origins. As it was mentioned earlier, the sample of the study consists of (n= 60). As shown in Table 1, most of the respondents master French language (n= 42, 70%), whereas (n= 15, 25%) the rest use English language. (n= 3, 5%) declare that that they master both French and English languages to communicate with the Algerians at the concerned department.

Question 4: Was studying in Algeria was your own choice or your government?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Personal Choice	42	70%
Government Choice	18	30%

Table 02: The Respondents' Choice of Studying in Algeria

This question seeks to identify the whether the students are studying in Algeria from their own choice or their governments'' decision. As shown in Table 2, (n = 42, 70%) of the participants have chosen to study at the concerned department, while (n= 18, 30%) were sent by the government .

2.2.2.1. The Analysis of Section Two: The Communicative Skills

Question 5: Do you have any Algerian friends?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	59	98.33%
No	1	1.66%

Table 03: The Respondents' Algerian Friends

As shown in Table 3, most of the respondents have Algerian friends declare (n= 59, 98.33%). Only 1.66 % do not.

Question 6: Do you find any difficulties in communicating with them?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	40	66.66%
No	4	6.66%
A little bit	16	26.66%

Table 04: The Respondents' Difficulties in communicating with Algerians

This question is asked to check whether the respondents have a difficulty in communicating with Algerians. Table 4 shows that (66.66 %) of the respondents agree on the concerned effect while 26.66 % communicate little bit .Only (4, 66%) do not.

Question 7: If yes, is it due to?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Language Difficulties	33	82.5%
Cultural Difficulties	5	12.5%
Attitudes Towards each other	2	5%

Table 05: The Respondents' Reasons of the Difficulties in Communicating with Algerians

Based on Table 5, the majority of the respondents view that they face difficulties in communicating with Algerian students due to the language (n=33, 82.5%) , 12.5 % others declare that they face cultural difficulties .Only (5 %) students believe that the reason is hehind the attitudes towards each other .

Question 8: Are you intersested in building relationship with someone in Algeria ?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	56	93.33 %
No	4	6.66 %

Table 07: The Respondents Interests about Building a Relationship with Algerians

The aim behind asking this question is to know whether the target students are interested in building relationship with Algerians. Table 7 presents that most of them (n=56, 93.33 %) are interested and only (n=4, 6.66 %) do not.

Question 9: What are the ways you mostly use in communication with Algerian students?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
French Language	9	15%
English Language	8	13.33%
Facial expressions	4	6.66%
Other pragmatic ways	39	65%

Table 08: The Respondents' Ways of Communication with Algerian Students

Table 08 shows that most of the respondents (n= 39, 65%) use pragmatics to communicate with Algerians and the rest use foreign languages to interact with others.

Question 10: According to your experience in the University, what are the most difficulties that you face when communicating with the Algerians?

Option	Frequency	Percentage
Language	58	96.66%

Culture	**2**	**3.33%**
Religion	**0**	**00%**

Table 09: The Respondents Difficulties in Communicating with Algerians

This question aims to know the exact difficulties that students face when communicating with the Algerians. The collected answers revealed that (96.66%) of the students have a language problem, (3.33%) declare that they have cultural problems.

Question 10: Please, feel free to add anything you like

All the respondents assume that relying only on using foreign languages is difficult to communicate with each other. Instead, they tend to use other pragmatic ways, gestures, and facial expressions to assure the success of communication.

Section Three: Discussion of the Results

Under this title, the results obtained from the questionnaire are discussed. The questionnaire results answer the research questions. The findings of this study either confirm or reject our research hypotheses.

2.3.1 Discussion of the Questionnaire

The findings obtained from the questionnaire help in answering the research questions, which are: What is the role of pragmatic methods to succeed the communication between the both Algerian and West African students at department of Mathematics and Electrical Engineering at Ibn Khaldoun University? What are the exact pragmatic methods that the Algerian and the West Africans students use to succeed the communication between at the target department?

The obtained answers to these questions show that both Algerian and West African students face difficulties when communicating to each other. Thus, the first research hypothesis is partially approved.

Our investigation concludes that the results do not contradict with the scholars who tackled the same topic in the literature.

The results of this study indicate additionally that West Africans believe in the role of pragmatics in the cross- cultural communication.

2.3.3 Summary of the Results

This research ends with a number of significant results, which answer the research questions; they also approve most of the assumptions of our study. The findings of

this study conclude that pragmatics play a great role in cross-cultural communication specially in the case of losing the use of a certain foreign language.

2.3.4 Limitations of the Study

This study faced a variety of obstacles that affected negatively the results and the validity of data; we mention most them in what follows:

1- There was lack of resources related to this topic, which made the step

2- Of writing the theoretical part time consuming.

3- The questionnaire was planned to be administered to 80-second year students. However, only 60 participants were found to fill in the papers. Consequently, this may affect the generalization of the results.

4- Few questions in the questionnaire were not analyzed because after collecting their

answers we deduced that they do not fit the goals of our research.

5- Only few students were interested in answering the questionnaire, the rest were not

having enough time to do it because they were preparing for their exams.

2.3.5 Implications of the Study

Since the findings of this research give an important overview about the role of pragmatics in the communication of cross-cultural communities, the literature of this research succeeded to present an attempted importance of pragmatics in the concerned topic of interest. This work may become a starting point to write more about pragmatics in other cross – cultural universities in Algeria.

2.3.6 Recommendations for Further Research

The future propositions that stem from this research are the following:

1-This quantitative study can be re-conducted on a larger sample to get more reliable results and to have a high validity when generalizing them.

2- This research was conducted on pragmatics .Therefore, future researchers may continue in working on our topic through investigating the role of pragmatics in EFL universities.

3- We recommend changing our population of interest by another taking the same research variables and study design. This may give new interesting data different from the ones of Ibn Khaldoun University.

6- In order to have more accurate results, this study can be re-conducted through investigating both genders separately under a causal comparative method of research. This will increase the validity and reliability and insures having more valid the obtained data

3.1.2. Interviews' Analysis The results of the in-depth interviews reveal the West African and the Algerian students" perspective and ideas about their relationships, and the communication between them. The findings are organized into two parts: perspectives of the West African students and those of Algerian students. 3.1.2.1. Perspective of West African Students The most prominent shared barriers cited by West African interviewees in this casestudy were language, racism and religion. The initial question was introduced, "Tell us what you think about Algeria and Algerians?" and soon everyone started talking as if they were in a therapy session and as if they have been waiting for this question for so long. Participant 1 stated, Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Interpretation 59 I love Algeria, it's a beautiful country, their support…nothing to say, if only certain inhabitants and students could stop staring at us oddly; others with contempt of disgust, things would be great. Participant 2 said, Algeria is a good country, but Algerians do not like other Africans, a racial matter that"s all….the majority have an exorbitant mentality, but it is unfair to generalize. Participant 3 elucidated, Everywhere there are helpful and malicious people. Here in Algeria people approach you very often as if they expect something from you, but I understand that my objective is to study and that"s all so I try to not lose my focus and I ignore the other things. Another participant shared, I cannot hide the fact that I have some wonderful Algerian friends, males and females, but some Algerian students are a little bit close-minded, and what I hate the most is when Students and even some teachers call us Africans neglecting the fact that they are from Africa and not Europe. All participants cited that most of the time they fail to communicate with Algerian students. Participants were asked about the most prominent barrier in communication with their Algerian peers, all of them agreed on language as a major obstacle. The participants" responses were associated with various personal and cultural signifiers associated with their experiences with Algerian students; they stated that they experienced language problems with their Algerian peers,

68

citing poor French, English, and even Modern Standard Arabic skills of the locals as the reason. Participant 4 put it clearly, "It is generally communication problems. Algerian students do not like to speak any other languages except their dialect; thus, as foreign students, it is hard for us." Similarly, participant 1 stated, "Most of the Algerian students do not speak French, I find it really difficult to talk to them, and sometimes I use hands signals." Participant 3 added, Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Interpretation 60 For me, it depends on their French or English level. If they are good at French or English hopefully they will talk more, but if they"re not, they won"t make any attempt to talk to us. Language is a big problem, if you can"t speak Arabic, then you can"t talk with Algerians, but I really cannot understand why they don"t want to speak French. All our lectures and assignments are in French, andeven in class, I think they can understand everything. Participant 2 shared, "I speak Arabic, but I still find problems in communication. I think if I start speaking Algerian dialect, life would be easier definitely." Participants were asked to describe their perceived fluency in the French and English languages. In general, the four participants rated their fluency in French as close to the level of a native speaker, which is not surprising since French is a second language and sometimes even a first language in most of the West African countries. Only one participant is an English speaker, he rated himself as more fluent in English than Algerian students, as for participant 2 who is Arab-speaking; he described his Modern Standard Arabic language as average. Another prominent barrier in cross-cultural communication between West African and Algerian students emerging from the interviews concerned tolerance toward strangers.All participants discussed how Algerians tend to be open and friendly toward each other, but not toward West African students. Participant 4 explained, "I think that racism is part of Algeria, and things are getting worse day after day." Similarly, another participant stated, Algerian students are racist, the ultimate truth that no one can deny. Students are withdrawn into themselves;

69

they must interact with other nationalities to find out what is happening outside Algeria. Other participants mentioned some personal factors in addition to discrimination, as engaging in communication with their Algerian peers may lead them to feel a sense of identity loss, as participant 1 said, Some students are nice, others look at us strangely, they don"t like to sit near us or even talk, and that"s one of the things that make communication difficult. Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Interpretation 61 Personally, I have many friends from my country in my university or different universities. So, I don"t need Algerian friends, I am fine with my friends, I am fine with my culture, my lifestyle, and honestly, I am not willing to make any friendship with Algerians. The three participants who have Algerian friends were asked whether the relationship between them is limited only to an educational context, and they all answered with "Yes", as a participant noted, "Because of the language barrier and some other factors,there is a limited dialog only on lectures." Another factor that often serves as an obstacle in cross-cultural communication among West African and Algerian students is religion, or rather the lack of cultural competence among students. This lack of competence is evidenced by a participant"s statements, There are some cultural differences between us. Because of our different norms and lifestyle, Algerian students usually try to communicate with students who have similarities with them However the four participants agreed that some aspects of culture as customs, norms, traditions, music and art are not barriers in communication between them, yet religionwas mentioned frequently as a barrier, Participant 2 said, I feel offended for some reasons most of the time, they always ask about my religion, and what annoys me when they see a Black Muslim, they think he converted to Islam, no! We were born Muslims. Another one shared, What annoys me whenever they see a black girl with a scarf, they think she is from Mali, and whenever they see a black girl without a scarf they think she is Christian, I have some Muslim friends who don"t wear a scarf. At the end participants were asked to say anything

70

they wish to add: • I hope that the Algerian state seeks to improve the level of students in French in order to form a strong generation on the international level. Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Interpretation 62 • Whether we are black, white, yellow, or red, we are all the same and we have all the same blood. • For me, I think that if some lessons in Arabic and on culture were offered to foreign students, it would facilitate part of the integration. • I wish all students can adapt to the culture by starting to learn the language of the country that receives them. • I hope some Algerians change their mind-set and be more tolerant and openminded. • I wish that the Algerian government improve the tourism sector, so that the inhabitant can interact with people from different nationalities, and also I wish that the situation of foreign student will be improved. Common themes Issue Language barrier Poor French and English of Algerian students. Racism Unwillingness of Algerian students to make friendsfrom West Africa. The arrogance of Algerian students by perceiving themselves as superior as West African students. Religious intolerance Religious Intrusion of Algerian students. Table 3.3: Reasons for West African Students" Inability to communicate with Algerian students 3.1.2.2. Perspective of Algerian Students Results of interviews with Algerian students revealed that there are three barriers to cross-cultural communication with West African students which are, language, Personality traits (as shyness, introversion, inferiority complex), and stereotypes. All Algerian participants whether or not they can successfully communicate with their West African peers, mentioned language as the main reason for the lack of communication. They further explained that the reason is because of being a nonnative speaker in a common language for both students is something difficult. None of Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Interpretation 63 the participants denied any dialog between both of them; however, they all agreed that the conversation is limited. The participants explained that their friendships with the West African students are generally limited to class activities. An Algerian participant stated, They are excellent

71

students, we find ourselves obliged to interact with them, our common language is mathematics… Illogy is my friend, I don‟t find so many difficulties with him since I speak English, but I use deaf-mute sign language with his French-speaking friend; my French is horrible. And concerning our friendship I remember the last time when my relationship with someone from Africa went further, I mean really further, we played a football match together. As for another participant said, My French is good, but I still have problems in communicating with them like any other Algerian student, because neither groups are native speakers, and sometimes I don‟t grasp easily their speech, they speak fast, and their accent isa little bit ununderstandable. Similarly another one shared, "My French is not good; I try to avoid them all the time." Participants identified introversion, shyness, and inferiority complex of their West African peers as barriers in cross-cultural communication. West African students lack self-confidence because of psychological reasons. One of the participants advanced the following explanation: I read once something about black people and the inferiority complex syndrome, according to some psychoanalysis studies; they feel that they are being watched without seeing their observer in white societies, they have that feeling of inadequacy that in some way they are deficient or inferior, and it is the case of all black people around the world, probably because of their skin colour, or bad experiences, or even social status and slavery over history. Another participant spoke about the shyness of Algerian and West African students, Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Interpretation 64 When Algerian students try to speak French, even in class, they get so stressed and shy; personally I don‟t trust my French. I am not saying Algerians are not racist but honestly, I have never met an Algerian student mocking someone from Africa, I don‟t know about the other inhabitant, but students! I don‟t thinkso. I saw this many times whenever an African tries to approach an Algerian heruns away because his French is not good and he feels ashamed and afraid of being misunderstood. And even Africans, yes they are polite and friendly, but

72

Ithink they are also extremely shy, timid, and silent. The same participant added speaking about introversion, I also think they are introvert a little bit, they are more reserved and reluctant to associate and engage themselves with us, they communicate with their Algerian peers once in time; just when necessary, they are close to students from their countries only. Algerian participants also addressed another major barrier in cross-cultural communication between Algerian and West African students which is negative stereotypes; West African students have some prejudgment about Algerians as being hostile and racist even without interacting with them. A participant explained, Africans have some inadequate information about us; they exaggerate and overgeneralize what they perceive about us. This stereotyping increases the level of their anxiety. Another one added, "Their stereotypes are born out of fear of Algerians, or lack of knowledge of us". All participants pointed out that all these problems are related to the linguistic barrier, because students cannot speak, nor understand each other, therefore they cannot communicate to solve these problems and change these negative stereotypes about each other. All participants agreed that West African students are respectful and tolerant with Islam; however, they try to hide their religion most of the time, though overwhelmingly it can be recognized from their names. Participants were asked why Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Interpretation 65 do they use the word African although they are Africans, and they all mentioned that it is back to social factors, and the use of the word is subconscious because it is internalized in their brains unintentionally and not for any insult. Participants were asked to add anything they would like to say in the end: • I think we should get rid of our shyness, because what we are doing is wrong, and as long as we continue to do so, they will feel excluded and lonely, though it is not our intention. • I think we should improve our French, because it is really hard to make contact for extra dialog. • I hope that their opinion on Algerian people one-day changes. • We are all from Adam and Adam is from dust. Common themes Issue Language barrier Inability of speaking French

73

of Algerian students Personality traits Shyness personality of Algerian students. Shyness and introversion personality of West African students. Stereotypes Negative assumptions of West African students Table 3.4: Reasons for Algerian Students'' Inability to communicate with West African students 3.2. General Discussion of Results This study was carried with the aim of examining cross-cultural communication between West African and Algerian students, besides the barriers that encounter both groups during the process of seeking intercultural awareness. The research was conducted using a qualitative, in-depth interview protocol along with questionnaire to identify the cross-cultural barriers among Algerian and West African students at Tiaret University. Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Interpretation 66 The discussion of the results is connected to the literature review presented in Chapter one, to the proposed hypotheses, and to questionnaire and interview findings. Based on the findings of the questionnaire and in-depth interview, it has been confirmed that the Algerian and West African students fail to communicate with each other, and when there is a contact, it is only for educational purposes. As discussed previously, foreign students face some adjustment issues when residing in other countries for their higher studies (Andrade, 2006; Lin & Betz, 2009; Wright & Schartner, 2013). Andrade (2006) further points out that these adjustment issues canin some cases be lessened by the creation of relationships between foreign and local students. Research also indicated that it is not only foreign students that can benefit from cross-cultural friendships but local students as well (Barron, 2006; Campbell, 2011; Geelhoed et al., 2003; Leask, 2009), i.e., lectures, assignments, and class projects, as some Algerian participants mentioned in the current investigation. Before mentioning the relationship problems of West African students with Algerian peers, one noteworthy finding should be mentioned. None of the interview participants spoke about cultural differences as customs, traditions, art…Nevertheless,the findings revealed that the Algerian students have a positive attitude towards West Africans and believe they are

74

polite and respectful, in contrast West African students have negative attitude towards their Algerian peers perceiving them as racist and close-minded, which is mentioned in several studies with students in Western countries speaking about the feelings of loneliness, exclusion, and isolation they feel (e.g., Gareis et al., 2011; Lee & Rice, 2007; Sawir et al., 2008). As Gareis (2000) found, language ability plays a significant role in the establishmentof intercultural friendships and successful communication. In this study, all participants stated that the major prominent barrier is language. French is the medium of instruction at Tiaret universities and it is a common languagefor Algerian and West African students. However, both student groups are not native French speakers and they encounter communication problems. West African students declared that Algerian students always refuse to speak French but they prefer Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Interpretation 67 to speak their own language. While Algerian students explained that they feel embarrassedbecause of their bad French. Other factors as racism, religion, personality traits, and stereotypes; have been notedto be the reasons for poor relationships. These characteristics include shyness, introversion, inferiority complex, religious intolerance, negative assumptions, and unwillingness to make friends from other countries. Both groups acknowledged that they feel more comfortable interacting with members within their groups than socializing with other students. In this study, both groups of participants generally showed isolation and unwillingness to make contact. It appears that introversion and shyness may have prevented them from engaging with each other in relationships. It is possible that their introversion and shyness are linked to their poor language skills and may have also resulted in the anxiety and the feeling of discrimination and exclusion to which some WestAfrican participants referred. A participant in a study conducted by Kudo and Simkin (2003) reflected similar feelings: "I could talk a lot with Asians with no embarrassment. But when I was with Australians, because they were native speakers of

75

English, I got very nervous and couldn"t speak at all." Students in the Current research are unable to manage successful cross-cultural communication. The effect of the language barriers is clearly visible in this study, the reason for the willingness to be in a homogenous group, the negative stereotypes, and the feeling of exclusion are related to a lack of language ability rather than to cultural differences. Kondakçı et al. (2008) point out that domestic and foreign students form their own homogeneous groups when working on projects, because of their poor language skills and inability to communicate effectively with those whose primary language is different. The results of a number of studies concur with those of the current study. A participant in a study conducted by McKenzieand Baldassar (2017) stated, "I"ve noticed that international students tend to group together, particularly if they all speak the same language, and are from the same country." Another participant in Kudo and Chapter 3: Data Analysis and Interpretation 68 Simkin"s (2003) study shared, "I don"t become close with someone who has nothing in common with me. It is not because I don"t like him/her" And also another participant in a study conducted by Bennett et al. (2013) explained, "Other Japanese and I have the same language and share the same information. So, I find it easier to talk with Japanese people than with people in this country." Conclusion The current chapter discussed and examined the findings of this study, starting with highlighting the informants' background in addition to the detailed examination of their given answers obtained through the research tools mentioned in the previous chapter; questionnaire and in-depth interview; which reflect their stance, perception and attitudes towards each other in a cross-cultural communication context." in addition to the main discussion of the results

GENERAL CONCLUSION

Gerneral Introduction

      Pragmatics education is vital and essential in today's globalized society. The explanation for this is that people use English today to interact and communicate with one

another, whether it is for academic conferences or international trade (McKay, 2002). Knowing various cultures and pragmatics is crucial to preventing misunderstandings brought on by cultural differences. Pragmatics studies place a strong emphasis on intercultural discourse appropriateness. English speakers should become more proficient in cross-cultural communication by studying pragmatics. Because they are aware of cultural differences and the significance in appropriate languages, their pragmatic competence would be better. Put another way, both native speakers and non-native speakers would find it easier to communicate internationally if pragmatics were taught and learned. Since pragmatics enables learners to communicate effectively across cultural and linguistic boundaries and prevent misunderstandings, pragmatics is a crucial component of language learning.

This dissertation discusses pragmatics as it is used among the community of students of Ibn Khaldoun University of Tiaret . The dissertation includes three chapters. Two theoretical chapters are devoted to reviewing the related literature to the central cncepts of the study.The first chapter covers the study of semantics , the definition, history, types, features, and importance . The second chapter includes pragmatics , its definitions , types ,..

The practical chapter presents the field work of this research. It gives an account about the descriptive study conducted by the researchers on 60 master one students of Algerian and West African at the Mathematics and Electrical Engineering Department English Department, Ibn Khaldoun University . The participants have been randomly assigned, since the researchers selected them using a simple stratified random sampling strategy. The data collection tool is a questionnaire in English language together with another translated copy both Arabic and French languages . The gathered data from the instrument is analyzed quantitatively.

The analysis of the data shows that pragmatics plays a significant role in cross-cultural communication .

REFERENCES

Al-Arishi, A. Y. (1994). Language attrition of Saudi ESL-and EFL-trained teachers: Articles and prepositions. *Journal of King Saud University" Education Sciences & Islamic studies*, *6*(2), 1-19.

Atia, N., & Houlden, K. Popular Postcolonialisms. *Taylor & Francis eBooks DRM Free Collection*.

Ahlstrand, B., Lampel, J., & Mintzberg, H. (2001). *Strategy safari: A guided tour through the wilds of strategic mangament*. Simon and Schuster.

Appiah, E. (2018). Polycode Structure of" Body Language" by Allan and Barbara Pease.

Bhanthumchinda, S. (1969). *A study of the difficulties of Thai students in pronouncing English consonants* (Doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University).

Botha, M. P. (2008). The New African Queer Aesthetics. *Kinema: A Journal for Film and Audiovisual Media*.

Byran .M colleeagues 1994 teaching and learning language and culture

Cruss cultural pragmatics and appologies new jersey .NJ ablex publishing corporation

Boufranche N. 1998 on pragmatics transfer studies in english language and linguastics p 5-20

Brockman .S 2009 teaching german culture . Neuse curiculm

Books N. 1964 language and language learning

Brown .P and levinson .S 1987 politness : some universals in language use combridge university press Journal of pragmatics p 36 1973

Crystal, D. (2006). *Words words words*. OUP Oxford.

81

Distractors, N. C. M. (2003). 44th Annual Meeting—November 6–9, 2003—Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. *Abstracts of the Psychonomic Society—Volume.*

Frege in Horn and Ward (2006: 76) states that reference is a kind of verbal "pointing to" or "picking out" of a certain object or individual. that one wishes to say something about.

Glauser, B., Görlach, M., & Schneider, E. W. (1993). A new bibliography of writings on varieties of English, 1984-1992/93.

Goh, C. C. (2002). Exploring listening comprehension tactics and their interaction patterns. *System*, *30*(2), 185-206.

Hofstede, G. (n.d.). "Cultural differences revisited: Dimensions of culture." In M. Bond (Ed.), The Handbook of Chinese Psychology (1st ed., pp. 189-195). Oxford University Press.

Hofstede, G. (1994). "Cultural constraints in management theories." In W. Jackson & M. Schuler (Eds.), Restoring our Competitive Edge (pp. 10-13). John Wiley & Sons.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Sage publications.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational dynamics*, *16*(4), 5-21.

House, J., & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language. *Perspectives on language in performance*, *2*, 1250-1288.

Holmez .J 1990 Apologies in new zealend english . language in society p 19-155

Huck .N gass 1996 non native refusals : a methodological persspective barlin : mouton de gruyter

Hofstede, G. (2011). "Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context." Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 2(1), 8

Hymes D. 1972 on communicative competence in J. pride j holmes EDS sociolinguastics : selected reading 269-293

Harmondsworth : penguin izadi Atasheneh N.

James W. 1971 the excultion of constractive analyses in G. nickel ED . Meanwhile,

Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions. Vintage Books

Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). "Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions." Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, 47(1), 3-25.

Kreidler, C. (2002). *Introducing english semantics*. Routledge.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M., Dąbrowska, E., & Divjak, D. (2015). Semantic typology. *Key Topics*, 1.

Lifshitz, N. (2019). Ornamental colouration as an indicator of environmental pollution with application to the tree swallow (Tachycineta bicolour).

Lobner 2002 and Al sady. Semantics technology on overview marko grobelnik and jozef steven institute

Lorente, J. I., & Panera, A. (2010). COMPETENCE FORMATION IN PERFORMING ARTS LEARNING. AN EDUCATIONAL APPROACH FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE VISUAL STUDIES. In *INTED2010 Proceedings* (pp. 2616-2626). IATED.

83

Levinson Article (1983:9) Leech book (1983:13).

Miller, J. S. (2000). *Something completely different: British television and American culture*. U of Minnesota Press.

Muduli, A. (2011). Performance Based Reward and National Culture: An Empirical Evidence from Indian Culture. *Synergy (0973-8819)*, *9*(1).

Melati, M. (2019, January). AN ANALYSIS OF TOPIC SHIFT IN A GIRLS COMMUNITY. In *International Seminar and Annual Meeting BKS-PTN Wilayah Barat* (Vol. 1, No. 1).

Mey, J. L. (2002). The relation between micro-and macropragmatics in Modern Language Studies. *Changing Philologies: Contributions to the Redefinition of Foreign Languages. Museum Tuscalanum Press, Copenhagen*, 89-104.

Partee, B. H. (2011). Formal semantics: Origins, issues, early impact. *Baltic International Yearbook of Cognition, Logic and Communication*, *6*(1), 13.

Schoenherr, J. R. (2022). *Ethical artificial intelligence from popular to cognitive science:* Shinar, D., Becker, J., Bläsi, B., Jaeger, S., Luostarinen, H., & Suikkanan, R. conflict & communication online, Vol. 3, No. 1 & 2, 2004 www. cco. regener-online. de ISSN 1618-0747.

Trust in the age of entanglement. Routledge.

Talmy, L. (2011). Cognitive semantics: An overview. *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning*, *1*, 622-642.

Taavitsainen, I., & Fitzmaurice, S. (2008). *Historical pragmatics: What it is and how to do it1* (Vol. 52, p. 11). Walter de Gruyter.

Persin Advances in asian social science 1.77-81

Parker Book (1986;p 11),

Hofstede, G. (1984). Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Sage Publications.

Shweder, R. A., & LeVine, R. A. (1984). Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion. Cambridge University Press.

Schein, E. H. (2010). "Organizational culture and leadership." Jossey-Bass, 52-53.

Scupin, R. (2011). "Cultural Anthropology: A Global Perspective." Pearson Education, 4-

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (Vol. 2). John Wiley & Sons.

Sztencel, M. (2018). Semantics, Pragmatics and Meaning Revisited. *Cham: Springer International Publishing. doi: https://doi. org/10.1007/978-3-319-69116-9.*

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business. Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). "Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business." McGraw-Hill Education, 23-25.

URSINI, F. A., TSE, K., & WU, T. (2023). Extending the Semantic Cartography Hypothesis Beyond French Spatial Prepositions. *Les prépositions complexes en français: théories, descriptions, applications*, 121.

Ziran 1988 a servey of pragmatics changshan : hunan education press

Ziran 1997 pragmatics and english learning shanghai foreign languge education press

The development of pragmatics competence

APPENDECIES

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: *The Students' Questionnaire in English*

This questionnaire is designed for the purpose of gathering information for a Master's degree dissertation that is entitled " Investigating the Role of Pragmatics in the Cross-Cultural Communication ". The case study of Mathematics and Electrical   Engineering Department English Department, Ibn Khaldoun University.

Be assured that your answers will be used for this research only, also in anonymously manner.

Guideline: please, put a tick (√) in the corresponding oval to choose the option that describes your point of view the most for each question, and provide a full answer when required.

Thank you in advance for your precious collaboration.

Section 1: General Information

1. What is your age in years?

……………Years old

2. What is your origin ?

...

3.What are the languages you most master ?

- ◈ English   ☐
- ◈ French   ☐
- ◈ Both French and English   ☐
- ◈ Arabic   ☐

4.Was studying in Algeria was your own choice or your government ?

- ◈ Personal Choice   ☐
- ◈ Government Choice   ☐

Section 2: The Communicative Skills

5. Do you have any Algerian friends ?

◈   Yes   ☐

◈ No   ☐

6. Do you find any difficulties in communicating with them ?

a- Yes   ☐

b- No   ☐

c- A Little bit   ☐

7. If yes , is it due to ?

a- Language Difficulties   ☐

b- Cultural Difficulties   ☐

c- Attitudes Towards each other   ☐

8. Are you intersested in building relationship with someone in Algeria ?

a- Yes   ☐

b- No   ☐

9. What are the ways you mostly use in communication with Algerian students ?

a- French Language   ☐

b-English Language   ☐

c-Facial expressions   ☐

d- Other pragmatic ways   ☐

10. According to your experience in the the University, what are the most difficulties that the you face when communicating with the Algerians ?

a- Language   ☐

89

b- Culture ☐

c- Religion ☐

11. Please , feel free to add anything you like .

....

....

....

....

Thank you again

Appendix 2: *Questionnaire des étudiants en Français*

Ce questionnaire est conçu dans le but de recueillir des informations pour un mémoire de

maîtrise intitulé « Enquête sur le rôle de la pragmatique dans la communication

interculturelle ». L'étude de cas du Département d'anglais du Département de mathématiques et de génie électrique, Université Ibn Khaldoun.

Soyez assuré que vos réponses seront utilisées uniquement pour cette recherche, également de manière anonyme.

Ligne directrice : veuillez cocher (√) dans l'ovale correspondant pour choisir l'option qui décrit le plus votre point de vue pour chaque question, et fournir une réponse complète si nécessaire.

Merci d'avance pour votre précieuse collaboration.

Section 1 : Informations Générales

1. Quel est votre âge en années ?

……………Ans

2. Quelle est votre origine ?

....

3. Quelles sont les langues que vous maîtrisez le plus ?

- ◈ Anglais
- ◈ Français
- ◈ Français et anglais
- ◈ Arabe

4. Étudier en Algérie était-il votre choix ou celui du gouvernement ?

- ◈ Choix personnel

◈ Choix du gouvernement ☐

Section 2 *: Les compétences communicatives*

5. As-tu des amis algériens ?

◈ Oui ☐

◈ Non ☐

6. Rencontrez-vous des difficultés à communiquer avec eux ?

a- Oui ☐

b- Non ☐

c- Un peu ☐

7. Si oui, est-ce dû à ?

a- Difficultés linguistiques ☐

b- Difficultés culturelles ☐

c- Attitudes les uns envers les autres ☐

8. Êtes-vous intéressé à nouer des relations avec quelqu'un en Algérie ?

a- Oui ☐

b- Non ☐

9. Quels sont les moyens que vous utilisez le plus dans votre communication avec les étudiants algériens ?

☐

92

a- Langue française

b-Langue Anglaise   ☐

c- Expressions faciales
                         ☐

d – Autres voies pragmatiques   ☐

10. D'après votre expérience à l'Université, quelles sont les principales difficultés que vous rencontrez lorsque vous communiquez avec les Algériens ?

d- Langue   ☐

e- Culture   ☐

f- Religion   ☐

11. S'il vous plaît , n'hésitez pas à ajouter tout ce que vous voulez .

....

....

....

....

                                                            Merci

تم تصميم هذا الاستبيان لغرض جمع المعلومات لرسالة ماجستير بعنوان "تحقيق دور البراغماتية في التواصل بين

الثقافات". دراسة حالة قسم الرياضيات والهندسة الكهربائية قسم اللغة الانجليزية جامعة ابن خلدون.

تأكد من أن إجاباتك سيتم استخدامها لهذا البحث فقط، وأيضًا بطريقة مجهولة.

المبدأ التوجيهي: يرجى وضع علامة (√) في الشكل البيضاوي المقابل لاختيار الخيار الذي يصف وجهة نظرك أكثر

لكل سؤال، وتقديم إجابة كاملة عند الحاجة.

نشكركم مقدمًا على تعاونكم الثمين.

القسم 1: معلومات عامة

1 – كم عمرك بالسنوات ؟

سنة...............

2 – ما هو أصلك ؟

....

3 – ما هي أكثر اللغات التي تتقنها ؟

◈ الانجليزية ☐

◈ الفرنسية ☐

◈ الفرنسية والانجليزية ☐

◈ العربية ☐

4. هل كانت الدراسة في الجزائر اختيارك أم حكومتك؟

◈ اختيار خاص ☐

◈ اختيار الحكومة ☐

القسم 2 المهارات التواصلية

5. هل لديك أصدقاء أفارقة؟

◈   نعم   [ ]

◈   لا   [ ]

6. هل تواجه صعوبات في التواصل مع التلاميذ الأفارقة ؟

أ- نعم   [ ]

ب- لا   [ ]

ث- نوعا ما   [ ]

7.اذا اجبت بنعم الى ما يعود ذلك ؟

أ – صعوبات لغوية   [ ]

ب - صعوبات ثقافية   [ ]

ج- انطباعات اخرى تجاه بعضهم البعض   [ ]

8- هل أنت مهتم ببناء علاقات مع الأفارقة؟

أ- نعم   [ ]

ب- لا   [ ]

8- ما هي الطرق التي تستعملها عادة للتواصل مع الطلبة الأفارقة في جامعتك ؟

أ- اللغة الفرنسية   [ ]

ب- اللغة الانجليزية   [ ]

ج- تعابير الوجه   [ ]

د- طرق عملية أخرى   [ ]

9ـ وفقا لخبرتك في جامعتك ما هي أكثر الصعوبات التي تواجهها عند التواصل مع الطلبة الأفارقة ؟

أ ـ اللغة

ب ـ الثقافة

ج ـ الديانة

10. فضلا اكتب أي معلومة يمكنها افادة موضوع دراسة هذه المذكرة .

....

....

....

....

شكرا لكم مجددا

Résumé

Cette thèse examine le rôle de la pragmatique dans la communication interculturelle au Département de mathématiques et de génie électrique de l'Université Ibn Khaldoun. Elle cherche à déterminer si les étudiants ouest-africains et algériens rencontrent des difficultés de communication entre eux. Cette étude reposait sur deux hypothèses. Premièrement, nous émettons l'hypothèse que les étudiants algériens et ouest-africains du département de mathématiques et de génie électrique de l'université Ibn Khaldoun rencontrent des difficultés à communiquer entre eux. Deuxièmement, les étudiants algériens du département de mathématiques et de génie électrique de l'université Ibn Khaldoun utilisent certaines expressions faciales pour réussir à communiquer avec les étudiants ouest-africains. Les résultats de cette recherche confirment nos hypothèses.

ملخص البحث

تبحث هذه الأطروحة دور البراغماتية في التواصل بين الثقافات في قسم الرياضيات والهندسة الكهربائية في جامعة ابن خلدون. وهي تسعى إلى تحديد ما إذا كان طلاب غرب أفريقيا والجزائريين يواجهون صعوبات في التواصل مع بعضهم البعض. اعتمدت هذه الدراسة على فرضيتين. أولاً، نفترض أن الطلاب الجزائريين والغرب أفريقيين في قسم الرياضيات والهندسة الكهربائية بجامعة ابن خلدون يواجهون صعوبات في التواصل مع بعضهم البعض. ثانيًا، يستخدم الطلاب الجزائريون في قسم الرياضيات والهندسة الكهربائية بجامعة ابن خلدون تعبيرات وجه معينة للتواصل بنجاح مع طلاب غرب إفريقيا. نتائج هذا البحث تؤكد فرضياتنا.