

THE EFFECT OF CONTEXT, INFERENCE, AND INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION ON THE LANGUAGE USE IN CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION THROUGH THE KNOWLEDGE OF PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE

Mawj Khalil Ibrahim

Department of Psychological Counseling and Educational Guidance, College of Education, Al mustansiriyah University, Baghdad, Iraq.

mawjkhilil.92@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

Abstract

The goal of the study is to use pragmatic competence to explain the effect of context, inference, and multicultural communication on language in cross-cultural communication. The researchers examined pragmatic competence and the impact of intercultural communication, context, and inference on language. The qualitative exploratory analysis is used. The study investigates the value of pragmatic competence in effective communication. The study also investigates pragmatic competence, and its components such as context, inference and implication, cultural sensitivity, courtesy and social refinements, and the role that education plays in fostering these abilities. In addition, the significance of context, inference, implication, politeness, cultural sensitivity, and social graces in cross-cultural communication are investigated too. The study also shows the importance of educations' contribution to the development of pragmatic competence.

The study examines the comprehensive impact of pragmatic competence on language in context, inference, and cross-cultural communication. In positive communications and wealthy linguistic backgrounds, this influential effect helps to improve context relevance, facilitates cultural connections and communication, and encourages courtesy and respect.

An exploratory examination is quietly established to show the different aspects of pragmatic competence. This examination also demonstrates the importance of context and inference in the interpretation and comprehension of language. It also highlights the use of intercultural communication to manipulate language use and comprehension.

Keywords: pragmatic competence, context, inference, intercultural communication, cultural sensitivity.

Introduction

Background of the Study

The aspects of pragmatic competence have been the target of researchers. Their primary objective was to study language formation and its influence on intercultural communication, context, and inference. It is known that pragmatic competence is the skill that facilitates the use of language in different social and cultural contexts and the ability to comprehend its basic components of vocabulary and grammar. According to scholars, the context of situational utterances and the mutual knowledge of the debaters have a significant impact on the interpretation of linguistic expressions.

Furthermore, inference played a significant role in this study. This ability to infer meaning beyond explicit language has a major impact on effective communication as well. It has been determined that understanding implicit meanings and drawing conclusions from context are crucial elements of pragmatic competence.

Also, intercultural communication was another vibrant element of this research. The researchers examined the ways in which cultural differences, norms, values, and communication styles contribute to pragmatic competence. In today's more interconnected world, communication between individuals of diverse cultural backgrounds necessitates a deeper understanding of the ways in which cultural differences impact the use of language. The researchers' goal was to explore methods in which these components influence language comprehension, interpretation, and expression in various cultural contexts.

The nature of pragmatic competence has been the target of the researchers to investigate in this study. Their findings could have a significant influence on communicating across cultural boundaries, learning a language, and developing communication strategies in various social contexts. The researchers' work contributes to a better understanding of the relationships between context, inference, and cross-cultural communication that affect language usage and comprehension.

Research Context

A comprehensive examination of pragmatic competence in the context of interpersonal communication involves fundamental concepts and their

interrelationships to highlight the dynamics of effective and meaningful communication.

This study explores context at several levels and explains what crucial role context plays in influencing communication. A few examples of contextual factors that affect language speaking and understanding are situational cues, common knowledge, and environmental elements.

The concept of pragmatic competence is thoroughly examined in the study, examining its components, intricacies, and crucial role in fostering efficient communication. Also, understanding pragmatic competency is essential because it goes beyond linguistic skills and uses language in social contexts.

The role of cultural sensitivity in intercultural communication is also an important aspect. The study highlights the importance of cultural sensitivity to identify and understand cultural differences, norms, and values. They are indeed crucial to fostering understanding and closing gaps among diverse cultures.

The study also delves into inference and implication. These cognitive processes are examined about communication, showing how they improve language by adding new levels of meaning that often extend beyond explicit spoken expressions.

Research Objectives

Some potential research goals investigate the language in cross-cultural communication through pragmatic competence and its connection to intercultural communication, context, and inference. They are as follows:

1. Investigate the effect of pragmatic competence on cross-cultural communication.
2. Examine the use of cognitive capacities to comprehend verbal utterances and hidden meanings in cross-cultural communication.
3. Examine how language use and its interpretation in different situations is affected by situational signs and common knowledge in cross-cultural communication.
4. Analyze the language relationship between intercultural communication and pragmatic comprehension in cultural norms, distinctions, and values in diverse cultural situations.
5. Detect the connections between intercultural communication, context, and inference, and their impact on the use of language.

6. Assess the importance of pragmatic competence in intercultural communication and its role in developing culturally appropriate communication.

Literature Review

Language is a needed tool to study context, social interaction differences, and cultural changes. Pragmatic competence is the ability to use language effectively in various communication settings. It indicates a deep comprehension of language's complex phonics beyond its literal meaning (Culpeper et al., 2018: 16). Furthermore, language complexity changes due to inference and implication, but its true meaning extends to the suggested, the unsaid, and the implied meaning. According to Kecskes (2015: 1891), language transcends further than simple practical utterances in human communications. It is an art that carries the tones of politeness and social etiquette as well. Politeness in language is more than a superficial delicacy. It is a manifestation of respect, consideration, and acknowledgement of the shared social norms that govern human interactions.

In addition, pragmatic competence is enhanced by intercultural communication. In today's globalized society, people interact frequently with other people from different cultural backgrounds. Understanding cultural norms, values, and communication styles is necessary for pragmatic competence in cross-cultural communication (Timpe et al., 2015: 26-27). Pragmatic competence also calls for the flexibility to modify the use of language for cultural differences, to promote understanding among people, and to prevent unintentional misunderstandings (Kasper & Rose, 2002: 33).

In the intricate realm of language proficiency, pragmatic competence also stands as a cornerstone for effective communication. Defined as the ability to use language appropriately in various social contexts, pragmatic competence involves an understanding of context, inference, and cultural distinctions (Barron, 2003: 56). In addition, education, with its transformative power, plays a pivotal role in nurturing and developing pragmatic competence among individuals.

Pragmatic Competence in the Speech Act and Politeness Theory

Cross-cultural pragmatics is closely related to education and works to advance pragmatics instruction in language classrooms. The argument is that language

instruction overemphasizes the acquisition of linguistic knowledge while undervaluing the development of pragmatic competence. Consequently, when language learners eventually encounter communication within the culture, they are unable to convey their intentions effectively. This is because language learners apply the conversational standards of their language and culture to the target language. This phenomenon is recognized as the pragmatic transfer. This transfer can lead to miscommunication or negative cultural stereotyping. Thus, an increasing area of focus in studying language application is how to incorporate pragmatic knowledge into language instruction, depicting the strategies that most effectively apply (Taguchi, 2015: 21-23).

The ability to know “when” and “to whom” in a foreign culture is known as pragmatic competence. The guidelines that determine pragmatic competence can be intricate and complicated, making them challenging to learn. The learner must possess sensitivity and insightfulness in addition to the preparation and clear instruction to master such competence (Stadler, 2018: 42). According to Ellis (1997: 28), pragmatic competence includes the ability to control the emotional reaction connected to particular speech behaviours, which can make it challenging to adopt a style that is deemed improper in the context of one's native language (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993: 51). Therefore, pragmatics competence is the “complex interplay of language, language users and context of interaction” (Taguchi, 2015: 1).

Cross-cultural pragmatics is based on Speech Act and Politeness Theory, which is often investigated in conjunction with other areas of study. Speech Act and Politeness Theory is different from conversational inference as it only considers particular speech events or acts. Speech acts are verbal communications that serve a purpose just for being spoken. Speech acts are the fundamental building blocks of communication (Searle, 1969: 18-20), and they are involved in all linguistic communications. Similar to the speech act, the primary goals of cross-cultural politeness exploration are to determine the degree to which politeness is valued in a given society relative to other values and to identify similarities and differences in the ways that politeness is expressed in various cultures (Stadler, 2018: 56).

Methodology

Research Design

The design of the study followed the **qualitative research** approach to investigate the complexities of pragmatic language use, promoting a prosperous exploration of contextual connotations and interpretations. The study is conducted using the **exploratory analysis** as well. The study focuses on investigating various aspects of pragmatics, which is the analysis of how language is used in context to convey meaning beyond its literal interpretation.

Documents

This exploratory research examines pragmatic competence in various aspects such as:

1. The discussion of pragmatic competence elements and their importance in fostering meaningful and successful communication.
2. The examination of context with a focus on its crucial function in human communication.
3. The investigations of the functions of inference and implication in language communication and the language hierarchal levels that issue.
4. The importance of cultural sensitivity in cross-cultural communication and its promotion of mutual understanding in the connections between unlike populations.
5. The importance of manners and social etiquette in language and their support of courteous communication.
6. The enhancement of pragmatic competence through knowledge and linguistic skills to communicate in a contextually relevant manner.

Data Collection

The researchers conducted a qualitative analysis method to analyze the impact of pragmatic competence on intercultural communication, inference and implications, and context use in language. The effects of context, inference and implications, and intercultural communication on language were identified, examined, and addressed.

Data Analysis

To understand the intricate relationships between context, inference, intercultural communication, and their effects on the use of language within the

structure of pragmatic competence in cross-cultural communication, this data analysis approach thoroughly reviews and interprets the information that has been acquired. Pragmatic competence was examined in terms of qualitative interpretation of findings, drawing conclusions, and synthesizing data analysis results. The aim was to understand thoroughly the context, implications, inferences, and intercultural communication, and their influence on the use of language and interpretation in cross-cultural communication contexts.

Discussion and Analysis

Language is more complex than just a list of words. People utilize it as a flexible tool to manage the difficulties of communication. A characteristic of language competency known as pragmatic competence extends beyond vocabulary and grammar to include a sophisticated grasp of intercultural communication, context, and inference (Hymes, 1972: 278). The multi-dimensional nature of pragmatic competence and its central role in culturally sensitive and actual communication will be discussed and analyzed.

Understanding Pragmatic Competence

This skill relates to the suitable engagement of the language in different social backgrounds. It entails the thoughtfulness of the function of language in specific contexts and its proficiency in linguistic arrangements. A person with pragmatic competence can effectively and delicately communicate by navigating the distinctions of tone, index, and implied meaning. Therefore, Pragmatics is considered “a fundamental constituent of communicative language ability” (Timpe et al., 2015: 8).

Basically, pragmatic competence refers to an individual's ability to use language in a way that is contextually appropriate, socially sensitive, and culturally attuned. It transcends the knowledge of syntax and lexical expressions as it explores the thought of how language functions in various situations. This includes the awareness of social norms, the recognition of implied meanings, and the adaptability to different cultural and interpersonal contexts (Ifantidou, 2014: 32).

Context as the Container of Meaning

Context serves as the frame for meaning. People who possess pragmatic competence must have been aware of the context in which communication takes place. This context encompasses not only the physical environment but also the situational, social, and cultural elements that impact interpretation. For instance, a certain discourse might have different connotations at a formal dinner than it would at a relaxed family gathering. In fact, the progressive pragmatic competence is constructed by the conceptual or systematic variations rather than the language environment (Mao & He, 2021: 9-10).

In the complex melody of language, meaning is not solely confined to the words uttered. It unfolds within the vast and refined container of context. Context, in its multifaceted dimensions, serves as the base upon which language displays its forms of meaning, rendering communication rich, dynamic, and profoundly human. A meaning of a word or expression is often dependent on the context in which it occurs and cannot always be understood literally. Therefore, a speaker from a different cultural background needs to be proficient in the target language as well as have the necessary socio-pragmatic knowledge to be able to deduce the speaker's likely intended meaning. (Stadler, 2018: 36-38). In addition, grammatical knowledge transmits a primary meaning, while pragmatic knowledge, such as appropriateness and conventionality, can interpret and encrypt another kind of meaning. This is where the implied dichotomy remains. Interpreting and encrypting pragmatic meanings while accounting for communicators' social identities, such as their social rank and power, relate intensely to pragmatic competence environment (Mao & He, 2021: 2-3).

Moreover, context, in linguistic terms, refers to the set of circumstances or facts that surround a particular event or situation. It encompasses a spectrum of elements, including the physical setting, the participants, their relationships, the cultural background, and the chronological aspects of communication. Context also provides the background against which words and utterances gain their significance, shaping the interpretation and depth of meaning (Dattner, 2004: 14-15).

Language, by its nature, is susceptible to ambiguity. Words may carry multiple meanings, and the intended interpretation often focuses on the context in which they are used. Consider a simple word like "bank," which could refer to a financial institution or the side of a river. The context in which the word is

employed clarifies its intended meaning, illustrating how context acts as a clarifying lens in the face of linguistic ambiguity. “The main contribution of pragmatics is, precisely, the certainty that it is impossible to analyze language outside the context in which it is produced and interpreted” (Yus, 2011: 2). Thus, meaning is always shaped and derived by context rather than being inherent in a message (Stadler, 2018: 62).

In addition to language, pragmatic competence, a feature of language proficiency, relies heavily on a serious awareness of social context. This includes understanding the relationship between speakers, the formality of the setting, and the shared knowledge between communicators. For instance, a casual statement among friends may carry different implications than the same statement in a professional setting. Pragmatically competent individuals navigate this social context skillfully through meaning construction, adjusting their language use to align with situational expectations (Stadler, 2018: 63).

Understanding cultural context becomes crucial in today's globalized world where people from different cultural backgrounds interact with one another. Words and gestures can have different meanings in different cultures, and what is appropriate or polite in one culture may not be in another. To promote understanding and close any misunderstandings, intercultural communication requires a keen awareness of these cultural twists within a larger framework (Yus, 2011: 71). Therefore, depending utterly on the setting, addressee, and circumstances of the message, the meaning, for instance, of an utterance like "I've got a flat tire" can vary from “a request to fix or replace the tire to a request for a lift or turning down the request for a lift” (Standler, 2018: 5).

Context is dynamic. It changes with time, and language changes with it. Words and phrases acquire new meanings, and language implications change over time. To illustrate, people who are accustomed to use various contextual signals for interpretation may find it difficult to derive meaning from context because these signals can be interpreted inversely across cultural boundaries. Words that were once harmless, for example, could become more significant due to changes in cultural norms, technological advancements, or societal changes. Therefore, in order to establish the validity of interactional practices on a communicative level, it is imperative to examine these practices within their local cultural context. As a result, language always wavers with the temporal context, reflecting and influencing societal changes (Dattner, 2004: 23-25). These

conversations, for instance, proves how language helps in shaping the entire context:

"Sam: Coming for a drink?

Andy: Sorry. I cannot. My doctor will not let me.

Sam: What's wrong with you?"

"Sam: Coming for a drink?

Andy: Sorry. I cannot. My mother-in-law will not let me.

Sam: What's wrong with you?" (Kecskes, 2010: 2895).

The mere act of swapping out the word "doctor" for the word "mother-in-law" significantly alters the context of the surrounding statements. As a result, the meaning of the phrase "what's wrong with you?" changes along with the word itself. In contrast to the first example, where it indicates a health-related inquiry, the second example raises concerns about Andy's sanity and decision-making abilities by asking how he could have allowed his mother-in-law to control his lifestyle. As a result, language can play a significant role in influencing the context and the meaning that results, in addition to being shaped by the social and situational context (Kecskes, 2010: 426-427).

Inference and Implication

Drawing conclusions and understanding implications are critical skills in pragmatic competence. In fact, to draw a conclusion from any available data is known as inference, and it frequently depends on the communicators' shared knowledge. Those with pragmatic competence are able to recognize these subliminal signals, which enhances communication beyond the explicit language (Scollon & Scollon, 2001: 22). It is the mental process by which people make connections and fill in the blanks to understand meaning that might not be expressed directly. On the contrary, implication describes the additional meaning that language subtly conveys that goes beyond literal interpretation. When used in cycle, inference and implication enhance communication by adding levels of complex meaning. In fact, the intended meaning is more frequently concealed than explicitly stated. Thus, conversational inference refers to the listener's capacity to interpret spoken meaning from nonverbal signals (Stadler, 2018: 34-35).

In everyday communication, individuals constantly engage in the art of reading between the lines. Consider a statement like, "It's quite warm in here," uttered

with a subtle sigh. The inference might be that the speaker finds the temperature uncomfortably high. The implication may be a subtle suggestion to adjust the thermostat. In this seemingly straightforward statement, layers of meaning unfold through the interplay of inference and implication. Thus, conversational inference is more of a reflexive reaction to the social circumstances people are accustomed to face because of their upbringing in a particular cultural and social environment than it is a conscious process of introspection and analysis (Stadler, 2018: 26-28).

The effectiveness of inference and implication hinges on cultural distinctions and contextual relevance. Therefore, drawing inferences is somewhat less difficult when communicating with low-context cultures where meaning is conveyed speaker-centrally and thoughts are expressed fairly clearly. However, since inferences rely heavily on shared background, it is very problematic in cultures that tend to rely heavily on the addressee to make inferences. Depending on addressees to interpret indirect and implicit utterances to their intended meaning becomes problematic once the shared background knowledge is no longer established (Hofstede, 2001: 78-79). To illustrate, different cultures may interpret implicit messages differently, and what is implied in one cultural context might not be immediately apparent in another. For instance, a pause in conversation may carry different implications in Eastern and Western cultures, with the former valuing reflective silence and the latter potentially perceiving it as discomfort or hesitation.

Moreover, accurate inference is a key component of pragmatic competence, which is a critical component of language proficiency. It entails comprehending not only the expressed meanings but also the feelings and intentions that are implied by words (Barron, 2003: 64). For instance, even though a friend's response is neutral, a pragmatic listener might interpret it as an indication of annoyance based on its brevity. Therefore, the ability to interpret both explicit and implicit messages in the context of a larger idea falls under the category of effective pragmatic competence.

Basically, inference and implication are essential for expressing subtext and multiple levels of meaning in writing and artistic expression. Authors frequently use literary devices to subtly express themes, feelings, or criticisms of society. The actions of a character, the selection of symbols, or the tones in a dialogue can all act as means for addressees to deduce deeper meanings and understand

the implications woven throughout the oral and written discourse (Kecskes, 2010: 430).

Although implication and inference improve communication, they also present difficulties and possible ambiguities. When people read between the lines differently or when cultural and contextual differences result in different conclusions, misinterpretations may occur. Especially in cross-cultural interactions, navigating these obstacles calls for a keen understanding of the discourse as well as a dedication to honest and transparent communication (Dattner, 2004: 12).

Cultural Sensitivity in Intercultural Communication

In humans' interconnected global landscape, the ability to navigate the complexities of intercultural communication is more crucial than ever. The cultural backgrounds of speakers and addressees have such a profound impact on what people articulate, how they articulate their words, and how what these articulated words are interpreted that it often lies outside people's immediate awareness. Due to the fact that pragmatics and culture are so closely related, studying pragmatics is essential for exploring cross-cultural issues. Determining how utterances are intended and interpreted in the cultural context in which they occur is the focus of this branch of cross-cultural pragmatics. Pragmatic competence is concerned at the relationship between the sent and received messages. The goal of research is to combine a conversational interpretation and a cross-cultural pragmatic method. It also sheds light on different cultural practices and the extent to which people rely on the listener's communication to infer meaning. It attempts to understand the elements that cause someone from one cultural background to interpret the same message in a different way than someone from a different cultural background, as well as the problems that emerge during cross-cultural communication (Stadler, 2018: 82–84).

Cultural sensitivity is a dynamic talent that includes understanding and respect of a variety of cultural conventions, beliefs, and communication styles. It is at the core of successful cross-cultural relationships. Furthermore, cultural sensitivity refers to the awareness of the little cultural variations that affect the behaviors, attitudes, and speech patterns of individuals from various cultural origins. It goes beyond simply embracing diversity and entails a genuine curiosity and openness to understand the beliefs and principles that set many

cultures apart (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 25–26). In addition, cultural sensitivity is based on the knowledge that every culture is unique and that politely acknowledging these differences is essential for productive communication (Chua, 2018). To illustrate, the awareness of these principles - respect for cultural customs, active listening and empathy, avoidance of preconceptions and presumptions, knowledge of cultural differences, and flexibility and adaptability - strengthens cultural sensitivity.

First, recognizing “individual variety” is the first step to be aware of cultural differences. This identifies the communication methods, the cross-cultural differences in non-verbal clues, and social conventions. Furthermore, judgments and assumptions raise serious obstacles in the process of meaningful cross-cultural communication. Thus, cultural sensitivity disregards stereotyping and refrains assumptions which are based only on specific cultural background (Kim, 2017: 11). Sensitive communication involves not only hearing the words spoken but also understanding the emotions, perspectives, and cultural contexts that shape those words. In fact, empathy and attentive listening are needed for culturally sensitive communication. In addition, cultural sensitivity necessitates a level of flexibility and adaptability in communication styles (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 33). Moreover, respecting cultural practices, traditions, and rituals is a cornerstone of cultural sensitivity. This involves refraining from judgment and showing an appreciation for the diversity that contributes to the richness of the global tapestry (Martin & Nakayama, 2018: 56).

Fundamentally, language is an effective tool for expressing culture, and negotiating linguistic differences requires cultural sensitivity in particular. This calls for an awareness of idioms, metaphors, and cultural allusions that might not have exact translations in other languages. The use of language that is sensitive to cultural differences recognizes the possibility of misunderstandings and aims for clarity without sacrificing cultural integrity (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 36).

Body language, gestures, and facial expressions are examples of non-verbal cues that differ greatly between cultures. In some cultures, a gesture that is regarded as affirming might be interpreted differently. Cultural sensitivity also applies to nonverbal communication; people are advised to read cues in the context of their own culture and not misinterpret them (Chua, 2018: 131). Cultural sensitivity acts as a bridge over potential divides, but intercultural communication has its

challenges. People can create connections and meaningful relationships across cultural boundaries more easily when they approach communication with an openness to learn, a willingness to adapt, and a genuine respect for cultural differences (Kim, 2017: 15).

Politeness and Social Etiquette

Politeness and social etiquette are integral components of pragmatic competence. Politeness involves using language in a way that respects social norms and the feelings of others. Pragmatically competent individuals can measure the appropriate level of politeness in various situations, adjusting their language to convey respect and consideration for others. This aspect is crucial for maintaining positive social interactions and avoiding unintended misunderstandings (Dattner, 2004: 21).

In fact, the fundamentals of politeness entail positive and negative politeness, and respect for face. First, using language that creates a sense of connection, demonstrating friendliness, and highlighting shared interests are all examples of positive politeness. Positive politeness is influenced by remarks of gratitude, inclusive language, and compliments. Second, negative politeness is defined by language that honors the privacy and autonomy of others. This entails using language that mitigates the situation, such as "could" rather than "can," or apologizing to reduce imposition. Finally, in a particular interaction, an individual's positive social value is referred to as their "face," a sociolinguistic concept. Keeping a straight face for the speaker and the listener is often at the heart of being polite (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 28-29). In fact, politeness techniques assist people in maintaining their composure and preventing embarrassment or discomfort.

Certain traits, like politeness, are not innate in speech. This question, for example, "Do you think it would be possible for you to call Jean Thomas today?" (Holmes, 2013: 10) shows that although this statement may appear courteous at first glance, the meaning and level of politeness of the communication are primarily determined by the surrounding context, intonation pattern, and voice tone. Instead of conveying politeness, this statement conveys exasperation or even anger if it is made in a sarcastic tone, emphasizes the word "today," and is made more than once on the same day. Thus, meaning is almost totally context-

bound and never inherent in language, much like politeness (Holmes, 2013: 10-13).

The definitions of politeness and social etiquette differ from culture to culture. In one culture, a gesture or behavior that is deemed courteous might not be in another. Understanding these differences and being willing to modify language use to conform to the social norms of the target cultural context are prerequisites for successful cross-cultural interactions (Hofstede, 2001: 94). To illustrate, the fundamentals of politeness still hold true in this digital era where written text and online platforms are the primary means of communication. Appropriate greetings and sign-offs in written communications such as emails provoke a decent eloquent language and admit the possibility of clear interpretation. They are just a few examples of being polite in digital communication (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 58).

The Role of Education in Developing Pragmatic Competence

The educational contexts play a major role in the building of pragmatic competence. For language learners, exposure to real-world situations, authentic contexts, and cross-cultural experiences is advantageous (Mao, & He, 2021: 2). Pragmatic competence can be cultivated through role-playing activities, clear instruction, and the study of cultural differences, allowing learners to become more adept at using language in a range of circumstances. Students learn how language functions in a range of social contexts through immersive experiences such as group discussions, conversations, or reading texts from the real world (Taguchi, 2015: 5). Exposure to real language use becomes a vital component in the formation of an intuitive understanding of pragmatics (Stadler, 2018: 6).

Literature, in general, helps readers understand pragmatic distinctions since it presents a range of social circumstances and personalities. As a result, language arts courses usually include the study of literary works, which inspires students to explore the subtleties of character interactions, dialogue, and suggested meanings in texts (Taguchi, 2015: 16). These literary investigations greatly help in the pragmatic competence development process (Ifantidou, 2014: 22). Thus, by explicitly teaching pragmatic principles, educational programs can give students a theoretical understanding of how language functions in different social and cultural situations. Through instruction on speech acts, manners, and

the nuances of language use, students become aware of the pragmatic components of communication (Kecskes, 2015: 2894).

In addition, the development of pragmatic competence can be strengthened by the use of technology in the classroom. Students can practice and improve their pragmatic skills through virtual interactions provided by digital platforms, video conferencing, and online communication tools. The details of real-world interactions are mirrored in virtual communication experiences, which help in the development of language use that is appropriate for each situation (Yus, 2011: 13). Learners also can apply their understanding of pragmatics in real-world situations through interactive classroom activities like role-playing, simulations, and debates. Through these exercises that mimic actual communication scenarios, students can practice the use of language, make inferences, and refine their pragmatic skills in a supportive learning environment (Kasper & Rose, 2002: 14). Moreover, assessments that precisely measure pragmatic competence can be a part of education. The evaluation of students' written and spoken responses, their capacity for meaning inference, and their use of language in diverse social contexts are all possible components of these assessments. Pragmatic competence evaluations encourage students to actively improve their communication abilities (Taguchi, 2015: 36).

Conclusion

Being the art of effective communication, pragmatic competence extends beyond the structural components of language. As individuals strive to communicate effectively in diverse settings, the cultivation of pragmatic competence becomes not only a linguistic skill but also a cornerstone for fostering understanding, building relationships, and navigating the intricacies of human interaction. (Ifantidou, 2014: 62-63).

In brief, understanding the significance of context in communication is an invitation to appreciate the profound complexity and beauty that are inherent in the ways that people convey meaning. It is not just an academic exercise. In fact, context adds depth and richness to language as it converts simple words into a complex and dynamic representation of the human experience by disentangling the layers of context (Barron, 2003: 44).

Besides, inference and implication give communication more depth, subtlety, and richness in both everyday conversations and literary and artistic works.

Acquiring the abilities of inference and implication is a call to investigate the complexity of language and the deep nuances of human communication (Cohen & Olshtain, 1993: 39). In addition, politeness and social etiquette in language can also be used to build harmonious social environments, manage cultural expectations, and cultivate positive relationships. People who practice good manners and social etiquette in language not only communicate more effectively but also help to weave a culture of respect and understanding throughout the diverse fabric of human society (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 24-25).

In the growth of pragmatic competence. Education provides people with the skills they need for nuanced and contextually appropriate communication through exposure to real language use, explicit instruction, cross-cultural experiences, and interactive activities (Taguchi, 2015: 27). The role that education plays in cultivating pragmatic competence is becoming important, enabling people to negotiate the complexities of language in a multicultural and interconnected world (Dattner, 2004: 8).

References

1. Barron A. (2003). Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context. John Benjamins. Crossref.
2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
3. Chua, R. Y. J. (2018). The rise of global cosmopolitans: Multiculturalism, globalization, and the importance of cultural sensitivity. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 47(2), 124-142.
4. Cohen, A., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 33–56.
5. Culpeper J., Mackey A., Taguchi N. (2018). Second language pragmatics: From theory to research. Routledge. Crossref.
6. Dattner, B. (2004). A framework for understanding cross-cultural misunderstandings. Retrieved from www.dattnerconsulting.com/papercross.doc
- a. Ellis, R. (1997). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
7. Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across cultures (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

8. Holmes, J. (2013). *Women, men and politeness*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- a. Hymes D. (1972). On communicative competence. In Pride J., Holmes J. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Penguin.
9. Ifantidou E. (2014). *Pragmatic competence and relevance*. John Benjamins. Crossref.
10. Kasper G., Rose K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Basil Blackwell.
11. Kecskes, I. (2010). Situation-bound utterances as pragmatic acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42 (11), pp. 2889-2897.
12. Kecskes I. (2015). How does pragmatic competence develop in bilinguals? *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(4), 419–434. Crossref.
- Kim, Y. Y. (2017). *Communication and cross-cultural adaptation: An integrative theory*. Routledge
13. Mao, T., & He, S. (2021). An Integrated Approach to Pragmatic Competence: It's Framework and Properties. *SAGE Open*, 11(2), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211011472>
- Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2018). *Intercultural communication in contexts*. McGraw-Hill Education.
14. Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural communication*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
15. Stadler, S. (2018). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, C.A. Chapelle (Ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0289.pub2>
- Timpe V., Wain J., Schmidgall J. (2015). Defining and operationalizing the construct of pragmatic competence: Review and recommendations (ETS Research Report No. RR-15-06). Educational Testing Service.
16. Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance. *Language Teaching*, 48(1), 1–50.
17. Yus, F. (2011). *Cyberpragmatics: Internet-Mediated Communication in Context*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.