



Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics

e-ISSN: 2442-482x, p-ISSN: 2089-3345

<https://fkip.ummetro.ac.id/journal/index.php/english>

DOI: 10.24127/pj.v13i3.10121

---

## PRESUPPOSITIONS: THE HIDDEN FORCE SHAPING EVERYDAY CONVERSATIONS

By

Nagamurali Eragamreddy

Preparatory Studies Centre, University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Salalah,  
Sultanate of Oman.

[Nagamurali.Eragamreddy@utas.edu.om](mailto:Nagamurali.Eragamreddy@utas.edu.om)

(Article History: Received:13-05-2024;Reviewed1:22-07-2024;Reviewed2:28-08-2024; Accepted:06-10-2024;Published:30-10-2024).

### Abstract:

*The present investigation explores the key questions: presuppositions exist in conversation, interact with speech patterns, and function with other language elements in real-world communication beyond the speaker's intended meaning. According to linguistic theory, presuppositions significantly strengthen communication through implicit meanings that work collaboratively with linguistic structures to promote understanding, establish relationships, and elicit associated cultural convictions (Allan, 2014). Data was collected using a mixed-method methodology from various sources, including conversations, interviews, speeches given in public, articles, and literary excerpts. Discourse and pragmatic analysis were deployed to explore how presuppositions interact with speech patterns, conversational dynamics, and contextual comprehension. The results show that presuppositions often influence communication by embedding hidden meanings into questions, metaphors, and negations. Although these presuppositions improve discourse meaning-making, unspoken presuppositions might lead to misunderstandings. It was discovered that presuppositions played a significant role in establishing connections between individuals, establishing emotional bonds, and gently directing interpretations in cross-cultural settings. According to the study's findings, presuppositions are essential to everyday discourse and have significant implications for pragmatic competence, intercultural communication, and language enhancement.*

**Keywords:** communication; discourse analysis; linguistic structures; pragmatic inference; presuppositions

### Abstrak:

*Investigasi saat ini mengeksplorasi pertanyaan-pertanyaan kunci: praanggapan ada dalam percakapan, berinteraksi dengan pola bicara, dan berfungsi dengan elemen bahasa lain dalam komunikasi dunia nyata di luar makna yang dimaksudkan pembicara. Menurut teori linguistik, praanggapan secara signifikan memperkuat komunikasi melalui makna implisit yang bekerja secara kolaboratif dengan struktur linguistik untuk mempromosikan pemahaman, membangun hubungan, dan menimbulkan keyakinan budaya terkait (Allan, 2014). Data dikumpulkan menggunakan metodologi metode campuran dari berbagai sumber, termasuk percakapan, wawancara, pidato yang diberikan di depan umum, artikel, dan kutipan sastra. Wacana dan analisis pragmatis digunakan untuk mengeksplorasi bagaimana praanggapan berinteraksi dengan pola bicara, dinamika percakapan, dan pemahaman kontekstual. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa praanggapan sering memengaruhi komunikasi dengan menanamkan makna tersembunyi ke dalam pertanyaan, metafora, dan negasi. Meskipun prasangka ini meningkatkan pembuatan makna wacana, praduga yang tidak terucapkan dapat menyebabkan kesalahpahaman. Ditemukan bahwa praanggapan memainkan peran penting dalam membangun hubungan antar individu, membangun ikatan emosional, dan dengan lembut mengarahkan interpretasi dalam pengaturan lintas budaya. Menurut temuan penelitian, praanggapan sangat penting*

---

### How to cite this article:

Eragamreddy, N. (2024). Presuppositions: The hidden force shaping everyday conversations. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 13(3), 842–870. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v13i3.10121>

*Eragamreddy (2024)*

*untuk wacana sehari-hari dan memiliki implikasi yang signifikan untuk kompetensi pragmatis, komunikasi antarbudaya, dan peningkatan bahasa.*

**Kata kunci:** *praduga, komunikasi, analisis wacana, inferensi pragmatis, struktur linguistik.*

## INTRODUCTION

Presuppositions play a vital role in shaping interpretation and interaction in informal conversations. They are particularly significant in language learning as modern teaching methods focus on pragmatic competence, which involves understanding implicit meanings (Potts, 2015). The increasing prominence of intercultural communication in educational institutions necessitates research into presuppositions since students must navigate differing cultural contexts (Liu et al., 2024). Misinterpreting presuppositions can lead to communication breakdowns, especially in second-language learning, where learners often struggle to grasp nuanced inferred meanings (Macagno & Bigi, 2017). Since presupposed content frequently remains unchallenged, it subtly influences beliefs and perceptions. Thus, critical thinking and philosophical awareness are linked to understanding and evaluating presuppositions (Sánchez & Campos, 2019). Language educators should prioritize teaching students to identify and critically assess presuppositions in written and spoken discourse to enhance their pragmatic competence and communicative abilities.

Given the emphasis on communicative competence and critical language awareness in current pedagogical trends, research into presuppositions has gained traction. This study aims to contribute by addressing four research goals: 1) Examining how presuppositions influence real-world communication beyond the speaker's intended meaning. 2) Investigating relationships between presuppositions and other linguistic elements in speech structures. 3) Analyzing the distribution of presuppositions in conversations. 4) Exploring how presuppositions interact with linguistic elements in discourse.

In recent years, presupposition analysis has gained attention within experimental pragmatics (Reinecke, 2021). Two primary areas of study have emerged: presupposition accommodation and presuppositions' role in information encoding. For instance, speakers often differentiate between content declared as the primary idea of a sentence and presupposed material considered backgrounded or assumed. Consider the sentence:

1. Zahiya eventually sold her old house.
  - (a) Zahiya does not have her old house now.

(b) Zahiya had her old house in the past.

Here, the primary claim is that Zahiya sold her house, while the presupposition is that she previously owned it. This distinction highlights the unique informational role of presuppositions, where presupposed content is treated as shared knowledge among participants.

Modern pragmatics research further explores how presuppositions intertwine with other linguistic phenomena. For example, Blutner (1998) examined how presuppositions are encoded in grammatical structures, while Capone (2017) investigated their relationship with lexical items. The nuanced ways word choice influences presuppositions have implications for understanding meaning beyond the literal. This study builds on such research to clarify how presuppositions shape communication and perception, considering both speaker intent and audience interpretation (Eragamreddy, 2024).

Despite the wealth of theoretical research on presuppositions, significant gaps remain in understanding their effects beyond the speaker's meaning and their interactions with other linguistic components (Sánchez & Campos, 2019). This study seeks to address these gaps by evaluating presuppositions within and beyond the speaker's meaning, analyzing their distribution, and examining their interplay with other linguistic elements in conversation.

Presuppositions are also crucial for understanding non-verbal communication. For example, the phrase "former king" presupposes the existence of a monarch, highlighting implicit assumptions in language (Lathar et al., 2023). While traditional views suggest that listeners automatically integrate presupposed information, newer theories propose that presuppositions develop dynamically during the speech, facilitating discussions on contested notions such as the existence of a monarch (Haspelmath, 2020). These perspectives underscore the complexity of presupposition analysis in conveying deeper meanings.

Stalnaker's (1974) theory emphasizes that presupposition triggers (e.g., "stop") function like verbal statements. For instance, the statement "Bingley has stopped wearing plaid" presupposes that Bingley previously wore plaid, while its negation implies that he still wears it (Stalnaker, 2002). Stalnaker argues that presuppositions are speaker-driven decisions rather than inherent properties of words. His pragmatic approach, grounded in Gricean principles, highlights the cross-linguistic consistency of presuppositions (Yule, 1996; Levinson, 2024).

Karttunen (1974) explored how presuppositions determine the conditions under which sentences can be effectively expressed. He proposed a recursive notion of "satisfaction of presuppositions" to address the challenges posed by compound sentences (Lewerentz, 2021). But compound sentences are difficult, and there's no simple way to figure out their presuppositions (Grove, 2022). Recent studies challenge earlier claims about presupposition triggers. For example, Djärv and Bacovcin (2020) refuted the idea that prosody alone governs presupposition projection. They demonstrated that lexical triggers and contextual factors significantly influence presuppositions (Simons et al., 2017; Abrusán 2016; Roberts, 2012; Simons, 2022). Similarly, Schlenker (2021) proposed a "triggering algorithm" to explain how cognitive processes and contextual cues generate presuppositions, even from seemingly insignificant phrases.

In contrast to Bale's (2007) assertion that presuppositions are dictated by verb kinds, Smith & Yu (2022) investigate presuppositions about sentence agents. Khanaif sawy (2022) emphasized the importance of shared cultural understanding when translating presuppositions from Arabic to English. These findings illustrate how presuppositions extend beyond the literal meaning, requiring contextual and cultural considerations for effective communication.

Blumberg (2023) criticized theories that allow the main sentence to bind the presuppositions of subordinate clauses, arguing that such models fail to account for the complex relationships between speaker meaning, context, and presuppositions. In a study of Joe Biden's victory speech, Lathar et al. (2023) showed how lexical triggers, particularly noun phrases, conveyed presuppositions that shaped the audience's interpretation. Panizza (2024) explored how presupposition breaches in indirect speech can deviate from the speaker's intended meaning, underscoring the interplay between grammar, pragmatics, and presuppositions.

Yule (1996) categorized presuppositions into six types: existential, factual, non-factual, lexical, structural, and counterfactual. These categories capture various presuppositional phenomena, from sentence construction to truth values. Recognizing how presuppositions transcend literal meaning enhances our understanding of language's capacity to convey complex ideas (Karttunen, 1974; Strawson, 1950).

This study advances linguistic theory by providing a deeper understanding of presuppositions' effects on communication (Lathar et al., 2023). By exploring how

presuppositions operate beyond the speaker's intent, the research contributes to pragmatics and linguistic theory (Sánchez & Campos, 2019). The findings have practical implications for language teaching, particularly in developing pedagogical approaches to enhance students' pragmatic competence (Alsuhaibani, 2022). Moreover, the study underscores the importance of presuppositions in intercultural communication, showing how they influence perceptions, power dynamics (Rothschild, 2011) and interpretations across cultural contexts (Farini, 2011). Upon all, the study seeks the answers, and thus, the following are the research questions of the study: 1). how can presuppositions extend beyond the speaker's intended meaning in real-world communication scenarios? 2). how do presuppositions interact with other linguistic components in speech structures? 3). how do presuppositions appear in discourse? 4). How do presuppositions interact with other linguistic elements in discourse?

## METHODOLOGY

### *Design*

This study used a mixed methods approach that combined qualitative analysis with case studies to investigate how presuppositions influence communication (Subedi, 2016; Ivankova et al., 2006; Li et al., 2015). First, conversational evaluation gathered data qualitatively on the functioning of presuppositions in explicit and implicit contexts. Case studies explored the cases in which presuppositions played a role in meaning. Evaluation of assumptions brought a deeper understanding of all contexts of communication, increasing the validity of the study (Capone, 2017). The research questions reflected the focus of the study.

### *Data collection and instrument*

The researcher collected written and spoken communication samples to improve comprehension of how presuppositions function in different situations. Based on several factors, specific videos were chosen for spoken communication. Initially, to represent a variety of presuppositional usage, the conversations and speeches needed to include various people and contexts. The researcher selected a casual discussion between two friends, Tom and Sarah, from Helena Daily English on YouTube, as it presented some informal, common language rich in implicit meanings. An interview between Robbie and Asia from the IELTS Blog was selected as an additional video to investigate formal spoken interaction and

exemplify how presuppositions develop during organized conversations. Thus, it is clear that the author functions as a human instrument.

Furthermore, a public speech by Mr. Anand Mahindra, presented at a virtual graduation ceremony at Dhirubhai Ambani International School, was included because of its formal and inspirational background, offering perceptions of public discourse presuppositions. The videos were chosen to thoroughly analyze presuppositional effects due to their diversity in formality, context, and communication goal. This range allowed the study to investigate how presuppositions function differently in speech, conversation, and interview contexts, providing a more thorough knowledge of their function in various spoken circumstances.

The author chose a variety of texts for textual communication according to three primary standards: genre, formality, and context. The personal narrative style of Pratap's piece "My First School Teacher" from *Indian Stories For All* was selected because it provides insights into storytelling presuppositions. The article "A Threat To Bananas" from the British Council (n.d) addressed the presuppositions in informational texts analytically and factually. Finally, a literary excerpt of *The Night At The Hotel* by Siegfried Lenz was selected because of its usage of presuppositions in fictional conversations. These texts were selected to study various communication styles thoroughly due to their diverse forms.

### ***Data analysis techniques***

Discourse and pragmatic analysis are the primary data analysis methods the researcher used in this study. The main goals of discourse analysis are to locate presupposition triggers, assess their frequency, and investigate how presuppositions interact with other linguistic components in discourse structures. While pragmatics examines how presuppositions influence pragmatic interpretation in communication and implicatures, as well as the contextual implications of these concepts. Hence, the present research attempted to clarify the complex connection between speaker meaning and presupposition effects by using these approaches meticulously using qualitative and quantitative analysis.

***Qualitative Analysis:*** The discourse analysis approach is qualitative by nature since it looks closely at how language is used in conversation. The research aims to find presupposition triggers, comprehend their interactions with other linguistic elements, and examine their function in discourse structures. The qualitative component resides in the

interpretive component of discourse analysis, in which the researcher aims to comprehend the underlying meanings, patterns, and purposes of presuppositions within the context of communication. Pragmatic analysis is also qualitative because it explores how communication interprets meaning. The study investigates how presuppositions impact implicatures, pragmatic interpretation, and contextual implications. Analyzing how speakers communicate meaning that goes beyond the words themselves, considering the speaker's context and implied intentions, is known as pragmatic analysis. This study is qualitative because it necessitates the interpretation of nuanced context-specific details and intricate levels of meaning.

**Quantitative Analysis:** Discourse analysis includes a quantitative component, even if the main techniques covered are qualitative. The quantitative component of discourse analysis is evaluating the occurrence of presupposition triggers. This entails calculating the frequency with which they appear within a given dataset to gain a more structured, quantifiable knowledge of the prevalence of specific presuppositions and possible trends within discourse. Together with the qualitative insights gleaned from the entire discourse analysis, this quantitative analysis aids in developing more objective, data-driven conclusions.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *Result*

**Conversation between Tom and Sarah adopted from (YouTube, 2024).**

### *Implied meanings in contextual understanding*

Presuppositions typically go well beyond the intention of the speaker in many significant exchanges like that between Tom and Sarah. For instance, in Tom's question, "Do you have any brothers or sisters?" he assumes that Sarah has at least one sister. The idea carries along the presupposition even though the response could merely affirm or deny siblings. Sarah's "No, I don't have any siblings" makes the presupposition false, under the condition that she has no brothers and sisters at all. Later studies have demonstrated that speakers do utilize presuppositions to carry shared knowledge, as when Sarah replied, "Yes, I have one brother." The phrase "his name is Jack" presupposes her brother's name is relevant, even though Tom's question is ambiguous. Such presuppositions make communication more efficient but may lead to confusion if out of place.

Presuppositions can be used to influence the listener's understanding of the context of the conversation. Here, Tom establishes a mutual reference point by saying, "Emily is shorter than Jack," without asking Sarah anything. This presupposition shows how the speaker's presuppositions are projected beyond what is actually said.

### ***Presuppositions and syntactic structures***

Presuppositions in speech refer to things like negations, questions, and comparisons. Presuppositions in different grammatical structures are also a part of Tom and Sarah's conversation. For example, in Tom's utterance "Emily is shorter than Jack", there is a presupposition that their height is relevant, but he does not explain why that matters. He does not explicate the importance of height in the conversation. It must be deduced by the hearer.

Presuppositions usually co-occur with question forms to provide implicit context. For example, when Tom asks, "Do you live with your parents and brother?" it presupposes that Sarah's family structure is familiar or significant. The exchange of information is more than a question; it subtly starts to frame how the listener views Sarah's family life. Negative statements have implications. Sarah calling Jack "not chubby" suggests weight is a relevant concern. The denial suggests that either Tom or the listener might have had preconceived ideas regarding Jack's appearance. Speakers enrich conversation by subtly negotiating the expectations of society through the interplay of presuppositions and concealment.

### ***Presuppositions in conversational dynamics***

Presuppositions are subtle aspects of dialogue that color how people view each other. They come in the form of implicit comparisons, shared cultural knowledge, or unspoken truths. Tom believes that Sarah knows her brother's age when he asks, "How old is your brother?" This is an indication of how presuppositions are helpful in interactions; without them, there would not be a smooth flow of communication. Also, they mostly occur in topics at hand. Implicitly, Sarah's utterance, "Jack is funny," presupposes that his sense of humor is appropriate to the situation. Tom's remark about Emily, "sometimes a little shy with new people", takes for granted that the addressee is familiar with shyness as a condition of which people's experience and conduct are reasonably socially consequential. These examples demonstrate how presuppositions are sprinkled throughout the normal talk and encode common sense concerning people and social life. Presupposition notions abound in talk. Encounters not infrequently contain at least one presupposition such as shared experience or

previous knowledge. For instance, a comparison of the height of siblings presupposes that physical characteristics or abilities matter.

### ***Presuppositions and pragmatic inference***

Presuppositions in conversation have to do with grammar, implicature, context, and deixis. For instance, if Tom says, "My parents, sister, and I live in an apartment," it presupposes that the audience already knows he lives with his family and is part of that family structure. The presupposition here mirrors cultural norms concerning living situations and family structures. Presuppositions trigger with deixis or context-dependent expressions. This proves that Sarah presumes the listener already knows based on the context given, who "we" are in "We all live together in a house"; the "that" used by Tom in "That sounds like fun" indicates the activity is understood by both parties without explicitly stating its meaning. Speakers communicate effectively by using presuppositions and deictic aspects, avoiding excessive explanations.

### ***Quantification of frequencies supporting the findings***

Presuppositions are common in ordinary language, as can be seen by how often they appear in conversation. They control almost all of the gestures made by Tom and Sarah. Of the twenty-six exchanges, twenty-one involve presuppositions. These can include simple facts like sibling ages or more complex ideas like comparisons and family dynamics. Presuppositions are rampant, which indicates they are part of the very fabric of natural language. The study puts a number on the occurrences, demonstrating how much speakers rely on presuppositions to convey meaning implicitly and effectively. This points out the importance of understanding presuppositions in language teaching, since misinterpretation may cause problems in communication, especially for second language learners who are not aware of the implicit presuppositions of the target language.

### **Interview between Robbie and Asia adopted from (IELTS-Blog, 2015).**

### ***Implied meanings in contextual understanding***

Presuppositions are crucial in communication, providing Asia's perspective on the world and influencing cultural presumptions related to childhood, development, and retribution. For example, "A happy childhood comes firstly from the parents" implies that the parents' role in a child's happiness is crucial. The statement "Technology will take over the

world fully, and the children will become lazier" criticizes contemporary parenting techniques and concerns about the decline of traditional values in the face of technological domination.

### ***Presuppositions and syntactic structures***

Linguistic structures and presuppositions play a crucial role in conversations, influencing the speaker's understanding of generational differences and societal norms. Presuppositions, conditional claims, and implicit meanings are intertwined, such as "They're supposed to be responsible" and "Well, I am on the last brick of the century." These elements, combined with metaphor, conditionality, and modality, enhance the conversation and emphasize the importance of parental responsibility and cultural transitions.

### ***Presuppositions in conversational dynamics***

Presuppositions vary in conversations from obvious to subtle. Some presuppositions in the dialog between Robbie and Asia are that childhood memories in parenting are important, witnessed by the question Robbie's character poses: "What things have you learned from your childhood about bringing up a child?" This certainly is not true for everyone. Asian's response: "It's challenging. The quote, "It's rough. All children are unique, so a kid looking just like their parents has it easy." Parenting would seem easier when parents and children share characteristics. Of course, that may not ring true with all, however, it does suggest that there might be an underlying belief here that shared characteristics make the rearing of a child easier. Presuppositions in discussions are those unsaid beliefs, that both accept without explanation to allow a smooth flow of communication. On the other hand, differences in presuppositions are at times very liable to cause misunderstanding.

### ***Presuppositions and pragmatic inference***

Presuppositions play a crucial role in discourse, influencing tense, modality, and evaluative language. In Asia's statement, she uses the modal verb "shouldn't" to express her moral stance, highlighting the presupposition that parents often lose their inhibitions. The power of the modal verb is determined by the presupposition that parents are prone to losing their inhibitions. In the statement "Well, as I said before," Asia uses the future tense to create a forward-looking vision, making the assertion sound more factual than hypothetical. The relationship between modality and presuppositions is essential in conveying morality and evaluative language.

### ***Quantification of frequencies supporting the findings***

A study can track specific presupposition types to measure their frequency and their interactions in conversation. Existential presuppositions, such as "Parents are responsible," occur seven times in the discourse. Five proactive presuppositions, such as "Technology will take over"; six lexical presuppositions, such as "They're supposed to be responsible." The respective frequencies point out the significance of presuppositions in conversational shaping and meaning. They are in dynamic interaction with modality, tense, and evaluative expressions, reflecting the worldview of Asia.

### **Public Speech by Anand Mahindra adopted from (Mahindra, 2021)**

#### ***Implied meanings in contextual understanding***

Presuppositions in speech can extend beyond the speaker's intended meaning, such as using phrases like "young friends" to establish a relationship with the audience. This presupposition suggests that the audience will accept the word of affection and emotionally connect with the message. Another presupposition is the idea that the graduating class is "special" due to their unique experiences during COVID-19. This presupposition encourages a deeper connection with the story of overcoming obstacles, strengthening the graduates' sense of togetherness. In real-world communication, presuppositions often promote rapport and shared presumptions, even when not explicitly stated.

#### ***Presuppositions and syntactic structures***

The speech uses presumptions, assertions, negations, and rhetorical devices to convey the speaker's unique experience. The speaker mentions the loss of customary graduation ceremonies but contrasts this with the class's "special" nature. The speaker also uses conditional expressions to establish a connection with the listener, implying a connection is sought and feasible. Parallel structures suggest the audience has experienced or recognized lessons from the epidemic, such as appreciation, adaptability, and empathy. These presuppositions guide the listener through introspection, acknowledgment, and confirmation, coordinating with the speech's logical flow.

#### ***Presuppositions in conversational dynamics***

Presuppositions subtly pervade the speech, manifesting as common knowledge, emotional judgments about the audience, and social norms. The speaker presumes that the

*Eragamreddy (2024)*

listener now values basic needs like "a warm bed, food on the table, and a roof over my head" more than before the epidemic. The phrase suggests a common experience among the students, but she does not ask if they have had one. Rather, she assumes they've learned the lesson: "I truly believe that all of you have now learned the hard way how to be extremely grateful." That assumption ties the speaker to a larger context. It makes the speaker an accustomed figure, which brings him closer to the listener. The presuppositions also frame the future. "You are the luckiest class in history" implies something about the audience's future view of their experiences. It assumes that their current challenges will be viewed as an opportunity for growth, which could perhaps shape students' views of the future.

### ***Presuppositions and pragmatic inference***

The speech's persuasiveness is enhanced by its use of presuppositions, which are often intertwined with other language devices like modality, temporal references, and metaphors. The speaker uses phrases like "you will remember" to emphasize the lasting impact of the lessons learned. Metaphors like "life turned upside down" are used to connect with the audience's emotions and foster understanding. The speaker also uses rhetorical techniques like acknowledgment and praise to validate the audience's efforts. For example, when the speaker commends the pupils for their "grit and courage," it is assumed they demonstrated these qualities, demonstrating the courage and significance of their sacrifices.

### ***Quantification of frequencies supporting the findings***

*Presuppositions of Shared Experience:* The speaker and audience share a story buttressed by at least eight references to shared experiences during the epidemic.

*Presuppositions of Positive Outcomes:* Many feel the pandemic taught very important lessons despite challenges, for it is in adversity that resilience and development are born.

*Assumptions of Future Success:* The speaker makes five assumptions about the pupils' success, usually with the help of modal verbs such as "will" and "can," which sets a very positive tone for the story.

*Emotional Response Presuppositions:* The speech includes seven emotional presuppositions about resilience, empathy, and gratitude, encouraging listeners to reflect on their emotional journey.

**Article by Pratap adopted from (Pratap, 2007).**

***Implied meanings in contextual understanding***

In Pratap's story, the presuppositions carry deeper messages, creating strong psychological and emotional connections. For example, when he describes Hazarilal as "fair, tall, and handsome," it suggests that those traits are inherently admirable—authority, knowledge, and respect. The speaker, however, is going to show how these features affected him about the instructor, not just presenting their physical aspects. This means that in that culture, respect toward authority figures is based on appearance. Although Pratap and Gargi hold different memories of Hazarilal, the latter's pleasure in knowing him as a teacher hints at a common emotional sense. That would suggest the speaker and the audience go back a long way hence a connection in shared feelings more than just mere facts.

***Presuppositions and syntactic structures***

Pratap's account demonstrates that presuppositions interact with linguistic elements such as time and modality in an enhancement of meaning. The use of the present tense—"I still remember"—underlines the permanence of this moment. On the other hand, "I still remember that we started with a calligraphy lesson" implies calligraphy was a big and memorable thing. The presupposition and tense combine to link past and present. Pratap also assumes his teacher's act was extraordinary: "he came to each one of us and printed the letters on our clay-washed wooden slates." This shows how the teacher is depicted as being very diligent by use of presupposition and by use of language, notably the verbs "came" and "printed". This knowledge goes beyond the speaker's words, showing deep concern and dedication.

***Presuppositions in conversational dynamics***

The story of Pratap unveils presuppositions through overt claims, writing style, and tone. Pratap feels that the good teachers enhance the experience of the students. He remembers how the teacher "remained my teacher for all four years." The way the author emphasized how the teacher made an everlasting impact brings out their significance in the whole story. Pratap deals with cultural mores and teachings, more so on the Vedas, unveiling assumptions. The Vedic teachings are assumed to be of universal benefit, for he goes on to say, ". this early grounding in the robust, scientific, far-seeing insights of our ancestors remains to this day my unshakable intellectual and spiritual foundation." This assumption—

*Eragamreddy (2024)*

that the reader values the Vedas' cultural significance—remains in the background of the conversation, though not overtly stated.

### ***Presuppositions and pragmatic inference***

The text uses presuppositions, cultural references, emotional appeals, and storytelling to create a coherent narrative. It highlights the importance of Arabic and Devanagari scripts and uses linguistic and cultural devices to raise cultural awareness. Pratap's views on the legacy of the instructor also use metaphorical language, with the statement "the finest school in the universe: the school of life" implying life as the best educator. This encourages the reader to see their experiences as education.

### ***Quantification of frequencies supporting the findings***

The text is replete with presuppositions. Presumptive sentences appear in almost every paragraph, especially in cultural and interpersonal contexts. More than 60% of the sentences bear meaning by way of emotion, personal reflection, or cultural allusions. Measuring presuppositions indicates that they influence the interpretation that readers apply to the speaker's experiences and intentions.

### **An essay on "A Threat to Bananas" adopted from the (LearnEnglish, 2019)**

#### ***Implied meanings in contextual understanding***

The essay "A Threat to Bananas" explores the complex nature of agricultural monocultures and the susceptibility of banana plantations to disease. It suggests that the short-term success of monocultures may lead businesses to overlook long-term risks, as United Fruit saved itself from bankruptcy by copying the same growing conditions. The text also suggests that scientists are "racing against the inevitable" to avert the extinction of the Cavendish banana, highlighting the unstable situation and the fragile equilibrium between short-term remedies and long-term sustainability. This suggests that agricultural sectors may neglect the possibility of future damage in their pursuit of instant profits.

#### ***Presuppositions and syntactic structures***

The essay uses presuppositions to emphasize the urgency of the situation and the potential dangers of relying too heavily on one product. It uses a warning tone and presupposition that the fungus TR-4 would spread, highlighting the vulnerability of Latin America due to its farming techniques. The article also discusses genetically modified

bananas, suggesting that while it is discussed as a potential solution, it is presupposed to be a "sophisticated version of the same temporary solution." This creates a conflict between innovation and uncertainty in the scientific debate on genetically modified crops. The essay suggests that biotechnology can be helpful, but it doesn't address the root cause of declining biodiversity. The presuppositions influence the logical structure of the story and work in conjunction with other language devices to emphasize the message's warning element.

### ***Presuppositions in conversational dynamics***

This article implies the dangers of monocultures and agricultural sustainability. For example, when it says that the Gros Michel banana was "cloned from shoots instead of seeds" in crowded fields, it suggests this method led to the fungus that destroyed the crops. It has a presupposition that views these methods, though effective, as sowing the seeds of disaster. Also, the phrase "growing practices in South East Asia haven't helped matters" indicates a better approach to dealing with the plantations. These assumptions amount to critiques of contemporary agriculture and appear in arguments regarding modifying the Cavendish variety. Even though the essay emphasizes the advantages of genetic engineering, "Racing against the inevitable" suggests defeat without significant modifications. This acknowledges the value of scientific innovation while highlighting the ineffectiveness of some techniques.

### ***Presuppositions and pragmatic inference***

The essay uses presuppositions to emphasize the urgency and threat of the current situation in agriculture. It discusses the switch from Gros Michel to Cavendish bananas, highlighting the delicate nature of monocultures and the potential consequences of dependence on them. The essay also uses statistical data to illustrate the decline of Cavendish bananas, with a 46% drop in 2015 due to TR-4 and adverse climate conditions. This recession signals the start of a significant industrial crisis, making the reader aware of the insecurity of the situation. The essay also discusses TR-4-resistant plants, suggesting that even genetically altered bananas may not be a long-term solution. This highlights the weakness of technological solutions in the context of disease and biological evolution, emphasizing the need for warning and addressing the limitations of current techniques in agriculture.

### ***Quantification of frequencies supporting the findings***

*Eragamreddy (2024)*

*Agricultural Vulnerability Presuppositions:* The article points out that monocultures are susceptible to disease, especially regarding the spread of Fusarium and the switch from Gros Michel to Cavendish bananas, which is stated almost eight times.

*Presuppositions of Inevitability:* Five scenarios indicate that the extinction of the Cavendish banana is very likely, mostly because of the spread of TR-4 and insufficient current farming methods.

*Presuppositions of Scientific Uncertainty:* The four presuppositions of unpredictability in genetic modifications of bananas reveal that changes can delay challenges but won't provide permanent solutions.

### **A Literary Excerpt of the Night at the Hotel by (Lenz, 1995a)**

#### ***Implied meanings in contextual understanding***

In "The Night at the Hotel," presuppositions in everyday conversation extend beyond the speaker's explicit meaning and create multiple levels of character knowledge. Schwamm's attempts to address his son's sensitivity to not getting a wave from other train travelers are implicitly aimed at addressing the problem. However, the conversation with a stranger reveals a presupposition beyond this goal, as the stranger unexpectedly acknowledges the boy's feelings and meets them, giving an unexpected thrill. This hypothetical situation demonstrates how presuppositions can influence feelings and behaviors beyond anticipated effects. The stranger's wave evokes a deeper connection to humanity, highlighting the active role of presuppositions in both speakers' and listeners' thoughts and feelings.

#### ***Presuppositions and syntactic structures***

The narrative features implicit presuppositions in language elements such as inquiries, declarative assertions, and conversational tone. The night receptionist presupposes that Schwamm is another customer searching for a hotel room, emphasizing efficiency and involvement. Schwamm's conversation with a stranger is marked by categorical remarks, such as "They took away my wife" and "Children mean nothing to me," implying Schwamm is aware of the stranger's seriousness. These statements engage with conversational components like hesitations, queries, and indirect remarks, covering up more profound feelings or unspoken ideas. Presuppositions often communicate with discourse markers, allowing the

listener to conclude from both stated and inferred information. This connection enhances the character's intentions and emotional environment.

### ***Presuppositions in conversational dynamics***

As the story develops, presuppositions come to the surface as tacit expectations in the discourse. One belief is that Schwamm will wave to his son, but this is upset when a stranger does so. Schumann tries to appease his son and does it with the line "Herr Schwamm, won't you relieve the poor boy's anguish by waving on the morning train?" That assumption is beneath Schumann's action and influences reader expectations. The story also brings in presuppositions with rhetorical questions and implicit remarks. For example, when the stranger asks, "Why should I care? Children mean nothing to me," we get a sense of detachment and tragedy. Those kinds of presuppositions bring much deeper psychological complexities to light and show how discourse can reveal and conceal meaning.

### ***Presuppositions and pragmatic inference***

Presuppositions are crucial language elements in Schwamm's interactions, implying uncertainty and nuanced meanings. They are not present in an empty environment and are combined with pragmatic markers like pauses and hesitations. The unexpected statement from the stranger, "Don't turn on the light," blends with obscurity and silence to create an anxious atmosphere. The final reaction of the stranger, waving to Schwamm's son, complicates previous presuppositions about the stranger's nature, highlighting a deeper foundation of empathy. These language components reinforce basic presuppositions about human relationships and fragile nature.

### ***Quantification of frequencies supporting the findings***

Schwamm repeatedly expresses his desire for his child's happiness throughout the narrative, both explicitly and implicitly.

- Expressly mentioned (e.g., Schwamm outlining his justification for the trip): Three instances.
- Referred to implicitly (e.g., through the rhetorical questions posed by the stranger): Four instances.
- Presupposed but not stated explicitly (e.g., Schwamm's inner feelings): Two instances.

Recurrent events reveal the frequency of presuppositions' influence on discourse, allowing readers to follow the progression of meaning beyond obvious events, highlighting their constant shape in plots and character connections.

### ***Discussion***

#### ***Extending beyond intended meaning***

As seen by the conversations, speeches, and literary excerpts examined, presuppositions frequently go beyond the speaker's explicit communication, constructing nuanced meanings that affect comprehension and engagement. During their talk, Tom asks Sarah a straightforward inquiry about her brothers but inadvertently adds layers of meaning regarding Sarah's family (Youtube, 2024b). Similarly, Robbie and Asia's conversation demonstrates how cultural presuppositions impact communication, such as those around technology and children (IELTS-Blog, 2015). These results are consistent with the notion set forward by Stalnaker (1974), according to which presuppositions function in the shared space between speakers, enabling them to deduce meanings that are not explicitly expressed. The public speech by Anand (Mahindra, 2021) is another example of how presuppositions may improve rapport with audiences since terms like "young friends" imply familiarity and attachment. This result is consistent with Yule's (1996) theory that, by avoiding explicit declarations, presuppositions can improve communication efficiency and build rapport between speakers and listeners.

The research also shows that presumptions can cause miscommunication when the presuppositions that underlie a conversation are not revealed, as Pratap's story (2007) regarding different perspectives on Hazarilal's character illustrates. This is consistent with Levinson's (1983) research, which suggests that misaligned presuppositions can obstruct successful communication when standard information is wrongly inferred. The presuppositions in "The Night at the Hotel" show how implicit meanings impact feelings and actions even when not expressed explicitly. Despite the apparent resentment, Schwamm's interaction with the stranger highlights empathy and our shared humanity (Lenz, 1995). This indicates the dual potential of presuppositions to encourage connection or misunderstanding. It also coincides with Stalnaker's (1974) theory, which says presuppositions impact interactions by constructing common ground and contrasts with Levinson's (1983) worry about miscommunication from unshared presuppositions. By analyzing these instances, it

becomes evident that although presuppositions enhance communication, there is a possibility of misunderstanding or ambiguity. These results imply that implicit shared meanings play a significant role in real-world communication. However, these interpretations must be meticulously negotiated to prevent misunderstandings.

### ***Interaction with Speech Structures***

The study shows that presuppositions interact with questions, negations, and comparison structures, among other language elements, to enhance meaning in speech. This conversation was demonstrated in the Tom and Sarah conversation (YouTube, 2024), where the remark "Emily is shorter than Jack" suggests a belief about the value of height but fails to clarify its meaning. This is consistent with theories of comparison structures, which employ implicit presuppositions to convey information (Levinson, 1983). Presuppositions can serve as indicators of social norms and duties, as demonstrated by the usage of modality in the interview between Robbie and Asia (IELTS-Blog, 2015) through the statement, "They're supposed to be responsible" are made. Asia's remark reinforces the notion that modality interacts with presuppositions to form social narratives by drawing on cultural expectations regarding parental duty (von Fintel, 2001). This is consistent with earlier research on the inconspicuous methods in which modal verbs (Palmer, 2001) bring cultural values into discourse. In his public lecture, Mahindra (202) uses parallel structures and conditional assertions, which presuppose that listeners have experienced comparable loss and adaptability throughout the epidemic. For example, the claim that graduates were members of a "special" class even if they missed customary ceremonies highlights questions about shared cultural experiences. This demonstrates Yule's (1996) finding that presuppositions guide listeners through implicit comprehension, which connects individual and group encounters.

Temporal presuppositions, such as "I still remember" in Pratap's story (2007), highlight the ongoing significance of previous events, supporting Stalnaker's (1978) and Kravchenko's (2017) research on how tense may embed presuppositions into speech and reinforce emotional impact. This is reflected in the passage from Lenz's (1995) story 'The Night at the Hotel,' which exemplifies how categorical claims frequently presuppose common comprehension without additional clarification. Therefore, these results imply that presuppositions function as subtle procedures that direct the listener's comprehension and improve communication by encoding implicit meaning, consistent with more general theories of language.

***Appearance of presuppositions in discourse***

Presuppositions serve as underlying presumptions in language, implicitly affecting interpretation skills (Ouerchefani et al., 2024), creating agreed understandings, and directing the flow of speech. This is seen in the video discussion between Tom and Sarah (YouTube, 2024) when Tom asks Sarah how old her brother is, presupposing that family members' characteristics are interesting subjects of conversation. This supports the theory by Stalnaker (1974) that presuppositions develop from mutual understanding and make interactions easier by lowering the need for explicit explication. In the same way, presuppositions are included in Robbie's question on parenting skills learned from childhood in Asia and Robbie's interview (IELTS-Blog, 2015), which implies that a person's background shapes how they bring up their children. This is consistent with the idea presented by Levinson (1983) of presuppositions as practical deductions made from conversational implicature, in which implicit information is employed to establish a relationship and balance perspectives between the speaker and the listener.

Presuppositions on common incidents during the epidemic are used as rhetorical strategies in Anand Mahindra's speech (Mahindra, 2021) to promote emotional connection. Mahindra exemplifies how presuppositions create shared narratives in public speaking by presupposing that the audience admires appreciation for essential needs more than previously. This is consistent with van Dijk's (1989) claim that presuppositions are essential in forming ideological frameworks and describing collective experiences in speech. The work written by Pratap (2007) presupposes that Vedic teachings are universally significant, which represents cultural presuppositions. Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness, which holds that speakers retain countenance by adopting culturally relevant presuppositions and increasing relationship dynamics in conversation, is consistent with the connection between presupposition and cultural references.

Similarly, presuppositions regarding ineffective procedures are employed to criticize farming methods in "A Threat to Bananas" ((LearnEnglish, 2019), carefully placing the reader in the position of criticizing these practices. This is consistent with the critical discourse analysis approach of Fairclough (2013), which emphasizes how presuppositions influence beliefs in text and direct interpretation. Finally, presuppositions about thoughts and intentions are incorporated into character conversation in Lenz's *Night at the Hotel* (1995), quietly

exposing the psychological complexities. As demonstrated by the rhetorical question "Why should I care?" which presupposes emotional detachment, Goffman's (1981) theory of frame analysis describes how people maintain their social roles and communicate in their inner emotions due to their presuppositions.

### ***Interaction with other linguistic elements***

The study's analysis of various texts and conversations demonstrates the complex relationship between presuppositions and other linguistic components in speech. Presuppositions coexist with deixis in Tom and Sarah's conversation. For example, Sarah employs the word "we," implying that everyone knows who is involved in this statement (Youtube, 2024). This is consistent with previous research on presupposition theory by Levinson (1983), which highlighted the importance of context in comprehending deictic references. The discussion demonstrates how presuppositions often function following implicit assumptions about family systems, consistent with cross-cultural research on politeness and presupposition in social hierarchies conducted by Brown and Levinson (1987). Modality and presuppositions interact in Robbie and Asia's conversation; for example, "should" suggests moral responsibilities (IELTS-Blog, 2015). This is consistent with the modal verb's reliance on common cultural standards, as per Lyons' (1977) concept of modality and its presuppositional power. Asia's observation that parents get impatient emphasizes how social expectations form presuppositions. This is confirmed by Simons's (2003) theory that presuppositions result from prevailing societal views.

In his public speech (Mahindra, 2021), he shows how language techniques may enhance the effect of presuppositions by combining them with metaphors. His remark on "life's lessons" presupposes that everyone views challenges as teaching opportunities. This aligns with Talmy's (2000) research on metaphor and cognition, which shows how metaphors strengthen preconceptions as they form conceptual frameworks. Presuppositions about the cultural relevance of texts connect with metaphorical language in Pratap's (2007) article. According to the research by Fairclough (2003), presuppositions can define ideological viewpoints in conversation. This is consistent with his findings. Comparably, the presupposition of an imminent agricultural disaster blends with statistical facts in the article "A Threat to Bananas" (LearnEnglish, 2019), connecting with economic research on risk communication, as demonstrated in Mahmoudi and Knierim (2015). Finally, presuppositions

are employed in declarative discourse and tone in the (Lenz, 1995b) literary excerpt to show how language produces ambiguity and suspense. This supports Austin's speech act theory (1975), which investigates presuppositions' role in the illocutionary force.

## CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

### *Conclusion*

This research investigated four main questions: In real-world communication, presuppositions go beyond the speaker's intended meaning; they also interact with speech patterns, appear in discourse, and work with other language components. According to the theory, presuppositions gently enhance communication by including implicit meanings that interact with linguistic structures to direct comprehension, build relationships, and elicit common cultural knowledge. Key findings indicate that, as Tom and Sarah's interaction demonstrates, presuppositions regularly function alongside comparisons, negations, and queries, enhancing speech by incorporating implicit meanings. Similarly, in Robbie and Asia's conversation, presumptions form social expectations through their interaction with modality and deixis. Presuppositions blend with claims and metaphors in speech to generate a shared experience. The article «A Threat to Bananas» contributes to the article's general warning tone by employing critical language and underlying presuppositions, highlighting the urgency of taking immediate action to solve the problems facing the agriculture industry. Presuppositions heighten emotional and cultural relevance in the story and Lenz literary excerpt, directing the reader through implicit comprehension of character motives and social standards. According to the research, presuppositions are essential to everyday communication and significantly impact social dynamics and interpretation. They serve as cognitive efficiencies that gently direct comprehension and communication. These results are consistent with general pragmatic theories, highlighting presuppositions' role in enhancing discourse and establishing shared meaning.

### *Limitation*

The study highlights several limitations. First, a mixed-method approach that combines qualitative and quantitative analyses may lack generalizability due to the limited sample size and potential subjectivity. Second, the focus on specific forms of discourse—conversations, interviews, political speeches, articles, literary texts, essays, and casual

*Eragamreddy (2024)*

conversations—limits the scope of the research. Broader data from online interactions, promotional materials, academic writing, and legal documents would help generalize the findings. This study further does not explain in detail how the cultural and social contexts of the listeners influence presupposition interpretation. This limits its applicability in varied communicative settings. Future research might address such limitations by using more data sources, having a broader participant background, and developing a more comprehensive methodology.

### ***Implication***

This study focuses on the role of presuppositions in shaping communication. It provides practical insights for discourse analysis, language teaching, and cross-cultural communication. Knowledge of how presuppositions interact with modality, deixis, and other linguistic components can help improve pragmatic competence in learners. This information may help create a more thorough grasp of how language works in various contexts. Future research could expand data collection to include a broader range of discourse and textual sources, such as debates and storytelling, to understand spoken language presuppositions better. It also highlights the impact of presuppositions on cross-cultural communication, suggesting that recognizing cultural influences can reduce misinterpretations and improve mutual understanding. Moreover, discourse analysts can apply these results to discover more profound meanings in media texts, political rhetoric, and literary works.

### **COMPETING INTERESTS**

The author declares no competing interests. This research was conducted independently, and no financial or other relationships could potentially bias the interpretation or presentation of the findings.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The author extends sincere gratitude to Mrs. Haseena Begum. K for her invaluable assistance in obtaining the full text of the literary excerpt of Siegfried Lenz used for the current study. Her assistance made possible to the current investigation.

### **BIO-PROFILE**

Dr. Nagamurali Eragamreddy is a seasoned educator with 26 years of teaching experience, currently a senior lecturer at the University of Technology and Applied Sciences, Salalah,

*Eragamreddy (2024)*

Sultanate of Oman. He holds a PhD in Linguistics and has extensive expertise in English Language Teaching (ELT), Linguistics, and Semantics. His research focuses on pragmatic markers, language skills development through technology, and the impact of semantics on communication. With over two decades of teaching experience, Dr. Eragamreddy has authored numerous publications in reputed journals, covering topics like Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) and digital integration in language education. He actively contributes to international journals and continues influencing academic discourse through his scholarly work.

## REFERENCES

- Abdulabbas, I. A. (2020). A pragmatic analysis of presupposition in mata najwa. *Indian Journal of Economics and Business*, 19(1), 91–97. [http://www.ashwinanokha.com/resources/7.ijeb ijeb 1.pdf](http://www.ashwinanokha.com/resources/7.ijeb%20ijeb%201.pdf)
- Abrusán, M. (2016). Presupposition cancellation: Explaining the 'soft-hard' trigger distinction. *Natural Language Semantics*, 24(2), 165–202. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-016-9122-7>
- Allan, K. (2014). *Linguistic meaning*. London: Routledge.
- Alsuhaibani, Z. (2020). Developing EFL students' pragmatic competence: The case of compliment responses. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820913539>, 26(5), 847–866. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820913539>
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bale, A. C. (2007). Quantifiers and verb phrases: An exploration of propositional complexity. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 25, 447-483. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-007-9019-8>
- Blumberg, K. (2023). Attitudes, presuppositions, and the binding theory. *Journal of Semantics*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffad007>
- Blutner, R. (1998). *Lexical pragmatics*. *Journal of Semantics*, 15(2), 115–162. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/15.2.115>
- British Council. (n.d.). *A threat to bananas*. Retrieved 1 May 2024, from <https://learnenglish.britishcouncil.org/skills/reading/c1-reading/threat-bananas>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (No. 4). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Capone, A. (2017). Presuppositions as conversational phenomena. *Lingua*, 198, 22–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2017.06.014>
- Clair, R. N. St. (1982). The contexts of language. In R. N. St. Clair & H. Giles (Eds.), *The social and psychological contexts of language* (pp. 23–50). Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203780848>
- Djärv, K., & Bacovcin, H. A. (2020). Prosodic effects on factive presupposition projection. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 169, 61–85. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.04.011>
- Eragamreddy, N. (2024). Navigating implicit meanings: The pragmatic function of presuppositions in communication. *International Journal of Linguistics and Translation Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlts.v5i3.463>
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Farini, F. (2011). *Cultures of education in action: Research on the relationship between interaction and cultural presuppositions regarding education in an international*

- educational setting. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(8), 2176–2186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.02.001>
- Fitriani, E. S. (2021). The presupposition triggers in thesis abstract. *International Journal of English and Applied Linguistics (IJEAL)*, 1(3), 283–290. <https://doi.org/10.47709/ijeal.v1i3.1273>
- Ghafoory, D. S., & Miran, L. D. (2022). The realization of presupposition triggers in the types of presupposition in articles by non-native English writers. *Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities*, 29(10, 2), 64–95. <https://doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.29.10.2.2022.25>
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Grove, J. (2022). Presupposition projection as a scope phenomenon. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 15(15), 1–39. <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.15.15>
- Grunig, J. E. (2017). Symmetrical presuppositions in public relations. In C. H. Botan (Ed.), *Public relations theory* (pp. 17–44). Routledge. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351225748>
- Haspelmath, M. (2020). Human linguisticity and the building blocks of languages. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10(January), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03056>
- Hussien, A. L., & Mohammed, H. I. (2022). Presupposition triggers: Iraqi EFL students' strategies in approaching presuppositions. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 7(5), 114–122. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.75.19>
- Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 3–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05282260>
- IELTS-Blog. (2015). *Speaking Test 1 with Asia (transcript)*. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5HjLHnjhVjc&ab\\_channel=IELTS-Blog](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5HjLHnjhVjc&ab_channel=IELTS-Blog)
- Ijabah, N., & Argina, A. W. (2022). Understanding advertiser's intention: The analysis of presupposition triggers in advertisement. *Acitya: Journal of Teaching and Education*, 4(2), 320–338. <https://doi.org/10.30650/ajte.v4i2.3237>
- Jerome, R. K., & Jauro, L. B. (2022). Analysis of presupposition in selected speeches of Martin Luther King. *International Arab Journal of English for Specific Purposes (IAJESP)*, 5(1), 54–67. <https://revues.imist.ma/index.php/IAJESP/article/download/31980/16623>
- Kahfi, R. A. Al, Rosdiana, A., & Santos, M. R. (2024). Analysis of pragmatic presupposition of characters in Disney's Luca film. *Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 7(2), 249–265. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24176/kredo.v7i2.12302>
- Karttunen, L. (1974). Presupposition and linguistic context. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 1(1–3), 181–194. <https://doi.org/10.1515/thli.1974.1.1-3.181>
- Khanaif sawy, A. N. A. AL. (2022). A pragmatic study of presupposition in Imam Ali's some selected translated sayings in 'Nahjul Balagha'. *Eastern Journal of Languages, Linguistics and Literatures (EJLLL)*, 3(4), 37–49. <https://www.qabasjournals.com/index.php/ejlll/article/download/94/102>
- Kravchenko, N. K. (2017). Indirect speech acts via conversational implicatures and pragmatic presuppositions. *Cognition, Communication, Discourse*, 14, 54–66. <https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2017-14-05>

- Lathar, V., Shet, J. P., Paulina, C. J., Vennila, S., Moorthi, S., Mony, R. R., Raj, S. P., Fatima, A. R., & Divya, C. (2023). An analysis of presuppositions in the victory speech of president Joe Biden. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(5), 299–309. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n5p299>
- Lenz, S. (1995). *The selected stories of Siegfried Lenz* (M. Reon. (Ed.)). Northwestern University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. C. (2024). The dark matter of pragmatics. In M. J. Culpeper & Haugh (Eds.), *The dark matter of pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009489584>
- Lewerentz, L. (2021). *Situations, presuppositions, and contexts*. University of Oxford.
- Li, J., & Sun, Y. (2018). Presuppositions as discourse strategies in court examinations. *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, 3(2), 197–212. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijld-2018-2008>
- Li, L., Worch, E., Zhou, Y., & Aguiton, R. (2015). How and why digital generation teachers use technology in the classroom: An explanatory sequential mixed methods study. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 9(2), 9. <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2015.090209>
- Liu, Y., Huang, Q. & Li, X. (2024). Review of inquiries in philosophical pragmatics. Theoretical developments. *Corpus Pragmatics* 8, 161–165. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41701-02300161-y>
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Vol. 2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahindra, A. (2021). *Anand Mahindra: Life changing motivational speech*. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HF8w15f1dj4>
- Macagno, F. & Bigi, S. (2017). Understanding misunderstandings. Presuppositions and presumptions in doctor-patient chronic care consultations. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 14(1), 49-75. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2017-0003>
- Mahmoudi, H., & Knierim, A. (2015). Risk communication for farmers' adaptation to climate change: A new task for agricultural advisory services. *International Journal of Performability Engineering*, 11(6), 533.
- Makasiahe, A. K. (2020). *The usage and types of presupposition in 'CNN' Twitter social media: Pragmatics approach* [Putera Batam University]. [http://repository.upbatam.ac.id/344/1/cover s.d bab III.pdf](http://repository.upbatam.ac.id/344/1/cover%20s.d%20bab%20III.pdf)
- Ouerchefani, R., Ouerchefani, N., Rejeb, M. R. B., & Le Gall, D. (2024). Pragmatic language comprehension: Role of theory of mind, executive functions, and the prefrontal cortex. *Neuropsychologia*, 194, 108756. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2023.108756>
- Panizza, D. (2024). Presuppositions in indirect reports: A window into the semantics/pragmatics interface. In R. Capone, A., Perconti, P., Graci (Ed.), *Philosophy, cognition and pragmatics* (pp. 269–293). Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-50109-8\\_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-50109-8_15)
- Peter, C. A., Mukuthuria, M., & Muriungi, P. (2016). The use of presupposition in the creation of socio-political dominance in Kenyan parliamentary debates between 1992 and 2010. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(24), 154–172.

- <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1112919.pdf>
- Polyzou, A. (2015). Presupposition in discourse: Theoretical and methodological issues. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 12(2), 123–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2014.991796>
- Potts, C. (2015). Presupposition and implicature. In S. Lappin & C. Fox (Eds.), *Handbook of contemporary semantic theory* (pp.168-202). Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118882139.ch6>
- Pratap. (2007). *Indian storied for all: My first school teacher*. <https://partapstoriesforall.blogspot.com/2008/11/my-first-school-teacher.html>
- Reinecke, R. (2021). *Presuppositions: An experimental investigation* [Université de Lyon]. <https://www.theses.fr/2020LYSEN067>
- Roberts, C. (2012). Information structure in discourse: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 5(6), 1–69. <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.5.6>
- Rothschild, D. (2011). Explaining presupposition projection with dynamic semantics. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 4(3), 1–43. <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.4.3>
- Sánchez, L., & Campos, M. (2019). Epistemological presuppositions in communication theory. In M. Bergman, K. Kirtiklis, & J. Siebers (Eds.), *Models of communication: Theoretical and philosophical approaches* (pp. 34–46). Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315231402-3>
- Sbisà, M. (1999). Presupposition, implicature and context in text understanding. In F. Bouquet, P., Benerecetti, M., Serafini, L., Brézillon, P., Castellani (Ed.), *Modeling and using context. CONTEXT 1999. Lecture notes in computer science* (Vol. 1688, Issue May, pp. 324–338). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48315-2\\_25](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48315-2_25)
- Schlenker, P. (2021). Triggering presuppositions. *Glossa*, 6(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.5334/GJGL.1352>
- Simons, M. (2003). Presupposition and accommodation: Understanding the Stalnakerian picture. *Philosophical Studies*, 112, 251-278. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023004203043>
- Simons, M. (2013). On the conversational basis of some presuppositions. In A. Capone, F. Lo Piparo & M. Carapezza (Eds.), *Perspectives on linguistic pragmatics* (Vol. 2, pp. 329–348). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-01014-4\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-01014-4_13)
- Simons, M. (2022). On Heim's on the projection problem for presuppositions. In L. McNally & Z. G. Szabó (Eds.), *A reader's guide to classic papers in formal semantics: Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy, vol 100* (Vol. 100, pp. 155–170). Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85308-2\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85308-2_9)
- Simons, M., Beaver, D., Roberts, C., & Tonhauser, J. (2017). The best question: Explaining the projection behavior of factives. *Discourse Processes*, 54(3), 187–206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163853X.2016.1150660>
- Smith, R. W., & Yu, J. (2022). Agentless presuppositions and the semantics of verbal roots. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 40(3), 875–909. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-021-09524-z>
- Song, Y., & Wang, S. (2022). The application of pragmatic presupposition in developing critical thinking of writing. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 45(4), 583–595.

Eragamreddy (2024)

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1515/CJAL-2022-0406>

- Stalnaker, R. (1974). Pragmatic Presuppositions. In M. Munitz & P. Unger (Eds.), *Semantics and Philosophy* (pp. 197-214). New York: New York University Press.
- Stalnaker, R. (1978). Assertion. In P. Cole (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics* (Vol. 9, pp. 315-332). Cambridge: Academic Press.
- Stalnaker, R. (2002). Common ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 25(5–6), 701–721. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1020867916902>
- Strawson, P. F. (1950). On referring. *Mind*, 59(235), 320–344. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351153607-8>
- Subedi, D. (2016). Explanatory sequential mixed method design as the third research community of knowledge claim. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 4(7), 570-577. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-4-7-10>
- Syafaat, M., & Saragih, G. (2024). Types of presupposition and derivational affix in the novel pride and prejudice by Jane Austen. *INFERENCE: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.30998/inference.v6i1.14643>
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics* (Vol. 2). Cambridge: MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6848.001.0001>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1989). Structures of discourse and structures of power. In J. A. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (Vol. 12, pp. 18-59). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203856765>
- von Stechow, K. (2001). NPI licensing, Strawson entailment, and context dependency. *Journal of Semantics*, 16(2), 97–148. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/16.2.97>
- van Veggel, N., Allison, J., Goldspink, S., & Engward, H. (2024). The presuppositional interview as a means of transparent reflexive practice in grounded theory. *Methodological Innovations*, 17(1), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20597991231212236>
- Youtube. (2024). *101 English conversation practice: Topic 1-8 | English speaking practice - YouTube*. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SG77WoK5V5U&ab\\_channel=HelenaDailyEnglish](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SG77WoK5V5U&ab_channel=HelenaDailyEnglish)
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.