

*English as a Second Language (ESL) Teachers' Experiences in Incorporating Pragmatics  
in ESL Classrooms: A Case Study*

Meral Muyesser, Rowan College at Burlington County, United States

The European Conference on Language Learning 2024  
Official Conference Proceedings

**Abstract**

It is imperative that ESL instructors understand the field of pragmatics, which is the knowledge of using the target language in social and cultural contexts through everyday social interactions, and learn how to incorporate pragmatics into lesson plans. The research on the incorporation of pragmatics is still limited; it is not sufficiently understood to what extent ESL teachers incorporate pragmatics. Thus, the purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore if and how ESL teachers address pragmatics when it is not part of their program curriculum. The purposefully selected sample consisted of 15 community college ESL instructors from the Mid-Atlantic Region of the United States. The primary method of data collection was semi-structured interviews, with supplementary methods including observations and document review. Utilizing inductive analysis, the results were analyzed and interpreted and grouped into three themes based on the study's conceptual framework, the Interaction Hypothesis. The research revealed that ESL teachers do not teach pragmatics explicitly; they only address errors caused by cultural differences as they arise and only if they are recognized by the instructors. Also, ESL teachers, regardless of their level of pragmatics awareness and knowledge, face a variety of challenges, such as the lack of language materials that cover pragmatics and having an overloaded curriculum. The findings of this case study support previous research by highlighting a strong need in the area of practice and recommended more emphasis in integrating pragmatic learning and teaching in ESL programs. It also highlights a number of opportunities for future research.

Keywords: ESL Teachers' Pragmatic Awareness, Incorporating Pragmatics in ESL Classrooms, EFL Teachers

**iafor**

The International Academic Forum  
[www.iafor.org](http://www.iafor.org)

## **Introduction**

One of the essential yet complicated aspects of learning a new language is pragmatics, which refers to the social language skills that humans utilize in everyday interactions. Second language (L2) pragmatics examines how L2 speakers use both linguistic and nonlinguistic methods to create and interpret meanings, how their usage evolves over time, and the influences affecting this development (Taguchi & Kádár, 2024). The key to effective communication does not lie in the successful expression of the speaker's intended meaning but it also lies in the recipient's interpretation, which can be affected by their home culture and social norms. A male ESL student who endeavored to compliment his teacher by saying, "You are wearing a very cute dress. It fits you" might be considered as an inappropriate compliment by a female teacher. However, as an English language learner, the student, who hears American speakers complimenting each other frequently on looks and clothes, intends to reveal his enthusiasm for employing the target language by complementing his American female teacher. ESL and EFL teachers need to understand that solely teaching syntax and forms of the target language is not adequate for learners to become competent in every aspect of the English language. However, one of the difficulties that hinders pragmatic instruction is mandatory curricula (Borer, 2018). Some ESL instructors do not cover pragmatics because it is not part of their curriculum. EFL/ESL programs do not embrace pragmatics in their curriculum. Sharif et al. (2017) stated that most language programs are currently still trying to operate on a traditional curriculum, and most EFL teachers have an overloaded curriculum to cover and are often conditioned to teach to the test rather than to the student. Therefore, it is not clear how and to what extent ESL teachers address pragmatics when it is not part of the curriculum. Focusing on a sociocultural perspective to examine how ESL teachers address pragmatics through their interactions with their students and each other, this case study utilized the Interaction Hypothesis as its conceptual framework, and the following question guided the research and addressed the study's purpose:

- How do community college ESL teachers address pragmatics when it is not an explicit part of their program curriculum?

## **Conceptual Framework**

Interactions among teachers and students play a crucial role in any learning, particularly in language learning, since learning is boosted through socially supported inter-communications (Stinemetz, 2019). Interacting with colleagues and students help ESL/EFL teachers build their ability to notice sociocultural language differences and allow them to adjust their teaching repertoire accordingly (Moeller & Catalano, 2015; Norouzian & Eslami, 2016). Since interaction is one of the primary components of language learning and teaching, and interaction is constructed by participants as they dynamically negotiate not just meaning but also their cultural and social identities, interaction is essential to the study of pragmatic development (Norouzian & Eslami, 2016). Thus, the Interaction Hypothesis shed light on if and how ESL teachers addressed pragmatics when it was not an explicit part of their program curriculum by exploring the types of interactions that teachers engaged in to develop learners' pragmatic competence in classrooms.

## Literature Review

### *The Intersection of Pragmatic and Communicative Competence: Developing Additional Skills*

Within L2 teaching and learning, pragmatics includes speech acts, conversational construction and implicature, discourse association, and sociolinguistic features of language use. The study of pragmatics also explores the ability of language users to match utterances with contexts in which they are appropriate (Taguchi & Kadar, 2024). When someone says, "I have a lot of work to do tonight," they might be expressing their workload or subtly declining an invitation to go out or even implying that they might not want to be bothered. As Taguchi and Kadar (2024) stated these types of claims have standard implications that make sense in light of the surrounding circumstances, and the context between the speaker and the listener determines both parties' intended meanings. Thus, pragmatics delves into the ways in which meaning is influenced by context as well as the differences that exist between the speaker's intention and the listener's perception. However, the speaker's intentions or listener's perceptions are also shaped by their cultural background. Pragmatics provides insight into the target culture, and students cannot communicate effectively without having pragmatic competence (Bardovi-harlig, 2020); thus, teaching of pragmatics should aim to build learners' pragmatic competence by facilitating the learners' sense of being able to find socially appropriate language for the situations that they encounter.

To fully grasp pragmatic competence, it's essential to first understand the concept of 'competence' and the relationship between pragmatic and communicative competence. In second language acquisition, the primary goal is to develop the ability to use language effectively in communicative situations. The focus of language teaching is to help learners achieve what Hymes (1972) termed communicative competence—namely, the ability to use language accurately to meet communication objectives by applying grammatical and sociocultural knowledge in context (Taguchi, 2019). Taguchi and Li (2020) describe language competence as both the knowledge of the language and the ability to apply that knowledge to produce meaningful oral and written expressions appropriate to the situation. Since developing competence involves acquiring knowledge, and communicative competence emphasizes the application of this knowledge in specific contexts, it can be concluded that communicative competence relies on two key elements: knowledge and skill application. However, as Bardovi-Harlig (2015) pointed out, possessing linguistic knowledge and communicative competence alone does not ensure that language learners will become fully proficient in the target language, as they must also understand the target culture and apply sociocultural knowledge appropriately in social contexts. Thus, even though pragmatic competence intertwined with communicative competence, it still requires additional features for learners to fully develop. These additional features are summarized by Taguchi (2019) in three layers since pragmatic competence is complex and encompasses a diverse knowledge domains and skill sets: (1) linguistic and sociocultural understanding of appropriate forms to use in various contexts; (2) interactional skills to apply knowledge in a flexible and adaptable way to changing circumstances; and (3) agency to decide for oneself whether or not to apply knowledge in the community. Pragmatic competence is not just about knowing how language forms relate to functions and contexts. It also involves using this knowledge flexibly and adaptively in conversations. This means that the connections between language forms, functions, and contexts are not fixed. Instead, they depend on the ongoing interaction and are created together by the people involved in the conversation (Taguchi & Li, 2020).

## ***The Importance of Teaching Pragmatics***

Rather than focusing only on students' awareness and how learners acquire pragmatic awareness, it is also imperative to focus on teachers' awareness of pragmatics and understand how they integrate their professional knowledge of pragmatics into their classroom practice. Taguchi (2015) and Cohen (2016) showed that students' pragmatic awareness is correlated to ESL teachers' mindfulness and perception of pragmatics and the method of instruction that they utilize in classrooms. Taguchi (2015) reviewed 58 studies conducted over the past 30 years, focusing on the role of pragmatics in language instruction. One key finding from this comprehensive analysis was that raising awareness of pragmatics and explicitly teaching it can significantly benefit language learners. Therefore, as Cohen (2016) stated, the role of teachers cannot be undervalued since pragmatics can be demanding for learners to obtain on their own, and it is crucial to perceive and define pragmatic awareness as a vital teaching target that language teachers should be aware of and should be made aware of.

A more recent study that was conducted by Ren et., al. (2023) explored how instruction impacts second language (L2) learners' pragmatic competence and identified factors that influence the effectiveness of such instruction. A thorough literature review identified 29 primary studies involving 1,898 L2 learners, resulting in 54 effect sizes for comparisons between groups. The findings indicated that pragmatic instruction significantly improves L2 pragmatic competence and explicit instruction tends to be more effective than implicit instruction. Plonsky and Zhuang (2019) also conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of L2 pragmatics instruction, synthesizing 50 studies available up to 2016. Their findings confirm significant and sustainable effects of L2 pragmatics instruction. They observed that explicit instruction was more effective than implicit instruction; instruction that included feedback outperformed instruction without feedback; and teaching that provided opportunities for practice was more effective than teaching without such opportunities. Language is a vehicle essential for effective and meaningful interactions and leads to a better understanding of speakers' intended messages. However, how a listener perceives and interprets the messages does not only depend on how a speaker conveys his or her intended messages, but it also depends on the listener's receptive pragmatic competence. Thus, it is imperative that ESL/EFL teachers are aware of pragmatics and incorporate pragmatics in their lessons so that they help their students develop their pragmatic competence.

## **Research Methodology and Design**

Given that the researcher was working with a phenomenon happening "within a real-life context" and addressing the question of "how" to understand and create an in-depth description and analysis of the participants' experience, a qualitative case study research method was utilized. The case study methodology aligned with the problem and research question. As it is stated by Yin (2018), it is crucial that researchers achieve methodological cohesion, which can only be accomplished when the research question aligns with the method of data collection, method of data analysis, sample size and type, the assumptions of the approach, and the results expected from the approach. To provide sufficient detail and utilize various data collection methods as a form of triangulation, data collection methods for this case study were individual semi-structured interviews, observations, and document review.

## **Population and Sample**

This study targeted community college ESL teachers in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The institution was selected as the research site due to its abundance of ESL teachers and access to resources. The ESL program was designed as an English Language Transition Program (ELT). Hence, students took courses only twice a week and were allowed to take college courses once they completed the ESL program. The number of participants was decided based on the scope of the study, the study design, and saturation. Fifteen participants were purposefully selected, 2 male and 13 female ESL instructors, who had diverse educational backgrounds and varying years of professional experience. Eleven participants had at least 10 years of teaching experience in the field, and the educational backgrounds of the 15 participants ranged from Master of Arts degrees in mostly TESOL and TEFL to one participant who had a PhD in Linguistics.

## **Materials and Instrumentations**

### ***Interviews***

Thirteen open-ended interview questions were used as the primary instrument for data collection for this descriptive, case study. The interview questions were developed and implemented to allow participants to give in-depth details about their in-class experiences regarding teaching pragmatics in their ESL classrooms. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the interviews were conducted via Zoom. To ensure participants' privacy and confidentiality, the recorded sessions were saved solely as audio files. Although NVivo was used for transcription, the researcher meticulously reviewed each transcript alongside the audio recordings to ensure precise transcription. To maintain credibility and accuracy, the researcher also engaged in member checking by having participants review the initial findings.

### ***Observations***

Five synchronous session recordings of four diverse ranges of ESL classes, considering different subjects and levels, were collected from five different participants to observe if and how pragmatics occur in different subjects and levels taught by the participants, as well as to learn more about how participants address pragmatics. The four purposely selected courses were: English for Academic Purposes, an integrated, high-advanced course, a high intermediate writing course, a high intermediate reading course, and a low intermediate speaking and listening course. Because the sessions were recorded using a video conferencing platform, a transcript accompanied the recording, and the researcher checked the accuracy of the transcription. An observation checklist, which aligned with the research question, was also created and used.

### ***Document Review***

Document analysis was another instrument for this qualitative data collection technique. As Bloomberg and Volpe (2022) stated, the document review provides a substantial asset for delivering insights gained through other data gathering methods. For this study, to explore if and how the participants implemented pragmatics into their teaching, sample lesson plans were collected. Reviewing participants' lesson plans helped verify the information provided by the participants and ensure the accuracy and comprehensiveness of the collected data.

## Data Collection and Analysis

For this specific case study, the inductive analysis approach was utilized by systematically organizing files, reviewing the interview transcripts, observation notes, and documents, and creating memos. Then, to guide the researcher in analyzing the data, in alignment with the Interaction Hypothesis framework, codes were created. Emergent codes as well as descriptive and in vivo code were utilized. Because it is seldom that a research gets precise coding in the first iteration (Saldana, 2016), re-coding was conducted to refine and improve accuracy. Final codes and themes emerged and direct interpretation was employed to create assertions and generalizations. To provide transparency, reliability and trustworthiness, the data was cross examined to identify themes and links among them. A data summary table was designed and participant responses were consistently documented to accurately report and analyze the findings.

## Limitations

There were two limitations of this study. First, because the participants were selected only from community colleges, it would be difficult to transfer the results into other contexts. Given the diversity of ESL programs and the varying curriculum and focus areas, ESL teachers' pragmatic awareness and instructional experience at community colleges may differ from those of ESL teachers at four-year colleges. Second, although the problem and purpose of the study were directly relevant to EFL teachers, as pragmatics is a vital aspect of teaching and learning a foreign language, the study's findings could not be generalized to EFL teachers.

## Findings

***Theme 1: Addressing Culture and Pragmatics.*** The majority of participants (14 of 15) indicated that they do not teach pragmatics explicitly; they only incorporate communication skills and address errors caused by cultural differences as they arise. Two of these same participants (2 of 15) also stated that they can identify the pragmatic miscommunications that occur in classrooms and address them properly. For instance, Chloe stated, "So, I don't explicitly focus on pragmatics. I teach pragmatics as pragmatic errors arise, so for example, when the student said, "Do I have to?" I said, "Yes in American culture when someone says that I would like you to, they are indirectly commanding you to do something" or different things like asking my age. I say to them, "I'm a lady and in the US, you can't ask me that." And when we do that, I usually talk about it's usually a dialogue. So, we talked about what it's like in their countries and how it's the same or different. Sometimes it arises out of readings that we do, but most of the time it is student-generated errors that become teachable moments." Rachel said, "I don't teach as a specific part of my lesson. I wouldn't say now we're going to do pragmatics or now we're going to focus on norms. I think it's... I sort of allow it to happen a little bit more naturally. It's definitely something I teach because that's something that I think is very important. And it's part of the success that I want for them is to be able to interact appropriately and know how to interact. So, I think I could build it into conversation lessons especially."

Marry also stated that she did not teach pragmatics explicitly. She said, "I don't teach pragmatics, I mean explicitly but when I encounter miscommunications due to the differences between the cultural norms, I correct my students and explain the norms, and the following class I usually create classroom activities, such as a role play dialogue for them to practice in

class.” Donna also noted, “So, I am not teaching pragmatics explicitly. It comes up spontaneously. I don't think I label it. I think I just. I do it. It's you know, if I'm doing speaking exercises or listening exercises.”

The researcher noted that neither the lesson plans gathered from the participants nor the transcribed observations indicated that the participating instructors incorporated pragmatics explicitly. Both the lesson plans and observations helped triangulate the responses during the interview.

***Theme 2: The Role of Interaction.*** All participants (15 of 15), during the interview, stated that through their interactions with their students, they gained knowledge about both culture and pragmatics. Eight participants also stated that their understanding of pragmatics and culture had also been greatly aided by their interactions with coworkers and former graduate classmates. For instance, Catherine, said: “You know, the community college in which I teach. It has a number of students and a number of different cultures and all come together right in this one classroom. It is a heterogeneous mix of homogeneous learning, if that makes any sense. I mean, interacting with people from all different cultures has also educated me about pragmatics, interacting with colleagues has definitely assisted me in learning more about pragmatics. I love when my students will educate me about it, about an aspect of conversation in their culture.”

Elizabeth also underlined the importance of interaction and commented: “Absolutely, interacting with my students helps me to learn about other cultures. I feel like I ask the question all the time in my class, “How do you say this in your native language?” or you know, “How is this looked upon in your country?” In reading, too, in the current textbook, there's actually a chapter about a professor who does a study between American students and Brazilian students and being late for class and getting cultural differences. I feel like I'm learning all the time and I'm eager to learn. I want to know how it's done in other countries and in other cultures and other languages. That helps me and that helps inform my teaching going forward.”

Rachel also highlighted the importance of interaction with students and stated, “The students definitely helped me learn about other cultures the most, not just because I'm interacting with them in a usual sense, but because a lot of the assignments or activities or group work I give them is about their home culture. It's about telling me where you're from. Tell me how you celebrate this.” Melissa highlighted the benefits of sharing experiences with colleagues and stated, “I think my colleagues at the community college, I met a few who have experienced living abroad or only living here, but have experienced enough with people who are from other countries where they gain. They have at least an understanding from a humanistic perspective, that we're not dealing with the same types of cultural or social norms that we have here. I learn from my colleagues by talking to them between classes or exchanging ideas during our department meetings.” However, Jamie's answer with regard to interacting with colleagues was dissimilar. He said, “I don't really interact with many of my co-workers. I teach part time. I don't spend time on campus. I usually teach and leave.”

From the transcribed observations, the researcher noted instances of interactions where teachers needed to negotiate the meaning and made clarifications of speech acts while they were interacting with their students. For instance, Marry, who was teaching a reading course, was reviewing a vocabulary section in the textbook. One of her students suddenly sneezed, and another student said “Live Healthy,” then the student who sneezed said, “Thank you.”

However, the instructor said, “Did you mean ‘God Bless You?’” And, the student said, “Sorry, I am not sure, in my country this is what we say.” Then, the instructor turned this into a teachable moment by opening a small discussion on how to respond to a sneeze in English and how these responses differ across various countries. She told her students not to rely on word-for-word translations, as this can lead to miscommunications.

***Theme 3: Challenges of Integrating Pragmatics.*** All of the participants (15 of 15), regardless of their level of pragmatics awareness and knowledge, face a variety of challenges. One of the challenges that participating ESL instructors mentioned that they faced was lack of resources. 12 of 15 participants stated that the textbooks that they use do not cover pragmatics explicitly. For instance, Mary stated, “Textbooks and online materials do not cover pragmatics that much. However, some of the textbooks that I have been using include cultural materials. For example, some textbooks have passages related to cultural norms or holidays which allow us to talk about them as part of our pre-reading activities. For example, one of the passages that we recently read was about being punctual, so I opened a discussion on that topic because punctuality is a social concept, which varies from culture to culture.”

Rose also said, “I haven't used any sort of materials to cover pragmatics, like I said. Now I'm thinking, you know, I need to cover it more. But I mean, I try to do a lot of research when it comes to what I plan for my class. And I really haven't come across anything.” Elizabeth also confirmed Rose's thought and stated, “The textbooks to me. I don't think they cover pragmatics at all. I think for the most part, I know that they do not address that.” Emily also said, “I think most of the texts that I've worked with and online programs, I would say minimal, if any. Maybe some beginning language material more so. And what do I usually do? I usually find funny videos or things online that I use as icebreakers.”

A few participants who have been teaching speech courses stated that some of the speech textbooks cover culture and pragmatics but insufficiently. Chloe stated, “So in my experience not much at all in the current textbooks that I am using there is no pragmatic information included at all; however, I have seen speech books that do cover some pragmatics, so I know it's out there in some language materials it's just not in any of the ones that I have used in the last 10 years.” Donna, also stated, “I haven't located any materials to cover pragmatics or cultural aspects of language, but I think sometimes it's in there. It's just not labeled that way.”

Another challenge was an overloaded curriculum. Some of the participants stated that they did not teach culture and pragmatics because they had so much content and skills to cover in a semester. For instance, Catherine stated, “You know. I do see value in it, but teaching all four language skills within a course. It just seems to be heavy in one because of the way they're designed. Like you have to get through all of these things, and we only have 15 weeks. So, it gets a little overwhelming in that way as an instructor.”

Chloe and Anna also confirmed Catherine's thoughts and mentioned how difficult it is to balance trying to teach so many skills to diverse learners in one semester. Chloe said, “So obviously striking a balance in trying to teach both the formal academic language, the listening comprehension skills, the note-taking skills, and everything else that goes along with college life makes it challenging at times to incorporate pragmatics. But I do think it's important because they can cause a lot of awkward situations and miscommunications.” Anna stated, “I don't teach pragmatics explicitly because it's not part of our curriculum, but also there are so many goals to be accomplished, so many skills to cover, and I really don't have time to cover everything.”



## Discussion

Current research emphasizes the importance of utilizing explicit instruction and provides evidence for the efficiency of explicit teaching (Nguyen, 2018; Sabet & Veisy, 2015); however, based on the semi-structured interviews and observations, it is evident that participating ESL instructors are not addressing pragmatics explicitly in their ESL classrooms. Most of the participants do not feel comfortable teaching pragmatics explicitly; they only address it if they can notice the errors due to cultural differences and only if they arise spontaneously while interacting with students. Though the participants do not teach pragmatics explicitly, most of the participating ESL instructors incorporate communication skills and expose language learners to conversational dialogues and make their classroom as interactive as possible. This is supported by the current research, yielding discoveries with regard to the effective methods of pragmatics instruction, and confirming that the incorporation of communication skills creates meaningful conversational dialogues, thus creating positive changes in L2 learners' pragmatic knowledge and competence. Zavalova (2017) stated that one way to teach pragmatics is through exposing language learners to conversational dialogues and employing formulaic language and encouraging learners to memorize the pragmatic formulas. Bardovi-Harlig (2015) also suggests designing meaningful formulaic sequences, known as pragmatic formulas, incorporating role plays into classrooms, and utilizing authentic resources to expose learners to the pragmatic aspects of the target language.

The Interactionist Hypothesis shed light on if and how ESL teachers address pragmatics when it is not an explicit part of their program curriculum by exploring the types of interactions that teachers engage in to develop learners' pragmatic competence in classrooms. Moeller and Catalano (2015) and Norouzian and Eslami (2016) asserted that as ESL/EFL teachers are learning to become teachers and improving their teaching through professional development or other informal experiences, interaction with their teachers, colleagues, and students helps build their ability to notice sociocultural language differences and allows them to adjust their teaching repertoire accordingly. During the interview, the majority of the participants emphasized the importance of interaction and how they learn by interacting with their students and colleagues. These responses indicate that regardless of the formal incorporation of pragmatics, instructors are aware of the benefits of interactive instructional practices and the interactions between themselves and the students. It is evident that interaction plays an important role in the way that ESL teachers notice and address cultural aspects in second language learning and pragmatics. It was also evident that although the participating instructors did not cover pragmatics explicitly, teachable moments arose and ESL teachers could have facilitated appropriate interactions in the ESL classroom, providing for spontaneous pragmatic exchanges. However, because some of the instructors did not recognize the pragmatic errors, they did not take those opportunities and address them properly. Therefore, it could be suggested that ESL teachers' understanding and awareness of pragmatics are crucial in determining how effectively they identify and address pragmatic errors in the classroom.

The challenges that participating ESL teachers face are connected to the lack of language materials that cover pragmatics and having an overloaded curriculum to cover. Most of the participating ESL teachers expressed that the textbook materials do not cover pragmatics adequately. Existing research studies support the data and have demonstrated that second language pragmatics has hardly been integrated effectively into the textbooks (Bardovi-Harlig, 2018; Tajeddin & Teimournezh, 2015; Tujuba & Davidson, 2017). Tajeddin and

Teimournezha (2015) examined what and how cultural components are offered in the dialogues and reading passages of two textbooks, one domestic and one international. The analysis exposed that learning the target culture from the two textbooks is highly unlikely due to the lack of suitable, targeted cultural components. Tujuba and Davidson (2017) analyzed the teachability of pragmatics in a communicative English skills textbook, and they affirmed that the general content and usage of pragmatic information and the authentic dialogues or real-life exercises that have been utilized in the textbook is irrelevant and insufficient.

Another challenge that participating ESL teachers faced was an overloaded curriculum. ESL programs focus only on the four main language components or they incorporate so many skills into those four components that there is not enough time to incorporate pragmatics explicitly. Bardovi-Harlig (2018) also emphasized that pragmatic competence is not typically addressed in the language classroom, probably due to the lack of curriculum and materials based on pragmatics. This finding was reflected in the study by Yesil and Demiroz (2017), who confirmed that even though the language instructor embraces the integration of the target language culture into the courses, they cannot assign adequate time to have culturally-enhanced courses due to their overloaded curriculum. This study emphasizes the link between an overloaded curriculum to cover the fundamental linguistic skills and the lack of time available to dive into pragmatics.

### **Recommendations and Conclusions**

A lack of pragmatic competence impacts communication both in and outside of the ESL classroom (Hillard, 2017). If intercultural miscommunication ensues due to the lack of pragmatic competence, ESL students might feel discouraged, offended, and isolated. Thus, to help ESL students communicate effectively in a target language, it is crucial that ESL teachers place more emphasis on pragmatics and develop innovative approaches that promote pragmatic skills more naturally for language learners. Regardless of the participants' level of pragmatic awareness and knowledge, the majority of participants valued incorporating culture and pragmatics into their ESL classrooms and were interested in expanding their knowledge in pragmatics. However, it is evident that ESL instructors' level of awareness is limited and they are not addressing pragmatics explicitly.

Though the findings of this case study support previous research by highlighting a strong need in the area of practice and recommended more emphasis in integrating pragmatic learning and teaching in ESL programs, the study still highlights a number of opportunities for future research. Future researchers should focus on exploring the factors that affect current ESL teachers' ability to notice pragmatic errors during interactions and how to help them seize teachable moments and address pragmatics as the opportunities arise.

## References

- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2015). Operationalizing conversation in studies of instructional effect in L2 pragmatics. *System*, 48(15), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.002>
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2018). Matching modality in L2 pragmatics research design. *Elsevier*, 75(18), 13-22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.03.007>
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2020). Pedagogical linguistics: A view from L2 pragmatics. *Pedagogical Linguistics*, 1, 44–65. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pl.19013.bar>
- Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2022). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A roadmap from beginning to end* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Borer, B. (2018). Teaching and Learning Pragmatics and Speech Acts: An instructional pragmatics curriculum development project for EFL learners. *School of Education Student Capstone Projects*. 176. Retrieved from [https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse\\_cp/176](https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_cp/176)
- Cohen, A. (2016). The teaching of pragmatics by native and nonnative language teachers: what they know and what they report doing. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(4), 561-585. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.4.2>
- Fauziati, E. (2015). A state of the art of communicative competence theory. *Journal of English Studies (ADJES)*, 2(2), 78-86.
- Hilliard, A. (2017). Twelve activities for teaching the pragmatics of complaining to L2 learners, *English Teaching Forum*. Retrieved from [https://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource\\_files/etf\\_55\\_1\\_p02-13.p](https://americanenglish.state.gov/files/ae/resource_files/etf_55_1_p02-13.p)
- Hymes, D. (1972). *On communicative competence*. In I.B.Pride & J. Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. UK. USA: Penguin Books Ltd. Chapter 18, 269-293.
- Moeller, K. A., & Catalano, T. (2015). Foreign language teaching and learning. *International Encyclopedia for Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 327-332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.92082-8>
- Nguyen, T. (2018). Pragmatic development in the instructed context A longitudinal investigation of L2 email requests. *Pragmatics*, 28 (2), 217–252. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.00007.ngu>
- Norouzian, R., & Eslami, Z. (2016). Critical perspectives on interlanguage pragmatic development: An agenda for research. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 25–50. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L4200012868>
- Plonsky, L., & Zhuang, J. (2019). A meta-analysis of L2 pragmatics instruction. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (1st ed., pp. 21-39). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351164085>

- Ren, W., Li, S., & Lü, X. (2022). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of second language pragmatics instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 44(6).  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac055>
- Sabet, M., K., & Veisy, N. (2015). The impact of pragmatic awareness techniques on EFL learner's real-life use of L2. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 5(2), 389-400.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Sharif, M., Yarmohammadi, L., Sadighi, F., & Bagheri, S. M. (2017). Teaching pragmatics in the EFL classroom: Challenges, lacunas, and suggestions. *Advanced Education*, 8(1), 49-53. <https://doi.org/10.20535/2410-8286.108300>
- Stinemetz, K. A. (2019). A Qualitative Case Study: Exploring Perspectives of University English Language Learners on Cultural and Linguistic Preparedness for Academic Success at an American Midwestern University. Retrieved from <https://search-proquest-com.proxy1.ncu.edu/pqdtlocal1006252/advanced?accountid=28180>
- Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, & should be going. *State-of-the-Art Article*, 48(1), 1–50.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000263>
- Taguchi, N. (Ed.). (2019). *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351164085>
- Taguchi, N., & Kadar, D. Z. (Eds.). (2024). *Encyclopedia of applied linguistics: Pragmatics volume*. Wiley.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370022814\\_Pragmatics\\_An\\_Overview](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370022814_Pragmatics_An_Overview)
- Taguchi, N., & Li, S. (2020). Contrastive pragmatics and second language (L2) pragmatics: Approaches to assessing L2 speech act production. *Contrastive Pragmatics*, 1-23.  
<https://doi.org/10.1163/26660393-bja10014>
- Taguchi, N., & Roever, C. (2017). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Tajeddina, Z., & Teimournezhad, S. (2015). Exploring the hidden agenda in the representation of culture in international and localized ELT textbooks. *The Language Learning Journal*, 43(2), 180–193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2013.869942>
- Tujuba, D., E. & Davidson, M., L. (2017). Analysis of teachability of pragmatics in communicative English skills textbooks used in Adama Science and Technology University. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 7 (5), 445-456.
- Yeşil, Ş., & Demiröz, H. (2017). An exploration of English language teachers' perceptions of culture teaching and its effects on students' motivation. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 13(1), 79-95.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research. Design and method* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zavialova, A. (2017). An emerging pedagogical approach to teaching pragmatic formulas.  
*TESL Canada Journal*, 34(3), 192–204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v34i3.1279>