



The Impact of Iranian EFL Teachers' Meta-Pragmatic Awareness on Their Classroom Practices and Teaching Strategy Development

Behnood Samani

Department of English Language Teaching, Sara. C., Islamic Azad University, Sarab, Iran.

b.samani@iau.ac.ir

Mehrdad Amiri  (Corresponding Author)

Assistant Professor, Department of English Language Teaching, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran.

amirimehrdad@cfu.ac.ir

Naser Ghafouri 

Department of English Language Teaching, Tabriz C., Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran.

ghafoori@iaut.ac.ir

ARTICLE INFO:

Received date:
2025.07.12

Accepted date:
2025.11.04

Print ISSN: 2251-7995
Online ISSN: 2676-6876

Keywords:

Classroom Practices, EFL Teachers, Meta-Pragmatic Awareness, Pragmatics, Teaching Strategy Development



Abstract

Instructing interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) is essential for effective second language communication. The present study set out to investigate the impact of Iranian English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' meta-pragmatic awareness on their classroom practices and developing strategies in teaching pragmatics. To do so, a qualitative study was designed in which 30 EFL teachers selected through convenience sampling from different districts of Tehran City took part. The participants' classes were observed through an observation checklist three times during the semester, and live notes were taken in the classroom in terms of their teaching ILP practices and teaching strategy development both before and after an in-service meta-pragmatics training course awareness. The results of the observation data analysis showed the success of the in-service training course of meta-pragmatics. Furthermore, adopting an inductive approach in teaching pragmatics, correcting errors either after a delay or on the spot, and comparing L2 and L1 pragmatic features were among the most frequently used strategies teachers developed after being trained with respect to meta-pragmatics. The study results have some implications for foreign language teacher trainers, EFL teachers, and EFL learners.

Citation: Samani, B.; Amiri, M. & Ghafouri, N. (2025). The Impact of Iranian EFL Teachers' Meta-Pragmatic Awareness on Their Classroom Practices and Teaching Strategy Development. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 17 (36), 255-278. DOI: 10.22034/elt.2025.68108.2804

Introduction

Interlanguage pragmatics (ILP), which is defined as a field of second language acquisition studying how learners of a second/foreign language understand, produce, and acquire pragmatic aspects of communication (e.g., speech acts, politeness strategies, conversational implicatures), mainly focuses on how L2 learners' pragmatic competence develops, often in comparison to native speakers and across different proficiency levels (Prastikawati et al., 2024). Moreover, pragmatics is defined as a linguistics notion which is concerned with "how language is used by its users, as well as how their use of language affects the other participants in a given conversation or interaction" (Alcón-Soler, 2005, 62). In addition, Glaser (2020) defines pragmatic awareness as "conscious, reflective, and explicit knowledge about pragmatics, that is, knowledge of those rules and conventions underlying appropriate language use in particular communication situations and on the part of members of specific speech community" (p. 33). In the same vein, meta-pragmatics refers to the study of how speech acts serve specific communicative events under certain conditions which includes describing the correct use of language in the pragmatic domain" (Silverstein, 1993, 33). Another distinction, however, is usually made between "pragmatic awareness" and "meta-pragmatic awareness"; the former which is intuitive and experiential, refers to the ability of L2 speakers to notice and understand how language is used in social interaction — including norms, politeness, indirectness, and cultural appropriateness — without necessarily reflecting on or analyzing those rules explicitly (Amiri & Javanshir, 2017), while the latter, meta-pragmatic awareness, refers to the explicit, reflective ability to analyze, articulate, and evaluate how pragmatic norms work in language use. In general, pragmatic awareness focuses on the sensitivity and recognition of how language functions in context, while meta-pragmatic awareness involves conscious knowledge about rules, strategies, and cultural conventions governing communication (Cheng et al., 2024).

Even though many second language instructors are not native speakers, practical training is still not a standard component of most in-service training programs (Gauci et al., 2017). It's been reported that EFL teachers think that their students may misunderstand them because they don't have the necessary pragmatic knowledge of the target language (Nuzzo & Brocca, 2024). Instead of depending just on instructors' intuitions, pragmatics education should be grounded in research findings. Training EFL teachers, whether they are native or not, should focus on helping them become more pragmatically aware and enhancing their ability to analyze pragmatic phenomena independently (Glaser, 2020).

EFL teachers can foster their students' autonomy and self-awareness through a combination of meta-pragmatic knowledge enhancement and effective classroom practices (Boulton, 2017; Sanchez-Hernandez & Martinez, 2023). This combination may enable EFL instructors to understand that native speakers and textbook norms are not the ultimate judges of proper language usage. When advocating for initiatives to raise pragmatic awareness, educators should instead depend on data-based research that has been autonomously undertaken. In recent years, more people have started to see that teaching pragmatics of the target language to EFL teachers is a good way to improve professional development (PD) for

educators and help include communicative activities in EFL lessons (Nuzzo & Brocca, 2024; Wu, 2024). However, there is a dearth of evidence showing that metapragmatic awareness may be effectively developed through in-service teacher training programs.

A key factor in teaching pragmatics to the EFL learners is the way EFL teachers practice pragmatic notions and functions in the classroom context (Farrell, 2017; Wu, 2024). However, the instructional English Language Teaching (ELT) materials they use and the way they focus on pragmatic concepts play a substantial role in helping learners improve their ILP knowledge (Liu, 2023; Liu et al., 2021; Meihami & Khanlarzadeh, 2015). Nevertheless, in spite of such a vital role, textbooks have been blamed for the insufficiency of pragmatics-focused materials (Cohen, 2019; Derakhshan et al., 2024). When it is reported that teachers do not take serious measures to benefit from interactional opportunities to cultivate pragmatic competence (Ren, 2022; Tateyama, 2019; Wu, 2024), the first purpose of this study is to investigate whether participating in the in-service training course of meta-pragmatics can help Iranian EFL teachers highlight pragmatic features while teaching conversational tasks.

Moreover, the role of teaching strategies in helping learners improve their ILP abilities has been already highlighted in the literature (Anis & Anwar, 2020; Cohen, 2019; Farrell, 2017). However, Iranian EFL teachers' ability to develop strategies aiming at facilitating the process of pragmatic development among EFL learners is in the paucity of research (Amiri & Birjandi, 2015; Davarzani & Talebzadeh, 2020). Accordingly, another purpose of the study is to investigate the extent to which participating in the in-service training course of meta-pragmatics can lead to any strategy development in the teaching of pragmatics among Iranian EFL teachers. In general, the present study was carried out to see if enhancing EFL teachers' meta-pragmatic awareness, presented through an in-service training course, could leave positive impacts on their classroom practices and teaching strategy development.

1. Literature Review

The present section reviews the literature pertaining to the role of EFL teachers in teaching interlanguage pragmatics, EFL teachers' meta-pragmatic awareness, and strategy development aiming at teaching L2 pragmatics in practice.

1.1 The Role of EFL Teachers in Teaching Interlanguage Pragmatics

Inter-language pragmatics is defined as “non-native speakers' comprehension and production of speech acts and how the L2 speech act related knowledge is acquired” (Kasper & Rose, 2002). In order to help learners develop their pragmatic competence, instruction comes into play (Wu, 2024). EFL learners depend on the input they receive in the classroom, mainly through their coursebooks and their teachers in the second place (Sanchez-Hernandez & Martinez-Flor, 2022). In the latter case, teachers can be considered as models that can provide learners with the necessary input in terms of politeness, language functions, and formulaic language (Azizi & Namaziandost, 2023; Tajeddin et al., 2018). Some researchers are, however, negative about the input provided by the teacher as an appropriate model for learning pragmatics in the classroom (Bardovi-Harlig, 2018; Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2023) mentioning the teachers' high use of direct strategies as a result of an attempt to modify their own speech problems.

Being a non-native speaker may also give the impression that teachers may not be trusted upon to make good models for their students (Li, 2022; Sato et al., 2025). Moreover, a great number of EFL teachers may neither have ever had any contact with a native speaker nor have they had enough opportunities to fully develop their pragmatic knowledge and skills. As a result, EFL learners have limited opportunities to develop their pragmatic competence (Glaser & Martínez-Flor, 2024). Accordingly, teaching L2 pragmatics takes significance in teacher education programs (Eslami & Eslami-Rasekh, 2008; Ishihara & Cohen, 2014; Kanık et al., 2023; Noviyenty, 2023; Tajeddin & Malmir, 2024; Wu, 2024). Additionally, teachers should continue to contemplate how to foster students' pragmatic competence in EFL classes (Wu et al., 202). To begin, EFL teachers might have trouble defining pragmatics and identifying effective teaching tactics. Additionally, they may not fully understand the pragmatic rules of the target language (LoCastro, 2012). The second issue is that most EFL instructors are overly preoccupied with teaching students the language skills needed to pass national certification exams or proficiency tests, leaving them little time to cover pragmatics (Amiri et al., 2015; Glaser, 2020). According to Bardovi-Harlig (2018), developing effective communication skills with native speakers is frequently overshadowed by the pursuit of high exam scores in EFL classrooms. Consequently, teachers have difficulties in fitting the instruction of pragmatics and other exam-related topics into class time constraints (Usó-Juan & Martínez-Flor, 2008). As a third point, practical research results are not often accessible to EFL teachers (Webb, 2013). Furthermore, the results of the most recent pragmatics studies do not align with current teaching practices (Tajeddin, 2021). Teachers would rely on their intuitive feelings when deciding to teach pragmatics (Wu, 2024). Additionally, it appears that instructors are among the primary venues where second language learners receive pragmatic feedback. Unfortunately, such an arrangement might lead to biased lessons or comments given to second language learners because every educator has their own unique identity (Samani et al., 2024).

Teacher Training Courses (TTC) for teachers that include techniques for teaching pragmatics are necessary to make them aware of the importance of their speech and the use of appropriate teaching materials for their learners' pragmatic acquisition (Noviyenty, 2023; Sanchez-Hernandez & Martinez-Flor, 2022). It has recently become more apparent that "it is vital to give in-service teachers and prospective teachers a solid grasp of pragmatics" (González-Lloret, 2023) to sustainably incorporate pragmatics into language classrooms and curriculum. According to Martínez-Flor et al. (2023), the importance of enhancing teachers' theoretical understanding of second language pragmatics and providing them with practical skills to integrate pragmatic ability into their everyday lessons is being more acknowledged. Myrset and McConachy (2023) state that in order for pragmatics to become a permanent part of teacher education programs, research based on evidence is needed to understand language teachers' requirements, demands, attitudes, beliefs, awareness, practices, and pedagogical repertoires. Furthermore, teacher education programs can be considered collaborative pedagogical interventions that aim to provide language teachers with the necessary expertise in their subject area, as well as in pedagogical content knowledge, local curriculum, and educational settings (Glaser & Martínez-Flor, 2024; Ishihara, 2024). To sum up, pragmatics is not heavily covered in EFL teacher training and education; hence, EFL instructors are reluctant to teach it (Amiri et al., 2015; Derakhshan et al., 2024). According to Martínez-Flor et al.

(2023), teacher preparation programs have often disregarded pragmatics and paid little attention to teachers' skill sets in this discipline. In addition, the problem of how to teach pragmatics successfully in EFL classrooms has not been addressed, and what little attention pragmatics has received has mostly been concentrated on theoretical elements (Wu, 2024). The failure to adequately address different aspects of pragmatics in language instruction is probably the root cause of this oversight (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005). Accordingly, it is necessary to focus on the role of enhancing EFL teachers' L2 pragmatics literacy and helping them get updated in terms of how to teach it to their learners.

1.2 EFL Teachers' Meta-Pragmatic Awareness

In a language awareness method to teaching L2, special attention is paid to cultivate L2 learners' awareness of how the target words and structures are typically used in communication (Cohen, 2019; Wu, 2024). As being communicatively competent empowers Both EFL teachers and learners to act effectively in the L2 classroom, making L2 teachers aware of what they know implicitly about the resources of the target language use can be particularly important in the education of L2 teachers (Li, 2022; Long, 2014). This can be useful in two perspectives. On one hand, it may hone L2 teachers' communicative language competence and on the other hand, it may make the way for L2 teachers to figure out what and how they should teach to help L2 learners more effectively and successfully acquire the target language (Ishihara & Cohen, 2014; Sato et al., 2025).

A pragmatic awareness approach to the classroom can assist students in the development of their sociolinguistic and pragmatic competences, although linguistic competences—that is, proficiency with the language system in all its facets—are essential for both speaking and learning a language (Glaser & Martínez-Flor, 2024). It is important to note that this approach is consistent with Ren's (Ren) perspective that pragmatic competence is linked to the ability of second language learners to engage in coherent and meaningful conversations in a variety of communication settings.

One objective of the pragmatic awareness teaching method is to assist second language learners in developing a greater understanding of the disparity between their performance and that of native speakers of the target language (Amiri & Birjandi, 2015; Farashaiyan et al., 2020). Likewise, Kanik et al. (2023) argue that L2 teachers can improve their understanding of language use, become more independent, and better assess their own and their students' language skills by having meaningful conversations in the target language and easily accessing materials that show real-life communication.

To get the objectives of pragmatic awareness teaching, the concept of noticing should be given enough attention. In fact, 'noticing' in L2 learning is a crucial step toward effective acquisition (Cohen et al., 2023). In addition, L2 teacher trainers should pave the way for the L2 teachers to participate actively and eagerly in an interactive climate in which they can make reasonable deductions about pragmatic uses of the target language (Ishihara, 2024). There are accounts of teachers and learners, with high levels of pragmatic awareness, who do not have sufficient pragmatic competence (Amiri & Javanshir, 2017; Noviyenty, 2023). Hence, developing pragmatic competence takes significance in training L2 teachers. Through taking meta-pragmatic training, L2 teachers enhance their own pragmatic and meta-pragmatic

knowledge (Nuzzo & Brocca, 2024), learn how to develop teaching strategies (Myrset & McConachy, 2023) and how to make learners conscious about the pragmatic and meta-pragmatic features of the target language community (Wu, 2024).

Pragmatics prioritizes the development of conscious reflecting ability due to its fundamental nature. Given the lack of a definitive guideline for appropriate or inappropriate pragmatic behavior, teachers may opt to focus their lessons on enhancing students' self-awareness by utilizing corpus linguistics and real-world examples (Ishihara, 2024). Essentially, students should be provided the opportunity to become pragmatic phenomena researchers and analyzers within large linguistic use samples. In the context of teacher preparation programs, this is especially important, since potential teachers need to work on their ability to communicate clearly and concisely with their students. Note that many language instructors are L2 learners whose proficiency in the target language may be limited (Long, 2014), which might make them unsure about pragmatic considerations (Cohen, 2018). Glaser (2020) highlights how teachers may feel more at ease focusing on grammar, vocabulary, and other areas of language accuracy when they have a perceived lack of pragmatic knowledge and intuition, as well as anxieties about the appropriateness of their language use. One true thing is that when it comes to evaluating the pragmatic appropriateness of language usage, native speakers and learners could focus on different things. Economidou-Kogetsidis (2023) found that, in student-faculty emails, Greek learners placed more value on the message's formality than on its substance or social-pragmatic qualities, in contrast to native speakers. In addition, Nuzzo and Brocca (2024) found that native speakers' intuitions could not always reflect the reality of speech actions and might lead them to misunderstand the importance of specific aspects in real conversations. Accordingly, raising EFL teacher awareness through different procedures such as explicit training, discussing cross-cultural concepts, and watching authentic movies can be taken into account.

1.3 Strategy Development in Teaching L2 Pragmatics

As Anis and Anwar (2020) present, teaching strategies "are techniques that teachers use to deliver course material in ways that keep students engaged and practicing different skill sets" (p. 199). In fact, based on the classroom conditions, the topic of the unit, language proficiency of the learners, class size, learners' needs, and materials, any EFL instructor may select different teaching strategies to teach target language functions, speech acts, and in general ILPs (Noviyenty, 2023; Saleem et al., 2022). Moreover, the term development is often used to describe an individual's overall progress, rather than a concentration on a single career. It has a longer-term objective of helping instructors improve in their knowledge of teaching and of themselves as educators (Farrell, 2017). In the present study, the strategies EFL teachers use and develop to more effectively teach inter-language pragmatics to the Iranian EFL learners were taken into consideration.

EFL teachers make use of different strategies to teach pragmatics such as discussions of social norms and language usage, role-playing, and the utilization of real materials (Mahmud, 2019). Additionally, they emphasize the need of students being able to express themselves clearly, giving them chances to practice in real-life situations and utilizing visual aids to help with comprehension (Saleem et al., 2022). Common strategies employed in the L2 classroom

include: 1) using authentic materials, such as real-life scenarios and diverse literary genres; 2) engaging in role-playing and situational practice to explore various moods, including the introduction of pragmatic awareness through dialogues from coursebooks with differing emotions and vocal tones (Derakhshan et al., 2021); 3) facilitating discussions by encouraging dialogue on social norms, appropriate language, and cultural conventions of the target language community (Noviyenty, 2023); 4) providing clear and concise explanations and instructions; and 5) leveraging technology, digital tools, and online resources (Saleem et al., 2022).

With respect to teaching and learning pragmatics, Ishihara and Cohen (2014) argued that textbooks need to be adapted for teaching pragmatics. Ren (2022) indicates that different areas such as learning, teaching, and assessing L2 pragmatics, should be taken into account while preparing EFL teachers for the L2 classroom teaching. Moreover, Interlanguage Pragmatic Learning Strategies (IPLS) were examined by Derakhshan et al. (2021) as potential indicators of L2 speech act knowledge. The study examined how EFL learners' IPLS and speech-act pragmatic knowledge of typical English speech acts such as requests, apologies, refusals, compliments, and complaints are related to each other. Likewise, the are accounts of paying attention to pragmatics instruction in the L2 classroom based on specified strategies such as raising learners' awareness toward the variety of cultures in the current multilingual-multicultural contexts (Sanchez-Hernandez & Martinez-Flor, 2022), analyzing the pragmatic value of speech acts (Rasulov, 2022), and teaching pragmatic markers (PMs) to enhance successful communication among people in a multicultural-multilingual context (Sanchez-Hernandez & Martinez-Flor, 2022). In addition, using multimedia materials and technology in the L2 classroom to interpret different stages of teaching and learning speech acts has been suggested (Sadikov & Abdusalimova, 2025).

Literature review revealed that EFL teachers' meta-pragmatic awareness plays a significant role in their classroom practices (Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2023; Nuzzo & Brocca, 2024), which has not been well documented in the Iranian EFL context (Samani et al., 2024). In addition, the significance of EFL teachers' participation in the in-service training courses of meta-pragmatics was highlighted. It is time to see if such a training would lead to any strategy development in the teaching of pragmatics among Iranian EFL teachers. With respect to the study purposes and the literature reviewed, the researchers formulated the following research questions.

RQ1. To what extent does participating in the in-service training course of meta-pragmatics lead to the improvement of classroom practices in teaching pragmatics among Iranian EFL teachers?

RQ2. To what extent does participating in the in-service training course of meta-pragmatics lead to any strategy development in teaching pragmatics among Iranian EFL teachers?

2. Method

The impact of Iranian EFL teachers' meta-pragmatic awareness on their classroom practices and teaching strategy development was investigated through a qualitative design relying on observing EFL teachers' classes both prior to and after their participation in an in-service

course of meta-pragmatics. Irrespective of fairly small sample size of the participants (n=30 EFL teachers) and possible training effects which can be considered as limitations in this study, an observation checklist was used to minimize the observer effect. The present section provides information about the participants and the research setting. The instruments which were utilized to collect the data are delineated in the next section. Then, the data collection procedures are explained in detail. Finally, this section concludes with an elaboration on the data analysis procedures

2.1 Participants

Participants of the current study were 30 Iranian EFL teachers who were selected based on random sampling as a statistically sound method for gathering unbiased data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2023), for the purpose of classroom observation, from eight different educational department zones in Tehran city, including zones one, three, six, seven, eight, eleven, fourteen, and seventeen. The participants' classes were observed through an observation checklist validated through expert judgment approach by a panel of five experts who were PhD holders of TEFL and descriptive live notes taken in the classroom in terms of their teaching ILP practices and teaching strategy development both before and after an in-service training course of meta-pragmatics awareness. Among the respondents, 18 females and 12 males with the age range between 23-35 years old, experience range between 5-12 years of teaching of whom 11 were holding a master degree and 19 a bachelor degree in TEFL and other related fields. The next step was to observe their classes to see how they actually taught pragmatics. The logistical challenges of selecting a homogenous sample in terms of age, qualification, and years of experience necessitated not controlling these variables. Moreover, participation was entirely voluntary, all instructors were kept in the dark about their identities, and they were kept apprised of the study's ultimate results.

2.2 Instruments

A classroom observation checklist and a training program for the EFL teachers taking part in the study were employed. The description of the instruments is presented in the following sub-sections.

2.2.1 Class Observations

To fulfill the study purposes, the participant teachers' classes were observed both before and after the intervention. Observations were done according to a pre-defined checklist validated through expert judgment approach meaning that it was scrutinized in terms of language and content by a panel of five experts who were PhD holders of TEFL. Then, the researchers made required modifications according to their comments and suggestions. In addition, the inter-rater reliability of the experts concerning the checklist was estimated through Cohen's Kappa ($\kappa = 0.85$), representing a strong agreement. See Appendix A for this checklist which includes 20 items. For each question, a five-point Likert scale was used, which ranged from one (never) to five (always). EFL teachers' emphasis on pragmatic characteristics in textbooks was examined and the researchers paid close attention to the EFL teachers' performance in the L2 classroom. In addition, any specific strategies used by the teachers in order to teach pragmatic notions of the English language was focused on and one of the researchers took descriptive notes in this

regard both as a priori and a posterior activity; before the in-service training course and after that. It should be noted that one of the researchers attended the classroom sitting in one corner where it was guaranteed that he would not affect the performance of the EFL teachers and students in order to not affect classroom activities.

2.2.2 The Pragmatic Training Course (In-service Training)

The main aim of the pragmatic training course was to increase the EFL teachers' pragmatic awareness and improve the quality of their instruction regarding pragmatic features. Thirty EFL teachers who were randomly selected volunteers to take part in the training course were trained as follows. In order to achieve the course objectives, it was divided into two phases. The first phase consisted of content knowledge dealing with defining pragmatics, clarifying the contents of pragmatic awareness, defining speech acts and different types of the speech acts, and explaining cross cultural variance and pragmatic failure. The second phase included pedagogical knowledge related to instructing the participants to learn how to teach pragmatic features, making them aware of the pragmatic features in the textbooks and sources for supplementary materials, how to give corrective feedback, and how to assess their students. Appendix B presents the schedule of the training course.

2.2.3 Data Collection Procedure

The data collection procedure was basically categorized into three distinct phases described below.

Phase One: In the first phase of the study, the classes of 30 EFL teachers taking part in the study were observed by one of the researchers to see if the teachers would teach and highlight the pragmatic features in their classes. In fact, the researchers aimed to explore how the EFL teachers dealt with the pragmatic contents included in the ELT instructional materials and which strategies they employed in this respect before joining the meta-pragmatic instruction in-service training course. To do this, the observation of each class for three times prior to the teacher training course, was run based on a checklist designed and developed by the researchers. Likewise, the researcher's notes taken in the classroom concerning the likely strategies used by teachers in teaching pragmatic notions was of prime significance. The scale was validated through expert judgment approach meaning that a panel of five experts, who were TEFL PhD holders, were asked to scrutinize it in terms of language and content. The researchers made required modifications according to their comments and suggestions. One of the researchers sat in the back of the classroom and filled out the checklist when the EFL teacher was doing his/her career responsibilities.

Phase Two: The next step of the study, which was considered as the main part, was running the pragmatic training course. At this stage, the 30 EFL teachers whose classes were observed were invited to attend the meta-pragmatic training course lasting for 10 one-hour sessions. The classes were held online through *Skyroom* which is a reliable Learning Management System (LMS). During this course, the EFL teachers became familiar with the diverse aspects of pragmatic instruction which appears in appendix B. Put it in a nutshell, in this phase, an attempt was made to foster the EFL teachers' pragmatic awareness.

Phase Three: After the pragmatic training course finished, the 30 EFL teachers' classes were

observed again for three times. In this phase, the classroom observations similar to the first phase, were run according to the pre-defined checklist as well as one of the researcher's notes in terms of the teachers' use of specific strategies in teaching pragmatic notions of the second language. The checklist investigated how the pragmatic training course had affected the teaching and assessing pragmatics of the EFL teachers. In short, this was done to examine if the EFL teachers' pragmatic awareness had increased and was evident in their classroom practices.

2.2.4 Data Analysis

With respect to the first research question, the valid percentage reported for the teachers' practices before and after the in-service training, as observed and scored through the checklist, were taken into account in terms of all items of the checklist. For the second research question, the researchers used the notes taken in the classroom as well as the results of the observation checklist to check for the strategies used by the teachers both prior to and after the in-service training course as observed in the classrooms. In so doing a thematic analysis was used to analyze the data collected through notes taken in the classroom. Hence, in line with Strauss and Corbin (1998), open, axial, and selective coding methods were used to analyze the data pertaining to the notes. Then, the results of the observation checklist were taken into account.

3. Results

3.1 Research Question One

The first research question intended to explore the impact of participating in the in-service training course of meta-pragmatics on the improvement of classroom practices in teaching pragmatics among Iranian EFL teachers. Observational results prior to the intervention indicated that the mean scores of participants on items 2 and 9, excluding pragmatic errors and disregarding textbook pragmatic features, exceeded 4, which shows the highest mean. Additionally, 60% of participants frequently neglected pragmatic errors before the meta-pragmatic instruction, while 73% often overlooked textbook pragmatic features. During the pretreatment phase, the instructors' mean scores on the additional factors were below 2, and around two-thirds (around 67%) of the participants infrequently implemented other pragmatic aspects in the classroom. Table 1 indicates that 60% of the teachers disregarded pragmatic errors and refrained from providing feedback on them (items 1 and 2). Most teachers did not correct these errors immediately, with 33.3% responding "never" and 66.7% "rarely," nor did nearly 50% address them subsequently (items 12 and 13). Seventy-three percent of the educators neglected the pragmatic aspects of the textbook (item 9), 66.7% infrequently provided learners with pragma-linguistic resources (item 17), and 73.3% rarely directed learners to supplementary materials (item 3). Students exhibited a lack of engagement in meta-pragmatic discussions and were not prompted to personalize the pragmatic features (items 19 and 20). Furthermore, the teachers did not compare the pragmatic elements of L1 and L2, since 20% never did so and 66.7% seldom made such comparisons in their lectures (item 15). Approximately 67.3% of teachers pushed learners to execute pragmatic characteristics at the production level (item 16).

In the posttreatment phase, 53.33% of the teachers often and 20% always gave feedback on pragmatic errors, while 26.66% sometimes provided such feedback (item 1). In addition, 16.66% of the teachers “never” and 50% “rarely” neglected the pragmatic errors (item 2). In item 3 (*referring students to complementary materials*), 40% of the teachers “often and 20%, “always” lead students to complementary materials. In item 4 (*using tasks to assess students' progress regarding pragmatic points*) 30% “often” and 16.66% “always” used tasks to assess students' progress regarding pragmatic points, while 20% “sometimes” and 16.66% “never” or “rarely” followed this procedure. For item 5 (*explicitly explaining socio-pragmatic features of the pragmatics cases*) 33.33% of the teachers “sometimes” relied on explicit explanations, while 50% “often” and 16.66% “always” explicitly explained socio-pragmatic features of the pragmatic notions to the learner.

With respect to item 6 (*getting students to assess the appropriateness of speech acts they perform*), 33.33% “sometimes” and 23.33% “often” followed this procedure, while 16.66% “always” did so. Moreover, item 7 (*encouraging students to assess their peers' performance of speech acts*) 60% (often and always) encouraged their learners to do peer assessment. In addition, 33.33% of the teachers “often” implicitly dealt with the textbook pragmatic features”, while 20% “always” relied on explicit teaching of pragmatics. Moreover, for item 9 (*overlooking the textbook pragmatic features*), 33.33% of the EFL teachers “never” and 40% “rarely” overlooked the textbook pragmatic features. It was also found that 36.66% of the teachers “often” and 33.33% “always” adopted a deductive approach to teaching pragmatic features (item 10), while 26.66% “often” and 33.33% “always” relied on an inductive approach (item 11) in this respect.

Correcting learners' pragmatic errors on the spot (item 12) was “often” done by 50% of the teachers and correcting learners' errors after a delay (item 13) was “always” done by 26.66% of the teachers. It is worth noting that 53.33% of the teachers “often” or “always” brought attention to the sociocultural features presented in the course book of the learners ((item 14). For item 15, 53.33% of the teachers “often” or “always” compared L2 and L1 pragmatic features, while 26.66% “sometimes” did such a comparison. Also, 83.33% of the teachers “often” or “always” encouraged students to perform pragmatic features at production level (item 16). In addition, 33.33% of the teachers “often” and 26.66% of them “always” encouraged their students to personalize pragmatic features taught in the class (item 19) or engaged them in meta-pragmatic discussions (item 20).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics; Teachers' Practices in Teaching Pragmatics before and after the In-service Training Course of Meta-pragmatics

Items	Mean		Never n/%		Rarely n/%		Sometimes n/%		Often n/%		Always n/%	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
1. The teacher gives feedback on pragmatic errors	1.6	3.5	8/40	0	12/60	0	0	8/26.66	10/33.33	16/53.33	0	6/20
2. The teacher neglects pragmatic errors	4.1	6.2	0	5/16.66	0	15/50	4/13.33	4/13.33	18/60	4/13.33	8/26	2/6.66

3. The teacher refers students to complementary materials	1.3	4.6	2/73	0	6/20	2/6.66	2/6.66	10/33.33	0	12/40	0	6/20
4. The teacher uses tasks to assess students' progress regarding pragmatic points	1.4	3.7	18/60	5/16.66	10/33	5/16.66	2/6.66	6/20	0	9/30	0	5/16.66
5. The teacher explicitly explain socio-pragmatic features of the pragmatics cases	1.4	6.2	18/60	0	12/40	0	0	10/33.33	0	15/50	0	5/16.66
6. The teacher get students to assess the appropriateness of speech acts they perform	2.0	3.7	8/26	2/6.66	14/46	6/20	8/26	10/33.33	0	7/23.33	0	5/16.66
7. The teacher encourages students to assess their peers' performance of speech acts	1.8	4.6	12/40	4/13.33	12/40	5/16.66	6/20	5/16.66	0	12/40	0	6/20
8. The teacher implicitly deals with the textbook pragmatic features	1.9	3.5	12/40	0	8/26.66	0	10/33.33	9/30	0	15/50	0	6/20
9. The teacher overlooks the textbook pragmatic features	4.2	4.6	0	10/33.33	0	12/40	0	8/26.66	22/73	0	8/26	0
10. The teacher adopts a deductive approach to teaching pragmatic features	1.7	3.6	8/26.66	11/36.66	12/73.33	10/33.33	0	9/30	0	0	0	0
11. The teacher adopts an inductive approach to teaching pragmatic features	2.1	3.6	2/6.66	5/16.66	22/73.33	5/16.66	6/20	2/6.66	0	8/26.66	0	10/33.33
12. The teacher corrects the pragmatic errors on the spot	1.6	4.6	10/33.3	0	20/66.7	0	0	10/33.33	0	15/50	0	5/16.66
13. The teacher corrects the pragmatic errors after a delay	2.0	4.6	8/26.66	0	14/46	2/6.66	8/26.66	10/33.33	0	10/33.33	0	8/26.66
14. The teacher highlights social distance, relationship and position between those performing a speech act in the textbook tasks.	1.9	3.5	10/33.33	5/16.66	12/40	5/16.66	8/26.66	4/13.33	0	8.26.66	0	8.26.66

15. The teacher compares L2 & L1 pragmatic features	1.9	6.2	6/20	0	20/66.66	0	4/13	8/26.66	0	12/20	0	10/33.33
16. The teacher encourages students to perform pragmatic features at production level.	2.6	6.2	0	0	10/33.33	0	20/6.66	5/16.66	0	15/50	0	10/33.33
17. The teacher provides learners with required pragma linguistic resources (fixed chunks and phrases)	1.6	6.2	10/33.3	0	20/66.66	0	0	10/33.33	0	12/40	0	8/26.66
18. The teacher assigns students some homework on pragmatic features of the textbook	1.8	6.2	6/20	0	24/80	0	0	5/16.66	0	15/50	0	10/33.33
19. The teacher encourages students to personalize the pragmatic features.	1.6	6.2	16/53	0	10/33.33	2/6.66	4/13.33	10/33.33	0	10/33.33	0	8/26.66
20. The teacher engages students in meta-pragmatic discussions.	1.5	6.2	16/53	0	12/40	0	2/6.66	10/33.33	0	10/33.33	0	8/26.66

3.2 Research Question Two

The second research question of the study was an attempt to find the extent to which participating in the in-service training course of meta-pragmatics could lead to any strategy development in the teaching of pragmatics among Iranian EFL teachers. Both notes the researchers had taken in the classroom observations and the checklist results (Table 1 above) were used to answer this question: The results of notes taken represented that in-service training course of meta-pragmatics could help EFL teachers in strategy development in the teaching of pragmatics among Iranian EFL teachers. Teachers exposed to the training course explicitly explained socio-pragmatic features of the pragmatics cases to the learners. In addition, Majority of the observed teachers compared L2 and L1 pragmatic features in their classes. Also, teachers taking part in the training course of meta-pragmatics mainly referred the students to complementary materials and encouraged students to assess their peers' performance of speech acts, though teachers sometimes corrected the pragmatic errors of the learners on the spot and sometimes after a delay. Moreover, the majority of the participants rarely/never overlooked the textbook pragmatic features.

Results of the classroom observations showed that for the participants who received the training course, items 2, 5, 10, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 in the checklist have the highest mean score ($M=6.2$). Detailed analysis of the valid percentage of the responses given to each item shows that out of the observed teachers 66.66%, "never/rarely" and 13.33% "sometimes" neglected pragmatic errors (item 2). Moreover, all observed teachers (often/always=66.66%,

sometimes=33.33%) explicitly explained socio-pragmatic features of the pragmatics cases (item 5). With regard to item 10, it can be seen that all observed teachers (often/always=70%, sometimes=30%) adopted a deductive approach to teaching pragmatic features, which for item 15, it can also be seen that all observed teachers (often/always=55.33%, sometimes=26.66%) compared L2 and L1 pragmatic features in their classes.

Results also indicate that for the observed teachers, the items 3, 7, 9, 12, and 13 have the next highest mean score ($M=4.6$). With respect to items 3 and 7, it is seen that 60 percent of the observed teachers often/always referred the students to complementary materials in their EFL classes and encouraged students to assess their peers' performance of speech acts and 33.33% sometimes referred students to complementary materials. Likewise, two thirds of (73.33%) the participants never/rarely overlooked the textbook pragmatic features, while 8 (26.66%) sometimes did so. In addition, with regard to items 12 and 13, the researcher observed that 8(26.66%) of the teacher sometimes and 60% often/always corrected the pragmatic errors on the spot and sometimes after a delay; while 10(33.33%) of the teachers sometimes and 20 (66.66%) often/always corrected the pragmatic errors on the spot. Furthermore, it can be seen that items 4 and 6 have the mean score of ($M=3.7$). Detailed analysis of the valid percentage of the item options show that nearly half of the teachers (46.66%) often/always and 20% sometimes used tasks to assess students' progress regarding pragmatic points (item 4). Moreover, 12 (40%) of the observed teachers often/always got the students to assess the appropriateness of speech acts they performed (item 6), while 10(33.33%) sometimes did so. Therefore, it can be argued that after receiving the training course, the teachers valued assessing the students' pragmatic performance.

Items 10 and 11 have the mean score of 3.6 ($M=3.6$). It can also be seen in Table 1 above, that after the treatment about two-thirds of the participants (70%) never/rarely adopted a deductive approach to teaching pragmatic features, but 9(30%) of them sometimes did so. However, 20 (57%) of them often/always adopted an inductive approach to teaching pragmatic features, and 6.66% of the teachers sometimes used the inductive approach. As it is evident in Table 1 above items 1, 8, and 14 have a mean of 3.5 ($M=3.5$). Hence, it can be seen that 22 (73.33%) of the teachers often/always and 26.66% sometimes gave feedback on pragmatic errors of the learners (item 1). This represents the effectiveness of the treatment teachers experienced in the training course of meta-pragmatics. Moreover, two thirds of (70%) of the teachers often/always and 30% sometimes implicitly dealt with the textbook pragmatic features (item 8). Detailed analysis of the observations also showed that 53.33% of the teachers often/always and 13.33 of them sometimes highlighted social distance, relationship and position between those performing a speech act in the textbook tasks (item 14), while 33.33 either never or rarely did so.

Results of the classroom observations also showed that majority (25/83.33%) of the teachers "often/always" and 16.66% "sometimes", encouraged students to perform pragmatic features at production level (item 16). Also, almost two thirds (66.66%) of the teachers observed "often/always" and 33.33% "sometimes" provided learners with required pragma linguistic resources (fixed chunks and phrases) (item 17). Likewise, majority (83.33%) of the teachers "often/always" and 16.66% "sometimes", assigned students some homework on pragmatic

features of the textbook. Moreover, with respect to encouraging students to personalize the pragmatic features (item 19) and engaging students in meta-pragmatic discussions (item 20), 60% “often/always” and 33.33% “sometimes” followed these procedures, while only 2 teachers (6.66%) did not do so.

4. Discussion

The first research question was an attempt to examine the extent to which participating in the in-service training course of meta-pragmatics would lead to the improvement of classroom practices in teaching pragmatics among Iranian EFL teachers. Hence, the classroom practices of teachers before and after taking part in an in-service course of meta-pragmatics was compared and contrasted. With respect to the real practices of the EFL teachers in the L2 classroom context, it was demonstrated that the meta-pragmatic training course had a significant effect on their performance. This contradicts earlier research by authors like Glaser (2020) who found that teachers who participated in related studies didn't give pragmatics in action the time and attention it deserved. The instructors' lack of understanding of the real-world implications of teaching pragmatics might be to blame. This study's instructors were more comfortable instructing students in pragmatic aspects because they probably had greater faith in their own pragmatic talents, in contrast to those of the instructors in Glaser's (2020) research. The reason behind the change might be that teachers can improve their understanding of pragmatic elements of the target language their students are exposed to, which allows them to teach pragmatics even if it's not as easy as teaching grammar or vocabulary. To facilitate some intricacies and complexities which teaching pragmatics entails, which makes its teaching demanding and risky; many teachers either make use of social media or newly developed applications or try to update themselves through watching films. Both of these techniques were emphasized in the training course of the teachers taking part in the present study.

The present study findings showed that making teachers aware of the pragmatic features and empowering them with using social media properly could compensate for the ineffectiveness of the coursebooks. This is in line with Cohen et al.'s (2023) study confirming that teacher can gain pragmatics awareness by means of technology as a part of their professional development (PD) process. The rationale behind this is that synchronous or asynchronous technological offerings could furnish educators with readily available resources that could help them better understand how to sequence lessons, pinpoint essential material, and devise tactics for teaching second language pragmatics in the classroom. Likewise, as Nuzzo and Brocca (2024) reported, informing teachers of the pragmatic notions and functions besides moving them toward “autonomy in investigating, analyzing, and reflecting on pragmatic issues” (p. 1), would offer a truly promising approach in enhancing EFL teacher training in pragmatics.

Another justification that would be more acceptable for the success of training teachers in terms of pragmatics can be germane to the opinion that the results may have been affected by the training course which has increased knowledge and academic awareness of the EFL teachers. The findings are in agreement with those of Noviyenty (2023), who discovered that English instructors improved their pragmatic skills through various means, including exposure to Western films and literature, practice speaking with native speakers, and participation in international friendship groups. As a results of this they could have a better performance in

their classes teaching pragmatics to EFL learners. Moreover, the present study findings can take support from Gauci et al.'s (2017) study of ILPS of pre-service teachers in the Italian L2 context proving that increasing EFL teachers' pragmatic awareness plays a significant role in the EFL education. The present study's results also support earlier research showing that training teachers in meta-pragmatics is important and that this training is needed in second language education because of the rapid growth of globalization. According to some scholars (Ishihara, 2024; Tajeddin, 2021; Tajeddin & Alemi, 2021) making teachers more aware of the meta-pragmatic features of the target language is a beneficial development that could change how pragmatics is taught and challenge existing language hierarchies. It is worth noting that the present study findings reject the reports of some of the previous studies (i.e., Eslami-Rasekh, 2008) which questioned the positive effect of training pragmatics to EFL teachers and its impact on their learners. The present study findings proved that meta-pragmatics training can enhance teachers' theoretical and practical knowledge simultaneously.

With respect to the second research question, it was found that the in-service training course of meta-pragmatics could help EFL teachers in strategy development in the teaching of pragmatics among Iranian EFL teachers. Teachers exposed to the training course explicitly explained socio-pragmatic features of the pragmatics cases to the learners which is in line with Bardovi-Harlig (2018) arguing that in the EFL context explicit teaching of socio-pragmatic notions would facilitate inter-language pragmatic development of the learner. Moreover, this finding, in terms of strategy development for EFL teachers, takes support from studies such as Alkawaz et al. (2023) and Noviyenty (2024) who found the significant effect of explicit pragmatic instruction on EFL students' production of speech acts. Moreover, it can be argued that in line with a compelling body of interventional studies which have targeted explicit/deductive and implicit/inductive teaching designs, the present study suggests explicit instruction of inter-language pragmatic notions and functions. This is in line with an overall trend in support of explicit/deductive instruction (Cohen et al., 2023; Derakhshan et al., 2024; Martínez-Flor et al., 2023).

It was also found that all observed teachers compared L2 and L1 pragmatic features in their classes. This strategy would facilitate the development of inter-language pragmatics for the learner as already proved in some other studies (Canbolat et al., 2021; Ghavamnia et al., 2012; Hosseinpur & Nevisi, 2018, Wu, 2024). Though the explicit-implicit teaching of pragmatics has attracted a lot of attention as mentioned above, this interest has overshadowed a third possibility which relies on the employment of learners' mother tongue which has received a remarkable amount of attention in second language acquisition research (Cheng, 2013; Eslami & Eslami-Rasekh, 2008; Hosseinpur & Nevisi, 2018). Results also indicate that teachers taking part in the training course of meta-pragmatics mainly referred the students to complementary materials. These highlights using authentic course books in the L2 classroom, which provides real pragmatic concepts for the learners to learn and use. This strategy has also been referred to in some previous studies (Bardovi-Harlig, 2018).

Another strategy employed by teachers following the training course was that in their EFL classes they encouraged students to assess their peers' performance of speech acts, though teachers sometimes corrected the pragmatic errors of the learners on the spot and sometimes

after a delay. This strategy is also in line with some of the previously reported research results on teaching and assessing inter-language pragmatics (Chiu et al., 2022; Ren, 2022) and can be considered both significant and facilitating in the L2 classroom to foster both pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic knowledge of learners.

Results of the classroom observation also showed that prior to the intervention teacher sometimes dealt with the textbook pragmatic. However, after the training course, the majority of the participants rarely/never overlooked the textbook pragmatic features. This shows that the functions and notions presented in the course books are valuable, in case they are taken into account by the teachers. Therefore, not only do the use of authentic materials help the development of pragmatic knowledge of the L2 learners, but also emphasizing the existing points in the domestically produced course books can help the learner a lot in this regard. This is in line with Bardovi-Harlig (2018) who recommend giving proper feedback to the learner, using authentic materials, and employing interpretation and production after the input is given. Bardovi-Harlig et al. (2015) offer a potentially helpful and modern solution to the authenticity challenge by outlining the steps involved in creating corpus-based products. These phases include choosing a corpus, recognizing expressions, gathering dialogue snippets, getting the snippets ready for instruction, and concentrated noticing and producing. Language teachers can access real language usage and incorporate it into their lesson plans thanks to the availability of internet corpora (Ishihara & Cohen, 2014).

Activities that raise awareness must be created in order for language learners to notice and, consequently, comprehend the input. The socio-pragmatics or pragma-linguistic aspects will be the main emphasis of this observation job. The socio-pragmatic assignment will involve observing the reasons behind TL speakers' refusal of an invitation to a party, for instance. Kasper and Rose (2002) suggested utilizing an observation sheet for this, and a discussion of metalinguistic knowledge can come last. The variety of linguistic forms used to accept and decline an invitation are the main focus of the pragma-linguistic assignment. This can be accomplished by providing the list of practical expressions to language learners. In addition to printed materials, audio and video resources will be used as learning aids.

Tateyama (2019) discovered that using video in EFL classes is highly successful. His study's conclusions show that using films to teach speech act can improve students' fluency in producing routines and chunks. Similar to this, Ishihara (2024) said that films provide verbal and nonverbal cues that influence communication pragmatics, such as intonation, pauses, hedges, gestures, and space, making them rich teaching resources for pragmatics. In light of the previously discussed benefits of interactive practice, role-playing exercises will be incorporated into the production task to enhance the previously provided written assignments. This will be accomplished by providing students with a detailed explanation of the part they will play before the practice. According to Kanık et al. (2023), although role play can give the pupil an opportunity for practice as in real communication, it may also not be effective if learners are not given appropriate context before carrying out their tasks. The role plays may be very challenging if the context is unclear, because learners have to create an ongoing context when they take part in communication. Pragmatic teaching in the EFL classroom is particularly important because both areas of pragmatic competence, pragma-linguistics and social-

pragmatics, seem to be very difficult for English language learners. They have a very low level of contact with the TL community, and therefore they are prejudiced to cultural values in this area.

Conclusion

The present study findings showed a significant improvement in the EFL teachers' pragmatic practices regarding teaching pragmatic features after receiving meta-pragmatic instructions. It can be concluded that raising pragmatic awareness in the EFL teachers is very important to pave the way for communication skills in the L2 classroom. When EFL teachers have a clear understating about the significance of pragmatic knowledge and they know how to cultivate it in their classes using appropriate instruction techniques, it can be expected to see promising results in the communication skills of the EFL learners. One of the key factors that can lead to such a high pragmatic awareness in instruction is taking part in pragmatic training courses.

It can be concluded that EFL teachers need to be well aware of the importance of pragmatic features and do their best to teach pragmatic features to the language learners. It can also be concluded that if the EFL teachers have a clear understating about the significance of pragmatics and they know how to cultivate it in their classes using appropriate instruction techniques, they can greatly contribute to the EFL learners' communication competence. The results of this study have some implications for stakeholders, namely EFL teacher trainers, EFL teachers, and EFL learners. To sum up, it can be concluded that EFL teachers need to well aware of the importance of pragmatic features and do their best to teach pragmatic features to the language learners. It can also be concluded that if the EFL teachers have a clear understating about the significance of pragmatics and they know how to cultivate it in their classes using appropriate instruction techniques, they can greatly contribute to the EFL learners' communication competence.

Acknowledgments (Required)

Authors thank the EFL teachers who participated in the study.

پښتونستان کاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرہنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی

References

- Alcón-Soler, E. A. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System*, 33(3), 417–435. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.06.005>
- Alkawaz, A., Afrouz, M., Nejadansari, D., & Dabaghi, A. (2023). The effect of explicit pragmatic instruction on EFL students' production of speech acts: Pragmalinguistic vs. sociopragmatic errors in focus. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 15(31), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.22034/elt.2023.54597.2521>
- Amiri, M., & Birjandi, P. (2015). Reliability and content validity of a comprehensive discourse completion test of interlanguage pragmatics for academic situations. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 12(9), 654–659. <https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8072/2015.09.002>
- Amiri, M., & Javanshir, T. (2017). The effect of instruction type and pushed output tasks on young Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic awareness. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 7(4), 202–221.
- Anis, M., & Anwar, C. (2020). Self-organized learning environment teaching strategy for ELT in Merdeka Belajar concept for high school students in Indonesia. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 5(2), 199–204. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v5i2.869>
- Azizi, Z., & Namaziandost, E. (2023). Implementing peer-dynamic assessment to cultivate Iranian EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic competence: A mixed-methods approach. *International Journal of Language Testing*, 13(1), 18–43.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2018). Teaching of pragmatics. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 17. 7(1), 1–16.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Vellenga, H. E. (2015). Developing corpus-based materials to teach pragmatic routines. *Tesol Journal*, 6(3), 499–526. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.177>
- Boulton, A. (2017). Corpora in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 50(4), 483–506. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000167>
- Canbolat, H. C., Atasoy, S., & Naiboğlu, B. (2021). The Effects of explicit pragmatic teaching on young learners' pragmatic development. *The Journal of International Lingual Social and Educational Sciences*, 7(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.34137/jilses.906273>
- Cheng, T. P. (2013). Codeswitching and participant orientations in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(4), 869–886. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.15404781.2013.12046.x>
- Cheng, L.P., Gao, Y., Mao, H., & Peng, Y. (2024). Metapragmatic awareness development in Chinese Children: A conversational competence perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 231, 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2024.07.013>
- Chiu, E. F.-Y., Chen, Y.-s., & Tai, H.-Y. (2022). Investigations into EFL students' pragmatic and grammatical awareness through peer collaboration. *Sustainability*, 14(17), 10568. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710568>
- Cohen, A. D. (2018). *Learning pragmatics from native and nonnative language teachers* (Vol. 123). Multilingual Matters.
- Cohen, A. D. (2019). Strategy instruction for learning and performing target language pragmatics. In A. U. Chamot & V. Harris (Eds.), *Learning strategy instruction in the language classroom: Issues and implementation* (pp. 140–152). Multilingual Matters.
- Cohen, A. D., Knight, S. W., & Sykes, J. M. (2023). Teachers gaining awareness of L2 pragmatics by means of an asynchronous professional development module. In A. Martínez-Flor, A. Sánchez-Hernández, & J. Barón (Eds.), *L2 Pragmatics in Action: Teachers, learners and the teaching-learning interaction process* (pp. 31–61). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.58>

- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2023). Revisiting mixed methods research designs twenty years later. In C. N. Path (Ed.), *Handbook of mixed methods research designs* (pp. 21–36). SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529614572.n6>
- Davarzani, F., & Talebzadeh, H. (2020). The effect of virtual and real classroom instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development: microblogging versus traditional instruction of speech acts to Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 13(27), 72–99. <https://doi.org/10.30495/JAL.2021.680904>
- Derakhshan, A., Malmir, A., & Greenier, V. T. (2021). Interlanguage pragmatic learning strategies (IPLS) as predictors of L2 speech act knowledge: A case of Iranian EFL learners. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 18(1), 235–243 <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.1.14.235>
- Derakhshan, A., Malmir, A., Pawlak, M., & Wang, Y. (2024). The use of interlanguage pragmatic learning strategies (IPLS) by L2 learners: the impact of age, gender, language learning experience, and L2 proficiency levels. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 62(4), 1985–2008. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2022-0132>
- Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2023). “The language is very formal and appropriate”: L2 learners’ in/appropriateness evaluations and metapragmatic judgments in student-faculty emails. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 217, 17–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2023.09.001>
- Eslami, Z. R., & Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2008). Enhancing the pragmatic competence of non-native English-speaking teacher candidates (NNESTCs) in an EFL context. In E. Alcón Soler & A. Martínez-Flor (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 178–197). Multilingual Matters.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal*, 59(3), 199–208. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci039>.
- Farashaiyan, A., Sahragard, R., Muthusamy, P., & Muniandy, R. (2020). Questionnaire development and validation of interlanguage pragmatic instructional approaches and techniques in EFL contexts. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 9(2), 330–342. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v9n2p330>
- Farrell, A. (2017). *The target English/es used by EFL teachers from Ireland: Current trends and perspectives* (PhD dissertation), University of Limerick. <https://doi.org/10.34961/8601>
- Gauci, P., Ghia, E., & Caruana, S. (2017). The pragmatic competence of student-teachers of Italian L2. *Current issues in intercultural pragmatics*, 323–345. <https://doi.org/10.1075/pbns.274.15gau>
- Ghavamnia, M., Tavakoli, M., & Rezazadeh, M. (2012). A comparative study of requests among L2 English, L1 Persian, and L1 English speakers. *RAEL: Revista Electrónica de Lingüística Aplicada*, 10, 105–123.
- Glaser, K. (2020). Assessing the L2 pragmatic awareness of non-native EFL teacher candidates: Is spotting a problem enough? *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 16(1), 33–65. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lpp2020-0003>
- Glaser, K., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2024). Guest editorial: L2 pragmatics in language teacher education? *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics: System*, 131, 103581. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103581>
- González-Lloret, M. (2023). The road System travelled: Five decades of technology in language education. *System*, 118, 103124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103124>
- Hosseinpour, R. M., & Nevisi, R. B. (2018). L1-based Instruction: Does It work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(1), 233–241. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.1.18.233>
- Ishihara, N. (2024). Fostering a translingual framework in teacher education focused on pragmatics: Identity and the multilingual turn in pragmatics pedagogy. *System*, 125, 103457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103457>
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Routledge.

- Kanık, M., Youbi, G. M., Sharon, T. T., & Kasapoğlu, M. The (Non-) Teaching of pragmatics in an EFL context. *Journal of Language Education and Research*, 9(1), 43–58. <https://doi.org/10.31464/jlere.1221693>
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Blackwell.
- Li, X. (2022). Text classification of conversational implicatures based on lexical features. *Applied Artificial Intelligence*, 36(1), 3160–3175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08839514.2022.2127598>
- Liu, M. H. (2023). Blended cross-tier language teacher development: designing online video-based pragmatic assessment. *English Teaching & Learning*, 47(1), 21–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321021-00106-1>
- Liu, Y., Liu, X., & Zhang, Y. (2021). A pragmatic study on teachers' feedback in EFL classroom in China. *English Language Teaching*, 14(5), 109–123.
- LoCastro, V. (2012). *Pragmatics for language educators: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Routledge.
- Long, M. (2014). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley Blackwell.
- Mahmud, M. (2019). The use of politeness strategies in the classroom context by English university students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 597–606. <http://eprints.unm.ac.id/id/eprint/20711>
- Martínez-Flor, A., Barón, J., & Sánchez-Hernández, A. (2023). *L2 pragmatics in action*. John Benjamins B.V.
- Meihami, H., & Khanlarzadeh, M. (2015). Pragmatic content in global and local ELT textbooks: A micro analysis study. *Sage Open*, 5(4), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015615168>
- Myrset, A., & McConachy, T. (2023). Incorporating pragmatics into primary English language teacher education. In D. Valente & D. Xerri (Eds.), *Innovative practices in early English language education* (pp. 305–327). Springer. <https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-031-12922-3>
- Noviyenty, L. (2023). Non-native EFL lecturers' strategies in building their pragmatics competence. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 7(2), 376–395.
- Nuzzo, E., & Brocca, N. (2024). Raising the (meta) pragmatic awareness of non-native pre-service teachers of L2 Italian with a telecollaborative data-driven learning project on formal email writing. *System*, 127, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103518>
- Prastikawati, E. F., Lestari, M. Y. W., & Asropah, A. (2024). Nurturing interlanguage pragmatic competence through dynamic assessment. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics*, 5(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.56874/jeel.v5i2.1999>
- Ren, W. (2022). *Second language pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sadikov, E., & Abdusalimova, N. (2025). The implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) in developing esl learners listening comprehension: a theoretical and pedagogical perspective. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, 1(4), 1174-1178. <https://www.academicpublishers.org/journals/index.php/ijai>
- Saleem, A., Saleem, T., & Aziz, A. (2022). A pragmatic study of congratulation strategies of Pakistani ESL learners and British English speakers. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 7(8), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00134-9>
- Samani, B., Amiri, M., & Ghafouri, N. (2024). EFL teachers' pragmatic awareness and classroom practices influenced by an in-service training course of meta-pragmatics. *Curriculum Research Journal*, 1(05), 14-44. <https://doi.org/10.71703/cure.2024.1118645>
- Sánchez-Hernández, A., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2022). Teaching the pragmatics of English as an international language: A focus on pragmatic markers. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(2), 256–278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211064933>
- Sato, M., Thorne, S. L., Michel, M., Alexopoulou, T., & Hellermann, J. (2025). Language, people, classrooms, world: Blending disparate theories for united language education practices. *The Modern Language Journal*, 109(S1), 15–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12976>

- Silverstein, M. (1993). Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In J. A. Lucy (Ed.), *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics* (pp. 33–59). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511621031>
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Tajeddin, Z. (2021). Toward critical applied pragmatics: Moving from postcolonial hegemony to decolonial pragmatics pedagogy. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language (TESL-EJ)*, 25(1), 1–21.
- Tajeddin, Z., & Alemi, M. (2021). Moving from cultural ethnocentrism to ethnorelativism through the affordance of English language learning experience. In M. Victoria & C. Sangiamchit (Eds.), *Interculturality and the English language classroom* (pp. 21–36). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Tajeddin, Z., Alemi, M., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2018). Idealized native-speaker linguistic and pragmatic norms in English as an international language: exploring the perceptions of nonnative English teachers. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 18(3), 300–314. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2017.1413105>
- Tateyama, Y. (2019). Pragmatics in a language classroom. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics* (pp. 400–412). Routledge.
- Usó-Juan, E., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2008). Teaching intercultural communicative competence through the four skills. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*, 21, 157–170. <https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2008.21.09>
- Webb, C. (2013). Teaching pragmatics to international students in private language schools in the UK. *Contemporary English Teaching and Learning in Non-English-Speaking Countries*, 2(2), 27–41. Retrieved September 23, 2025. <http://www.Cetljournal.co.uk/article/view/12171/8265>
- Wu, X. (2024). A literature review on teaching pragmatics in the EFL context: Challenges and implications. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*, 15(2), 113–120. <https://doi.org/10.54097/09y5c855>

Appendices

Appendix A

Classroom Observation Checklist on the Pragmatic Features

		Never=1	Rarely=2	Sometimes=3	Often=4	Always=5					
No.	Item	1	2	3	4	5					
1	The teacher gives feedback on pragmatic errors.										
2	The teacher neglects pragmatic errors.										
3	The teacher refers the students to complementary materials.										
4	The teacher uses tasks to assess students' progress regarding pragmatic points.										
5	The teacher explicitly explains socio-pragmatic features of the pragmatics cases.										
6	The teacher gets the students to assess the appropriateness of speech acts they perform.										
7	The teacher encourages students to assess their peers' performance of speech acts.										
8	The teacher implicitly deals with the textbook pragmatic features.										
9	The teacher overlooks the textbook pragmatic features.										
10	The teacher adopts a deductive approach to teaching pragmatic features.										
11	The teacher adopts an inductive approach to teaching pragmatic features.										
12	The teacher corrects the pragmatic errors on the spot.										
13	The teacher corrects the pragmatic errors after a delay.										
14	The teacher highlights social distance, relationship and position between those performing a speech act in the textbook tasks.										
15	The teacher compares L2 & L1 pragmatic features.										
16	The teacher encourages students to perform pragmatic features at production level.										
17	The teacher provides learners with required pragma linguistic resources (fixed chunks and phrases).										
18	The teacher assigns students some homework on pragmatic features of the textbook.										
19	The teacher encourages the students to personalize the pragmatic features.										
20	The teacher engages the students in meta-pragmatic discussions.										

Appendix B

Schedule of the Pragmatic In-service Training Course

Sessions	Topics	Lesson Plan Designed
1	What is pragmatics?	The first session of the training course began with welcoming the EFL teachers to the course and letting them know the course purposes and implications. Then, the researcher asked the participants to discuss the components of a good communication, and try to extract their suggestions on the basic features of an effective method to teach conversations in their classes. Next, the researcher defined communicative competence and pragmatic competence as a major part of communicative competence. A short video of an author was displayed in which s/he defined pragmatics and its significance in using the target language properly. Following the video, the researcher wrote some questions about the pragmatic knowledge on the whiteboard, such as if the participants could teach pragmatics in their classes, if they had learned how to teach pragmatic features efficiently in their classes, or if from the teachers' perspectives it is essential to teach pragmatics in EFL classes and why. The researcher invited the participants to team up and discuss the questions one after another. At the end of the first session, the researcher shed lights on the pragmatics teachability and its importance in second language education. To more refine the point, the researcher provided a couple of tangible examples on the significance of pragmatic teaching.
2	Components of pragmatic awareness	The second session of the course focused on the components of pragmatic awareness. After greeting, the participants were given a handout consisting of the four components of pragmatic awareness, including context, goal, impact, and roles. Then, the participants were asked to discuss their meaning and effects on teaching pragmatic features in their groups. Then, the researcher tried to make sure that the participants had a clear understanding about the key components by explaining them in-details and providing a couple of tangible examples. In the next step, some authentic greeting dialogues were created. To this, at first, the participants were asked to talk about the ways through which they greeted each other, if it were formal, semi-formal or informal, and which words and phrases they used and why. Then, a hand-out with four different authentic situations were given to the participants and they were asked to create a dialogue for each situation and then analyzed them according to the four pragmatic awareness components.
3	Speech acts	The third session of the course focused on awareness raising of the participants about speech acts. In this session, the EFL teachers were asked to talk about the meaning of speech acts and their functions. Then, they were asked to produce some speech act examples with their functions. Next, the researcher

		explained the speech acts, speech act sets, various kinds of speech acts, the reasons of teaching speech acts, and mentioned examples of common speech acts. At the end of the session, the participants were asked if they had any questions about the subjects and shared their learning with their partners in 10 minutes.
4	Cross cultural variance and Pragmatic failure or divergence	The fourth session of the course deals with the cross-cultural variance and pragmatic failure or divergence. At the beginning of the session, the researcher will provide some examples of cultural variances that can make problems when communicating with English native speakers. Then, the researcher will explain the importance of covering and teaching cultural variances in EFL classes. Next, the definition of pragmatic rules will be provided by the researcher. Likewise, the pragmatic failure or divergence was defined accompanying with reasons could lead to it. The session continued with explaining the reasons of pragmatic failure and giving some examples. At the end of the session, the participants were invited to put forward their questions and share their understanding with other participants.
5	Cognitive frameworks & strategies for instructing L2 pragmatics	The fifth session of the course was assigned to pragmatic frameworks and strategies for teaching pragmatics in EFL classes. The researcher asked the participants if they could suggest any strategies for instructing pragmatics and would write the suggestion on the whiteboard. Then, various pragmatic frameworks like noticing hypothesis, awareness rising, input-output orientation, and interactional opportunities were discussed in-depth. Next, the researcher illuminated various strategies for teaching pragmatics, including explicit vs. implicit instruction, deductive vs. inductive instruction, and their advantages and disadvantages. The last step of this session explained the rubrics of planning a pragmatic lesson. At the end, the EFL participants were invited to raise their questions and discuss their comprehension.
6	Textbooks and supplementary material	The sixth session of the course was related to textbooks and supplementary materials. At first, the researcher asked the participants if they could give some examples of the pragmatic features in the ELT textbooks that they had been teaching. After receiving the participants' examples, to refine more the subject, the researcher provided more examples of pragmatic features taken from some common-used ELT textbooks, such as American English File, Touch Stone, and Four Corners. Next, the researcher asked the EFL participants to suggest their own strategies for teaching pragmatic features in their classes. The next step was equipping the participants to supplement the course books which lacked enough coverage of the pragmatic features. To do this, various authentic sources of pragmatic materials at the market were introduced and the strategies employed were discussed.
7	How to do corrective feedback	The seventh session of the course focused on how to give effective corrective feedback to the EFL learners' pragmatic errors. The researcher asked the participants to state how they could provide feedback to their students when they made a pragmatic mistake. After receiving the participants' suggestions and ideas, the researcher elaborated upon the different types of error correction and their positive points and weaknesses. Then, the researcher asked the EFL teachers to specify the corrective feedback strategies which could meet their students' needs. This session continued with presenting suitable types of corrective feed-backs according to the EFL learners' age and language proficiency, and the EFL students' individual differences and their needs. Then, the researcher presented various reasons why the EFL teachers could not usually correct their students' pragmatic mistakes. In the next step of this session, the participants were given some erroneous examples and were ask to find a suitable way to correct these errors and mention the underlying reasons in their groups. Like the previous sessions, the EFL participants were invited to put forward their questions and then shared their understanding of the subject with their partners.
8	Pragmatic assessment	The eighth session of the training course zoomed on assessing pragmatic features. At the beginning of this session, the researchers examined if the participants knew any effective methods to assess their students' pragmatic features. Then, the researcher tried to illuminate the underlying reasons to gauge the EFL learners' pragmatic production and the benefits it could bring to their learning. Later on, the steps taken for assessing pragmatic contents were introduced. At first, the EFL teachers inform students about the contextual factors that were involved in assessment. Secondly, the comprehension of speech acts was measured. Thirdly, the EFL teachers tried to measure speech act production through oral role-play, written discourse, discourse completion task (DCT), multiple-choice items, and short answer completion items. The session continued with presenting and discussing six strategies for assessing pragmatic features, including (1) Realistic situations; (2) Rating for key aspects of performance; (3) Debriefing students' interpretations of the context; (4) Checking the role of subjectively in L2 pragmatic performance; (5) Checking learners for their speech acts responses; and (6) Determining when to assess learners' speech acts performance.
9	Practicum	The final two sessions of the training course were allotted to practical teaching techniques. In each session, 15 EFL teachers taught pragmatic features (every teacher taught one topic), given by the researcher and chosen from common pragmatic features. Five of the teachers in each session were given the course book page including the pragmatic feature and five others were asked to find materials needed to teach the same pragmatic features from the sources that had been introduced in the sixth session. In this way, teaching pragmatic features through textbooks and supplementary materials were compared.
10	Practicum	