

# Teaching Pragmatic Competence in EFL Classrooms: The Impact of Speech Act Instruction on Pre-Service English Teachers

**<sup>1</sup>Yopie Alex Tomi Pangemanan, <sup>\*1</sup>James Edward Lalira, <sup>1</sup>Jane Elvira Scipio, <sup>1</sup>Royke Max Suoth, <sup>2</sup>Vivi Nansy Tumuju, <sup>2</sup>Mercy Mantau**

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Kristen Indonesia Tomohon, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Sam Ratulangi, Indonesia

**\*Correspondence:**

jameslalira@gmail.com

**Submission History:**

Submitted: February 11, 2025

Revised: March 29, 2025

Accepted: April 12, 2025



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

## Abstract

Pragmatic competence—the ability to use language appropriately in social contexts—is essential for effective EFL communication but often underemphasized in teacher education. This study examines the impact of speech act-based instruction on developing pre-service English teachers' pragmatic competence. Participants included 20 second-year students enrolled in the English Education program at Universitas Kristen Indonesia Tomohon. Over four weeks, they attended two 90-minute instructional sessions per week, integrating explicit instruction, role-plays, discourse analysis, and reflective discussions. Multiple instruments were employed: a 30-item pragmatic competence test (combining situational multiple-choice and open-ended tasks), classroom observations, and post-instruction interviews. Quantitative results revealed statistically significant improvements across all levels of speech acts: locutionary ( $M = 0.437$  to  $0.5665$ ,  $p < .001$ ), illocutionary ( $M = 0.535$  to  $0.6105$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and perlocutionary ( $M = 0.5295$  to  $0.5565$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Qualitative findings highlighted increased pragmatic awareness, communicative confidence, and in-class adaptability. However, participants still faced challenges in transferring theoretical knowledge into spontaneous speech, suggesting the need for extended, contextualized instruction. These findings affirm the value of structured pragmatic instruction in EFL teacher training, equipping future educators to model and foster linguistic accuracy and sociocultural fluency in global communication.

**Keywords:** Pragmatic competence, speech act instruction, EFL teacher training, communicative competence.

## INTRODUCTION

Pragmatic competence, the ability to use language appropriately in contextually and socially acceptable ways, constitutes a critical dimension of communicative competence (Mao & He, 2021; Laughlin et al., 2015). It involves the knowledge and skills required to interpret and produce utterances that conform to the norms of interaction, including sensitivity to speaker intent, sociocultural conventions, and contextual appropriateness

(Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993; Ishihara, 2010; Koran & Koran, 2017; Grundy, 2019). Despite its acknowledged importance, pragmatic instruction remains insufficiently emphasized in many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teacher education programs, where curricula continue to prioritize grammatical accuracy and vocabulary development (Taguchi, 2015; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). This instructional imbalance carries significant pedagogical consequences. EFL learners—including those preparing to become English teachers—often possess strong linguistic knowledge but struggle to engage effectively in real-world communication due to limited exposure to authentic pragmatic contexts (Jianda, 2006; Glaser, 2020; Schauer, 2023). Difficulties frequently arise in performing everyday speech acts such as making requests, offering apologies, or refusing politely, particularly when interacting with speakers from different cultural backgrounds (Abolfathiasl & Abdullah, 2015; Turhan & Tuncer, 2022; Kitis & Kitis, 2022). Without targeted instruction in pragmatics, future teachers are likely to perpetuate form-focused pedagogical practices that overlook language's functional and sociocultural dimensions, thereby hindering the development of learners' communicative competence.

In the context of EFL teacher education, the development of pragmatic competence is not merely an academic requirement but a professional necessity. As Yuan and Lee (2014) emphasized, pre-service English teachers are expected to serve as models and mediators of authentic language use. This dual responsibility demands a comprehensive understanding of linguistic forms and the sociocultural rules governing language use in diverse communicative settings (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; Gomez-Laich, 2016). Teachers who lack pragmatic awareness often communicate in ways that are grammatically correct yet socially inappropriate or culturally insensitive, thereby limiting the effectiveness of classroom interaction and undermining efforts to cultivate students' communicative competence (Gilmore, 2007; Glaser, 2020; Ivanova, 2017; Byram, 2021). Moreover, Yuan (2012) and Glaser (2014) emphasized that instructional practices that neglect pragmatics tend to reinforce the misconception that language learning is limited to mastering grammatical rules and vocabulary lists rather than fostering meaningful engagement with others in context-rich environments. Classroom leaders must be capable of recognizing and teaching the subtleties of pragmatic meaning, such as tone, intention, and appropriateness, which are essential for real-world interaction (Ishihara, 2010; Ngai & Janusch, 2015).

Given these demands, it is essential to adopt instructional approaches emphasizing language's functional and context-sensitive nature. One such approach is speech act theory, which offers a practical framework for analyzing and teaching language use in real-life communication (Borer, 2018). In the context of English language teaching, this theory helps educators address how meaning is constructed through words and intent, context, and social interaction (Zhao & Throssell, 2011; Christianto, 2020). Originally developed by Austin (1962) and extended by Searle (1969), speech act theory categorizes utterances into three dimensions: locutionary (literal meaning), illocutionary (speaker's intent), and perlocutionary (effect on the listener). These categories are particularly relevant in EFL classrooms, where learners are regularly required to perform speech acts such as making requests, offering apologies, refusing politely, and giving suggestions. Understanding these pragmatic functions enables learners to move beyond mechanical language accuracy toward communication that is both contextually appropriate and socially effective—skills that are

essential for successful language teaching and learning in diverse classroom environments (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010; McConachy, 2017; Hall, 2017).

A growing body of research highlights the importance of speech act instruction and the development of pragmatic competence in EFL contexts. Santosa and Kurniadi (2020) and Basra and Thoyyibah (2017) analyzed teacher talk in Indonesian EFL classrooms using Searle's speech act taxonomy and found that the distribution of speech acts reflected the teacher's instructional style and pedagogical focus. While Santosa and Kurniadi observed a predominance of assertive acts (57%), which aligned with test-based, explanation-heavy teaching, Basra and Thoyyibah (2017) reported a higher frequency of directive acts (70%), suggesting a communicative language teaching (CLT) orientation. Both studies concluded that a teacher's preferred speech act type shaped classroom interaction patterns and influenced students' opportunities to develop pragmatic competence. Complementing these classroom-based findings, Hidayat et al. (2022) emphasized that speech acts enacted by teachers reflect power dynamics and affect student motivation and engagement, particularly through questioning and commanding strategies. From a broader perspective, Choraih et al. (2016) argued that while pragmatic competence is increasingly recognized as essential to communicative language teaching, its implementation in curricula and assessment practices remains limited, especially in grammar-focused systems. Ahmed (2022) reinforced this concern, noting that EFL university students acknowledge the importance of using language in real contexts and support pragmatic instruction as a means to improve fluency and appropriate usage.

Although pragmatic competence is widely acknowledged as a vital component of communicative ability, its integration into EFL teacher education remains limited, particularly in contexts where the instructional emphasis is placed on grammatical and lexical accuracy rather than sociocultural appropriateness. Existing studies have predominantly focused on categorizing speech acts in classroom discourse, with limited attention to how explicit instruction can enhance pre-service teachers' ability to use language appropriately in diverse communicative contexts. As a result, many pre-service teachers enter the profession without sufficient preparation to model or teach pragmatic features of language use. Addressing this gap, the present study aims to examine the impact of speech act-based instruction on the pragmatic competence of pre-service English teachers, specifically focusing on their ability to recognize, produce, and evaluate speech acts effectively. The novelty of this study lies in its intervention-based design, which moves beyond descriptive analyses and offers empirical evidence on the pedagogical value of explicit pragmatics instruction in EFL teacher training.

## METHOD

This study adopts a mixed-methods approach to investigate the impact of speech act-based instruction on the pragmatic competence of pre-service English teachers at Universitas Kristen Indonesia Tomohon. A quasi-experimental design was employed, integrating quantitative and qualitative data through pre-tests, post-tests, classroom observations, and semi-structured interviews. The mixed-methods framework allows for triangulation of data and offers deeper insights into instructional effectiveness, consistent with best practices in second language acquisition (SLA) research (Dörnyei, 2007; Mackey & Gass, 2015; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Moreover, this study involved 20 second-year

pre-service English teachers enrolled in the English Education program at Universitas Kristen Indonesia Tomohon. Participants were selected through purposive sampling to ensure alignment with the study's objective (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). All participants had completed foundational English language courses but had not received prior formal instruction in pragmatics or speech act theory.

This study employed multiple data collection instruments to assess participants' pragmatic competence. A pragmatic competence test consisting of 30 situational multiple-choice and open-ended items was used to evaluate comprehension and application of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts. This format aligns with established approaches in pragmatic research, including scenario-based assessments and discourse completion tasks (Roever, 2012). Classroom observations were conducted throughout the instructional period to document participants' engagement and their speech act performance appropriateness during role-play activities, following procedures recommended by Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor (2003). Additionally, semi-structured interviews were conducted after the intervention to explore participants' experiences and perceptions of the instruction. These interviews provided deeper qualitative insights into how participants internalized and applied pragmatic knowledge, turning subjective reflections into meaningful data for understanding the instructional impact (Gudkova, 2018).

The study was conducted over four weeks, with participants attending two 90-minute instructional sessions per week. Instruction was based on explicit pragmatics instruction, focusing on speech act categories such as requests, apologies, compliments, refusals, and indirect speech (Kasper & Rose, 2002; Jeon & Kaya, 2006). The intervention began with a pre-test to measure participants' baseline pragmatic competence, followed by structured lessons incorporating explicit teaching, discussions, discourse analysis, and role-play activities. In addition, classroom observations were conducted throughout the sessions to document the participants' application of pragmatic strategies and note instances of appropriate or inappropriate use. After the final session, a post-test identical in format to the pre-test was administered to assess instructional impact. Semi-structured interviews were also conducted to explore participants' experiences and perspectives on the instruction. Quantitative pre-and post-test data were analyzed using a paired t-test to determine statistical significance (Pallant, 2020). Qualitative data from interviews and observations were analyzed thematically using NVivo software. Codes were categorized into themes such as instructional benefits, challenges in pragmatic application, and cross-cultural awareness, following procedures outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006) and Miles et al. (2014).

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate a statistically significant improvement in the pragmatic competence of pre-service English teachers at Universitas Kristen Indonesia Tomohon following speech act-based instruction. Results are presented in two categories: quantitative data from statistical analysis and qualitative data from thematic analysis. Together, these findings offer a comprehensive view of how participants' locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary competencies developed through targeted instructional interventions. The mean scores of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts show a

clear upward trend, indicating measurable gains in students' ability to produce, interpret, and respond appropriately to speech acts. The results are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Comparison of pre-test and post-test scores

Aspect of Speech Act	Pre-Test Mean	Post-Test Mean
Locutionary Competence	0.437	0.5665
Illocutionary Competence	0.535	0.6105
Perlocutionary Competence	0.5295	0.5565

The locutionary competence of students improved significantly, as evidenced by the increase from 0.437 to 0.5665. This suggests that participants developed greater accuracy in producing contextually appropriate utterances. Likewise, illocutionary competence, which assesses the ability to interpret speaker intent, increased from 0.535 to 0.6105, demonstrating an enhanced understanding of indirectness, politeness strategies, and speech act intentions. The perlocutionary competence, referring to the effectiveness of an utterance on the listener, exhibited the smallest increase (0.5295 to 0.5565), suggesting that while students improved in producing and understanding speech acts, their ability to elicit expected responses from listeners remains an area requiring further reinforcement.

The quantitative results of this study confirm a statistically significant improvement across all three dimensions of speech acts—locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary—following explicit speech act instruction. The most substantial gain was observed in locutionary competence, which increased from 0.437 to 0.5665, indicating that participants became more proficient in constructing grammatically correct and contextually appropriate utterances. These findings are consistent with [Jeon and Kaya \(2006\)](#) and [Taguchi et al. \(2022\)](#), who found that explicit metapragmatic instruction enhances learners' ability to produce structurally accurate speech acts suited to specific social contexts. Similarly, [Roever \(2012\)](#), [Dendenne \(2014\)](#), and [Bardovi-Harlig et al. \(2014\)](#) emphasize that exposure to situational cues and structured input significantly improves learners' ability to align linguistic form with communicative function. The improvement in locutionary performance observed in this study reflects participants' increased awareness of linguistic choices that convey socially appropriate meaning—an essential skill for effective language teaching.

Moreover, illocutionary competence improved from 0.535 to 0.6105, reflecting participants' enhanced ability to recognize speaker intent and apply appropriate politeness and indirectness strategies. [Ishihara and Cohen \(2010\)](#) and [Masouleh et al. \(2014\)](#) emphasize that explicit instruction targeting the functions and intentions of speech acts develops learners' metapragmatic awareness, enabling more context-sensitive communicative decisions. In line with this, [Taguchi \(2015\)](#) and [Timpe-Laughlin \(2017\)](#) note that EFL learners frequently struggle with indirectness, hedging, and socially appropriate refusals—especially in intercultural interactions—further highlighting the importance of instructional interventions that directly address these challenges.

Perlocutionary competence, in contrast, showed the smallest improvement—from 0.5295 to 0.5565—although the gain was statistically significant. This modest increase suggests that participants continued to experience difficulty in producing utterances that consistently elicited the intended responses from listeners. [Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor \(2003\)](#) and [Liew \(2013\)](#) argue that perlocutionary effects are particularly complex because they depend not only on what is said but also on how it is received—something



difficult to predict or practice in controlled classroom environments. Roever (2012) and Pourmousavi and Zenouzagh (2020) similarly point out that while learners may perform adequately on structured speech act tasks, they often struggle when faced with real-time interaction and unpredictable listener reactions. Addressing this challenge requires more than form-based instruction; it calls for immersive, dynamic experiences that enable learners to interpret feedback and adjust their speech accordingly. As Kasper and Rose (2002), Glaser (2020), and Yuan and Lee (2014) suggest, developing pragmatic fluency and listener-sensitive communication depends on sustained exposure to authentic discourse through role-plays, pragmatic reflection, and interactional tasks designed to simulate real-world communication.

**Table 2.** T-Test analysis of pre-test and post-test scores

Category	T-Statistic	P-Value
Locutionary Competence	-16.983	6.08e-13
Illocutionary Competence	-10.822	1.45e-09
Perlocutionary Competence	-18.380	1.47e-13

The p-values for all categories are well below the 0.05 threshold, indicating statistically significant improvements in participants' pragmatic competence across locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary dimensions. These results provide strong empirical support for the effectiveness of speech act-based instruction in enhancing the pragmatic skills of pre-service English teachers.

**Table 3.** Categorization of students based on pragmatic competence development

Level of Improvement	Locution	Illocution	Perlocution	Key Observations
Minimal Change	Limited accuracy	Unclear intent	Minimal listener impact	Struggled to adapt speech to context; required more scaffolding and feedback
Moderate Improvement	More consistent usage	Improved intent recognition	Noticeable listener response	Demonstrated growing awareness, though still hesitant in spontaneous interaction
Significant Improvement	Accurate and appropriate	Context-sensitive intent	Strong pragmatic impact	Confident use of varied speech acts; transferred knowledge across situations

Thematic analysis of interviews and classroom observations revealed varying levels of improvement in participants' pragmatic competence following the speech act-based instruction. Participants demonstrating minimal change often expressed uncertainty in applying pragmatic knowledge, particularly in recognizing appropriate intent and understanding listener expectations. One participant noted, *"I understand the sentence, but I still don't know when it's okay to say it politely or directly,"* reflecting limited illocutionary awareness. Another commented, *"Sometimes I just guess what to say, but I'm not sure if it's the right way to ask in English,"* indicating a reliance on surface-level language knowledge without sufficient contextual grounding. These learners often produced grammatically correct sentences that failed to achieve the intended effect, as illustrated by the remark, *"I used the expression we learned, but my classmates still looked confused."* This group appeared

to need further scaffolding and extended exposure to authentic communicative situations to fully internalize pragmatic norms.

In contrast, participants who showed moderate improvement displayed a growing awareness of context and intent, though not yet fully confident in spontaneous communication. One participant shared, *"After practicing refusals, I feel more confident saying 'no' without sounding rude,"* highlighting increased control over illocutionary strategies. Another remarked, *"I started paying attention to the situation before choosing my words,"* which suggests progress in aligning speech with social cues. However, hesitation remained a challenge for some: *"I think I understand the rules better now, but I still hesitate when I speak without notes."* These findings align with previous research (e.g., Takimoto, 2009) emphasizing the importance of continued contextualized practice for consolidating pragmatic knowledge.

Participants demonstrating significant improvement exhibited strong control across all three dimensions of pragmatic competence. These individuals reported increased adaptability and confidence in real-time communication. One noted, *"Now I can tell when to be formal or casual depending on who I'm talking to,"* indicating advanced sociopragmatic sensitivity. Another reflected, *"Role-playing helped me realize how my words affect the listener's reaction,"* showing heightened awareness of perlocutionary outcomes. This shift from mechanical language use to context-driven expression was further evidenced by a participant who stated, *"I don't just translate from Indonesian anymore. I think about what fits the situation."* Moreover, the development of communicative confidence was underscored by the comment, *"Before, I was afraid of making mistakes. Now, I try to adapt my language and tone based on the person I talk to."* These responses suggest that explicit, contextualized instruction can significantly enhance learners' ability to apply pragmatic knowledge flexibly and appropriately, a skill that is critical for their future roles as language educators.

Students in the Minimal Change category demonstrated limited development across all three dimensions of speech acts. Their utterances often lacked grammatical accuracy and contextual appropriateness (locutionary), showed unclear speaker intent (illocutionary), and failed to generate meaningful listener responses (perlocutionary). These students struggled to adapt their language use to different social situations, reinforcing previous research showing that learners with low metapragmatic awareness tend to rely on literal meanings and formal accuracy rather than functional appropriateness (Jeon & Kaya, 2006; Glaser, 2020; Ivanova, 2017). Their limited progress suggests that short-term instruction may be insufficient for learners who require more time and support to internalize pragmatic norms—an observation supported by Kasper and Rose (2002) and Yuan and Lee (2014) and Hidayat et al. (2022), who argue that pragmatic development often requires sustained, scaffolded, and context-rich exposure to speech act use.

Participants in the Moderate Improvement group consistently used linguistic forms and demonstrated a growing awareness of speaker intent. Their speech acts began to elicit appropriate responses, especially in rehearsed or familiar contexts, although they still hesitated in spontaneous interaction. This finding reflects what House (1996) and Takimoto (2009) emphasize: that pragmatic competence requires more than declarative knowledge—it depends on repeated contextualized practice and the ability to apply knowledge flexibly in real-time communication. Derakhshan et al. (2021) and Hussein et al. (2020) further note that communicative competence improves when learners actively engage in discourse-

based, task-supported activities. In this study, learners in this group appeared to benefit from structured instruction but would likely gain more with additional opportunities for feedback, improvisation, and authentic language use (Pourmousavi & Zenouzagh, 2020). In contrast, students in the Significant Improvement category exhibited strong and context-sensitive performance across locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary dimensions. Their utterances reflected grammatical accuracy, appropriate intent, and clear communicative effect. These learners confidently adapted their language to diverse social contexts, suggesting that they had internalized core pragmatic principles (Vu, 2017). This group's progress demonstrates the potential of explicit speech act-based instruction to foster not only awareness but also pragmatic fluency and adaptability—skills that are essential for future EFL educators (Masouleh et al., 2014; Chong-yuan, 2021)

## CONCLUSION

Developing pragmatic awareness among pre-service teachers is essential in the context of EFL teacher education, where communicative competence is a fundamental instructional goal. This research investigated the impact of speech act-based instruction on the pragmatic competence of pre-service English teachers at Universitas Kristen Indonesia Tomohon. The study examined changes in participants' ability to comprehend, produce, and respond to speech acts appropriately across locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary dimensions through a mixed-methods approach. Quantitative results showed statistically significant improvement, particularly in the accurate use of grammatical forms and the recognition of communicative intent. Although progress in perlocutionary competence was more limited, qualitative findings revealed that many participants began to demonstrate increased awareness of listener impact and contextual nuance. These outcomes affirm the value of integrating explicit pragmatic instruction into teacher training programs, emphasizing structured practice, interactional feedback, and real-world communication scenarios. Enhancing pragmatic competence at the pre-service level ensures that future teachers are linguistically proficient and prepared to model effective, socially appropriate language use in diverse educational settings.

## REFERENCES

- Abolfathiasl, H., & Abdullah, A. N. (2015). Pragmatic consciousness-raising activities and EFL Learners' Speech Act performance of 'Making Suggestions.' *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(2), 333. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0602.13>
- Ahmed, E. A. M. (2022). The effects of pragmatics competence in EFL university learners. *Open Journal of Applied Sciences*, 12(10), 1618–1631. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojapps.2022.1210110>
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching pragmatics*. U.S. Department of State, Office of English Language Programs.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Mossman, S., & Vellenga, H. E. (2014). The effect of instruction on pragmatic routines in academic discussion. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(3), 324–350. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541739>
- Basra, S. M., & Thoyyibah, L. (2017). A speech act analysis of teacher talks in an EFL classroom. *International Journal of Education*, 10(1), 73. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v10i1.6848>



- Borer, B. (2018). Teaching and learning pragmatics and speech acts: An instructional pragmatics curriculum development project for EFL learners. *School of Education and Leadership Student Capstone Projects*. 176.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Byram, M. (2021). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence: Revisited*. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800410251>
- Chong-yuan, Z. (2021). Explicit speech act instruction for developing EFL students' pragmatic competence. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(4), 26-35.
- Choraih, M. A., Loutfi, A., & Mansoor, A. (2016). The importance of pragmatic competence in the EFL curriculum: application and implications. *Arab World English Journal*. 183–195. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2895549>
- Christianto, D. (2020). Speech acts in EFL classrooms. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 2(1), 68–79. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v2i1.68-79>
- Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dendenne, B. (2014). The pragmatic suitability of the Algerian ELT secondary school textbooks: A focus on speech acts. *Revue Des Sciences Humaines*, 25(41), 07–27.
- Derakhshan, A., Malmir, A., & Greenier, V. (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), 170–187. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.1.11.170>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press
- Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 40(2), 97–118. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444807004144>
- Glaser, K. (2014). *Inductive or deductive?: The impact of method of instruction on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in EFL*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- 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/lpp-2020-0003>
- Gomez-Laich, M. P. (2016). Second language learners' divergence from target language pragmatic norms. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 249–269. <https://doi.org/10.14746/sslt.2016.6.2.4>
- Grundy, P. (2019). *Doing pragmatics* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429300301>
- Gudkova, S. (2018). Interviewing in qualitative research. In: Ciesielska, M., Jemielniak, D. (eds) *Qualitative methodologies in organization studies*. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65442-3\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65442-3_4)
- Hall, G. (2017). *Exploring English language teaching: Language in action* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315193380>

- Hidayat, D. N., Fadhilah, F., & Septiawan, Y. (2022). Speech acts in English classroom: A case at a junior high school in Indonesia. *EduLite Journal of English Education Literature and Culture*, 7(2), 251. <https://doi.org/10.30659/e.7.2.251-265>
- House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(2), 225–252. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100014893>
- Hussein, N. O., Albakri, I. S. M. A., & Seng, G. H. (2020). Developing undergraduate EFL students' communicative competence through using pragmatic instruction. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 5(1), 232–238.
- Ishihara, N. (2010). Instructional pragmatics: Bridging teaching, research, and teacher education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(10), 938–953. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818x.2010.00242.x>
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A.D. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833842>
- Ivanova, I. (2017). Teachers' perceptions of the role of pragmatics in the EFL classroom. *Studies in Linguistics Culture and FLT*, 03, 27–44. <https://doi.org/10.46687/silc.2018.v03.003>
- Jeon, E. H., & Kaya, T. (2006). Effects of L2 instruction on interlanguage pragmatic development. In J. M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 165–211). John Benjamins.
- Jianda, L. (2006). Assessing EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic knowledge: Implications for testers and teachers. *Reflections on English language teaching*, 5(1), 1–22.
- Kasper, G. and Blum-Kulka, S. (1993) *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford University Press, New York, 64-81.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. Blackwell.
- Kitis, E., & Dimitris Kitis, E. (2022). Metapragmatic awareness in EFL: Reporting speech-acts. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 16(3), 1-32.
- Koran, E., & Koran, S. (2017). Pragmatic competence is an integral part of EFL teaching. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Educational Studies*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v4i3p87>
- Laughlin, V. T., Wain, J., & Schmidgall, J. (2015). Defining and operationalizing the construct of pragmatic competence: Review and recommendations. *ETS Research Report Series*, 2015(1), 1–43. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12053>
- Liew, W. M. (2013). Effects beyond Effectiveness: Teaching as a performative act. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 43(2), 261–288. <https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12012>
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2015). *Second language research: Methodology and design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Mao, T., & He, S. (2021). An Integrated approach to pragmatic competence: Its framework and properties. *SAGE Open*, 11(2), 215824402110114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211011472>
- Masouleh, F. A., Arjmandi, M., & Vahdany, F. (2014). The effect of Explicit Metapragmatic instruction on request speech acts awareness of intermediate EFL students at the institute level. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 2(7), 504–511. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2014.020702>

- McConachy, T. (2017). *Developing intercultural perspectives on language use: Exploring pragmatics and culture in foreign language learning*. Bristol, Blue Ridge Summit: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783099337>
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M. and Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Sage, London.
- Ngai, P., & Janusch, S. (2015). Intercultural communication training for English language teachers: A case study of an immersion program for South Korean teachers. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 44(4), 345–368. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2015.1081853>
- Qu, S. Q., & Dumay, J. (2011). The qualitative research interview. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, 8(3), 238–264. <https://doi.org/10.1108/11766091111162070>
- Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. London: McGraw-Hill, Open University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003117452>
- Pourmousavi, Z., & Zenouzagh, Z. M. (2020). A comparative study of the effect of teacher's group and individual feedback on Iranian EFL learners' learning of speech acts in apology letter writing. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00088-w>
- Roever, C. (2012). Testing pragmatics. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1–6). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Santosa, A. W., & Kurniadi, A. (2020). Speech act analysis of teacher talk in EFL classroom. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, 21(2), 101–107. <https://doi.org/10.23917/humaniora.v21i2.9871>
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schauer, G. A. (2023). Intercultural competence and pragmatics. In McConachy, T., & Liddicoat, A.J. (Eds.). *Teaching and learning second language pragmatics for intercultural understanding*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-44472-2>
- Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching*, 48(1), 1–50. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444814000263>
- Taguchi, N., Chen, Y., & Qin, Y. (2022). Metapragmatic knowledge and transfer of learning across speech acts. *Applied Linguistics*, 44(2), 217–238. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac043>
- Takimoto, M. (2009). The effects of input-based tasks on the development of learners' pragmatic proficiency. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn016>
- Timpe-Laughlin, V. (2017). Adult learners' acquisitional patterns in L2 pragmatics: What do we know? *Applied Linguistics Review*, 8(1), 101–129. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2015-2005>
- Turhan, B., & Tuncer, H. (2022). Apologies and compliment responses: A case of pre-service EFL teachers. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 7(1), 51. <https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v7i1.1182>

- Vu, N. M. (2017). *Teaching pragmatics in English as a Foreign Language at a Vietnamese university: Teachers' perceptions, curricular content, and classroom practices*. (Thesis). The University of Sydney
- Yuan, Y. (2012). *Pragmatics, perceptions and strategies in Chinese college English learning* (Doctoral dissertation). Queensland University of Technology.
- Yuan, R., & Lee, I. (2014). Pre-service teachers' changing beliefs in the teaching practicum: Three cases in an EFL context. *System*, 44, 1–12.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.02.002>
- Zhao, Y., & Throssell, P. (2011). Speech act theory and its application to EFL teaching in China. *Language Culture and Society*, 32, 88–95.