

# A Literature Review on Teaching Pragmatics in the EFL Context: Challenges and Implications

Xiaoling Wu

The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

---

**Abstract:** Teaching and learning pragmatic knowledge is important yet challenging since it is less visible. This paper mainly reviews what challenges both teachers and language learners would face from four perspectives when teaching and learning pragmatics, including EFL classroom context, EFL teachers, and teaching materials. This paper would further review the teaching implications of how to deal with these challenges to help learners develop their pragmatic competence. The aim of this paper is to have a complete understanding of improving EFL learners' pragmatic ability by reviewing pragmatic knowledge, instructional pragmatics, and the challenges of teaching pragmatics within EFL contexts.

**Keywords:** Pragmatics; EFL Context; Interlanguage Pragmatics; Instructional Pragmatics.

---

## 1. Introduction

Teaching and developing learners' pragmatic ability is considered a significant yet challenging thing. It is important to teach and learn pragmatics, since pragmatic knowledge could help L2 learners have a deeper understanding of form, function, and contexts when learning L2, and also help L2 learners know social and cultural norms of discourse. Pragmatic knowledge of L2 could help L2 learners know how to appropriately use language in real life, leading to more confidence and self-efficacy [5, 32]. Therefore, learning pragmatic knowledge is useful and necessary. However, it is challenging to teach pragmatic knowledge since it is less visible compared to other linguistic aspects, such as vocabulary, sentences, and grammar, and furthermore, language use could be varied across different contexts. Therefore, instructional pragmatics is one of the most significant aspects of second language education. The motivation for teaching pragmatics stems from research in interlanguage pragmatics, which has demonstrated that having pragmatic competence is as important as having linguistic competence when it comes to achieving competency in a second language [6]. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss interlanguage pragmatics when reviewing instructional pragmatics. This literature review first introduces the definition of pragmatics and theoretical components in topics of inquiry in pragmatics, including speech acts, implicature, presupposition, deixis, and reference. Then, this paper would discuss interlanguage pragmatics and instructional pragmatics, since interlanguage pragmatics creates a need for teaching pragmatics. For example, pragmatic competences, one of the parts of interlanguage pragmatics, include pragmlinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence. How to develop L2 learners' pragmatic competence is worthy of discussion when teaching pragmatic knowledge. Therefore, this paper would discuss interlanguage pragmatics, pragmatic competences, and then instructional pragmatics. Furthermore, this paper also reviews the challenges of teaching pragmatics. There are many factors influencing the results of teaching pragmatics, and the review would focus on three factors, including EFL classroom context, EFL teachers, and teaching materials. This paper would further review the teaching implications of how to deal

with these challenges to help learners develop their pragmatic abilities. The final part is conclusions, which would make a summary of this literature review. The purpose of this paper is to review pragmatic knowledge and instructional pragmatics within EFL contexts with the aim of improving EFL learners' pragmatic skills.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1. Pragmatics

Pragmatics is considered a solution to the problem of syntax and semantics, which means pragmatics provides a systematic explanation of implicit meanings and intentional human actions [34]. Therefore, pragmatic ability refers to the basic component of language that helps us understand what information we can find from context, even when words are not explicitly spoken. Pragmatics could be separated into two areas: cross-cultural pragmatics and interlanguage pragmatics [9], and interlanguage pragmatics [28]. Cross-cultural pragmatics is defined as the exploration of how individuals communicate and behave in their native language and cultural setting and compare different cultures [51]. The term interlanguage was first defined by [51], and it is commonly referred to as a self-contained system with its own set of rules. Interlanguage pragmatics explores how closely L2 learners approach the target language, how their perception and production are influenced by their L1, and the trajectory of their L2 acquisition [42]. Interlanguage pragmatics would be discussed more specifically, followed by instructional pragmatics, since the purpose of this paper is to review the challenges and implications of teaching pragmatics. It is important to discuss how interlanguage pragmatics creates the need for instructional pragmatics. The next part would review the central topics of inquiry in pragmatics, since these topics are theoretical components of pragmatics.

### 2.2. Five Topics of Inquiry of Pragmatics

Theoretical components of pragmatics include five topics of inquiry. They are speech acts, implicature, presupposition, deixis, and reference [26]. Since the paper is to review pragmatics, a brief discussion on these five topics of inquiry would be showed in order to have a comprehensive understanding of pragmatics.

### 2.3. Speech Acts

Speech acts play a crucial role in the study of pragmatics. Speech acts could be defined as the behavior of speaking, which involves uttering a series of morphemes, words, or sentences. Speech acts include locutionary force, illocutionary force, and perlocutionary force. Locutionary force refers to literal meaning, illocutionary force means implicit meaning, and perlocutionary force is defined as the ultimate outcome or impact on the listeners [27, 26; 29]. For example, the locutionary meaning of the statement "I'm hungry" indicates that the speaker is in a state of hunger. The illocutionary meaning of this sentence could imply that the person would cook at home or go to restaurants. The perlocutionary force might lean toward the hearer taking action, such as ordering takeout or preparing dinner. Direct speech acts occur when conversations show intended meanings or illocutionary force. Compared to direct speech acts, an indirect speech act happens when conversations do not align with the illocutionary force [14, 26; 50]. Indirect speech acts pose a greater challenge for L2 learners as they require them to analyze context, comprehend sociocultural norms, and furthermore adhere to language rules. To comprehend indirect communication, one must identify the contextual elements linked to the speech act and adapt to the standard and unconventional usage of indirect speech actions in the L2 [2; 9; 61]. L2 learners could understand knowledge of indirect speech acts by familiarizing themselves with the target language within its sociocultural framework, which involves the social protocols and cultural conventions linked to the target language. The intricate characteristics of indirect speech acts validate the necessity of explicit instruction on pragmatics and speech acts in the EFL classroom.

### 2.4. Implicature

Implicature, also known as inference, is one of the components of pragmatics. Implicature refers to the implicit meanings arising during conversation, in contrast to the literal meanings. The inferred meanings of speakers' utterances are significantly different and appear unconnected to their verbal meaning [1]. For instance, when A asks a question, "Would you like to go hiking with me?", and B responds, "I'm getting cough." The speaker would infer that B would prefer to stay at home rather than go hiking. Grice [21] provided a comprehensive examination of the implicature. He developed the concept of implicature by relating it to the theories of conversational implicature and cooperative principles.

### 2.5. Presupposition

Presupposition, one of the components of pragmatics, refers to the implicit assumptions that are common knowledge, which could be influenced by lexical and semantic meanings and common beliefs between speakers and hearers, in addition to absolute or indisputable truths. The presupposed knowledge is viewed as the background of communication [8; 19]. While the veracity of the remaining part of the phrase cannot be taken for granted, it may be assumed to be true by both the speaker and the listener based on their beliefs, backgrounds, or experiences. Presupposition functions at a subconscious level in communication and manifests as shared knowledge or fundamental truths that both the speaker and listener acknowledge without explicitly addressing them.

### 2.6. Deixis

Deixis investigates how languages are used in connection

to time, space, and speaker of conversation. Deictic expressions mean something that both speakers and hearers are referring to, sometimes even using body languages, such as pointing, although they do not relate to any particular object or specific concept [18; 24; 47]. Spatial deictic expressions refer to situations that speakers would use terms such as "here" and "there". Temporal deictic expressions, also known as temporal deixis, encompass time-related lexical terms such as now, then, and later. Personal deixis use pronouns, such as we, you, and them). Deictic expressions require that both speakers and hearers are familiar with contextual information during conversation, as their meaning is constrained without the necessary context. For example, "They are there now" is a deictic statement that hearers might be perplexed without sufficient context. Deixis is a universal feature found in all languages, as it involves the usage of time, space, and person references, although these references may vary in their expression [60].

### 2.7. Reference

References can be classified as either exophoric or endophoric. Exophoric referents are phrases that have not been previously stated in the ongoing conversation, while endophoric referents link back to items that were previously brought up. For example, "Students in this class all passed the examination" and "it is very easy for them." The pronouns "it" and "them" in the second statement relate to the examination and students mentioned in the first sentence, respectively. Reference not only adds significance to communication by using common terms and phrases, but it also enhances the efficiency and coherence of discourse by using alternatives, such as pronouns [14]. Reference is a pragmatic consideration because the referents used in conversation depend not just on their semantic significance but also on the surrounding context. This part discusses theoretical components, which could help us have a comprehensive understanding of pragmatics. The next part would discuss interlanguage pragmatics and instructional pragmatics, since the study of interlanguage pragmatics could influence instructional pragmatics.

## 3. Interlanguage Pragmatics and Instructional Pragmatics

It is important to review interlanguage pragmatics since it has a great impact on the teaching methodologies of pragmatics. Instructional pragmatics aims to figure out how to overcome pragmatic failures and what teachers could do to help L2 learners develop their pragmatic abilities [30; 31; 32; 57].

### 3.1. Interlanguage Pragmatics

Interlanguage pragmatics examines how L2 learners would understand pragmatics. The focus is on L2 learners' comprehension and utilization of the second language, specifically on L2's understanding of L2 sociocultural norms. The field of interlanguage pragmatics seeks to investigate the relationship between the development of interlanguage and the development of pragmatic skills in second language learners [7]. Interlanguage pragmatics studies involve assessing the pragmatic conventions linked to language use and studying how these conventions are performed by both native speakers and non-native speakers of a language. For instance, Hinkel [23] discovered that skilled non-native

speakers in English were capable of identifying pragmatic knowledge in English, similar to native speakers. However, they were less proficient in using that pragmatic knowledge in real-life situations. This indicates that although non-native speakers could achieve a high level of pragmatic competence, they also face difficulties translating into the ability to use language effectively in real-life situations. Bardovi-Harlig and Dornyei [3] discovered that EFL students and teachers in Italy and Hungary showed a high level of proficiency in identifying grammatical faults in English. Furthermore, these individuals were good at recognizing grammatical errors compared to pragmatic errors. They considered the grammatical faults to be more significant than the pragmatic errors compared to native speakers. This study indicated that even highly skilled second language learners might not fully comprehend the importance of pragmatics in a second language. These investigations examine the discrepancy between the interlanguage pragmatics of second language learners and the expectations of native speakers. This discrepancy would create difficulties in communication in a second language. Interlanguage development encompasses progress in both language acquisition and pragmatic comprehension. Therefore, the development of interlanguage would be followed by pragmatic competence, which would be discussed in the next part.

### 3.2. Pragmatic Competence

Pragmatic Competence L2 learners' pragmatic competence is determined by how well their interlanguage pragmatics align with the cultural or social norms of the target language. Pragmatic competence in a second language refers to the integration of an L2 learner's understanding and abilities to use language appropriately within the social and cultural expectations of the target language. Pragmatic competence requires that learners have both linguistic knowledge and cultural awareness. Hinkel [25] demonstrated that pragmatic competence and cultural competence are intimately interconnected in language learning and use. The L2 learner's pragmatic competence is evidenced by their ability to effectively and appropriately communicate and react in various language-related circumstances in the L2 context [13; 30; 62].

### 3.3. Two Aspects of Pragmatic Competence

Two Aspects of Pragmatic Competence Pragmatic competence includes two parts: pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence. Some studies [39, 55] have already introduced a significant differentiation between pragmatics and sociopragmatics, which has had a crucial impact on the evaluation of pragmatic competence.

### 3.4. Pragmalinguistic Competence

Pragmalinguistics study how learners use grammar and language to convey meanings in specific contexts [13; 30; 52; 59]. It focuses on the relationship between language and interpersonal interactions. Sociopragmatics, on the other hand, focuses on the appropriate social behavior and social perceptions that influence how people interpret and perform communicative actions.

### 3.5. Sociopragmatic Competence

Sociopragmatic competence refers to the ability to effectively engage in verbal and non-verbal communication [13]. At this level, pragmatic competence is demonstrated by

a sufficient comprehension of the dominant cultural norms of the second language [30]. In addition, it involves comprehending contextual elements such as age, gender, social position, social role, and proximity in connection to L2 social norms (52; 59). An instance of sociopragmatic competence can be observed in the practice of backchanneling, which requires listeners to provide speaker feedback to demonstrate their attentive engagement. Learners' proficiency in using backchanneling demonstrates linguistic proficiency at the sociopragmatic level [32]. Pragmalinguistics and sociopragmatics are closely connected. It would be challenging to solely assess pragmalinguistic knowledge without including sociopragmatics, or vice versa, due to their tight relationship [42]. At present, there is a greater emphasis on doing studies that investigate pragmatic concerns rather than sociolinguistic ones [55].

### 3.6. Assessment of Sociopragmatic and Pramalinguistic

Sociopragmatic and Pramalinguistic proficiency of L2 Learners is often assessed by actual talks in genuine situations and the proportion of effective interactions achieved by L2 learners. Research on pragmatic competence indicates that the acquisition of pragmatic and sociopragmatic skills is interconnected and could be improved as long as there is adequate exposure to linguistic structures and sociocultural norms [3; 12; 13; 23; 35; 48]. Within the context of EFL teaching and learning, there is a prevailing inclination to prioritize the acquisition of grammar and vocabulary at the expense of social norms. This trend highlights the importance of providing guidance on sociopragmatic abilities to enhance overall pragmatic competence [6; 30; 31; 58].

### 3.7. Instructional Pragmatics

Instructional pragmatics provides a comprehensive understanding of the elements that lead to the failure of L2 learners in pragmatics, considering the relationship between interlanguage development, pragmatic and sociocultural norms, and pragmatic competence. A pedagogy, known as instructional pragmatics, for teaching and learning pragmatics has been developed in order to address the need to understand and overcome pragmatic failures and to help L2 learners enhance their total language competence [30; 31; 32; 58]. Even second language learners who possess a strong ability in grammar might still have difficulties understanding pragmatic norms. Although numerous pragmatic norms can be successfully transferred from the first language to the second language, this could not make sure that L2 learners would attain adequate pragmatic competence. Furthermore, L2 learners who are fully surrounded by a second language environment might not consistently develop pragmatic skills that are equivalent to those of native speakers [4; 22; 53]. The correlation between the quantity of input a learner receives in the second language and the acquisition of L2 norms might be well apparent. According to Schmidt's theory, the initial stage of acquiring a linguistic feature in the second language is the act of consciously perceiving that element through input [1; 32]. After a learner has observed something about L2, the subsequent action is to consciously focus on that particular aspect. Gradually, the learner should strive to become fully aware of the element and then retain or acquire it in order to use and demonstrate it with greater proficiency [10; 32; 50; 54]. The objective of instructional pragmatics is to facilitate the cognitive process of observing, focusing on, and being

aware of the pragmatic norms of the second language in order to enhance the learner's understanding and proficiency in pragmatics (1; 47; 56). To acquire practical skills, instructions used in EFL contexts should help L2 learners have either complete immersion and exposure to the L2 culture or explicit teaching on sociocultural norms. Meaningful input for pragmatics could be acquired through real-life experiences in society or through classroom instruction [6; 10; 33; 25; 30; 50].

## 4. Challenges in Teaching Pragmatics within the EFL Context

This part is going to introduce challenges in teaching pragmatics and mainly discuss three challenges, including the EFL classroom setting, EFL textbooks, and EFL teachers.

### 4.1. EFL Classroom Setting

Pragmatic competence is typically learned and developed in instructional settings, while classroom environments are usually not designed well to help learners improve their pragmatic competence [40]. For example, teachers are commonly seen as a bigger part of the classroom than students in traditional educational settings. Teachers might focus more on the syllabus during teaching language, so less time is given to encourage students to practice their pragmatic competence, such as using L2 to communicate with others in the real world. The chances to use target language in scenarios that closely resemble real-life conversations are restricted [40]. It is hard to teach and learn pragmatics in EFL settings. Because social norms of communication should be learned and practiced in real life, such as interaction within the home, school, or any other context outside the classroom that encourages learners to use language, EFL learners lack opportunities to practice language in real-life situations, leading to challenges in acquiring social rules of language. According to [41], compared to ESL learners, EFL learners have little or no opportunities to practice English in real-life situations beyond the classroom. EFL classrooms focus mostly on ensuring grammatical accuracy on a small scale rather than on overall pragmatic appropriateness [3]. This is because the teaching approach tends to prioritize the structural syllabus. Furthermore, in the EFL classroom, language is regarded as an entity rather than a tool for communication, and there are restricted chances for social interaction [15]. EFL classroom settings are typically limited in their ability to facilitate effective communication and cannot accurately simulate real-life language usage. Consequently, it fails to adequately equip language learners with the necessary skills to engage in effortless conversations within the target language community [59]. Teachers play a crucial role as the main source of input for EFL learners. According to [44], non-native teacher talk could be characterized by several features. Firstly, direct strategies are commonly used in EFL settings, which allow teachers to be in a state of power in classrooms. This asymmetrical relationship between the teacher and students could influence pragmatic aspects of the teacher's speech. Secondly, the English used in the classroom is often dependent on these materials due to its heavy reliance on textbooks, which might be different from everyday conversations in real life, leading to unnatural teacher talk [59]. Lastly, classroom language within the context of EFL tends to be more polite compared to language used in real-world interactions because of the hierarchical relationship

between teachers and learners [35].

### 4.2. EFL Textbooks

How instructional materials are important has been discussed a lot [43]. Textbooks as a main source of instructional resources are particularly crucial since both teachers use textbooks as a guide to help learners understand and use language knowledge. However, textbooks might not be the most reliable materials to help learners develop pragmatic competence [6]. The contents of textbooks might lack practical knowledge and have less connection with situations in the real world since they are based on authors' intuition rather than empirical research [46, 45, 39]. For example, when it comes to the apology speech act, textbooks would provide relevant expressions to help learners understand how to apologize in a formal way, but textbooks might not focus on semantic formulas or teach learners strategies on how to use those expressions, such as when to apologize and how to apologize effectively [48]. Corpus studies have revealed significant disparities between the English language used in textbooks and the English language observed in spoken or written corpora. [45]. Therefore, textbooks are inadequate for preparing EFL learners for spontaneous real-life situations. Furthermore, activities and tasks in textbooks designed for practice are restricted, and textbooks only offer superficial practice for various speech acts [8].

### 4.3. EFL Teachers

There are still considerations for teachers to develop learners' pragmatic competence in EFL classrooms [33]. Firstly, EFL teachers might have difficulties understanding what pragmatics is and what useful strategies they could use. They might also have limited awareness of the L2 pragmatic norms [40]. Secondly, most EFL teachers have limited time available to teach pragmatics as they have to focus on language knowledge designed for examinations or other national certificates [11]. In the EFL classroom, achieving high scores on exams is often prioritized over developing effective communication skills with native speakers [3]. Therefore, it is challenging for teachers to teach both pragmatics and other knowledge required for examinations in class due to a lack of time [57]. Thirdly, an EFL teacher rarely has the opportunity to obtain pragmatic research findings [59]. In addition, there appears to be a discrepancy between the findings of the latest research and the methods used to teach pragmatics in classrooms [15]. Therefore, teachers would choose to teach pragmatics based on their intuition [16]. Furthermore, teachers seem to be one of the main sources of pragmatic input for L2 learners. But since each teacher possesses their own distinct identity, this might result in biased educational activities or biased feedback provided to L2 learners. In conclusion, EFL teachers are hesitant to teach pragmatics due to the lack of emphasis on pragmatic issues in their teacher education and professional development programs. Pragmatics has frequently been neglected in teacher training programs, and there has been a significant lack of attention given to teacher expertise in this field [61]. Moreover, if pragmatics has been given any consideration, it has primarily focused on theoretical aspects and has not tackled the issue of how to effectively teach pragmatics in EFL classrooms [14]. This neglect likely arises from a lack of emphasis on various parts of pragmatics in language teaching approaches [18].

## 5. Teaching Implications

According to teaching challenges, teaching implications would discuss three parts, including implications of the EFL classroom setting, EFL textbooks and other resources, the role of teachers when teaching pragmatic knowledge, and corrective feedback and assessment of pragmatic knowledge.

### 5.1. EFL Classroom Setting

The EFL classroom setting should be authentic, engaging, and pragmatically relevant, since EFL students might not have enough opportunity and time to learn L2 outside of classrooms [5; 20; 36]. EFL learners might achieve pragmatic competences (e.g., sociopragmatic, pragmalinguistic) even if they are insufficient in interacting with native speakers [53]. [53] also provided suggestions to help create EFL classrooms that are beneficial to teaching pragmatics. For example, in order to make classrooms more pragmatically rich, teachers could encourage learners to identify speech acts and use materials (e.g., videos, texts) to help learners understand the social norms of the target language. If students are allowed to have personal observations and analyze norms of home culture and target culture within the EFL classroom, they will develop the ability to identify speech acts and compare differences between their own cultures and cultures of the target language, which could help them navigate appropriate behavior in L2 [16, 32, 38]. Moreover, task-based interactions within the EFL classroom (e.g., teacher-assisted discussion, role-play) would also develop pragmatic competences [17, 25; 30]. To develop pragmatically friendly EFL settings, direct teaching is considered a useful tool [24]. A curriculum that combines instructional pragmatics and other aspects of language instruction could improve overall L2 instruction. By designing a pragmatically relevant classroom, learners could become more familiar with the social and cultural norms of their target language, leading to more confidence in using L2. Their L2 knowledge could be used fluently when they have chances to interact with native speakers outside of classrooms.

### 5.2. Textbooks and Resources in EFL contexts

As it was mentioned when discussing challenges, textbooks for EFL learners are insufficient on an empirical basis [47]. The author might design the contents of the textbook according to their intuition rather than an empirical basis. Therefore, it is advisable to design EFL materials by combining empirical research findings. For example, materials based on conversational analysis (CA) were used by [27] to help learners understand what opening sequences Americans and Germans would use in phone conversation. By using CA-basing materials, they found that action sequences of phone conversation could imply cross-cultural differences in verbal activities and, furthermore, that conversational encounter is the most natural form in pragmatics. These findings demonstrated that CA-based materials could be beneficial to learners' development in pragmatics since EFL learners could develop their ability to anticipate, interpret, and use pragmatically appropriate verbal activities. Thus, CA-based materials could be considered to be included in textbooks since they provide rich pragmatic resources on the basis of empirical evidence. A task-based syllabus was proposed by [49]. The requests and targets designed for learners were considered appropriate in real-life contexts. Taking an example from this syllabus, Roever supported the idea that a task-based syllabus might help

learners develop their abilities in both pragmatic competence and general L2 competence. Besides, teaching materials for pragmatics would be better to include at least three elements, such as social context, communication, and language use [53]. Thus, Taguchi summarized three types of tasks used in teaching materials that could develop learners' pragmatic competences, including receptive-skills tasks, productive-skills tasks, and conscious-raising tasks. In addition to textbooks or other traditional materials, technology is also considered a useful tool to teach and practice pragmatics instruction. For example, it has been investigated that videotapes of real interactions are seen as an effective medium during the process of teaching pragmatics explicitly [17]. Moreover, computer-assisted language learning is also viewed as a powerful tool to help teach and learn pragmatics. For example, social networking and virtual social platforms could offer learners more opportunities and time exposure to the cultures and social norms of their target language [53].

### 5.3. The Role of Teachers in Teaching Pragmatics within the EFL context

Teachers play a paramount role in developing learners' pragmatic competences since teachers are one of the most the most important sources of pragmatic input. Compared to grammatical knowledge, pragmatic input is insufficient. Therefore, teachers are mostly responsible for pragmatic behavior [37; 41]. There are some factors (e.g., experiences, beliefs, teacher training programs) contributing to successful pragmatically relevant input. For example, teacher training in pragmatics is critical [52], and EFL teachers should view pragmatics as an integral part of L2 instruction [20]. The safer way to improve learners' level of pragmatic competence is to make sure teachers know what they are supposed to know before teaching pragmatic knowledge [32]. According to [31], there are some components that teachers should know from three aspects of knowledge (e.g., knowledge of the subject, knowledge of pedagogical content, knowledge of learners, and curriculum) before teaching pragmatics. For example, from the aspect of knowledge of learners and curriculum, teachers should know learners' identities and cultures in advance and also understand the role of L2 pragmatics. From the perspective of knowledge of pedagogical content, teachers should know how to teach and assess L2 pragmatics. From the perspective of knowledge of the subject, teachers are suggested to know how L2 pragmatics change in different contexts and know pragmatic norms. A framework that includes the Noticing Hypothesis, the Output Hypothesis, the Interaction Hypothesis, and the Sociocultural Theory was designed by [31] to help teachers deal with how to teach pragmatics systematically. Moreover, two instructional approaches from [35] were also considered efficient methods to teach pragmatic knowledge, including deductive approaches and inductive approaches. Deductive instruction suggests that teachers should provide pragmatic norms first, and then learners should analyze examples. Compared to deductive instruction, inductive instruction requires learners to analyze examples first, and then teachers guide learners to discover pragmatic norms by themselves.

### 5.4. Corrective Feedback and Assessment of Pragmatic Knowledge

Research has demonstrated that L2 learners have rare opportunities to receive corrective feedback on pragmatic mistakes [34]. Despite extensive study [e.g. 21; 52; 60] On

the impact of corrective feedback on various aspects of language, there is a lack of research on the instructional values of corrective feedback at the pragmatic level, which necessitates a more in-depth examination to investigate how corrective feedback could be used in language classrooms and how corrective feedback influences learners' processes of developing pragmatics. In addition, ways of assessing pragmatic knowledge are still insufficient, despite the increasing number of studies on interlanguage pragmatics [33, 35, 43]. According to [9], even the most communicative assessments in the world do not have a systematic component for understanding how language is used in real-life situations. The evaluation of speech acts in language courses remains uncertain, despite the extensive research conducted on this topic [45]. [18] The functional test [55] was designed to assess pragmatics, and no other tests have been made known until now. As a result, teachers would choose not to evaluate students' understanding of pragmatic competence in the classroom [14], particularly for non-native teachers who feel incapable of assessing pragmatic competence in the target language. Since corrective feedback in teaching pragmatics is important, EFL teachers should be able to know how to make corrections at the pragmatic level, and they should also notice that correcting sociopragmatic mistakes is more difficult than pragmalinguistic mistakes [56]. Moreover, teachers might not understand how to assess pragmatic competence. [14] provided six strategies to help teachers assess learners' pragmatic competences, including choosing real speech act contexts, checking key aspects of pragmatics during performance, organizing discussion after performance, comparing students' performance with native speakers, providing rationale for why they should do something in a specific situation, and choosing an appropriate time to assess pragmatic knowledge. A framework was designed by [55] to assess interlanguage pragmatics. The framework includes a theoretical definition and practical methods to guide EFL learners' pragmatic ability.

## 6. Conclusion

The literature review mainly concerns the significance of teaching pragmatics, the challenges of teaching pragmatics, and the implications of dealing with these factors in the way of teaching and learning pragmatics. It has been shown that, in addition to grammatical knowledge and vocabulary, pragmatic knowledge is also important in learning L2. Learners who lack pragmatic competence would feel frustrated when communicating with native speakers. This literature review mainly introduces four factors that would influence teaching and learning pragmatic knowledge, including the EFL setting, teaching materials, teachers, and corrective feedback and assessment. The paper reviews teaching implications based on four challenges. From the perspective of the EFL classroom, it has been shown that pragmatically rich EFL settings could help learners absorb pragmatics within the classroom and then make learners more familiar with language use in different situations. From the perspective of EFL teachers, they are also important in developing learners' pragmatics, since teachers' knowledge of pragmatics and teaching methods directly influence students' interest in and motivation for learning pragmatics, which requires teachers to have much knowledge of pragmatics, knowledge of learners' cultures and needs, and also design student-centered activities. From the aspect of corrective feedback and assessment, teachers should also think about

efficient strategies to give corrective feedback and assess learners' pragmatic competence. Developing one's knowledge of pragmatics is as important as developing one's technology skills [40]. Therefore, it is necessary to teach pragmatic knowledge of the target language and raise learners' awareness of pragmatics.

## References

- [1] Alcon Soler, E. (2008). Investigating pragmatic language learning in foreign language classrooms. *IRAL, International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 46(3), 173-195.
- [2] Aubrecht, K. M. (2013). Helping English learners make pragmatically appropriate requests. Retrieved from [https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse\\_all/521/](https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_all/521/).
- [3] Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dornyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), 233-262.
- [4] Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System*, 33(3), 401-415.
- [5] Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching pragmatics*. Washington DC: US Department of State Office of English Language Programs.
- [6] Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. R. Rose, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2014). Documenting interlanguage development. In Z. Han, & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Interlanguage: Forty years later* (pp. 127-146). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [8] Bergmann, A., Currie Hall, K., & Ross, S. M. (Eds.). (2007). *Language files* (Tenth ed.). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press.
- [9] Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. and Kasper, G. (1989a). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- [10] Bu, J. (2012). A study of the effects of explicit and implicit teachings on developing Chinese EFL learners' pragmatic competence. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 6(3), 57-80.
- [11] Cai, L., & Wang, Y. (2013). Interlanguage pragmatics in SLA. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(1), 142-147. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.1.142-147>
- [12] Chang, Y. (2010). 'I no say you say is boring': The development of pragmatic competence in L2 apology. *Language Sciences*, 32(3), 408-424.
- [13] Chang, Y. (2011). Interlanguage pragmatic development: The relation between pragmalinguistic competence and sociopragmatic competence. *Language Sciences*, 33(5), 786-798.
- [14] Cutting, J. (2008). *Pragmatics and discourse* (Second ed.). London: Routledge.
- [15] Cook, H. M. (2001). Why can't learners of JFL distinguish polite from impolite speech styles. In K. Rose, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 80-102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [16] Chavarría, M. I., & Bonany, E. B. (2006). Raising awareness of pragmatics in the EFL classroom: A proposal. *Cultura, Lenguaje Y Representacion: Revista De Estudios Culturales De La Universitat Jaume I*, 3, 133-144.

- [17] Dufon, M.A. (2004). Producing a video for teaching pragmatics in the second or foreign language classroom. *Prospect*, 19(1), 65-83. Retrieved November 1, 2015 from [http://www.ameprc.mq.edu.au/resources/prospect/V19\\_N1\\_2\\_004](http://www.ameprc.mq.edu.au/resources/prospect/V19_N1_2_004).
- [18] Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal*, 59(3), 199-208. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci039>.
- [19] Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 40(2), 97-118.
- [20] Gilmore, A. (2007). Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 40(2), 97-118.
- [21] Grice, H. P. (1969). Utterer's meaning and intention. *The Philosophical Review*, 78(2), 147-177.
- [22] Halenko, N., & Jones, C. (2011). Teaching pragmatic awareness of spoken requests to Chinese EAP learners in the UK: Is explicit instruction effective? *System*, 39(2), 240-250.
- [23] Hinkel, E. (1996). When in Rome: Evaluations of L2 pragmalinguistic behaviors. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(1), 51-70.
- [24] Hinkel, E. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching the four skills. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 109-131.
- [25] Hinkel, E. (2014). Culture and pragmatics in language teaching and learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. (Fourth ed., pp. 394-408). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning, a part of Cengage Learning.
- [26] Huang, Y. (2014). *Pragmatics* (Second ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [27] Holtgraves, T. (2007). Second language learners and speech act comprehension. *Language Learning*, 57(4), 595-610.
- [28] Illes, E., & Akcan, S. (2017). Bringing real-life language use into EFL classrooms. *ELT Journal*, 71(1), 3-12.
- [29] Intachakra, S. (2004). Contrastive pragmatics and language teaching: Apologies and thanks in English and Thai. *REL C Journal: A Journal of Language Teaching and Research in Southeast Asia*, 35(1), 37-62.
- [30] Ishihara, N. (2006). Subjectivity, second/foreign language pragmatic use, and instruction: Evidence of accommodation and resistance. study I. emulating and resisting pragmatic norms: Learner subjectivity and foreign language pragmatic use. study II. centering second language (SL) speakers' experience: A study of SL speakers' resistance to pragmatic norms of the SL community. study III. web-based curriculum for pragmatics instruction in Japanese as a foreign language: An explicit awareness-raising approach Available from Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts (LLBA). (85644908; 200706328).
- [31] Ishihara, N. (2010). Instructional pragmatics: Bridging teaching, research, and teacher education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(10), 938-953.
- [32] Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- [33] Jianda, L. (2006). Assessing EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic knowledge: Implications for testers and teachers. *Reflections on English Language Teaching*, 5(1), 1-22. Retrieved May 7, 2014 from <http://www.nus.edu.sg/celc/publications/LiuVol5.pdf>.
- [34] Jucker, AH. (2008). Historical Pragmatics. *Language and Linguistics Compass*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00087.x>
- [35] Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: An Introduction*. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (eds.), *Interlanguage Pragmatics*, (3 -18). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [36] Krulatz, A. (2014). Integrating pragmatics instruction in a content-based classroom. *ORTESOL Journal*, 31, 19-25.
- [37] Latif, H. (2001). *A Sociopragmatic Study of EFL Moroccan Learners' Requests*. Unpublished DESA dissertation, Faculty of Education. Mohamed V, Souissi, Rabat.
- [38] Lazaraton, A. (2014). Second language speaking. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (Fourth ed., pp. 106-120). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning, a part of Cengage Learning.
- [39] Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- [40] LoCastro, V. (2012). *Pragmatics for language educators: A sociolinguistic perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- [41] Loutfi, A. (2016a). Pragmatic Transfer in Moroccan EFL Learners' Requests. *Asian Journal of Education and e-Learning (AJEEL)* 4, Volume 4, 15-24.
- [42] McNamara, T. & Roever, C. (2006). Language testing: The social dimension. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Volume16, 2242-258.
- [43] Morady Moghaddam, M. (2012). Discourse structures of condolence speech act. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 4(10), 105-125. Retrieved May 20, 2014 from [http://elt.tabrizu.ac.ir/article\\_609.html](http://elt.tabrizu.ac.ir/article_609.html)
- [44] Nikula, T. (2002). Teacher talk reflecting pragmatic awareness: A look at EFL and content-based classroom settings. *Pragmatics*, 12(4), 447-467. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.12.4.03nik>
- [45] O'Keeffe, A., Clancy, B., & Adolphs, S. (2011). *Introducing pragmatics in use*. London: Routledge.
- [46] Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1991). The learning of complex speech act behaviour. *TESL Canada Journal*, 7(2), 45-65. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v7i2.568>
- [47] Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1991). Teaching speech act behaviour to nonnative speakers. In M.Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 154-165). Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- [48] Padilla Cruz, M. (2013). Understanding and overcoming pragmatic failure in intercultural communication: From focus on speakers to focus on hearers. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 51(1), 23-54.
- [49] Roever, C. (2009). Teaching and Testing Pragmatics. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language Teaching*, (560-577). Oxford: Blackwell.
- [50] Rose, K. R. & Ng, C. (2001). Inductive and Deductive Teaching of Compliments and Compliment Responses. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 145-70). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [51] Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1- 23.
- [52] Selinker, L. (1974). *Interlanguage. Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*, Richards, J. C. (ed.), (pp. 31-54). London: Longman.
- [53] Taguchi, N. (2018). Contexts and pragmatics learning: Problems and opportunities of the study abroad research. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 124-137.
- [54] Takahashi, S. (2001). The Role of Input Enhancement in Developing Pragmatic Competence. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper

- (eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 200–22). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [55] Tajeddin, Z. (2014). *Interlanguage pragmatics and language teaching*. Tehran: Jungle Publications.
- [56] Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure. *Applied Linguistics* 4, 91-109.
- [57] 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>
- [58] Vellenga, H. E. (2008). *Instructional effectiveness and interlanguage pragmatics*. Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (275902800).
- [59] 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 April 29, 2015 from <http://www.Cetljournal.co.uk/article/view/12171/8265>
- [60] Yan, L., & Zhuang, Y. (2010). Reflections on the nature of pragmatic failure. *US-China Foreign Language*, 8(1), 1-7.
- Youn, S. J. (2015). Validity argument for assessing L2 pragmatics in interaction using mixed methods. *Language Testing*, 32(2), 199-225.
- [61] Yates, L., & Wigglesworth, G. (2005). Researching the effectiveness of professional development in pragmatics. In N. Bartels (Ed.), *Applied linguistics and language teacher education* (pp. 261-279). New York: Springer.
- [62] Yu, M. (1999). Universalistic and culture-specific perspectives on variation in the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. *Pragmatics Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association (IPrA)*, 9(2), 281-312.