EFL teachers' pragmatic awareness and classroom practices influenced by an in-service training course of meta-pragmatics

Article info

Authors:

Behnood Samani[1]
Mehrdad Amiri[2]
Naser Ghafouri[3]

Abstract

The present study focused on the effect of an in-service meta-pragmatics training course on Iranian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' pragmatic awareness and classroom pragmatic practices. A mixed methods design was used to achieve the objectives of the study. In the quantitative phase of the study, 300 EFL teachers were selected through convenience sampling and filled out the Pragmatic Awareness Questionnaire. In the qualitative phase, 60 of those teachers participated in a pragmatic training course. They were divided into experimental and control groups and underwent the processes of pretesting, intervention, and post-testing. Furthermore, 30 of these teachers were observed in terms of their teaching inter-language pragmatics both before and after the training course of meta-pragmatics. The results of the multivariate ANOVA (MANOVA) revealed that EFL teacher's pragmatic awareness was relatively low. In addition, the findings unveiled a statistically significant difference between the EFL teachers' meta-pragmatic awareness and their practices in terms of the 'language teacher' component. Moreover, the findings showed a statistically significant improvement in the EFL teachers' pragmatic practices regarding teaching pragmatic features after receiving the instructions. The results of this study have some implications for stakeholders, namely EFL teacher trainers, EFL teachers, and EFL students.

1. PhD Student in TEFL, English Department, Sarab Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sarab, Iran.
2. Assistant Professor, Department of English Language Teaching, Farhangian University, Tehran, Iran, (Corresponding Author). amirimehrdad@cfu.ac.ir
3. Assistant Professor, Faculty of Persian Literature and Foreign Languages, English Department, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran.

1. Introduction

Pragmatic competence is one of the most important aspects of communicative competence that contributes to the proper use of a second language (L2) (Bachman & Palmer, 2010). As a result, one of the primary objectives in L2 education has been to increase pragmatic awareness among L2 instructors and learners. This issue gains importance considering the fact that if EFL instructors and learners do not routinely engage with native target culture speakers, the lack of chances to be exposed to the target language in the EFL setting might make it more difficult for them to demonstrate the functional skills of the target language. As a result, they start to emphasize the appropriateness of language functions less and strive to emphasize grammatical precision (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998; Hassall, 2003; Niezgoda & Roever, 2001). In other words, EFL contexts often lack sufficient opportunities for social interactions and have simple and short discourse organizations, ordinary routines, and a small number of politeness markers, resulting in a failure to fully develop pragmatic competence with limited target language input (Source needed). Teachers and learners also tend to share the same first language (L1) and cultural background. This is a serious issue for people learning a foreign language in the Iranian setting. L2 learners may thus be unable to utilize the target language correctly in communicative circumstances if they don not receive enough pragmatic training, as is the case in Iran.

A lot of foreign language education programs are run in Iran. However, there is a deficiency in teaching pragmatics adequately in such programs (Ravari & Rashidi, 2024; Shakki et al., 2020; Tajeddin et al., 2017). Besides, the English Langauge Teaching (ELT) teaching materials utilized in the Iranian EFL context lack pragmatic information and do not adequately prepare EFL instructors and learners for the social elements of the target language (Meihami & Khanlarzadeh, 2015). As Taguchi (2012) argues, to be successful, EFL instructors should be more aware of their capacities for pragmatic analyses. They will work harder to emphasize and include pragmatic information in the classrooms they are preparing for. Moreover, limited comprehensive research have been conducted on the impact of pragmatic instruction on Iranian EFL teachers' real classroom practices (Amiri & Birjandi, 2015; Tajeddin et al., 2018). Accordingly, the present research examined how meta-pragmatics training affected the pragmatic awareness of Iranian EFL

instructors. Furthermore, an attempt was made to investigate the effect of such training on the teachers' real classroom practices in terms of teaching pragmatics and the strategies they usually employ or develop in this respect.

2. Review of the Related Literature

Globalization, with its concomitant rapid economic development across the globe, has created an urgent need for effective communication through international languages such as English worldwide. Becoming a multilingual speaker has changed to a strategic objective that individuals from different classes of society have been spending their time, effort, and wealth to realize. It is widely recognized that engaging with individuals from diverse nationalities, cultures, and linguistic backgrounds constitutes a significant endeavor (Amiri et al., 2015). It involves the acquisition of a second/foreign language (L2), as well as the comprehension and effective expression of ideas in communication and interaction (Brown, 2014).

To accomplish such a grand objective, various approaches have been adopted, among which the communicative approach highlights the importance of attaining not only the linguistic aspect but also the functional component of the L2. Numerous researchers (e.g., Basturkmen & Nguyen, 2017; Cohen, 2020; Kasper & Roever, 2005; Savvidou & Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2019; Watson et al., 2020) have contended that language learners must cultivate their linguistic proficiency and their pragmatic proficiency, which pertains to the purpose and application of the target language, in order to effectively engage in real-life communication situations. The review of the literature on Second Language Acquisition (SLA) reveals that L2 instruction has radically shifted regarding its underlying aims and beliefs between helping learners communicate through L2 rather than pushing them to master a body of grammatical rules (Cohen, 2020; Guo & Ellis, 2021; Römer, 2023). This shift in L2 instruction can be viewed from the decline of the Grammar-Translation Method in the 20th century when Communicative Competence (CC) and Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) were proposed (Halliday, 1973; Hymes, 1972; Savignon, 1972). From that time onward, the focus of L2 teaching has been swinging between teaching the bits and pieces of language to teaching the language utility (Celce-Murcia, 2014).

Similarly, some other scholars indicate that pragmatic competence has only fairly recently become the focus of attention in SLA studies (Adlan, 2022; Alcón-Soler, 2015; Amiri et al., 2015; Bardovi-Harlig, 2018; Cohen, 2020; Glaser, 2020; Liu, 2023; Tajeddin & Alemi, 2014; Wahyuni & Arieffiani, 2021). The rationale for this recent attention, as Cohen (2020) has proposed, is three-fold. First, a theoretical enthusiasm to explore a neglected component of communicative competence has emerged, particularly in view of its significance as one of the two principal components of language competence. Second, new trends in inter-language studies view pragmatic competence as a field of study pertaining to inter-language pragmatics. Third is the necessity of preparing students to acquire pragmatics or speech acts. Therefore, to remove the above-mentioned dearth of pragmatic knowledge, L2 teachers need to receive instruction regarding the importance of pragmatic and learn how to teach and highlight pragmatic features in their classes. Besides, it has been wildly argued that developing a good command of pragmatic competence demands a more noticeable amount of instructional time and attention since it has a more complex nature, and hence, it is much harder to acquire through mere exposure to input (Alkawaz et al., 2023; Bardovi-Harlig, 2013, 2016; Cohen, 2019; Ishihara & Cohen, 2014; Taguchi, 2012). Therefore, some researchers have suggested a more explicit approach to teaching different aspects of pragmatic competence (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig, 2018; Cohen, 2020; Ishihara & Cohen, 2014; Savvidou & Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2019).

The importance of teaching pragmatics and the superiority of explicit teaching of L2 pragmatics over its implicit instruction have been proven (Sanchez-Hernandez & Martinez-Flor, 2022; Taguchi, 2011; Ziafar, 2020). The influence of explicit, implicit, and contrastive lexical approaches on pragmatic competence: The case of Iranian EFL learners. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 58(1), 103-131.), and this indicates the need for preparing teachers to become able to implement the strategies of explicit teaching in their classes to make their students aware of the pragmatic features of English and create opportunities for them to use these features in a proper way to transfer their intended meaning (Ravari & Rashidi, 2024). With respect to the teachers' role in teaching pragmatics, Cohen (2012) points out that teachers' provision of strategies for instructing pragmatics is that L2 learners can learn pragmatic

features based on their priorities. Furthermore, he adds that L2 teachers need to raise L2 students' awareness regarding pragmatic features, as the enhancement and refinement of pragmatic competence cannot be accomplished by teachers alone. Teachers have a leading role to play in educating pragmatically competent language users. Nevertheless, their perspective and understanding of pragmatics are among the elements that affect how successful their educational sessions are. In fact, teachers' perception and awareness can have a determining effect on the time they allocate to materials and the approaches they use to teach them (Jia et al., 2006; Savvidou & Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2019).

Another pertinent aspect concerns the ELT instructional materials that are used in the L2 classroom. Since, in the EFL context, ELT textbooks are the major source of sufficient input, it seems necessary that EFL teachers highlight the pragmatic features during their teaching processes (Yeh & Swinehart, 2020). All in all, to boost pragmatic competence in L2 learners, the effects of L2 teachers, the ELT instructional materials, and the teacher education courses should be given enough attention (Meihami & Khanlarzadeh, 2015).

Instructional intervention has been shown to have "acquisitional advantages" in several pragmatic notions (Bardovi-Harlig, 2013, 2016, 2018; Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005; Povolná, 2014; Savvidou & Economidou-Kogetsidis, 2019). EFL teachers and learners are highly required to get proper pragmatic training in various circumstances. Povolná (2014) argues that it is crucial to figure out how to assist EFL instructors in becoming more aware of L2 pragmatic structures so that they may carry out assignments that improve their students' pragmatic competence (PC). As a result, EFL instructors should be made more cognizant that providing their students with the linguistic skills necessary to understand and speak the target language in context is an absolute need. To support this claim, Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998), Kasper and Rose (2002), and Basturkmen and Nguyen (2017) argue that L2 learners who may not get enough pragmatics training may vary significantly from other learners with enough exposure to pragmatic competency instruction in their classrooms. Because pragmatic ineptitude may have a negative impact on communication, it was shown that natural speakers tolerate grammatical mistakes and errors (Cohen, 2019).

Moreover, following an examination of eight ELT textbooks for cultural content, appropriateness, politeness, speech acts, and register, Vellenga (2004) deduces that there exists an insufficiency of pragmatic information in EFL textbooks, both in terms of quantity and quality. According to Crandall and Basturkem (2004), who share the same assessment of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) textbooks, foreign language teaching and learning textbooks lack pragmatic expertise. In addition, the lack of interaction with the target language in EFL situations, as well as the absence of opportunity to practice the target language, made acquiring the functional skills of the language considerably more difficult. As a result, it seems necessary to inspect whether the ELT instructional materials have covered the pragmatic contents as well as how they have been embedded in them (Cohen, 2018).

A review of the literature indicates that the pragmatic awareness of Iranian EFL teachers and the way they actually deal with pragmatics inside their classrooms have yet to be fully investigated (Bazaei et al., 2023; Norouzian & Eslami, 2016; Ravesh & Tabrizi, 2017; Sadeghinezhad, 2023; Tajeddin et al., 2017). Moreover, despite the recent call for incorporating pragmatics into teacher training courses, it has not been shown if such courses can affect the participating teachers' awareness (Ekin & Damar, 2013). Hence, this study firstly attempted to explore the present status of Iranian EFL teachers' awareness of meta-pragmatic notions and the extent to which they were aware of pragmatic concepts. Secondly, it aimed to find out how the pragmatic awareness of Iranian EFL teachers might change after attending a meta-pragmatic instruction course. The last purpose of the study was to investigate the extent to which participating in the in-service meta-pragmatics training course could lead to improved performance in teaching pragmatic features of the textbook in the classroom context. To accomplish the objectives of the study, the following research questions were formulated:

1. To what extent are Iranian EFL teachers aware of meta-pragmatic notions?
2. Does an in-service training course on meta-pragmatics affect pragmatics awareness among Iranian EFL teachers?
3. To what extent does participating in the in-service training course on meta-pragmatics lead to Iranian EFL teachers' highlighting pragmatic features in ELT textbooks to improve their teaching of pragmatics?

3. Methodology

3.1. Design

An exploratory sequential mixed methods study was designed to get a deeper grasp of the study. The reason was that according to Mackey and Gass (2016), combining quantitative and qualitative methods may help researchers better grasp their subject. As a result, In this study, the independent variable was the in-service training course focusing on meta-pragmatics, while the dependent variables encompassed Iranian EFL teachers' pragmatic awareness, pragmatic classroom practices, and the formulation of strategies for teaching pragmatics.

3.2. Participants

The participants of the current study in the quantitative phase were 300 Iranian EFL teachers selected by convenience sampling method from eight different school districts in Tehran, including districts one, three, six, seven, eight, eleven, fourteen, and seventeen. A total of Iranian EFL male (n=93) and female (n=107) teachers with different age ranges (22 and above) were selected based on their willingness to attend the study. All the participants held a B.A. or M.A. in English teaching, English translation, or English literature and had at least three years of teaching experience.

In the qualitative phase of the study, and more specifically, for the purpose of classroom observation, which occurred both before and after the in-service training, in line with Creswell and Plano Clark (2023), 10 percent of the total participants (30 out of 300) were selected through convenience sampling, and their classes were observed. These participants were selected from among the 60 participants who voluntarily attended the training course. Thirty EFL teachers' classes were observed to investigate their practical approaches to teaching pragmatics. There were 18 female and 12 male participants with an age range of 22-35 years and experience range of 5-12 years of teaching. Eleven of them held a Master's degree and 19 a Bachelor's degree in TEFL and other related fields, as mentioned above. Subsequently, their classes were observed to scrutinize their practical implementation of teaching pragmatics.

3.3. Instrumentation

A Pragmatic Awareness Questionnaire (Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005) and Class

Observations were used to collect the required data in the current study. The pragmatic Awareness Questionnaire developed and validated by Bardovi-Harlig and Griffin (2005) was used to test the EFL instructors' pragmatic awareness. The survey involves 30 items that ask EFL instructors to rate their pragmatic awareness on a Likert scale of one to five, with one being the most pragmatically unaware and five being the most pragmatically aware (See Appendix A). The reliability of the questionnaire was estimated in the current study through Cronbach's alpha. The internal consistency of the scale was reported to be 0.93, and the internal consistency of individual factors (1, 2, 3, 4) were 0.94, 0.93, 0.86, and 0.7, respectively. Since developers of the scale have already validated the questionnaire based on factor analysis and due to the fact that no alterations were made to the questionnaire in the current study, the validity check was not taken into account.

In order to explore the third research question, the researchers observed EFL teachers' classes both before and after the in-service training program. Observations were done according to a pre-defined checklist validated through an expert judgment approach. That is to say, the checklist items were developed in line with a thorough literature review on interlanguage pragmatics in the L2 classroom and the constructed checklist underwent scrutiny in terms of both language and content by a panel consisting of five experts. Then, the researcher made the required modifications according to their comments and suggestions (see Appendix B). For each question, a five-point Likert scale was used, which ranged from one (never) to five (always). EFL instructors' emphasis on pragmatic characteristics in textbooks was examined. The researcher paid close attention to the EFL instructors' performance in the classroom. It should be noted that the researcher 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 not to affect classroom activities.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

The data collection procedure was basically categorized into four distinct phases, as described below.

Phase One: The current study was conducted through the administration of questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed among 300 EFL teachers employed in schools across eight school districts in Tehran. It should be noted that the

questionnaires were given to the participants at their workplaces. Before the participants responded to the questionnaires, some pieces of information, including the aims of the research, various sections of the questionnaires, and simple definitions, were provided for them.

Phase Two: In the second phase, using a researcher made and validated checklist, researchers observed the classes of 30 participating EFL teachers to assess whether they incorporated and emphasized pragmatic elements within their teaching. Specifically, the researchers sought to investigate how these EFL teachers addressed pragmatic content in the ELT instructional materials before being exposed to pragmatic instruction through an in-service training course.

Phase Three: The next step of the study, which was considered the main part, was running the pragmatic training course. At this stage, 60 EFL teachers, including the 30 teachers whose classes were observed, were selected from the volunteer participants and invited to attend the pragmatic training course lasting 10 one-hour sessions. They attended the course in two experimental and control groups, with 30 individuals each. The classes were held online through *Skyroom,* a reliable Learning Management System (LMS). During this course, the EFL teachers in the experimental group became familiar with the diverse aspects of pragmatic instruction.

In the control group, the teachers worked with the school course books (i.e., Vision 1, 2, and 3) and focused on the language functions and pragmatic issues the way the teacher books mainly emphasized. Two weeks after the in-service training course enclosure, the 60 EFL teachers taking the course were tested against their pragmatic awareness knowledge as they completed the questionnaire of pragmatic awareness again.

Phase Four: After the pragmatic training course, the 30 EFL teachers' classes were observed again three times. In this phase, the classroom observations, similar to the first phase, were run according to the pre-defined checklist. The checklist investigated how the pragmatic training course had affected the teaching and assessment of the pragmatics of EFL teachers. In short, this was done to examine if the EFL teachers' pragmatic awareness had increased and was evident in their classroom practices.

4. Results

Research Question One

The first research question aimed to assess the level of awareness among Iranian EFL teachers regarding meta-pragmatic concepts. The teachers' responses to the Pragmatic Awareness Questionnaire (Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005) were subjected to descriptive statistical analysis to address this inquiry. Item 8 had the highest mean score of 3.43, indicating the need for teacher training workshops to increase language instructor's understanding of pragmatics. This indicates a perceived deficiency in understanding how to teach pragmatics among teachers, which they believe can be rectified through participation in teacher training workshops. In contrast, questions 4 and 9 had the lowest average scores (M=2.4). The first item expressed the intention to improve one's pragmatic competence, while the second item emphasized the importance of teachers possessing pragmatic competence as a qualification for their teaching profession. Around a quarter of the instructors concurred with item 4, but almost one-fifth agreed with item 9. Roughly 50% of the participants maintained a neutral stance on these issues, whilst approximately 20% indicated their disapproval. These data indicate that a significant number of instructors may not see improving their understanding of pragmatics as a necessary need for their career.

Concerning the EFL instructors' understanding of teaching pragmatics (questions 11-20 on the questionnaire), the item with the highest average score (M=3.4) was item 18: "My students inquire about pragmatic matters." This implies that learners exhibit a certain degree of interest in learning information concerning pragmatic aspects. In contrast, questions 14 and 19 had the lowest average scores (M=2.4). The first item expressed the idea of correcting the pragmatic faults made by my pupils, while the second item conveyed the notion that my students are conscious of their pragmatic competency. Around 25% of the instructors indicated "seldom" as their answer for both issues, while a comparable percentage chose "usually" and "always" as their replies. In relation to item 14, 60% of the participants responded with "sometimes," but 48% of the instructors selected this choice for item 19. These results suggest that, based on the instructors' perspective, learners typically have a limited understanding of pragmatic aspects, and their teachers do not consistently correct their pragmatic mistakes.

Regarding the teaching of pragmatics in schools and institutions, almost 74% of instructors answered "Never" for questions 21, 22, and 25, which asked if pragmatics is included in the teacher training courses offered by the school. "My colleagues and I engage in discussions regarding pragmatic competence," and "Supervisors and colleagues view my pragmatic competence as a characteristic of my professional effectiveness." For items 23 and 24, which refer to receiving comments from supervisors and coworkers about my ability to use language effectively and appropriately, and discussing the importance of emphasizing practical aspects in the course book with colleagues, about 71.3% of the participants chose the response option "Never." The replies suggest that most participants believe that pragmatic competence is not a central focus in the educational methods of the majority of institutions.

Regarding pragmatics instruction within course books and exams, over 55% of the teachers selected "Never," while approximately 20% chose "Seldom" for all five items. Less than 10% of the participants selected responses indicating "Usually" or "Always". Additionally, all items exhibited low mean scores, ranging from M=1.53 to M=2.55. These findings suggest a dearth of adequate activities or supplementary materials targeting teaching pragmatic features within educational settings.

Research Question Two

To address the second research question regarding the impact of an in-service training course on meta-pragmatics on pragmatics awareness among Iranian EFL teachers, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to compare the means of the two groups across the components of meta-pragmatic awareness, including schools, language teachers, course books and exams, and language learners, to ensure their homogeneity in terms of pragmatic awareness instruction prior to the main study. Before discussing the results, it is important to note that the three main assumptions of MANOVA (i.e., normality, homogeneity of variances, and homogeneity of covariances) were met. It was reported that the ratio of skewness and kurtosis to their respective standard errors was lower than ± 1.96. Consequently, the normality of the data was approved. Moreover, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was satisfied as the outcomes of Levene's tests indicated non-significance for all variables (p > .05). Additionally, the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices, as assessed through Box's M test, was also met

(Box's M = 2.39, p = .995).

As illustrated in Table 1, it was noted that the experimental and control groups exhibited nearly identical means on the pretest for the components of the ELT teachers' pragmatic awareness questionnaire, including schools, language teachers, language learners, and course books and exams.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics: Pretest of Pragmatic Awareness by Groups

Dependent Variable	Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Schools	Experimental	34.050	.498	33.041	35.059
	Control	34.250	.498	33.241	35.259
Language Teacher	Experimental	33.000	.819	31.341	34.659
	Control	33.300	.819	31.641	34.959
Language Learners	Experimental	6.013	.146	5.718	6.307
	Control	6.113	.146	5.818	6.407
Coursebook and Exams	Experimental	6.350	.171	6.004	6.696
	Control	6.175	.171	5.829	6.521

The results of between-subjects effects (Table 2) indicated that;

1. There was no significant difference between the experimental (M = 34.05, SE = .49, 95 % CI [33.04, 35.05] and control (M = 34.25, SE = .49, 95 % CI [33.24, 35.25] groups in the pretest of *schools* (F (1, 58) = .081, p = .778, Partial η = .002 representing a weak effect size).

2. There was no significant difference between the experimental (M = 33, SE = .81, 95 % CI [31.41, 34.65] and control (M = 33.30, SE = .81, 95 % CI [31.64, 34.95] groups in the pretest of *language teacher* (F (1, 58) = .067, p = .797, Partial η = .002 representing a weak effect size).

3. There was no significant difference between the experimental (M = 6.01, SE = .14, 95 % CI [5.71, 6.30] and control (M = 6.11, SE = .14, 95 % CI [5.81, 6.40] groups in the pretest of *language learners* (F (1, 58) = .236, p = .630, Partial η = .006 representing a weak effect size).

4. There was no significant difference between the experimental (M = 6.35, SE = .17, 95 % CI [6, 6.69] and control (M = 6.17, SE = .17, 95 % CI [5.82, 6.52] groups in the pretest of *course book and exams* (F (1, 58) = .525, p = .473, Partial η = .014 representing a weak effect size).

Table 2
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects; Pretest of Pragmatic Awareness

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Group	Schools	.400	1	.400	.081	.778	.002
	Language Teacher	.900	1	.900	.067	.797	.002
	Language Learners	.100	1	.100	.236	.630	.006
	Course book and Exams	.306	1	.306	.525	.473	.014
Error	Schools	188.700	58	4.966			
	Language Teacher	510.200	58	13.426			
	Language Learners	16.119	58	.424			
	Course book and Exams	22.188	58	.584			
Total	Schools	46838.00	60				
	Language Teacher	44468.00	60				
	Language Learners	1486.375	60				
	Course book and Exams	1591.250	60				

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed to compare the means of the two groups on the posttests for the components of schools, language instructors, language learners, and course books and examinations. This analysis addressed the second research question in the study. Prior to examining the outcomes, it is important to acknowledge that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met. The outcomes of Levene's tests indicated non-significance for all variables (p > .05). Additionally, the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices, as assessed through Box's M test, was also met (Box's M = 18.49, p = .090).

Table 3 shows that the experimental group had higher means on the posttest of schools, language teachers, language learners, and course books and exams as components of ELT teachers' pragmatic awareness questionnaire than the control group. Hence, the null hypothesis, "attending an in-service training course of meta-pragmatics has no significant effect on the pragmatic awareness among Iranian EFL teachers," was rejected.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics; Posttest of Pragmatic Awareness by Groups

Dependent Variable	Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Schools	Experimental	35.850	.645	34.544	37.156
	Control	33.750	.645	32.444	35.056
Language Teacher	Experimental	33.900	.974	31.927	35.873
	Control	31.750	.974	29.777	33.723
Language Learners	Experimental	6.375	.194	5.982	6.768
	Control	5.725	.194	5.332	6.118
Coursebook and Exams	Experimental	6.425	.210	6.000	6.850
	Control	5.620	.210	5.195	6.045

The results of between-subjects effects (Table 4) provided the researcher with information concerning the components of the pragmatic awareness questionnaire among Iranian EFL teachers following an in-service instructional program on pragmatics.

Table 4

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects; Posttest of Pragmatic Awareness

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Group	Schools	44.100	1	44.100	5.298	.027	.122
	Language Teacher	46.225	1	46.225	2.434	.127	.060
	Language Learners	4.225	1	4.225	5.599	.023	.128
	Coursebook and Exams	6.480	1	6.480	7.352	.010	.162
Error	Schools	316.300	58	8.324			
	Language Teacher	721.550	58	18.988			
	Language Learners	28.675	58	.755			
	Coursebook and Exams	33.494	58	.881			
Total	Schools	48802.00	60				
	Language Teacher	43867.00	60				
	Language Learners	1497.000	60				
	Coursebook and Exams	1490.795	60				

The results of between-subjects effects on the posttest of pragmatic awareness (Table 4) revealed that;

1. The experimental group (M = 35.85, SE = .64, 95 % CI [34.54, 37.15] significantly outperformed the control group (M = 33.75, SE = .64, 95 % CI [32.44, 35.05] in the

posttest of *schools* (F (1, 58) = 5.25, p = .027, Partial η = .122 representing an almost large effect size).

2. There was no significant difference between the experimental (M = 33.90, SE = .97, 95 % CI [31.92, 35.87] and control (M = 31.75, SE = .97, 95 % CI [29.77, 33.72] groups in the posttest of *language teacher* (F (1, 58) = 2.43, p = .127, Partial η = .060 representing a moderate effect size).

3. The experimental group (M = 6.37, SE = .19, 95 % CI [5.98, 6.76] significantly outperformed the control group (M = 5.72, SE = .19, 95 % CI [5.33, 6.11] in the posttest of *language learners* (F (1, 58) = 5.59, p = .023, Partial η = .128 representing an almost large effect size).

4. The experimental group (M = 6.42, SE = .21, 95 % CI [6, 6.85] significantly outperformed the control group (M = 5.62, SE = .21, 95 % CI [5.19, 6.04] in the posttest of *course book and exams* (F (1, 58) = 7.35, p = .010, Partial η = .162, representing a large effect size).

Research Question Three

To answer the third research question, the researchers observed and evaluated the classes of 30 EFL teachers taking part in the teacher training program of meta-pragmatics through a researcher-made observation checklist. This was done to find if participating in the in-service training course of meta-pragmatics could lead to Iranian EFL teachers' highlighting pragmatic features in ELT textbooks. Then, the observations for each teacher were merged, and the mean score for each item of the checklist and the valid percentages of each Likert scale (never, rarely, often, sometimes, always) were calculated.

For the teachers who attended the training course, items 19 and 20 of the checklist (Appendix B) had the highest mean score of 4.1. Detailed analysis of the valid percentage of the responses showed that the majority of the participants (90%) either often or always and 10% sometimes encouraged the students to personalize the pragmatic features and engaged the students in meta-pragmatic discussions.

It was also observed that items 1, 14, 16, and 17 had the second highest mean score (M=4). Concerning item 1, results of valid percentage showed that, after being exposed to the training course, all participants (sometimes= 8/26/7%, often= 13/43.3%, always=9/30%) gave feedback on the language learners pragmatic errors. With regard to

item 14, it was observed that all of the observed teachers highlighted social distance, relationship, and position between those performing a speech act in the textbook tasks (often=4.13.3%, often=22/73.3%, always=4/13.3%). It was also found that approximately two-thirds of the observed teachers (73.4 %) either often or always provided the learners with required pragma-linguistic resources (fixed chunks and phrases) and sometimes exposed the language learners to required fixed phrases and pragma linguistic resources in their classes.

Another related finding was that 70% (21) of the observed teachers often encouraged students to perform pragmatic features at the production level, and 8 (26.7%) always encouraged students to do so. It was also found that the same number of the observed teachers, 8 (26.7%), either sometimes or always provided learners with required pragma linguistic resources (fixed chunks and phrases), and about half of them (46.7%) did so.

Results also showed that 18 (60%) of the participants sometimes assigned students some homework on pragmatic features of the textbook, 9 (30%) often did so, but 3 (10%) rarely assigned the students to such homework. Finally, regarding the last two items, it was observed that 19 (63.3%) of the participants often encouraged the students to personalize the pragmatic features and engaged the students in metapragmatic discussions. In contrast, 8 (26.7%) of them always engaged the language learners in discussions and encouraged them to personalize the pragmatic features, and the rest (10%) sometimes did so.

The classroom observation results showed that items 5, 10, and 15 in the checklist had the third highest mean score (3.9) for the participants who received the training course. Detailed analysis of the valid percentage of the responses given to each item showed that all observed teachers (often/always=80%, sometimes=20%) explicitly explained socio-pragmatic features of the pragmatics cases. Concerning item 15, it can also be seen that all observed teachers (often/always=86.7%, sometimes=13.3%) compared L2 and L1 pragmatic features in their classes.

Results also indicated that items 3, 7, 12, and 13 for the observed teachers had the next highest mean score (M=3.8). With respect to items 3 and 7, it was seen that 70 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 30% sometimes did so. However, with regard to items 12 and 13, the researcher observed that 28(83.6%) of the teachers sometimes corrected the pragmatic errors on the spot and sometimes after a delay, while only 2(4.4%) of the teachers often corrected the pragmatic errors either on the spot or after a delay.

Furthermore, it can be seen that items 4 and 6 had a mean score of 3.7. Detailed analysis of the valid percentage of the item options showed that two-thirds (70%) often and one-third (30%) sometimes used tasks to assess students' progress regarding pragmatic points (item 4) and made the students assess the appropriateness of speech acts they perform. Therefore, it can be argued that after receiving the training course, the teachers valued assessing the students' pragmatic performance.

Regarding the next item of the checklist, it was found that 11 (36.7%) of the teachers sometimes, 17 (56.7%) of them often, and only 2 (6.7%) of the observed teachers always got the students to assess the appropriateness of speech acts they perform. Therefore, it can be argued that the workshop increased teachers' practice of pragmatics in this regard.

Results of the classroom observation also showed that 9 (30%) of the teachers sometimes, 16 (53.3%) of them often, and only 5 (16.7%) always encouraged students to assess their peers` performance of speech acts. Teachers were also observed to see whether they addressed the textbook's pragmatic features. Results showed that 15 (46.7%) of them sometimes dealt with this feature, but 16 (53.3%) implicitly dealt with the textbook pragmatically. However, about 67.6 % (20) of the participants rarely/never overlooked the textbook pragmatic features, and only 10 (33.3) overlooked the textbook pragmatic features.

It can also be argued that after the treatment, about two-thirds of the participants (70%) rarely adopted a deductive approach to teaching pragmatic features, but 28 (93.3) of them often and 2 (6.7%) of them always adopted an inductive approach to teaching pragmatic features. About one-third of the teachers either sometimes (5, 16.7%) or always (4, 13.3%) adopted a deductive approach to teaching pragmatic features.

With regard to the teachers' correction of the pragmatic errors on the spot or after a delay, results showed that 28 (93.3%) of the teachers corrected the pragmatic errors

either after a delay or on the spot, and 2 (6.7%) often corrected the pragmatic errors either on the spot or after a delay. Results also showed that after taking part in the workshop, 22 (73.3%) of the teachers often and 4 (13.3%) always highlighted social distance, relationship, and position between those performing a speech act in the textbook tasks, and 4 (13.3%) sometimes did this. Moreover, it was found that the majority of the participants, 24 (80%) mostly, and 2 (6.7%), always compared L2 and L1 pragmatic features.

5. Discussion

The first research question of the study aimed to find the extent which Iranian EFL teachers were aware of meta-pragmatic notions. The research findings revealed that the teachers' pragmatic awareness of a certain sub-construct, namely 'language teachers,' exceeded the hypothetical average to a modest extent. This indicates that they demonstrated a greater level of understanding of the importance of teaching pragmatics by language instructors. Nevertheless, their understanding of the other three sub-constructs was much lower than the expected average. The results align with the study undertaken by Ekin and Damar (2013) in the Turkish EFL setting, which examined the teacher trainees' understanding of metapragmatic concepts. Their research revealed that trainees had a broad understanding of the theoretical aspects related to the significance of teaching pragmatics. However, this understanding was frequently restricted and shallow. In a similar vein, Savvidou and Economidou-Kogetsidis (2019) discovered that instructors did not acquire a thorough understanding of pragmatics throughout their teacher education programs. Moreover, these findings are consistent with the results obtained in other contexts, as shown by Savic's (2016) research. The study indicated that EFL instructors' understanding of metapragmatics, specifically their perspectives on politeness, differed substantially and were shaped by the value systems they adopted.

The poor knowledge of pragmatics may be attributed to the characteristics of teacher training programs. According to Glaser (2020), pragmatics is often seen as an optional addition rather than a necessary part of achieving proficiency in a second language. Consequently, pragmatics is not typically integrated into many teacher training programs. As a result, prospective language teachers may not develop a deep understanding of various aspects of pragmatics.

The second question aimed at finding whther an in-service training course on meta-pragmatics affected pragmatics awareness among Iranian EFL teachers. The findings revealed that in all the components of the meta-pragmatic questionnaire, the experimental group had higher mean scores on the posttest than the control group. Hence, attending an online in-service training course on meta-pragmatics significantly affected the pragmatic awareness among Iranian EFL teachers. The findings of the study are in line with the results of some of the previous research conducted on L2 pragmatics (Chen, 2016; Seth et al., 2019; Shively, 2010; Takimoto, 2013). The literature recorded about the effects of both virtual and real classroom training on second language pragmatics development has confirmed the effectiveness of training techniques and strategies to enhance the inter-language pragmatics ability of EFL learners and teachers (Chen, 2016; Ishihara & Cohen, 2021; Taguchi, 2022; Takimoto, 2013). The current study's experimental phase was carried out in a virtual setting. When it comes to developing a second language, several studies have shown that virtual learning is effective for L2 learners. The results of this research corroborate those of Chen (2016), who studied Chinese EFL students over the course of 10 sessions using task-based teaching and 3D multi-user virtual learning to demonstrate the efficacy of virtual world training of meta-pragmatics in second language acquisition. Based on her research, Chen concluded that EFL learners benefit from the use of 3D multimodal resources in Second Life (SL) because they provide both verbal and visual assistance. Moreover, Ishihara and Cohen's (2021) study revelaed that incorporating tehnology into teaching pragmatics in terms of getting connected to real language use, was effective. Likewise, Taguchi's (2022) study on employing virtual reality in developing pragmatic tasks proved effective in using correct speech acts. In the same vein, Takimoto's (2013) survey on the effect of virtual learning of Samoan, as a foreign language, on Japanese undergraduate students revealed that interlanguage pragmatic norms of the target lanaguege were learned effectively. Moreover, the present study findiungs can take support from Shively's (2010) study proposing a model of pragmatics instruction for EFL learners studying abroad. He found that learning of Spanish culture and pragmatics was successful as it provided a model for pragmatic instruction in the study abroad context for the students and helped them improve their pragmatic knowledge of the Spanish world.

The results of the present research question are in line with the findings reported by Alemi et al. (2014). Investigating the effect of teaching experience on the EFL pragmatic rating, they found that there is a positive linkage between the teaching experience and the amount of pragmatic rating; meaning that those participants who had more teaching experience enjoy a higher level of pragmatic awareness. Moreover, the findings of the present research question are partially in line with Ren's (2022) research. In brief, he found that pragmatic instruction is more seen in the EFL teachers' classes who have been teaching English for more years. All in all, it can be said that teaching experience is a reliable predictor for pragmatic instruction.

The third research question focused on the extent to which participating in the in-service training course on meta-pragmatics could lead to Iranian EFL teachers' highlighting pragmatic features in ELT textbooks to improve their teaching of pragmatics. The results revealed that before attending the training course, the teachers always used to ignore the learners' pragmatic errors observed, dealt with the textbook pragmatic features implicitly, and overlooked the textbook pragmatic features; whereas, after receiving the treatment, they never ignored the errors or overlooked the textbook pragmatic features. Results also showed that after the treatment teachers were more concerned with the pragmatic features in their class and as a part of their teaching process, they included practical examples of pragmatics in their classes. Therefore, it can be argued that the more teachers are aware of metapragmatics, the more they are concerned with teaching pragmatic to the language learners.

The observed changes in instructors' knowledge of metapragmatics may be ascribed to many sources. One example of how the results might be better understood is through the notion of zones of proximal teacher development (ZPTD) suggested by Warford (2011). This concept is based on Vygotsky's theory of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). ZPTD, or Zone of Proximal Teacher Development, refers to the difference between a teacher's present level of ability and what they can achieve with the help of an adult or more skilled peer (Warford, 2011). It appears that the training course on metapragmatics served as a scaffold for English language teachers to enhance their understanding of various aspects of pragmatics. This is because the participating teachers were provided with hints and prompts within a reflective dialogic context. In other

words, through collaborative dialogues, the participating teachers pooled their cognitive resources to collectively shape metapragmatic awareness. This process may not have occurred or been as robust without such collaborative engagement.

According to Warford (2011), instructing teachers within ZPTD is a socially situated perspective of developing teacher cognition supporting them to gain pedagogical knowledge from intermental plane (i.e. between people engaged in joint sociocultural activity) and move it to the intramental plane (within the individual). In addition, in line with a series of studies on inter-language pragmatics instruction (Alkawaz et al., 2023; Amiri & Birjandi, 2015; Amiri et al., 2015; Ren, 2022), irrespective of the course books used in the L2 classroom, teachers can enhance L2 learners' pragmatic knowledge through explicit teaching and explaining the vague points to the students. Hence, teachers' strategy development in how to teach pragmatics takes significance in the L2 classroom.

Teachers exposed to the training course explicitly explained socio-pragmatic features of the pragmatics cases to the learners, which is in line with Taguchi (2012) arguing that in the EFL context, explicit teaching of socio-pragmatic notions would facilitate inter-language pragmatic development of the learner. Moreover, it can be argued that in line with a compelling body of interventional studies that have targeted explicit/deductive and implicit/inductive teaching designs, the present study suggests explicit instruction of inter-language pragmatic notions and functions. This aligns with an overall trend in support of explicit/deductive instruction (e.g., Ishihara & Cohen, 2014; Martinez-Flor & Uso-Juan, 2010; Takahashi, 2010).

Highlighting pragmatic notions take significance for the English as a second or foreign language from both globalization (Sánchez-Hernández & Barón, 2022) and international (Sanchez-Hernandez & Martinez-Flor, 2022) perspectives. Therefore, teachers' promotion in highlighting the pragmatic features in ELT textbooks is considered an important step forward and an attempt to improve their actual teaching of pragmatics in the L2 classroom.

6. Conclusion

According to the above discussions, it can be said that raising pragmatic awareness in EFL teachers is very important to pave the way for communication skills in the L2

classroom. When the EFL teachers have a clear understanding of the significance of PC and know how to cultivate it in their classes using appropriate instruction techniques, promising results in the communication skills of the EFL learners can be expected. One of the key factors that can lead to such a high pragmatic awareness in instruction is taking part in pragmatic training courses. As the results indicated, pragmatic training programs and workshops can be highly useful to affect the attitudes of EFL teachers toward PC. The results showed that the pragmatic training course contributed to the EFL teachers' pragmatic awareness of communicative capabilities. Nevertheless, despite the increasing recognition of the significance of pragmatic awareness, it is evident that certain problematic issues require close and meticulous attention to cultivate healthier environments conducive to successful pragmatic education. Unless these challenges are addressed, the cycle of difficulties hindering the teaching of pragmatic competence will persist in the Iranian EFL context.

It can be concluded that EFL teachers need to be well aware of the importance of pragmatic features and do their best to teach them to language learners. It can also be concluded that if the EFL teachers have a clear understanding of the significance of pragmatics and 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.

The findings of the present study can have implications for EFL teachers. They could use the findings to recognize that teaching English as a foreign language entails a challenging endeavor that necessitates appropriate English usage closely intertwined with cultural values, contexts, and interlocutors. It involves fostering EFL learners' proficiency in English while also fostering their awareness of the distinctions and similarities between their native language (L1) and English (L2). The current study highlights a significant instructional responsibility for EFL teacher trainers to enhance pragmatic awareness among EFL teachers, thereby ensuring adequate attention is given to pragmatic features in instruction.

Another major implication stems from results suggesting that EFL teachers exhibit a favorable attitude toward pragmatic instruction, indicating their willingness to incorporate

pragmatic features into their classes (Kim, 2016). To successfully handle the pragmatic components of the target language, it is highly recommended that EFL teacher trainers cater to their teacher students' requirements by developing a suitable teaching style that focuses on pragmatics. Furthermore, teacher trainers need to consider the subjectivity of their teacher students when delivering these pragmatics-oriented materials, ensuring that their students' self-perception and cultural identity are respected and not compromised.

Another significant teaching implication derived from the current findings underscores the role of the teacher-researcher in teaching pragmatics within EFL contexts. The positive instructional outcomes uncovered in this study indicate the necessity of integrating pragmatic instruction effectively into institutional curricula. By doing so, language learners can benefit from enhanced learning opportunities tailored to their needs. As noted by Cohen (2012), there exists a noticeable disparity between the findings of research in pragmatics and the prevailing approaches to language teaching. Therefore, teacher-researchers must proactively incorporate pragmatic instruction into curricula, utilizing authentic audio-visual inputs and naturally occurring resources, as Derakhshan and Eslami (2015) advocate.

The findings also carry significant implications for instructors of teacher training courses. A crucial aspect lacking in language teacher education programs appears to be sufficient emphasis on L2 pragmatic competence. This comprises two interconnected aspects. Firstly, teachers themselves require instruction on pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic facets of language. Pragmatics represents an area of language that demands greater focus, particularly within the EFL context of Iran. The lack of knowledge and awareness of pragmatics emerged as a notable issue among the teachers in this study.

EFL learners constitute another group that would benefit from increased instruction on the pragma-linguistic and socio-pragmatic dimensions of language. Instructors in teacher training courses should emphasize to teachers the importance of imparting instruction in these language aspects to their students. EFL students can take advantage of familiarity with different strategies to enhance their inter-language pragmatic knowledge once they are exposed to such strategies and pushed to have relevant and reliable outputs.

Given the fact that the participants selected for the teaching training course were

mainly from one region in the country, which can be considered a limitation for the present study, future studies are suggested to explore the status of the Iranian EFL teachers' awareness concerning pragmatic instruction. Accruing a larger pool of data from a wider spectrum could enhance the probability of the generalizability of the findings. In addition, it is suggested that more studies be done to examine the effects of pragmatic training courses on EFL teachers' pragmatic instruction and awareness over a long period. Other researchers could also adopt sociocultural approaches to training teachers and then compare the results. Moreover, since this study was limited to the context of public and private high schools, further research can be carried out to examine how teaching pragmatics is realized in Iranian universities, private language institutes, and ESP classes. Another line for further studies could be exploring the relationship between teachers' rise in pragmatic awareness and learners' gains in learning pragmatic competence. Finally, exploring how pragmatic features presented in the ELT world are actually taught in Iranian social media can be another fertile area for further research.

References

Adlan, O. M. A. (2022). The effects of excluding pragmatics from university syllabus on EFL learners' performance in academic texts (a case of Omdurman Islamic university students). *International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 9*(6), 56- 86.

Alcón-Soler, E. (2015). Pragmatic learning and study abroad: Effects of instruction and length of stay. *System, 48*(1), 62-74.

Alkawaz, A., Afrouz, M., Ansari, D. N., & Dabaghi, A. (2023). The effect of explicit pragmatic instruction on EFL students' production of speech acts: pragmalinguistic vs. Socio-pragmatic errors in focus. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 15*(31), 1-17.

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.

Amiri, M., Birjandi, P., & Maftoon, P. (2015). Valid criteria for the selection of speech acts of academic situations to develop a comprehensive discourse completion test of interlanguage pragmatics. *Int. J. Rev. Life. Sci, 5*(5), 81-90.

Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. (2010). *Language assessment in practice*. Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Developing L2 pragmatics. *Language Learning, 63,* 68-86.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2016). Pragmatics and second language acquisition. In R. Kaplan (Ed.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 232-243). Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2018). Teaching of pragmatics. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, *36,* 1-7.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(2), 233-259. http://tesol.aua.am/TQD_2000/TQD_2000/TQ_D2000/VOL_32_2.PDF

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System*, *33*(3), 401-415.

Basturkmen, H., & Nguyen, T. T. M. (2017). Teaching pragmatics. In G. Steen & A. Barron (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of pragmatics*. Routledge

Bazaei, P., Mowlaie, B., & Yazdanimoghaddam, M. (2023). The effect of strategy training of speech acts of request and apology on developing Iranian EFL Learners "pragmatic performance and critical thinking". *Journal of Language and Translation*, *13*(3), 65-81.

Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2014). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.). Cengage Learning.

Chen, J. C. (2016). The crossroads of English language learners, task-based instruction, and 3D multi-user virtual learning in second life. *Computers & Education, 102*, 152-171.

Cohen, A. D. (2012). Research methods for describing variation in intercultural pragmatics for cultures in contact and conflict. In C. Félix-Brasdefer & D. Koike (Eds.), *Pragmatic variation in first and second language contexts: Methodological issues* (pp. 271-294). John Benjamins.

Cohen, A. D. (2018). *Learning pragmatics from native and nonnative language teachers*. Multilingual Matters.

Cohen, A. D. (2019). Strategy instruction for learning and performing target language pragmatics. In A. Uhl Chamot & V. Harris (Eds.), *Learning strategy instruction in the language classroom: Issues and implementation* (pp. 140-152). Multilingual Matters.

Cohen, A. D. (2020). Considerations in assessing pragmatic appropriateness in spoken language. *Language Teaching, 53*(2), 183-202.

Crandall, E., & Basturkem, H. (2004). Evaluating pragmatics-focused materials. *ELT Journal, 58*(1), pp. 38–49. doi: 10.1093/elt/58.1.38.

Ekin, M. T. Y., & Damar, E. A. (2013).Pragmatic awareness of EFL Teacher Trainess and Their Reflections on Pragmatic Practices. ELT Research Journal, 2(4).

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.

Guo, R., & Ellis, N. C. (2021). Language usage and second language morphosyntax: Effects of availability, reliability, and formulaicity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 582259.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. Edward Arnold.

Hassall, T. (2003). Requests by Australian learners of Indonesian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *35*(12), 1903-1928.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride, & J. Holmes, (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Penguin.

Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet.* Routledge.

Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2021). Incorporating technology into pragmatics-focused instruction. In *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics* (pp. 240-258). Routledge.

Jia, Y., Eslami, Z. R., & Burlbaw, L. M. (2006). ESL teachers' perceptions and factors influencing their use of classroom-based reading assessment. *Bilingual Research Journal*, *30*(2), 407-430.

Kasper, G., & Roever, C. (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 317-334). Routledge.

Liu, M. H. (2023). Blended cross-tier language teacher development: designing online video-based pragmatic assessment. *English Teaching & Learning, 47*(1), 21-46.

Meihami, H., & Khanlarzadeh, M. (2015). Pragmatic content in global and local ELT textbooks: A micro analysis study. *Sage Open*, *8*, 25-37.

Niezgoda, K. & Roever, C. (2001) 'Pragmatic and grammatical awareness: A function of learning environment? In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 63-79). Cambridge University Press.

Norouzian, R., & Eslami, Z. (2016). Critical perspectives on interlanguage pragmatic development: An agenda for research. *Issues in Applied Linguistics 12*(2), 123-134.

Povolná, R. (2014). Pragmatic awareness and its role in teacher education. *Vienna English Working Papers, 4*(3), 111-118.

Ravari, R. K., & Rashidi, N. (2024). Interlanguage pragmatic learning strategies (IPLS) as predictors of Iranian EFL learners' comprehension of conversational implicature: Structural equation modeling approach. *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, *21*(1), 139-160.

Ravesh, M. M., & Tabrizi, H. H. (2017). The effect of teaching inter-language pragmatics on interpretation ability of Iranian translation students. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 8*(3), 44-54.

Ren, W. (2022). *Second language pragmatics.* Cambridge University Press.

Römer, U. (2023). Usage-Based Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Vis-à-Vis Data-Driven Learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 2*(32),1-11.

Sadeghinezhad, S. (2023). Developing pragmatic awareness of requests in the EFL classroom: A focus on instructional effects. *Research in English Language Pedagogy*, *11*(4), 710-732.

Sánchez-Hernández, A., & Barón, J. (2022). Teaching second language pragmatics in the current era of globalization: An introduction. *Language Teaching Research*, *26*(2), 163-170.

Sanchez-Hernandez, A., & Martinez-Flor, A. (2022). Teaching the pragmatics of English as an international language: A focus on pragmatic markers. *Language Teaching Research*, *26*(2), 256-278.

Savić, M. (2016). Do EFL teachers in Serbia have what they need to teach L2 pragmatics? Novice teachers' views of politeness. Pragmatics & Language Learning, 14, 207-231.

Savignon, S. J. (1972). Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign-language teaching. Series: Language and the teacher, *Hispania*, *56*(4), 11-31.

Savvidou, C., & Economidou-Kogetsidis, M. (2019). Teaching pragmatics: Nonnative-speaker teachers' knowledge, beliefs and reported practices. *Intercultural Communication Education*, *2*(1), 39-58.

Shakki, F., Naeini, J., Mazandarani, O., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Instructed second language English pragmatics in the Iranian context. *Teaching English as a Second Language Quarterly (Formerly Journal of Teaching Language Skills)*, *39*(1), 201-252.

Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 31,* 289-310.

Taguchi, N. (2012). *Context, individual differences and pragmatic competence.* Multilingual Matters.

Taguchi, N. (2022). Immersive virtual reality for pragmatics task development. *Tesol Quarterly*, *56*(1), 308-335.

Tajeddin, Z., & Alemi, M. (2014). Criteria and bias in native English teachers' assessment of L2 pragmatic appropriacy: Content and FACETS analyses. *Asia Pacific Educational Research, 23*(3), 425-434.

Tajeddin, Z., Alemi, M., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2017). Acquisition of pragmatic routines by learners of L2 English: Investigating common errors and sources of pragmatic fossilization. *Tesl-Ej*, *21*(2), 12-23.

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.

Vellenga, H. (2004). Learning pragmatics from ESL & EFL textbooks: How likely? *TESL-EJ, 8*(2), 25-38.

Wahyuni, E. S., & Arieffiani, D. (2021). The Implementation of authentic assessment in course syllabus incorporating the pragmatic acquisition. *JET (Journal of English Teaching) Adi Buana, 6*(01), 53-64.

Warford, M. K. (2011). The zone of proximal teacher development. *Teaching and teacher education, 27*(2), 252-258.

Watson, D. G., Jacobs, C. L., & Buxó-Lugo, A. (2020). Prosody indexes both competence and performance. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, *11*(3), 15-32.

Yeh, E., & Swinehart, N. (2020). Testing the waters: Developing inter-language pragmatics through exploration, experimentation, and participation in online communities. *Calico Journal, 37*(1), 121-135.

Ziafar, M. (2020). The influence of explicit, implicit, and contrastive lexical approaches on pragmatic competence: The case of Iranian EFL learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 58*(1), 103-131.

Appendix A

ELT Teachers' Pragmatic Awareness Questionnaire

Participant Background
University degree:
Major:
Gender: Male □   Female   □
Age:
Years of experience in language teaching: 1-2   □-5   6□0   □   11+ □

Residence in an English-speaking country: No   □   Yes   (□r……years)
Name of the school you teach at:
The highest level you teach:
Name of the course book which is used besides the book which is main focus of teaching in this school:

Directions: The questions below aims to investigate your views about pragmatic competence or the ability to appropriately use language functions (e.g. request, refusal, apology, complaint, thanking, compliment) in different formal and informal situations.

A. Language Teacher
1. I am familiar with the concept of pragmatics in language teaching.
    1. Strongly Disagree   2. Disagree   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree   4. Agree   5. Strongly Agree
2.   Pragmatic competence is important for me as a teacher.
    1. Strongly Disagree   2. Disagree   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree   4. Agree   5. Strongly

Agree
3.   I evaluate my own pragmatic competence as very good.
   1. Strongly Disagree   2. Disagree   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree   4. Agree   5. Strongly Agree
4.   I try to improve my pragmatic competence.
   1. Strongly Disagree   2. Disagree   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree   4. Agree   5. Strongly Agree
5. Pragmatics is an important aspect of language teaching.
   1. Strongly Disagree   2. Disagree   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree   4. Agree   5. Strongly Agree
6.   The instruction of pragmatic competence should be part of an effective language teaching program.
   1. Strongly Disagree   2. Disagree   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree   4. Agree   5. Strongly Agree
7. The measurement of learners' pragmatic competence should be part of an effective language testing program.
   1. Strongly Disagree   2. Disagree   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree   4. Agree   5. Strongly Agree
8.   Teacher training workshops are required to raise language teachers' awareness of pragmatics.
   1. Strongly Disagree   2. Disagree   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree   4. Agree   5. Strongly Agree
9   Teachers'' pragmatic competence should be considered as one of their qualification for a teaching career.
   1. Strongly Disagree   2. Disagree   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree   4. Agree   5. Strongly Agree
10. Teachers' pragmatic competence should be considered as a factor in their promotion and professional development.
   1. Strongly Disagree   2. Disagree   3. Neither Agree nor Disagree   4. Agree   5. Strongly Agree

B. Language Learners

11. I make my students aware of the significance of pragmatics competence in language learning.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
12. I assess my students' pragmatic competence through various activities...
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
13. I pay attention to my students' pragmatic errors.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
14. I correct my students' pragmatic errors.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
15. I care about pragmatic competence in evaluating my students' classroom activities.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
16. I encourage my students to notice the pragmatics features of the textbook to improve their pragmatic competence.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
    17. The exams in this language center include sufficient items to assess students' pragmatic competence.
     1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
    18. My students ask me questions about pragmatic issues.
     1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
    19. My students are aware of their pragmatic competence.
     1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
    20. My students pay attention to the pragmatic features
     1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always

C. Schools and Institutions

21. Pragmatics is addressed in the school's teacher training courses (TTC).
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
22. My colleagues and I discuss the issues related to pragmatic competence.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
23. Supervisors and colleagues comment on my pragmatic ability and appropriateness.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
24. My colleagues and I discuss the need to emphasize pragmatics features in the course book.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
25. Supervisors and colleagues consider my pragmatic competence as feature of my professional efficacy.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always

D. Course book and Exams

26. Activities in the course books include features related to pragmatic competence.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
27. Activities in the course books are sufficient for improving my students' pragmatic competence.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
28. There are supplementary materials in this school to teach pragmatic competence to students.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always
29. There are questions in the school's exams which assess students' pragmatic competence.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always

30. The school's exams encourage students to focus on pragmatic features in their course books.
    1. Never   2. Seldom   3. Sometimes   4. Usually   5. Always

Appendix B

Class 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 explain socio-pragmatic features of the pragmatics cases.					
6	The teacher get 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 deal 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.					