Enhancing Pragmatic Competence in Language Lessons for School Children

Shaizat Zhanysbekova[1], Saule Nurgali[2], Shoibekova Akbota[3], Sagnaeva Gulzira[4], Aitbayeva Nursaule[5], Asimbay Nurkassym [6]

Abstract

The study focuses on enhancing the pragmatic competence of schoolchildren in language lessons. Pragmatic competence, the ability to use language effectively and appropriately in various social contexts, is crucial for communication and social interaction. This research investigates methods for improving this competence in the language classroom by implementing targeted pedagogical strategies. The study adopts an experimental approach, comparing the outcomes of pragmatic-focused lessons against traditional language teaching. Results demonstrate that explicit instruction on pragmatics significantly improves students' understanding of context, politeness strategies, and social appropriateness in language use. The study concludes by recommending strategies for integrating pragmatic competence into regular language curricula to foster more effective communicators.

Keywords: *Enhancing, Pragmatic, Competence, Language, Lessons, Schoolchildren.*

Introduction

Pragmatic competence, which refers to the ability to use language appropriately depending on the social context, plays a critical role in effective communication. Unlike linguistic competence, which involves knowing grammar and vocabulary, pragmatic competence concerns knowing how to express oneself in culturally and contextually appropriate ways. For schoolchildren, developing pragmatic competence is essential not only for language proficiency but also for social interaction, empathy, and understanding of various communicative settings.

Despite its importance, pragmatic competence often receives limited attention in traditional language teaching, which primarily focuses on linguistic forms. Research in second language acquisition (SLA) has shown that pragmatics can be taught effectively, and this can significantly improve learners' ability to navigate complex social interactions. Therefore, this study seeks to investigate how language lessons for schoolchildren can be designed to improve pragmatic competence.

The concept of pragmatic competence involves a range of skills, including the use of speech acts, politeness strategies, and discourse management. Previous studies have highlighted the role of pragmatics in communication and have shown that students often struggle with pragmatic competence in foreign language contexts. Researchers like Bardovi-Harlig (2013) and Taguchi (2011) argue that explicit instruction in pragmatics can help learners acquire an understanding of the social rules governing language use.

Moreover, scholars have examined various approaches to teaching pragmatics. According to Kasper and Rose (2002), pragmatic instruction can take various forms, including explicit instruction, input enhancement, and interaction-based practices. Research has also suggested that pragmatic competence is often underrepresented in language curricula, even though it is integral to successful language acquisition.

---

[1] Kazakh National Agrarian research university.
[2] Candidate of pedagogical sciences, associate professor, Abay Kazakh national Pedagogical university.
[3] Ph.D, Associate Professor, M. Auezov South Kazakhstan University, Department of Journalism and Kazakh Language .
[4] Master of Science, senior teacher, Pavlodar Pedagogical University named after Alkey Margulan.

[5] Candidate of philological sciences

[6] Senior teacher

In today's increasingly interconnected world, the ability to communicate effectively and appropriately is essential. Language, as the primary means of communication, plays a pivotal role in shaping interactions, relationships, and social cohesion. While traditional language education has often concentrated on linguistic competence—knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, and syntax—there is an increasing recognition of the importance of pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence refers to the ability to use language effectively in social interactions, taking into account the social context, the relationships between speakers, and the rules governing appropriate language use. The development of pragmatic competence, therefore, is not just a theoretical aspect of language learning but is essential for students to become competent communicators in the real world.

This research aims to explore the development of pragmatic competence in language lessons for schoolchildren. It examines how language lessons can be structured to include pragmatic elements such as politeness strategies, conversational turn-taking, context-sensitive language use, and social appropriateness. The purpose of this study is to highlight the importance of teaching pragmatics in language classrooms and to provide evidence of its effectiveness for schoolchildren, a group often overlooked in terms of pragmatic instruction.

Pragmatic competence, often defined as the ability to use language appropriately and effectively in a given context, is an essential component of overall language proficiency. While linguistic competence deals with knowledge of grammar and vocabulary, pragmatic competence involves knowing how to use language in specific social situations. It entails understanding the subtleties of meaning that go beyond the literal interpretation of words, including tone, politeness, indirectness, and the ability to manage conversations appropriately. For instance, knowing how to greet someone in different settings (formal vs. informal), how to make requests or apologies appropriately, and how to understand sarcasm or humor, are all examples of pragmatic competence.

In real-world communication, it is not enough to simply know the vocabulary and grammar of a language. Effective communication requires the ability to understand and use language in ways that are socially acceptable and contextually appropriate. Without pragmatic competence, even a speaker with advanced linguistic knowledge may struggle to navigate social interactions or to build meaningful relationships. For schoolchildren, learning pragmatic skills early on can help them develop these abilities in both their native and second languages, ensuring that they are well-equipped for communication in diverse situations.

Despite the increasing recognition of the importance of pragmatics, it has historically received limited attention in language education. Traditional language teaching has focused primarily on grammar and vocabulary, often neglecting the social and contextual aspects of language use. This gap has been highlighted by researchers in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), who argue that teaching pragmatic competence is essential for students to become fully competent communicators.

The gap between linguistic competence and pragmatic competence has led to a growing interest in how pragmatics can be integrated into language lessons. Scholars such as Kasper and Rose (2002) and Bardovi-Harlig (2013) have emphasized the importance of explicit pragmatic instruction. Pragmatics is not something that is automatically acquired through exposure to a language, especially for children. As with other aspects of language, explicit teaching can help learners become aware of the social functions of language and learn the appropriate ways to express themselves in different situations.

For schoolchildren, pragmatic competence is crucial not only for language learning but also for their social and cognitive development. Children spend a significant portion of their time engaging in social interactions with peers, teachers, and family members. These interactions often involve negotiating meaning, managing conflict, and developing relationships, all of which require pragmatic skills. For instance, a child who knows how to ask for help politely or how to apologize sincerely is more likely to build positive relationships with others.

Additionally, pragmatic competence in the classroom can enhance students' academic performance. Teachers often rely on students' ability to engage in classroom discussions, follow instructions, and ask

questions in socially appropriate ways. Without the necessary pragmatic skills, students may struggle to participate effectively in these interactions, which could hinder their learning and social integration in the classroom.

Furthermore, pragmatic competence is a vital skill in preparing students for future professional and personal interactions. In today's globalized world, children are exposed to diverse cultural norms and communication practices. Understanding how to communicate appropriately with individuals from different cultural backgrounds is a valuable skill that will benefit students throughout their lives. It is, therefore, essential to equip schoolchildren with the tools they need to navigate these interactions by teaching them the fundamentals of pragmatics.

While the importance of pragmatic competence is widely recognized, there are several challenges associated with its instruction. One of the key challenges is the difficulty in assessing pragmatic skills. Unlike grammar or vocabulary, which can be measured through tests and exercises, pragmatic competence involves a more nuanced understanding of social contexts and relationships. Assessing how well a student can use language appropriately requires more than just a correct answer; it requires an understanding of the social dynamics at play.

Additionally, pragmatics is often taught implicitly rather than explicitly. In traditional language classrooms, pragmatics is often approached through incidental exposure or through textbooks that provide generic advice on politeness or conversational norms. While this exposure can be helpful, it is not sufficient for students to develop a deep understanding of pragmatic principles. Explicit instruction, including role-playing exercises, peer interactions, and cultural discussions, can help students become more aware of the social functions of language and improve their pragmatic competence.

Another challenge is the variation in pragmatic norms across cultures. For children learning a second language, the differences in social norms between their native culture and the target culture can be confusing. For instance, a child learning English might struggle with the concept of indirectness in requests, which is more common in English-speaking cultures than in other languages. Teachers need to be sensitive to these cultural differences and provide students with the tools to understand and navigate them.

One of the most critical aspects of teaching pragmatics is the emphasis on context. Contextualizing pragmatic instruction involves providing students with real-world scenarios where they can practice and apply their knowledge of social conventions. This can be done through various methods, such as role-playing, simulations, and guided interactions. In these activities, students are presented with different social situations and must decide how to respond appropriately based on the context.

For example, a teacher might ask students to imagine that they are at a formal dinner party and need to make a polite request for more food. In contrast, another activity might involve practicing how to request help from a peer in a casual setting. These activities encourage students to think critically about the social cues that influence language use, including the formality of the setting, the relationship between speakers, and the emotional tone of the interaction.

Incorporating such contextualized activities into language lessons helps students gain a deeper understanding of how language functions in the real world. It allows them to practice language in ways that reflect authentic communication situations and encourages them to consider the social dynamics involved in language use.

This study is organized into several sections, each focusing on different aspects of pragmatic competence and its development in language lessons for schoolchildren. The first part of the study outlines the theoretical framework of pragmatics and the importance of teaching pragmatic competence in language classrooms. It explores how pragmatic skills contribute to effective communication and social integration, emphasizing the significance of teaching these skills to schoolchildren.

The second section of the study focuses on the research methodology, describing the experimental design, participant selection, and data collection methods used to assess the effectiveness of pragmatic instruction. The experimental part of the study involves comparing a group of schoolchildren who received explicit pragmatic instruction with a control group who followed a traditional language curriculum.

The third section presents the results of the study, analyzing the pre-test and post-test scores, classroom observations, and student surveys. The results are discussed in terms of the effectiveness of pragmatic instruction in improving students' ability to use language appropriately in different social contexts.

Finally, the conclusion summarizes the findings of the study, highlighting the importance of incorporating pragmatic competence into language curricula for schoolchildren. It discusses the implications of the study for language teaching practices and suggests directions for future research in the field of pragmatics.

The development of pragmatic competence in language lessons for schoolchildren is an essential yet often overlooked aspect of language education. Teaching students how to use language appropriately in different social contexts not only enhances their language proficiency but also helps them build stronger social relationships and navigate the complexities of communication in the real world. While challenges remain in teaching pragmatics, the growing recognition of its importance in language education has led to the development of new pedagogical strategies aimed at enhancing pragmatic skills.

This research aims to contribute to the growing body of literature on pragmatic competence by providing evidence of the effectiveness of explicit pragmatic instruction for schoolchildren. By examining how language lessons can be designed to develop students' pragmatic skills, this study hopes to provide valuable insights into how pragmatics can be integrated into language curricula, benefiting both teachers and learners. The findings of this study have the potential to inform future language teaching practices and contribute to the broader conversation about the role of pragmatics in language education.

Research Questions

How can pragmatic competence be enhanced in language lessons for schoolchildren?

What are the effects of a pragmatic-focused approach on students' language proficiency?

How do students perceive the value of pragmatic instruction in language learning?

Methods

Participants

The study was conducted with two groups of schoolchildren aged 10-12, from a public school in a medium-sized urban area. Group A (experimental group) consisted of 30 students who received pragmatic-focused lessons, while Group B (control group) consisted of 30 students who received traditional language lessons.

An experimental design was used to evaluate the effectiveness of pragmatic competence instruction. The study lasted for six weeks and involved weekly language lessons, each lasting 45 minutes.

Experimental Group (Group A) Students in this group were taught pragmatic skills, such as politeness strategies, turn-taking, and appropriate language use in different social contexts. The lessons included role-playing, group discussions, and explicit instruction about cultural norms and social conventions in communication.

Control Group (Group B) Students in the control group were taught the standard language curriculum, which emphasized vocabulary, grammar, and reading comprehension. The focus was mainly on linguistic accuracy rather than social appropriateness in communication.

Both groups were given a pre-test to assess their initial level of pragmatic competence. The test consisted of situational dialogues where students had to choose appropriate responses based on the social context. The same test was administered at the end of the six weeks to measure any changes.

At the end of the study, students completed a survey to provide feedback on the lessons and their perceptions of how they had learned pragmatic skills.

In addition to the tests, the researchers observed classroom interactions, noting instances of students' use of pragmatics in role-play exercises and group discussions.

The data collected from the pre-test and post-test were analyzed using a paired t-test to compare the improvements in pragmatic competence between the experimental and control groups. The survey data were analyzed qualitatively to gain insights into students' perceptions. Classroom observations were used to provide contextual understanding of how pragmatic instruction was applied.

The experimental intervention involved a structured curriculum focusing on pragmatic elements. For example, students were taught how to:

- Use appropriate greetings and farewells in different contexts.

- Apply politeness strategies in requests, apologies, and refusals.

- Understand the role of context (formal/informal, familiar/unfamiliar) in determining language use.

- Practice conversational turn-taking and topic management in group discussions.

The lessons involved both teacher-led discussions and interactive activities such as role-playing and peer feedback sessions. These activities were designed to simulate real-life communication scenarios, enabling students to practice using language appropriately in various social contexts.

Results

The pre-test scores of both groups showed similar levels of pragmatic competence, indicating that both groups started with similar abilities. However, after six weeks of instruction, the results from the post-test revealed significant differences between the two groups. The experimental group showed a marked improvement in pragmatic competence, with a mean score increase of 35%. The control group, in contrast, showed only a slight improvement of 10%.

Students in the experimental group demonstrated better understanding and application of politeness strategies, such as using formal and informal speech appropriately. Additionally, they showed improvement in managing conversations, taking turns, and adjusting their language according to social contexts.

The survey results indicated that students in the experimental group found pragmatic instruction helpful and interesting. They reported feeling more confident in their ability to communicate in different social situations and expressed a greater understanding of how language can be used to navigate social relationships.

The primary data were collected from the pre-test and post-test results, the students' survey responses, and the classroom observation notes. The pre-test and post-test results provided quantitative data, while the survey and observations offered qualitative insights into students' perceptions and behaviors.

The pre- and post-test scores were analyzed using descriptive statistics and paired t-tests to compare the differences in pragmatic competence between the experimental and control groups. The mean scores for

each group were calculated, and the difference in scores between the pre-test and post-test was assessed for statistical significance.

The surveys were analyzed to identify common themes in students' experiences and feedback. Additionally, the observation notes were analyzed to understand how students applied pragmatic knowledge in real-life communication scenarios during role-playing activities.

The pre-test scores for both groups were fairly similar, indicating that the students had comparable initial levels of pragmatic competence. On a scale from 0 to 10, the average score for the experimental group was 5.2, while the control group scored slightly lower at 4.9. These scores suggest that neither group had significant prior knowledge of pragmatics, making the study suitable for investigating the effects of explicit instruction.

Pre-test Results (Mean Scores)

Group	Pre-test Score
Experimental Group	5.2
Control Group	4.9

Post-test Scores

After six weeks of instruction, both groups showed improvements in their post-test scores. However, the experimental group exhibited a much greater increase in their pragmatic competence. The experimental group's average score increased to 8.2, while the control group's score increased to 5.4.

Post-test Results

Group	Post-test Score
Experimental Group	8.2
Control Group	5.4

The paired t-test results showed that the difference in scores between the pre-test and post-test for the experimental group was statistically significant (p < 0.01), suggesting that the pragmatic instruction had a positive impact. In contrast, the control group showed a smaller, non-significant improvement, further supporting the effectiveness of pragmatic-focused lessons.

Paired t-test Results

Group	t-value	p-value
Experimental Group	5.46	0.0001
Control Group	1.72	0.09

The survey results revealed that the majority of students in the experimental group found the pragmatic lessons engaging and beneficial. Over 80% of the students reported feeling more confident in their ability to navigate social situations in both formal and informal contexts.

Survey Results

- **Did you find the pragmatic lessons helpful?**

  o Yes: 85%

  o No: 15%

- **Do you feel more confident in using appropriate language in different social situations?**

  o Yes: 80%

  o No: 20%

During role-playing activities, students in the experimental group demonstrated improved use of polite expressions, context-appropriate speech, and conversational turn-taking. For example, students who initially struggled with making polite requests were able to produce more nuanced and socially appropriate responses by the end of the experiment. In contrast, the control group continued to use more direct and less context-sensitive language.

The pie charts below show the distribution of students' perceptions of the effectiveness of pragmatic lessons and their increased confidence in applying pragmatic knowledge.

Chart 1: Students' Perceptions of Pragmatic Lessons

- **Helpful**: 85%

- **Not Helpful**: 15%

Chart 2: Confidence in Using Appropriate Language

- **More Confident**: 80%

- **Not More Confident**: 20%

The results from the pre-test, post-test, surveys, and classroom observations indicate that explicit instruction in pragmatic competence significantly improves students' understanding and use of language in socially appropriate ways. The experimental group showed a marked improvement in pragmatic skills, including the use of politeness strategies, understanding formal and informal language, and applying conversational norms.

The control group, which did not receive pragmatic instruction, showed minimal improvement in these areas. The statistical analysis confirmed that the experimental group's improvement was statistically significant, while the control group's improvement was not.

Students in the experimental group expressed a high level of satisfaction with the pragmatic lessons and reported feeling more confident in using language in a variety of social contexts. These findings suggest that pragmatic competence is not only teachable but also valued by students, as it directly impacts their ability to communicate effectively.

The experimental results demonstrate that pragmatic competence can be effectively developed in schoolchildren through explicit instruction in language lessons. The integration of pragmatic skills into language curricula not only enhances students' communicative abilities but also improves their social

interactions and confidence. The findings of this study suggest that pragmatics should be a core component of language education, ensuring that students develop both linguistic accuracy and social competence.

Future research should explore the long-term impact of pragmatic instruction and its applicability to different age groups and language proficiency levels.

Task 1: Interpreting a Bar Graph and Discussing Preferences

Students will practice interpreting data and discussing preferences using the appropriate language structures.	A bar graph showing the favorite activities of students in a class (e.g., Reading, Sports, Video Games, Music, and Drawing).

Instructions

1. Present the bar graph on the board or hand out a copy to each student.

2. Ask students to observe the graph carefully.

3. In pairs or small groups, have students answer the following questions:

What is the most popular activity?

How many students prefer sports?

What are the least favorite activities?

Are there any activities with similar popularity?

Students should then compare the data using phrases such as:

"More students like sports than video games."

"The least popular activity is drawing."

"Reading and music have almost the same number of votes."

Example Bar Graph

(Title: *Favorite Activities of Class 4B*)

- Reading: 15 students

- Sports: 20 students

- Video Games: 10 students

- Music: 12 students

- Drawing: 8 students

Task 2: Analyzing a Table and Reporting Information

Students will develop skills to interpret data from a table and report findings using clear and concise language.	A table showing the monthly temperatures in different cities.

Instructions

1. Provide the students with a table that contains the monthly temperatures (in Celsius) for three cities.

2. Ask students to fill in the following questions based on the data:

Which city is the coldest in winter?

Which city has the highest average temperature in July?

What is the difference in temperature between January and July in each city?

In pairs, students should report their findings to the class using the language structures:

"In January, Paris is colder than Rome."

"New York has the highest temperature in July, with 30°C."

"The temperature difference between January and July in Paris is 18°C."

City	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Paris	5°C	6°C	10°C	13°C	16°C	19°C	22°C	21°C	17°C	12°C	8°C	6°C
Rome	8°C	9°C	12°C	16°C	19°C	22°C	25°C	24°C	20°C	15°C	10°C	8°C
New York	1°C	3°C	7°C	12°C	18°C	24°C	30°C	29°C	24°C	15°C	9°C	3°C

Task 3: Making Predictions Based on Data Trends

Students will practice making predictions and suggesting outcomes based on data.	A line graph showing the increase in sales of a product over six months.

Instructions

1. Present a line graph that shows the sales of a product (e.g., a toy, smartphone, etc.) over the past six months.

2.   Ask the students to analyze the graph and answer the following questions:

What happened to the sales from month 1 to month 6?

Was there any month with a significant change in sales?

How do you think the sales will change in the next three months?

Students should use language for predictions, such as:

"Sales increased steadily each month."

"In month 4, the sales jumped dramatically."

"I think the sales will continue to rise next month."

Have students work in groups to create their own predictions for the next six months using the data trend.

Example Line Graph Description

The graph shows the sales of a new toy over six months. In the first two months, sales were low, but starting in month 3, there was a sharp increase, peaking in month 5. Sales slightly decreased in month 6.

Task 4: Comparing Data Using Tables

Students will practice comparing and contrasting different sets of data.	A table comparing the number of students participating in different after-school clubs.

Instructions

1.   Give students a table that shows the number of students in different after-school clubs (e.g., Drama, Art, Sports, Music, Science).

2.   Ask students to make comparisons using the table. Encourage the use of comparative and superlative forms (e.g., "more," "fewer," "the most," "the least").

3.   Sample questions:

Which club has the most participants?

Which has the least?

Compare the number of students in the Art and Music clubs.

Have students present their findings using language such as:

"The Drama club has the most participants."

"There are fewer students in the Science club than in the Music club."

"The Art club has 15 members, which is fewer than the Music club's 20 members."

Club	Number of Students
Drama	25
Art	15
Sports	30
Music	20
Science	10

These tasks help students practice pragmatic competence by encouraging them to use language for real-world communication, such as reporting data, comparing figures, and making predictions. Additionally, students learn to choose appropriate vocabulary and structures to express their understanding of the information presented in graphs and tables.

Discussion

The results suggest that explicit instruction in pragmatics can significantly enhance students' ability to use language appropriately in social contexts. The improvement observed in the experimental group confirms that pragmatic competence can be developed through targeted teaching strategies. This finding aligns with previous research (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig, 2013; Taguchi, 2011) that supports the effectiveness of pragmatic instruction in language learning.

The study also highlights the importance of integrating pragmatics into language curricula. While traditional language lessons focus primarily on grammar and vocabulary, teaching pragmatics enables students to become more effective communicators. This is particularly important in the context of global communication, where social norms and conventions vary widely across cultures.

The students' positive feedback further supports the idea that teaching pragmatics can be both engaging and valuable. Role-playing, in particular, emerged as an effective method for helping students apply theoretical knowledge in real-life scenarios. These findings suggest that pragmatics should not be an isolated component of language instruction but should be integrated into all aspects of language learning.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that enhancing pragmatic competence in language lessons is both feasible and beneficial for schoolchildren. The results show that explicit instruction in pragmatic skills significantly improves students' understanding of how to use language appropriately in different social contexts. Based on these findings, it is recommended that language curricula for schoolchildren incorporate more focus on pragmatics, integrating activities that foster awareness of social norms and communication strategies.

Future research should explore the long-term effects of pragmatic instruction and consider how these skills can be applied across different age groups and language proficiency levels.

References

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Pragmatics and Language Learning. University of Hawai'i Press.
Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (2002). Pragmatic Development in a Second Language. Blackwell Publishing.
Taguchi, N. (2011). Pragmatic Competence. Springer.
Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2013). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics into the classroom. In G. R. L. S. B. G. B. (Ed.), The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition (pp. 241-265). Cambridge University Press.
Cohen, A. D. (2010). Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence: A toolkit for teachers. Cambridge University Press.
Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic development in a second language. Blackwell Publishing.
Kecskes, I. (2013). Intercultural pragmatics. Oxford University Press.
LoCastro, V. (2012). Pragmatics for language educators: A sociolinguistic perspective. Routledge.

Taguchi, N. (2011). Pragmatic competence. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning (pp. 180–194). Routledge.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Peceptions and misperceptions in intercultural communication. Applied Linguistics, 4(2), 107-125.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with implications for second language teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 29(2), 355-383.

House, J. (2003). English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism? Journal of Sociolinguistics, 7(4), 556-578.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). Teaching pragmatics. In D. Nunan (Ed.), Pragmatics in language teaching (pp. 1-14). Cambridge University Press.

Yermekova, T.N., Ryskulbek, D., Azimova, G., Kapalbek, B., Mawkanuli, T., Language Instruction in Kazakhstan's Higher Education: A Critical Examination | Kazakistan Yüksek Öğreniminde Dil Öğretimi: Eleştirel Bir İnceleme, Novitas, 2024, 18(1), pp190–198

Shoibekova, G., Yermekova, T., Satbekova, A.A., Odanova, S., Malik, M.,Latin borrowings as a linguistic problem: Approaches, reasons, typology

XLinguae., 2020, 13(2), pp 149–156

Hudson, R. A. (1996). Sociolinguistics. Cambridge University Press.

Dufon, M. A., & Churchill, E. (2006). Pragmatics in second language acquisition: Theoretical issues and pedagogical implications. ELT Journal, 60(1), 31-40.

Nguyen, H. T. (2014). Pedagogical implications for teaching pragmatics in ESL classrooms. English Language Teaching, 7(6), 23-34.

Rose, K. R., & Kasper, G. (2001). Pragmatics in language teaching. Cambridge University Press.

Eslami, Z. R. (2005). Pragmatics in EFL teaching: Teaching pragmatics in the classroom. Journal of English Language Teaching, 58(3), 15-21.

Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.

Wolfson, N. (1989). Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

O'Keeffe, A., & Clancy, B. (2011). Pragmatics in language teaching and learning. Cambridge University Press

Holmes, J. (2013). An introduction to sociolinguistics. Routledge.

Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. B. (2011). The handbook of language socialization. Wiley-Blackwell.

SIBGAEVA, F. R., SAGDATZYANOVNA NURMUKHAMETOVA, R., SATTAROVA, M. R., & UDERBAYEV, A. Z. (2020). Development Trends of Bilingual Tatar Lexicography of the XXI Century. Utopía Y Praxis Latinoamericana, 25(1), 57-63. Recuperado a partir de https://produccioncientificaluz.org/index.php/utopia/article/view/34357

Seisenbiyeva, E., Begmanova, B., Aitova, Z., Tulebayeva, K., Madibayeva, K.

The basics of determining the speech of national traditions in literature | Les bases de la détermination du discours des traditions nationales dans la littérature

XLinguae., 2022, 15(4), pp 28–37

Aliya, K., Assemgul, A., Bayan, K., … Farida, O., Zhanat, B.

Pedagogical Terms in Self-Organization of Learners During Education Process in Higher Educational Establishments, Review of International Geographical Education Online, 2021, 11(5), pp 422–428