

A. Abdul Rakhmanuly*  **M.S. Zholshayeva** 

SDU University, Kaskelen, Kazakhstan

*e-mail: a.abdulrakhmanuly@sdu.edu.kz

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS OF MASTERING THE PRAGMATICS OF LINGUISTIC COMMUNICATION

The study addresses the critical need to integrate pragmatics into teaching the Kazakh language to develop student's communication skills in a globalized and multicultural context. The research explores strategies for preparing future teachers to effectively teach pragmatics, a key yet often overlooked component of language education. The study adopts a qualitative thematic analysis of over 60 academic works, focusing on the pedagogical challenges, instructional methods, and assessment strategies for teaching pragmatics. Comparative analysis between English and Kazakh language pragmatics highlights transferable methods while accounting for cultural and linguistic differences. Key findings underscore the abstract and culturally embedded nature of pragmatics, the lack of resources for Kazakh language instruction, and the importance of clear and explicit teaching methods. The study emphasizes the role of innovative tools, including digital platforms, in enhancing pragmatic competence. It contributes to the field by proposing actionable recommendations for teacher training programs, curriculum development, and pragmatic assessment tools tailored to the Kazakh context. The results offer practical insights for language educators and policymakers, fostering cross-cultural communication and effective language teaching in a rapidly changing world.

Key words: pragmatics, teacher training, challenges of teaching, pragmatic competence.

А. Абдул Рахманұлы*, М.С. Жолшаева

SDU University, Қаскелен, Қазақстан

*e-mail: a.abdulrakhmanuly@sdu.edu.kz

Тілдік қарым-қатынас прагматикасын менгертудің әдістемелік проблемалары

Зерттеу жаһандану және мәдениеттер тоғысының жағдайында студенттердің коммуникативтік дағдыларын дамыту үшін қазақ тілін оқытуда прагматиканы интеграциялаудың маңызын алға тартады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – болашақ мұғалімдерді прагматиканы тиімді оқытуға дайындаудың стратегияларын зерттеу. Себебі бұл тілдік білім берудің жиі еленбейтін, қындықтарға толы, бірақ маңызды құрамдас бөлігі болып табылады. Зерттеу нәтижелері 60-тан астам ғылыми еңбектерді сапалы тақырыптық талдауға негізделген. Бұл ғылыми еңбектер прагматиканы оқытудағы педагогикалық қындықтарға, оқыту әдістеріне және бағалау стратегияларына назар аударуы бойынша іріктелді. Негізгі нәтижелер прагматиканың абстарциялық, табиғаты мен мәдени контекстке тікелей байланысын, қазақ тілі бойынша ресурстардың жетіспеушілігін ғылыми еңбектерде жиі прагматиканы оқытудағы қындылығы, түсініктілігі мен нақтылығының маңыздылығын баса көрсетеді. Зерттеу прагматикалық құзыреттілікті арттыруды инновациялық құралдардың, соның ішінде цифрлық платформалардың рөлін ерекше атап өтеді. Бұл жұмыс мұғалімдерді дайындау бағдарламаларына, оқу жоспарларын әзірлеуге және қазақ тіліне бейімделген прагматикалық бағалау құралдарына арналған нақты ұсыныстар ұсыну арқылы осы салага өз үлесін қосады. Нәтижелер қазақ тілі мұғалімдері мен студенттері үшін практикалық ұсыныстар береді, мәдениеттер тоғысының жағдайында қарым-қатынас пен тиімді тіл оқытуды жақсартуға ықпал етеді.

Түйін сөздер: прагматика, мұғалімнің дайындығы, оқытудың қындықтары, прагматикалық құзыреттілік.

А. Абдул Рахманулы*, М.С. Жолшайева

SDU University, Каскелен, Казахстан

*e-mail: a.abdulrakhmanuly@sdu.edu.kz

Методические проблемы усвоения pragmatики языковой коммуникации

Исследование посвящено актуальной проблеме интеграции pragmatики в процесс обучения казахскому языку, что является важным условием для развития коммуникативных навыков студентов в условиях глобализации и межкультурного взаимодействия. Основная цель работы заключается в изучении стратегий подготовки будущих учителей к эффективному обучению pragmatике, ключевому, но часто недооцененному аспекту языкового образования. В исследовании используется качественный тематический анализ более 60 научных источников, который позволяет выявить основные педагогические проблемы, подходы к преподаванию и стратегии оценки pragmatической компетенции. Результаты исследования подчеркивают сложную и культурно обусловленную природу pragmatики, ограниченность ресурсов для преподавания pragmatики на казахском языке, а также необходимость использования четких и структурированных методов обучения. Отдельное внимание уделяется инновационным инструментам, включая цифровые технологии, которые играют важную роль в повышении эффективности обучения pragmatике. Исследование вносит вклад в развитие научной и практической базы, предлагая конкретные рекомендации для программ подготовки учителей, разработки учебных планов и создания инструментов оценки, адаптированных к казахскому контексту. Результаты исследования имеют практическую значимость для преподавателей, студентов и разработчиков образовательных программ, способствуя улучшению межкультурной коммуникации и качественного преподавания языков. Работа способствует формированию методической базы, необходимой для решения задач современного образования.

Ключевые слова: pragmatика, подготовка учителей, проблемы преподавания, pragматическая компетентность.

Introduction

In today's competitive, globalized world and intercultural context, professionals with high communication skills are essential and demanded. Therefore, teaching students in their mother tongue to understand different layers of meanings in sentences could be beneficial to build effective communication. However, we mainly concentrate on basic grammar rules and the direct meaning of the words rather than deep and complex concepts like discourse analysis or pragmatics of language, especially in the Kazakh language. Moreover, considering that philology students and language teachers understand the critical role of pragmatics in effective communication, most teachers lack adequate training and do not have access to materials or instruments that could help them teach their students effectively in this aspect. This article will review the main challenges of teaching pragmatics to students and how to prepare language teachers and philology students to teach pragmatics in the classroom. Nevertheless, the pedagogy of pragmatics was studied deeply in different languages internationally, especially in the context of teaching English to international students. So, in this article, we will review these works from the perspective of

teaching pragmatics of the Kazakh language, compare similarities and possible differentiations in the logic of languages and cultures of nations, and fill the gap.

The purpose of this study is to review possible strategies and methods to prepare language to teach pragmatics in Kazakh language to students and how to address possible challenges in this process, ultimately enhancing language learners' pragmatic competence. In the literature on the topic that we have reviewed, it is clear that a theoretical aspect of pragmatics has been studied significantly, while aspects like its practical implementation in the classroom and its pedagogy were focused on considerably less by academics. For example, Kasper and Rose (2001), in their book on pragmatics in language teaching, indicate that academics mostly overlook it and do not have enough materials and resources for proper teacher training. In terms of the practical significance aspects of this article, we want to focus on providing recommendations for university instructors for training future teachers on pragmatic instructions and curriculum design to develop the pragmatic competence of school students. Our goal is to identify the main challenges in teaching pragmatics by reviewing the works of academics and recent publications on the topic.

Additionally, we consider adapting these methods and recommendations to the context and realities of the Kazakh language. Pragmatics is a complex concept with cultural, cognitive, linguistic, psychological, and many other layers. Therefore, this article focuses mainly on practical aspects and will not explore theoretical questions. In the following chapters, we will describe the materials and methods used to conduct this study.

Materials and Methods

As a primary research method for this study, qualitative thematic analysis of existing literature was employed, and comparative analysis of English and Kazakh language pragmatics was based on cultural differences. In the first stage, articles connected to the topic were selected from different national and international academic databases, such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, and Scopus, focusing on works that discussed pedagogical implementations of pragmatics in language learning and teaching. As keywords for searching relevant articles were used these combinations of words: “pragmatics in language learning”, “teaching pragmatic competence”, “teaching Kazakh language”, and “comparative analysis and pragmatics”. Additionally, the relevance of articles was checked through screening and critical evaluation of abstracts, keywords, introduction and conclusion sections. All the studies that focused on teaching methods of pragmatics based on cultural differentiation, challenges in teaching pragmatics, and developing pedagogical instruments and tools for teaching pragmatics were prioritized. If articles mainly focused on theoretical aspects of pragmatics or, in general, linguistic issues were excluded from the review. In the second stage, these articles were categorized thematically, and for this purpose, Google Sheets were employed to organize classifications. Then, based on these categories, we critically reviewed other chapters of articles, and a qualitative thematic approach was applied to categorize and interpret data based on recurring themes such as instructional techniques, cultural adjustments and practical recommendations. Afterwards, a comparative analysis was conducted to identify possible similarities and differences in teaching pragmatics to students in Kazakh and English languages. Moreover, in this stage, the impact of sociolinguistic norms and cultural differences on productive communication was analyzed, and their effect on methods of teaching languages was evaluated. In addition, we tried to identify transferable

approaches in teaching pragmatic competence and raising students' awareness of contextually and culturally appropriate language in different situations. Overall, thematic coding was employed to categorize the results of these reviews and evaluations. The insights from these findings could also help organize possible approaches and strategies to teach pragmatics and face challenges in these processes. This qualitative analysis method helped us explore the pedagogical, contextual, social and cultural aspects of complex concepts of pragmatics (Creswell, 2013).

In the final version of the Google Sheets, we reviewed more than 60 works in depth, which were selected based on the criteria that were mentioned above. However, the majority of the works focused on English language pragmatics instruction, so in the discussion section, most of the ideas about the transferability of the ideas and methods of these works to the Kazakh language will be based on our predictions and expectations. Therefore, we do not claim they are possible and practical implications, as we were not based on empirical data on these predictions. Nevertheless, these ideas can play a foundational role in future inquiries to study possible strategies to develop methods of teaching pragmatics in the Kazakh language. Findings from the thematic analysis showed that there are three main themes in the literature: the first is instructional methods that contain techniques such as role-play, explicit instruction, and task-based learning, commonly used in English pragmatics instruction; the second is cultural factors that highlight cultural, social, political, economic and other important aspects of teaching pragmatic competence to students. Last but not least, assessment strategies were categorized, and we found quite interesting findings in their effectiveness in fostering pragmatic competence across languages through evaluation tools and fixing the progress of students.

The novelty of our methods and materials could be described by employing a comparative analysis approach from English to Kazakh to compare and find transferable strategies to teach pragmatics. We genuinely believe that well-recognized and international-level studies conducted in different countries to study the methods of teaching pragmatics in English could be valuable in identifying and guiding the teaching methodology of pragmatics in the Kazakh language. Even in Kazakh academic journals, we can find more research inquiries that have studied pragmatics in teaching English rather than the pragmatics of the Kazakh language. Nevertheless, we

will always try to take into account that these two languages, cultures and nations behind these languages are not close to each other, and pragmatics is always closely connected to the cultural and social context of the languages, so our comparative analysis was strictly conducted by keeping in mind this aspect. Additionally, unlike previous studies, this research emphasizes the role of pragmatics teaching in fostering cross-cultural competence in a Kazakh context, where pragmatic norms are closely tied to traditional and modern cultural practices.

Finding this could assist language teachers in looking for effective and innovative ways to instruct students to increase their pragmatic competence and effective communication in today's globalized world. With some cultural modification and adaptation, we could implement existing methods and strategies of teaching pragmatics in English into Kazakh language instructions, so experiment and find ways to solve problems of instructors connected to a shortage of the materials and methods of teaching pragmatics in their subject. Listing the challenges of instructors in teaching pragmatics in the Kazakh language and providing possible solutions, methods, strategies and tools to solve these problems can boost other innovative thinking and creative solutions on the topic. In the next chapter, we will discuss and describe in detail what was discovered in the literature that we have reviewed on this topic.

Literature review

As we mentioned in the introduction chapter, pragmatics is a comparatively new area of study in linguistics, and it is a more complex concept than basic grammar rules. Therefore, we can not assume that for busy teachers, the teaching of pragmatics could be easily integrated into their classroom or curriculum. Unlike grammar or vocabulary, pragmatics also requires considering how language is used in context, which can have many variables and factors that can affect productive communication in real life. In this chapter, we will list the challenges that come with teaching pragmatics to students, which are mentioned most in the body of literature.

One of the primary and most mentioned challenges with teaching pragmatics in the classroom was its abstract nature (Taguchi, 2011; Roever, 2009). Additionally, there are no clear and explicit rules for students or swot. They need to learn to catch subtle inferences, small context elements, psychological and cultural meanings of the phrases and a great sense of timing and environment (LoCastro,

2013; Van Dijk & Myin, 2019). In traditional curriculums and classrooms, it is easy to concentrate on rules and examples that are clear and standardised for assessment. However, pragmatics has more exceptions and conditions to consider, which are ignored mainly by instructors due to limited hours for the one topic to cover in the classroom. As a result, teaching pragmatics can challenge instructors to work with its abstract and complex nature in limited time and unorganised materials.

Pragmatic knowledge is closely tied to cultural context (Bublitz et al., 2010), and taking into account that we live in a very globalised intercultural context even within one country, creating universal tools and materials to teach pragmatics might be pretty challenging and impractical (Taguchi & Roever, 2020). For instance, the types of requests, norms of showing respect, refusals, sense of humour, and demonstrating closeness or distance to people through specific words can vary significantly within geographic regions. This requires understanding the differences in regions' usage of structural patterns of language and its interpretative nuances (Haugh, Kádár and Mills, 2013). Similarly, Kazakh culture and language have differentiations and contrasts in language usage based on historical, social, economic, and geographical factors, which directly affect pragmatic layers of meaning in the conversation (Smagulova, 2006). However, it is not studied from the perspective of how to teach Kazakh pragmatics in this context, and teachers can only work based on their intuition and knowledge of local differences.

Challenges with teaching pragmatics can be seen in its difficulties in recreation and replicating real-life circumstances, as it is deeply context-dependent (Kecskes, 2017). Even role-playing games or made-up examples sometimes fail to capture the complexity of real-world relationships. Additionally, simulating these situations in the classroom is extremely difficult and time-consuming. Moreover, in existing literature, we can face several debates on variables that should be considered in the case of the pragmatics of languages. Consequently, instructors will see a massive amount of chaotic discussions, data, and polemics, which will not help implement it in the lessons but will make it harder to cope. As a result, they prefer working on students' grammar accuracy and enriching their vocabulary rather than focusing on complex and inapplicable concepts of pragmatics, even if they realise its importance in productive real-life communications.

Despite these challenges, some instructors could implement methods to work with students' prag-

matic competence in their learning languages. At this stage, they also can face significant challenges in assessing students' pragmatic competence. It may require considerable work to evaluate the appropriateness and cultural sensitivity of language used by each student in each conversation from different perspectives and contextual variables. We also cannot create standardised measures, multiple-choice quizzes, tests, or detailed rubrics, as they can vary to be more intuitive and inherently tied to context and social norms in given circumstances. Pragmatic appropriateness cannot be checked as easily as grammatical and lexical correctness; it is like evaluating people's emotional intellect and biological age. We can tell a person's age based on their looks in most cases and definitely by their passport and ID details; however, it is hard to tell their emotional intellect levels based on this data; we need to interact with this person closely for some time to make approximate evaluations of their emotional intelligence. Because of this, many standardised tests fall short of capturing the complex and situation-specific elements of pragmatic skills, such as recognising indirect speech actions, comprehending politeness techniques, or reacting correctly in culturally sensitive circumstances (Ishihara & Cohen, 2021).

Ironically, one of the reasons that teachers face challenges in their practices in teaching pragmatics to their students is their preparedness to teach pragmatics, as many teacher training programs and university degrees often neglect its importance in their curriculum and do not provide their students(future education professionals) with proper tools to teach it. The problem is made worse by the frequent exclusion of pragmatics in language classes brought on by this lack of training and limited valuable tools and techniques in less studied languages like Kazakh compared to English. Enhancing teacher preparedness and providing targeted resources are critical to improving pragmatic instruction (Glaser, 2018).

Last but not least, students, in most cases, will not feel safe when they are faced with cases that they are not used to, and it will increase their anxiety. It can negatively affect the teaching process of pragmatics if students are asked to be in a different cultural context that is not similar to their cultural and social environment; it can make them significantly stressed and switch to defensive mode. Additionally, fear of making mistakes in these circumstances and uncomfortable feelings can keep students from active participation and discourage them from learning this skill (Wagner & Urios-Aparisi, 2008). Students do not know, without proper instructions, how

to interpret and perform pragmatically appropriate language structures and forms, which can decrease their confidence in their capabilities and performance. Instructors should engage in creating supportive and low-stress learning environments for students and provide more detailed instructions to increase students' confidence. The following results and discussion chapter will dive into practical aspects of pragmatics pedagogy and possible strategies to cope with these challenges in the Kazakh language and cultural context.

Results and Discussion

We employed the literature review method and qualitative thematic data analysis to critically evaluate a body of literature on possible practical implementations for teaching pragmatics to train future teachers how to face challenges. Therefore, in this section, we will discuss recommendations of experts and academics on their suggestions to cope with these situations. Overall, academics suggest effectively addressing pedagogical problems in teaching pragmatics, focusing on students' engagement, collaborative work and feelings of safety in classroom activities. Additionally, concentrating on creative and authentic ways and materials like case studies, interactive video dialogues, and film episodes might help make abstract concepts more tangible for students based on their recommendations. Increasing students' awareness of cultural differences, traditions, behaviours, language patterns, ceremonial elements in daily life routines, and common knowledge could also be beneficial for students to navigate different communication situations and styles of various cultures (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998).

In some cases, employing interactive conversations, role-plays, and simulations with random native speakers could help break barriers of fear and insecurities by providing students with a dynamic environment for practicing in the controlled atmosphere of the classroom. Teachers should also consider delivering timely feedback to students on their use of words, appropriateness, and cultural sensitivity of their chosen phrases in conversation to scaffold their progress in understanding pragmatic concepts and increase their competence. However, before that, teachers should also be clear and precise in their instructions, comprehensive in their explanation of pragmatic concepts, and provide detailed examples of communicative strategies to assist students' learning and application (Taguchi, 2011). Nevertheless, to carry out these recommen-

dations properly, we should not forget the importance of proper teacher training and the availability of required materials, resources, and practical and empirically proven methodologies.

Research on pragmatic competence in language teaching mainly focused on learners' acquisition of the new languages, their speech acts, and navigating conversational and politeness norms. In this aspect, Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998) indicated that "EFL learners and their teachers consistently identified and ranked grammatical errors as more serious than pragmatic errors; ESL learners and their teachers showed the opposite pattern, ranking pragmatic errors as more serious than grammatical errors" (Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei, 1998: 233). Based on these findings, we can also suppose that students not only learn a new second language separately but also explore new cultures and new perspectives of thinking by doing this. Therefore, teaching abstract concepts of pragmatics could be more effective when comparing different sociolinguistic and cultural perspectives. For example, Ninomiya and Shadayeva's (2020) cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of requests in Kazakh and Japanese gave insights into requests' cultural perspectives, which could help to easily understand the pragmatics behind it and its importance in effective communication by comparing these two languages and cultures. Rose and Kasper (2001) also highlighted the significance of interlanguage pragmatics, exploring developmental patterns in second-language learners' ability to navigate pragmatic aspects of communication.

Reviewed literature and empirical studies on the topic indicated that proper and direct explanations of the pragmatic concepts and communicative situations and failures based on pragmatic misinterpretations are more effective in increasing students' pragmatic competence rather than implicit methods such as role-playing or indirect simulations of the conversations (Rose & Kasper, 2001). This method helps students comprehend and assimilate context-specific communication rules more effectively. Moreover, instructors are strict and confident with comprehensive instructions and easily explain the topic by contextualising the examples with real-life communicative situations. In that case, students in this class are mostly successful in their learning and navigating the nuances of pragmatic communication in various sociocultural settings.

On the other hand, we should also not forget about technological innovations of the last decades with their affordances in making learning and teaching more effective and interactive to the level that

it is close to recreating real-world communication. Digital tools such as virtual reality, chatbots, and multimedia resources have been shown to enhance pragmatic learning by simulating authentic conversational contexts. These technological advancements solve the difficulties of simulating real-world contact in conventional classroom settings and offer experiential learning opportunities. Moreover, González-Lloret (2022) found "possibilities that tasks and technology-mediated contexts have to engage learners in discursive practices that may not be possible otherwise, exposing them to the cyber pragmatics of an ever-growing digital world" (González-Lloret, 2022: 173). Therefore, we can assume that technologies are already a big part of our real world and culture, so it also lies in the context of the pragmatics of the language. As a result, teaching pragmatics through technology is not only essential but also mandatory in today's reality.

From the side of the academic institutions and teacher training centres, finding effective ways of evaluating students' pragmatic competence and training instructors by developing an adequate corpus of materials, resources, and practical knowledge on how to teach pragmatics based on empirical data should be the main focus of inquiry. Only by proper training of future teachers and philology students can we be sure that other challenges will be handled properly in the classrooms to develop students' pragmatic competence.

Conclusion

All in all, despite being crucial for effective communication, the pedagogy of pragmatics is still not well studied in the Kazakh language. Our study confirmed that the main problem and best solution with teaching pragmatics is proper teacher training for this aspect and developing a good amount of resources and materials to employ in the classroom. Accurately assessing students' pragmatic competence also requires creating novel evaluation instruments suited to the Kazakh language and culture (Taguchi, 2011). Technology integration has the potential to be revolutionary because it may improve the effectiveness and engagement of pragmatics training while encouraging real-world application in controlled settings through the use of digital platforms, virtual simulations, AI chatbots, and interactive tools (González-Lloret, 2022).

Additionally, comparative analyses and cross-cultural research, like that done by Ninomiya and Shadayeva (2020), highlight the importance of stud-

ies and gaining data on the topic to make abstract concepts more tangible and accessible to teach through examples. It also can help promote cross-cultural competency and offer crucial insights into modifying teaching methods to various linguistic and cultural contexts. Lastly, to test and improve these suggested tactics and guarantee their suitability and efficacy within the Kazakh linguistic context, future research must prioritize empirical studies, as we are mostly based on this review and analysis of the existing body of the literature. These develop-

ments promise to improve learners' pragmatic proficiency and close the gap between theoretical knowledge and real-world language learning.

In conclusion, despite many obstacles to overcome, there are encouraging opportunities to advance pragmatic teaching in Kazakh. By expanding on the findings of this study, academics and educators may create new and efficient methods of teaching pragmatics, producing more capable and culturally sensitive communicators in a world that is becoming more interconnected by the day.

References

Bardovi-Harlig K., Dörnyei Z. Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning // *Tesol Quarterly*. – 1998. – Vol. 32, № 2. – P. 233-259.

Bublitz W., Jucker A.H., Schneider K.P., Trosborg A. (eds.) *Pragmatics across languages and cultures*. – Vol. 7. – Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2010.

Creswell J. W. Steps in conducting a scholarly mixed methods study. – University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 2013.

Glaser K. Enhancing the role of pragmatics in primary English teacher training // *Glottodidactica: An International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. – 2018. – Vol. 45, № 2. – P. 119-131.

González-Lloret M. Technology-mediated tasks for the development of L2 pragmatics // *Language Teaching Research*. – 2022. – Vol. 26, № 2. – P. 173-189.

Haugh M., Kádár D.Z., Mills S. Interpersonal pragmatics: Issues and debates // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 2013. – Vol. 58, № 1. – P. 1-11.

Ishihara N., Cohen A.D. *Assessment of L2 Pragmatics in the Classroom* // *Teaching and learning pragmatics*. – Routledge, 2021. – P. 259-296.

Kecskes I. Context-dependency and impoliteness in intercultural communication // *Journal of Politeness Research*. – 2017. – Vol. 13, № 1. – P. 7-31.

LoCastro V. *Pragmatics for language educators: A sociolinguistic perspective*. – London: Routledge, 2013.

Ninomiya T., Shadayeva M. Request strategies in Kazakh and Japanese: A cross-cultural pragmatic analysis // *Media Watch*. – 2020. – Vol. 11, № 4. – P. 648-667.

Roever C. Teaching and testing pragmatics // *The handbook of language teaching* / Eds. M. H. Long, C. J. Doughty. – Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. – P. 560-577.

Rose K.R., Kasper G. (eds.). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. – Vol. 10. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Smagulova J. Kazakhstan: Language, identity and conflict // *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*. – 2006. – Vol. 19, № 3-4. – P. 303-320.

Taguchi N. Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues // *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. – 2011. – Vol. 31. – P. 289-310.

Taguchi N., Roever C. *Second language pragmatics*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Van Dijk L., Myin E. Reasons for pragmatism: Affording epistemic contact in a shared environment // *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*. – 2019. – Vol. 18, № 5. – P. 973-997.

Wagner M., Urios-Aparisi E. Pragmatics of humor in the foreign language classroom: Learning (with) humor // *Studies on language acquisition: Developing contrastive pragmatics: Interlanguage and crosscultural perspectives* / Eds. E. Alcaraz-Sintes, A. Placencia. – Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2008. – P. 209-228.

References

Bardovi-Harlig, K., Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 32(2), P. 233-259.

Bublitz, W., Jucker, A.H., Schneider, K.P., Trosborg, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Pragmatics across languages and cultures*. (Vol. 7). De Gruyter Mouton.

Creswell, J.W. (2013). Steps in conducting a scholarly mixed methods study. University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Glaser, K. (2018). Enhancing the role of pragmatics in primary English teacher training. *Glottodidactica: An International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 45(2), P.119-131.

González-Lloret, M. (2022). Technology-mediated tasks for the development of L2 pragmatics. *Language Teaching Research*, Vol. 26(2), P. 173-189.

Haugh, M., Kádár, D.Z., Mills, S. (2013). Interpersonal pragmatics: Issues and debates. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 58(1), P. 1-11.

Ishihara, N., Cohen, A.D. (2021). Assessment of L2 Pragmatics in the Classroom. In *Teaching and learning pragmatics* (pp. 259-296). Routledge.

Kecskes, I. (2017). Context-dependency and impoliteness in intercultural communication. *Journal of Politeness Research*, Vol. 13(1), P.7-31.

LoCastro, V. (2013). *Pragmatics for language educators: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Routledge.

Ninomiya, T., Shadayeva, M. (2020). Request strategies in Kazakh and Japanese: A cross-cultural pragmatic analysis. *Media Watch*, Vol. 11(4), P. 648-667.

Roever, C. (2009). Teaching and testing pragmatics. In M. H. Long, C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 560–577). Wiley-Blackwell.

Rose, K.R., Kasper, G. (Eds.). (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching* (Vol. 10). Cambridge University Press.

Smagulova, J. (2006). Kazakhstan: Language, identity and conflict. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, Vol. 19(3-4), P. 303-320.

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

Taguchi, N., Roever, C. (2020). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.

Van Dijk, L., Myin, E. (2019). Reasons for pragmatism: Affording epistemic contact in a shared environment. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, Vol. 18(5), P. 973-997.

Wagner, M., Urios-Aparisi, E. (2008). Pragmatics of humor in the foreign language classroom: Learning (with) humor. In E. Alcaraz-Sintes & A. Placencia (Eds.), *Studies on language acquisition: Developing contrastive pragmatics: Interlanguage and cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 209-228). Mouton de Gruyter.

Information about authors:

Abdul Rakhmanuly Abdulkarim – PhD student at SDU University (Kaskelen, Kazakhstan, e-mail: a.abdulrakhmanuly@sdu.edu.kz).
Zholshayeva Maira – Doctor of Philology, professor at SDU University (Kaskelen, Kazakhstan, e-mail: maira.zholshayeva@sdu.edu.kz).

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Абдул Рахманұлы Абдулқәрім (корреспондент-автор) – PhD, SDU University (Қаскелен, Қазақстан, e-mail: a.abdulrakhmanuly@sdu.edu.kz);
Жолшаева Майра – филология ғылымдарының докторы, SDU University (Қаскелен, Қазақстан, e-mail: maira.zholshayeva@sdu.edu.kz).

Сведения об авторах:

Абдул Рахманұлы Абдулқарим (ответственный автор) – PhD, SDU University (Каскелен, Казахстан, e-mail: a.abdulrakhmanuly@sdu.edu.kz);
Жолшаева Майра – доктор филологических наук, SDU University (Каскелен, Казахстан, e-mail: maira.zholshayeva@sdu.edu.kz).

Date of receipt of the article: January 14, 2025.

Accepted: June 9, 2025.