A Study of Pragmatic Failure in Chinese University Students' English Conversations: A Qualitative Interview Approach

Xiaobang Wu¹, You Chen¹,*

¹College of Foreign Studies, Guangdong University of Science and Technology, Dongguan, Guangdong, 523083, China
*Corresponding author: doctorchen4949@gmail.com

Abstract: This study investigates pragmatic failures in English conversations among Chinese university students, focusing on their types, causes, and coping strategies. Using a qualitative approach, the study interviewed 8 English major undergraduates, evenly divided by gender and academic year. The results reveal two main categories of pragmatic failure: social pragmatic failures (75% of errors), including issues with directness, inappropriate forms of address, and cultural missteps, and language-related pragmatic failures (25% of errors), primarily linked to misused vocabulary or structures. The causes of pragmatic failures include language transfer from Chinese to English, lack of cultural context awareness, and insufficient classroom training and practical exposure. A significant number of participants indicated that they often transferred Chinese communication norms into English, which led to misunderstandings. Additionally, many students lacked awareness of cultural differences, such as politeness and appropriate address forms in English, further contributing to pragmatic failures. The study also explores the students' awareness of their mistakes and coping strategies. While most students were able to identify their mistakes through non-verbal feedback, only a few attempted to rephrase or apologize. The study highlights the need for more explicit instruction on pragmatics in the classroom and suggests integrating more real-life communication practice, cross-cultural comparisons, and immersive experiences to improve students' pragmatic competence. The findings emphasize the importance of cultural sensitivity and practical exposure in second language teaching, and call for educational reforms that focus on both linguistic accuracy and cultural adaptation in English language learning.

Keywords: Pragmatic Failure, Chinese University Students, English Conversation, Language Transfer, Cultural Context Awareness

1. Introduction

With the ongoing advancement of globalization, the central role of English in international communication has become increasingly evident. For language users, achieving effective communication in cross-cultural interactions requires not only mastery of grammatical accuracy but also the ability to adapt to dynamic cultural contexts. This ability hinges not only on the correct use of linguistic forms but also on a keen understanding of cultural norms and the real-time adjustment to contextual parameters[1]. When language forms and cultural cognition fail to work in harmony, communication is often hindered by information mismatches, and may even lead to communication breakdowns.

For Chinese English learners, pragmatic errors are a significant obstacle in English communication. While most learners have a solid grasp of syntax rules, many still encounter misunderstandings or conflicts in communication due to cultural differences[2]. This phenomenon highlights the limitations of traditional English teaching, which tends to focus excessively on language structure while neglecting cultural adaptation strategies. Existing research often concentrates on examining the surface features of pragmatic errors from an external perspective, with insufficient in-depth analysis of learners' cognitive logic and attribution mechanisms in real communicative contexts[3].

This study takes a learner-centered approach, focusing on the pragmatic errors encountered by Chinese university students in English conversation and their experiences. It aims to uncover the types, causes, and cognitive coping mechanisms of these errors. By analyzing the learner's perspective, this

study not only provides feasible suggestions for addressing pragmatic errors among Chinese university students but also offers valuable references for other universities in cross-cultural communication teaching.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Pragmatic Competence and Pragmatic Errors

Pragmatic competence refers to the ability of language users to select appropriate linguistic forms in specific contexts to achieve communicative goals[4]. Initially defined by Leech (1983), pragmatic competence is the ability to choose suitable language forms to achieve communication objectives in particular contexts[5]. This competence involves not only grammatical accuracy but also the ability to adjust language forms according to different social and cultural contexts. Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) further expanded this concept, arguing that pragmatic competence encompasses several elements, including strategy selection, sensitivity to context, and cultural awareness[6]. They emphasized that pragmatic competence is the fusion of linguistic ability and sociocultural competence. The core of pragmatic competence is not only knowing the correct use of grammar and vocabulary but also the ability to use language effectively in different cultural and communicative settings.

Thomas (1983) divided pragmatic errors into two categories: language expression errors and context-related errors[7]. Language expression errors typically occur when learners lack appropriate pragmatic forms in the target language. For example, learners may rely on literal translations from their native language and fail to adapt their language to the cultural and contextual differences of the target language. Context-related errors arise when learners fail to adhere to the sociocultural norms of the target language in specific communicative situations. These errors are not merely linguistic but reflect deeper cultural misunderstandings and misapplication of communication strategies.

2.2 Second Language Pragmatics and Interlanguage Pragmatics

Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP) is a critical field that examines how second language learners acquire the pragmatic rules of the target language. Kasper and Schmidt (1996) stated that the development of interlanguage pragmatics is a dynamic process, influenced by both pragmatic transfer from the learner's native culture and the amount of exposure to the second language[8]. Pragmatic transfer refers to the influence of the learner's native language and culture, which can lead to pragmatic errors when learners apply their native cultural norms to the target language. In second language learning, this transfer often causes learners to misunderstand or misuse pragmatic forms, especially in cross-cultural communication contexts.

Kasper and Rose (2002) argued that the development of interlanguage pragmatics is not only the result of language ability development but also the product of pragmatic transfer from the learner's native language[9]. As second language learners continue to interact with the target language, they gradually become aware of the differences between their native language and the target language and adjust their pragmatic behaviors. This adjustment process is key to acquiring the appropriate sociocultural norms and communication strategies of the target language. Therefore, interlanguage pragmatics is not just about learning a new language but also involves cultural adaptation and the modification of communicative behaviors.

2.3 Studies on Pragmatic Errors in EFL Contexts

International research on pragmatic errors in second language learning, particularly in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, has primarily focused on the deep impact of cultural cognitive biases and pragmatic decision-making. House (1996) conducted a comparative study between German and English and found that cultural frame mismatches were a core cause of pragmatic errors in non-native speakers[10]. Studies have shown that learners often fail to grasp cultural differences between their native language and the target language, leading to misunderstandings in communication. Certain culturally specific expressions that are acceptable in the learner's native language may be taboo or inappropriate in the target language. Kecskes (2014) developed a dynamic model, highlighting the complexity of the interaction between context reconstruction and cultural schemata[11]. He pointed out that pragmatic competence depends not only on mastering the grammatical rules of the target language but also on understanding and applying the cultural context in which communication occurs.

In China, research on pragmatic errors has largely focused on cross-cultural communication, revealing unique challenges faced by Chinese learners in English communication. Long Meifen (2017) pointed out that Chinese learners often encounter misunderstandings due to cultural differences, especially in the area of social pragmatics[12]. For example, learners may misinterpret or fail to apply politeness strategies appropriately, leading to miscommunication with foreign interlocutors. Ping Wenjiang (2017) categorized pragmatic errors into two types: one is the disconnection between language forms and contextual functions, and the other is the misinterpretation of implicit meanings, such as misunderstanding irony or euphemisms[13]. Despite these insightful studies on cultural differences, they have primarily focused on macro-level cultural factors, with limited exploration of learners' cognitive mechanisms and psychological decision-making processes in specific communicative contexts.

Overall, the existing research has shown that pragmatic errors are not solely linguistic mistakes but are often the result of cultural cognitive biases and misapplications of the target language's sociocultural norms. Therefore, addressing these cultural differences and helping learners adjust their pragmatic behaviors is an essential aspect of second language learning and teaching.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative research approach, utilizing semi-structured interviews as the primary method of data collection. The semi-structured interview format allows for flexibility in exploring participants' subjective experiences and pragmatic awareness in depth. This approach provides an opportunity to gain rich, detailed insights into the participants' perceptions of their pragmatic errors and the underlying cognitive mechanisms that influence their language use in real-life communicative situations. By encouraging participants to share personal reflections, the study aims to capture nuanced aspects of pragmatic competence that cannot be fully explored through quantitative methods alone.

3.2 Participants

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Participant ID	Gender	Year of Study	English Proficiency	Typical English Use
P1	Male	Junior (Year 3)	Intermediate to Low	Classroom interactions, group discussions, online chatting with foreigners
P2	Female	Sophomore (Year 2)	Intermediate	Class discussions, interactions with foreign teachers, product introduction at trade fairs
P3	Male	Sophomore (Year 2)	Intermediate	Classroom, occasional group work
P4	Female	Junior (Year 3)	Intermediate	Classroom interactions, group discussions, foreign teacher interaction
P5	Male	Freshman (Year 1)	Intermediate	Classroom question responses, group discussions, participation in events
P6	Female	Freshman (Year 1)	Below Average	Classroom activities (oral communication classes)
P7	Male	Senior (Year 4)	Intermediate	Professional courses, oral response in presentations, foreign teacher interaction
P8	Female	Senior (Year 4)	Intermediate	English classes, international travel (shopping in Hong Kong/Macau)

The participants in this study consist of 8 English major undergraduate students (see Table 1), evenly divided by gender (4 males and 4 females) and representing each academic year from freshmen to seniors (2 participants per year). This distribution ensures that the sample reflects a range of experiences and perspectives, with participants having practical experience in spoken English communication. The students were selected based on their status as English majors, ensuring they possess a reasonable level of language proficiency and are familiar with both academic and informal contexts of English use. The inclusion of students from different years allows for the exploration of how pragmatic competence and awareness evolve throughout their academic journey.

3.3 Interview Questions

The interview questions are designed to explore several key themes related to participants' pragmatic awareness, error experiences, cause analysis, and learning strategies. The interview guide was developed to ensure comprehensive coverage of the research focus while allowing room for flexibility in participants' responses. Example questions include "Have you ever experienced a situation where a mistake in speaking English led to misunderstanding?", "Why do you think you made that mistake?", "How do you usually deal with these mistakes when you realize them?", etc. These questions aim to prompt participants to reflect on their real-life experiences with pragmatic errors, the reasons behind these errors, and their strategies for overcoming them. The semi-structured format allows the interviewer to probe deeper into interesting or unexpected responses, providing a fuller understanding of participants' perspectives.

3.4 Data Collection

Data collection involved both online and offline interviews, depending on the availability and preferences of the participants. Each interview was audio-recorded to ensure accurate capture of participants' responses, and the recordings were later transcribed into text for analysis. All participants provided informed consent prior to the interview, and ethical considerations were strictly adhered to throughout the research process. Participants' anonymity was protected by using pseudonyms in the transcription and reporting of the data, ensuring their privacy and confidentiality. The interviews were conducted in a comfortable and relaxed environment, allowing participants to speak freely and openly about their experiences.

3.5 Data Analysis

Data analysis was carried out using thematic analysis, which is a widely used method in qualitative research for identifying and analyzing patterns or themes within data. The analysis focused on three main areas: 1) Types of Pragmatic Errors: The identification of different types of pragmatic errors, such as social pragmatic errors and linguistic pragmatic errors, based on participants' accounts; 2) Causes of Errors: The underlying reasons for pragmatic errors, including factors such as cultural differences, language transfer, and lack of pragmatic knowledge; and 3) Changes in Pragmatic Awareness: The evolution of participants' pragmatic awareness over time, including their understanding of the cultural and contextual nuances of English communication. Meanwhile, the analysis was guided by Thomas's (1983) pragmatic error model, which classifies errors into two broad categories: language expression errors and context-related errors. This model provided a useful framework for categorizing the types of errors reported by participants and understanding the cognitive processes behind them. Thematic coding was used to identify recurring themes within the interview data, and these themes were analyzed to generate meaningful insights into the participants' experiences with pragmatic errors and their awareness of these issues.

4. Findings

4.1 Types of Pragmatic Failure Identified

The study identified two primary categories of pragmatic failures: social pragmatic failures and language-related pragmatic failures. Among the participants, social pragmatic failures were more predominant, accounting for 75% (6 out of 8) of the identified issues. These failures manifested in several ways, such as improper directness, inappropriate use of forms of address, and cultural faux pas.

For example, Participant P1 (a junior) recalled:

"I said 'Give me your pen' to my teacher…then he looked very unhappy."

This statement highlights a failure to consider the hierarchical relationship between the student and the teacher, leading to an expression that could be perceived as impolite.

Participant P4 (a junior) also mentioned:

"When I used 'chick' in a conversation, I realized later that the term could be seen as sexist, but I wasn't aware of the cultural implications at the time."

This instance points to a failure to recognize the cultural connotations associated with certain words.

In another case, Participant P5 (a freshman) reflected on his experience:

"In formal situations, I used 'hey' to address unfamiliar people, which I later realized could be seen as disrespectful."

This shows a misunderstanding of how different cultural contexts require different levels of formality when addressing others.

Moreover, language-related pragmatic failures occurred but were less frequent, making up 25% (2 out of 8) of the issues. These failures were mostly related to misusing vocabulary or structures that didn't align with native speakers' norms. For instance, Participant P3 (a sophomore) said:

"During a class discussion, I said 'classify trash cans' instead of using the correct term 'sorted bins,' and everyone looked confused. That's when I realized my vocabulary wasn't quite right for the context."

This failure illustrates a misapplication of vocabulary that caused a breakdown in communication.

4.2 Causes of Pragmatic Failure

The analysis of the causes of pragmatic failures reveals three main factors, with specific percentages of participants who identified each cause.

4.2.1 Language Transfer (from Chinese to English)

87.5% (7 out of 8) participants identified language transfer from Chinese as a significant cause of their pragmatic failures. One participant, P2 (a sophomore), said:

"I used 'Give me your pen' to my teacher, which is common in Chinese, but impolite in English because it doesn't account for the relationship between the speaker and the listener."

This directly reflects how linguistic structures from Chinese were applied to English, leading to pragmatic failure due to cultural differences.

Similarly, Participant P5 (a freshman) shared:

"I sometimes use direct commands like in Chinese when speaking English, but later I realized that such expressions can sound rude in English."

This highlights how students' habits in their native language sometimes interfere with their understanding of proper pragmatic usage in English.

4.2.2 Lack of Cultural Context Awareness

75% (6 out of 8) of participants reported that their pragmatic failures were due to insufficient awareness of cultural contexts when speaking English. This was especially evident in cases where students unknowingly used culturally sensitive topics or terms. For example, Participant P1 (a junior) mentioned:

"I once discussed politics with an international student, not realizing that it could make them uncomfortable. I noticed their expression changed, and I had to change the subject."

This demonstrates a lack of cultural sensitivity and the failure to recognize the boundaries of appropriate topics in cross-cultural communication.

Participant P4 (a junior) also admitted:

"I didn't realize that using the word 'chick' to refer to a female could be seen as offensive in English-speaking countries. It was something I thought was neutral, but I learned it wasn't."

This shows the failure to consider how certain terms can have negative connotations depending on the cultural context.

4.2.3 Lack of Practical Exposure and Insufficient Classroom Training

62.5% (5 out of 8) participants indicated that a lack of practical exposure to real-world English communication, along with inadequate classroom training on pragmatics, contributed to their failures. For instance, Participant P3 (a sophomore) shared:

"We don't focus on practical communication in class. It's all about grammar and vocabulary. I don't get the chance to practice polite expressions or other social norms."

This indicates that, while students may understand formal grammar, they often struggle to adapt to informal or culturally specific ways of speaking.

Participant P6 (a freshman) echoed this concern:

"In class, we focus on writing and reading, but when it comes to speaking and understanding the culture, we don't get enough exposure or practice. We mostly learn from TV shows or chatting with foreign teachers, which isn't enough."

This points to the gap in structured, formal education in pragmatics.

4.3 Learners' Awareness and Coping Strategies

The learners demonstrated varying degrees of awareness and employed different coping strategies when faced with pragmatic failures.

4.3.1 Awareness of Mistakes

87.5% (7 out of 8) students were able to recognize their mistakes after the fact, often relying on feedback from non-verbal cues such as facial expressions or awkward pauses in conversation. For example, Participant P4 (a junior) observed:

"When I used 'chick,' I noticed the discomfort in the listener's face, which made me realize I had said something inappropriate."

This shows how students are able to pick up on visual cues that indicate something has gone wrong in communication.

Participant P7 (a senior) shared a similar experience:

"Once, I made a joke about gender and saw that my friend became really quiet. I immediately realized that it was a sensitive topic, so I apologized."

This illustrates how awareness often follows after recognizing the social cue, and students attempt to correct their behavior in response.

4.3.2 Apology and Rewording

50% (4 out of 8) participants made efforts to apologize for their mistakes or rephrase their statements in an attempt to repair the conversation. For example, Participant P8 (a senior) recalled:

"I said 'cheap and low-cost' to describe a product, and noticed the customer became uncomfortable. I immediately apologized and rephrased it as 'affordable with good quality.'"

This proactive response was more common among senior students, who tended to have a higher level of awareness and coping ability.

Participant P2 (a sophomore) explained:

"I've learned that if I say something that could offend someone, I need to quickly rephrase it or apologize. I once said something too direct, and I immediately tried to correct myself."

This shows that while rewording and apologizing are common strategies, they are more often used by students with greater experience.

4.3.3 Limited Formal Pragmatic Training

87.5% (7 out of 8) participants mentioned that they had not received sufficient formal instruction in pragmatics. As one freshman (P5) noted:

"We never really learned about how to be polite or adjust our language in specific situations in class. It was mostly about grammar and writing."

This highlights the widespread recognition of the lack of explicit pragmatics instruction in their educational experience.

Participant P6 (a freshman) commented:

"I've never been taught how to handle situations where politeness or cultural knowledge is

required. We mostly practice grammar exercises in class, but nothing about real-life communication."

This reflects a common sentiment among students, where practical training in pragmatics was not emphasized.

5. Discussion

5.1 Discussion in Light of Previous Studies

The findings of this study align with the existing literature on pragmatic errors, particularly in the context of second language learning. As highlighted by Thomas (1983), pragmatic failures can be categorized into two types: language expression errors and context-related errors. This study corroborates Thomas's model by identifying similar categories of pragmatic failure among Chinese university students, with social pragmatic errors being the most predominant. These include misusing forms of address, inappropriate directness, and violations of cultural taboos, which is consistent with earlier research on pragmatic errors in EFL contexts (House, 1996; Long, 2017).

The study found that language transfer from Chinese to English is a major cause of pragmatic failure, reflecting the pragmatic transfer theory proposed by Kasper (1996). As seen in the responses from participants, the application of Chinese norms in English communication led to significant misunderstandings, especially in terms of politeness and the hierarchy of social relationships. This finding is consistent with Kasper and Rose's (2002) work on interlanguage pragmatics, where pragmatic transfer is considered a key factor in second language learners' struggles to adapt their communication strategies.

Additionally, the lack of cultural context awareness observed in this study resonates with the findings of Kecskes (2014), who emphasized the complex relationship between cultural schemata and pragmatic competence. This study found that many students failed to recognize culturally specific expressions that could be offensive or inappropriate in English-speaking settings, especially regarding topics like gender and politics. These errors reflect a lack of sensitivity to the sociocultural norms of the target language, highlighting a gap in cultural awareness that is often overlooked in traditional English language teaching.

5.2 Responding to Gaps and Trends Identified in the Literature Review

This study addresses the gap in the literature regarding the cognitive mechanisms behind pragmatic errors, particularly the learners' own perspectives. Previous research on pragmatic errors has largely focused on macro-level cultural differences, such as the misinterpretation of politeness strategies (Long, 2017). However, this study goes deeper by capturing the personal reflections of learners on their mistakes, which provides a more nuanced understanding of the cognitive processes involved in pragmatic errors.

The findings reveal that the students' awareness of mistakes often came only after receiving non-verbal cues from their interlocutors, such as discomfort or confusion. This indicates that while the students are aware of some cultural differences, their ability to detect these differences in real-time communication remains limited. This supports the findings of House (1996) and Ping (2017), who pointed out that learners often need more exposure to the target language's culture and communication practices to effectively navigate social contexts.

Furthermore, this study highlights the insufficient pragmatic training in the classroom, a trend that is widely acknowledged in the literature. While language structure and vocabulary are given priority in traditional EFL classrooms, pragmatic competence, particularly in terms of cultural adaptation and real-time communication, is often neglected (Kasper, 1996). The participants in this study echoed the need for more targeted pragmatic training, which has also been emphasized by Kecskes (2014) in his call for more comprehensive language and culture integration in EFL teaching.

5.3 The Need for Cultural Sensitivity and Practical Exposure

The findings from this study underline the importance of cultural sensitivity and the need for practical exposure in developing pragmatic competence. The study participants showed a strong desire to improve their understanding of how language works in culturally varied contexts. As P6 (a freshman) noted, "We mostly practice grammar exercises in class, but nothing about real-life communication."

This highlights the need for English language curricula to incorporate more contextualized practice that mirrors real-life scenarios. Incorporating activities such as role-playing, simulations, or exchanges with native speakers could significantly enhance students' ability to navigate different social situations effectively.

The study also suggests that pragmatic competence should not only be seen as a linguistic skill but as a socio-cultural competence that requires students to be attuned to the norms and expectations of the target language community. As demonstrated by the participants' struggles with politeness and address terms, the lack of cultural awareness is a major barrier to effective communication in English. This finding aligns with the works of Kasper and Schmidt (1996), who argue that learners' pragmatic development is significantly influenced by their cultural understanding, which in turn affects how they use language in real-world communication.

5.4 Implications for Teaching and Learning

The findings from this study have important implications for language teaching.

Firstly, it is crucial to design curricula that include explicit teaching of pragmatic strategies, especially in areas like politeness, formality, and cultural norms. This could involve integrating cross-cultural comparisons in the classroom, helping students to become aware of the differences between Chinese and English communication styles.

Secondly, teachers should create more interactive opportunities for students to practice English in real-life contexts. This could be achieved by incorporating authentic materials, such as films, interviews, and podcasts, which expose students to natural conversations and offer insight into how native speakers navigate social and cultural challenges.

Thirdly, there is a need to train teachers in the effective integration of pragmatics into their teaching. As seen in the study, classroom-based pragmatic training is often insufficient. Educators should be equipped with strategies to incorporate pragmatic elements into language lessons and create a more interactive learning environment that encourages real-time engagement with social contexts.

In conclusion, this study has shed light on the types, causes, and coping strategies of pragmatic failure in Chinese university students' English conversations. The findings suggest that pragmatic competence is a crucial yet underdeveloped skill in English language learning and must be addressed through a more holistic approach to teaching that emphasizes both linguistic accuracy and cultural sensitivity.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Summary of Major Findings

This study aimed to investigate the types, causes, and coping strategies of pragmatic failures encountered by Chinese university students in English conversation. The major findings are as follows.

First, regarding the types of pragmatic failure, two primary categories were identified: social pragmatic failures and language-related pragmatic failures. Social pragmatic failures were more prevalent, accounting for 75% (6 out of 8) of the identified issues, and included improper directness, inappropriate use of forms of address, and violations of cultural taboos. Language-related pragmatic failures, which made up 25% (2 out of 8) of the errors, were primarily related to misusing vocabulary or structures that did not align with native speakers' norms, resulting in communication breakdowns.

Second, concerning the causes of pragmatic failure, the study found that language transfer (from Chinese to English) was the most significant factor, with 87.5% (7 out of 8) of participants indicating this as the primary cause of their errors. Lack of cultural context awareness was another major cause, with 75% (6 out of 8) of participants reporting that they were unaware of the cultural implications of certain expressions, leading to misunderstandings. Finally, lack of practical exposure and insufficient classroom training contributed significantly to pragmatic failures, with 62.5% (5 out of 8) of participants indicating that their classroom training focused more on grammar and vocabulary rather than pragmatic skills.

Third, as for coping strategies, most students were able to recognize their mistakes after receiving non-verbal feedback (e.g., facial expressions or pauses in conversation). About 50% (4 out of 8) of

participants attempted to correct their mistakes by rephrasing or apologizing. However, most students indicated that there was a lack of systematic pragmatic training in their classrooms, which hindered their ability to effectively apply pragmatic strategies.

6.2 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

While this study provides valuable insights into pragmatic failures in Chinese university students' English conversations, there are some limitations that need to be addressed in future research.

First of all, the study was conducted with 8 students from a single university, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Future studies should expand the sample size and include students from different universities or cultural backgrounds to provide a broader understanding of pragmatic failures in second language acquisition.

Second, the study employed a cross-sectional design, providing only a snapshot of students' pragmatic competence at one point in time. A longitudinal study would be beneficial to track the development of students' pragmatic awareness and coping strategies over time, particularly in response to different language-learning experiences.

Additionally, while the study explored students' coping strategies, it did not delve deeply into the effectiveness of these strategies. Future research could examine the effectiveness of the coping strategies employed by students and assess whether these strategies lead to improved communication in real-life contexts. Moreover, it would be helpful to explore whether such strategies evolve as students gain more exposure to the target language and culture.

Lastly, given the growing role of technology in language learning, future research could explore how technology can be used to teach pragmatics. This could involve using digital platforms for virtual exchanges, cultural simulations, or online role-playing, helping students to practice pragmatic competence in realistic, cross-cultural contexts.

To sum up, this study emphasizes the importance of developing students' pragmatic competence in second language learning, particularly in terms of cultural adaptation and social communication. The findings suggest that traditional English language instruction needs to incorporate more focused training in pragmatics to help students overcome cultural and communication barriers. By integrating pragmatic skills into language curricula and providing students with more real-world communication practice, educators can better prepare students for effective cross-cultural interactions.

Acknowledgment

References

[1] Kecskes, I. (2014). Intercultural pragmatics. Oxford University Press.

[2] Shi, W., & Li, W. (2019). Pragmatic failures in intercultural communication of Chinese foreign language learners. Scholars International Journal of Linguistics and Literature, 2(8), 196-222.

[3] Ed-deraouy, B., & Sana, S. (2024). Examining pragmatic knowledge in speech acts of request, compliment response, and apology among Moroccan EFL students. International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation, 7(1), 109-122.

[4] Xabibullayevna, I. U. (2024). Developing pragmatic competence in language teaching. Pedagogical Cluster-Journal of Pedagogical Developments, 2(6), 57-63.

[5] Leech, G. N. (2016). Principles of pragmatics. Routledge.

[6] Kasper, G. (2022). Interlanguage pragmatics. In Handbook of pragmatics. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[7] Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistics, 4(2), 91-112.

[8] Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. Studies in

second language acquisition, 18(2), 149-169.

[9] Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2002). Pragmatic development in a second language. Language Learning, 52(Suppl 1), 1–352.

[10] House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18(2), 225-252.

[11] Kecskes, I. (2019). English as a lingua franca: The pragmatic perspective. Cambridge University Press.

[12] Long, M. F. (2017). Analysis of pragmatic errors from the perspective of cross-cultural pragmatics. Macroeconomic Management, 33(S1):104-105.

[13] Ping, W. J. (2017). A study on pragmatic errors in communication. Language Planning, 62(32): 65-66.