



## PRAGMATIC INSTRUCTIONS IN ORAL COMMUNICATION IN CONTEXT

**Joseph Quinto**

*Benguet State University, La Trinidad, Benguet, Philippines*

*Author's correspondence E-mail: [j.quinto@bsu.edu.ph](mailto:j.quinto@bsu.edu.ph)*

### Submission Track:

||Submitted: 13<sup>th</sup> June, 2024 ||Reviewed: 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2024 ||Published :31<sup>st</sup> July, 2024

Copyright © 2024 Joseph B. Quinto



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/)

### Abstract

There is a need to revisit and recalibrate pragmatic instructions of English teachers in the Philippines to adequately communicate the competencies required of students. Consequently, the primary purpose of this research was to look into the pragmatic instructions utilized by senior high school English teachers and whether there was a difference in the use of their pragmatic instructions when grouped according to years of service and educational attainment in one leading private senior high school in Baguio City, Philippines. By employing a survey questionnaire and a series of classroom observations of all senior high school English teachers, the researcher found that they sometimes integrated at least one from instructional pragmatic approaches and at least one from interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques, interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques, interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques, and culture teaching techniques in every lesson in their Oral Communication in Context classes. Meanwhile, there was a discrepancy between the perceptions of English teachers as expressed in the questionnaire and their performance in the classroom. Although there were generally no significant differences in the application of pragmatic instructions by English teachers when grouped according to years of service and educational attainment, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that they incorporate more approaches and more techniques as they amass more years in the English teaching profession as well as when they obtain more advanced degrees in the graduate school. Besides adding to the body of literature regarding pragmatic instructions, this research endeavor also puts forward recommendations for future study.

**Keywords:** interlanguage pragmatics; oral communication in context; pragmatic instructions

### Abstrak

Terdapat kebutuhan untuk meninjau kembali dan mengkalibrasi ulang instruksi pragmatik para guru bahasa Inggris di Filipina agar dapat mengkomunikasikan dengan tepat kompetensi yang dibutuhkan oleh siswa. Oleh karena itu, tujuan utama dari penelitian ini adalah untuk menyelidiki instruksi pragmatik yang digunakan oleh guru bahasa Inggris di sekolah menengah atas dan apakah ada perbedaan dalam penggunaan instruksi pragmatik mereka ketika dikelompokkan berdasarkan tahun masa kerja dan tingkat pendidikan di salah satu sekolah menengah atas swasta terkemuka di Kota Baguio, Filipina. Dengan menggunakan kuesioner survei dan serangkaian observasi kelas dari semua guru bahasa Inggris di sekolah menengah atas, peneliti menemukan bahwa mereka terkadang mengintegrasikan setidaknya satu dari pendekatan pragmatik instruksional dan setidaknya satu dari teknik peningkatan kesadaran pragmatik interbahasa, teknik praktik komunikasi pragmatik interbahasa, teknik umpan balik korektif pragmatik interbahasa, dan teknik pengajaran budaya dalam setiap pelajaran di kelas Oral Communication in Context mereka. Sementara itu, terdapat ketidaksesuaian antara persepsi guru bahasa Inggris sebagaimana dinyatakan dalam kuesioner dan kinerja mereka di kelas. Meskipun secara umum tidak ada perbedaan signifikan dalam penerapan instruksi pragmatik oleh guru bahasa Inggris ketika dikelompokkan berdasarkan tahun masa kerja dan



*tingkat pendidikan, ada bukti yang cukup untuk menunjukkan bahwa mereka menggabungkan lebih banyak pendekatan dan teknik seiring bertambahnya tahun dalam profesi pengajaran bahasa Inggris serta ketika mereka memperoleh gelar yang lebih tinggi di sekolah pascasarjana. Selain menambah literatur mengenai instruksi pragmatik, penelitian ini juga mengajukan rekomendasi untuk studi di masa depan.*

**Kata Kunci:** *pragmatik interbahasa; komunikasi lisan dalam konteks; instruksi pragmatik*

## 1. Introduction

Proficiency in second language (L2) has traditionally been linked to grammatical competence. However, as opposed to common misconceptions about language learning, to be proficient in a second language does not only entail the ability to produce grammatically correct sentences, but it also entails the ability to use this language appropriately (Sorour, 2018). This is the realm of pragmatics which deals not only with the meaning making of a given sentence but also goes necessarily with its relation to the hidden meaning of a speaker (Siddiqui, 2018). When language learners attempt to express themselves in L2 context, they encounter some barriers with regard to the pragmatic content of their utterances. This sometimes happens despite the learners' ability to use the language properly at syntactic and semantic levels (Meihami & Khanlarzadeh, 2015).

Whilst research studies have been carried out in other countries (Farrell, 2019; Hilliard, 2017; Lu, 2019; Mohammad-Bagheri, 2015; Wyner & Cohen, 2015), there is a little scientific understanding and empirical investigation about pragmatics and pragmatic instructions in the Philippines (Caturay, 2018; Mendoza, 2017; Sioson, 2011). Thereupon, there is a need to revisit existing concepts in pragmatics and pragmatic instructions in the curriculum to fully articulate the competencies expected from the students. Consequently, this kind of pedagogical knowledge and pragmatic instructions from English teachers need to be recalibrated too.

According to Myers (2018), second language pragmatics is not easily acquired by second language learners for a variety of reasons including negative first language transfer, insufficient grammatical competence, and inadequate instruction. Hence, findings from research suggest a need for pragmatic instructions, and implications for language classrooms have been stressed as seen in recent publications (Krulatz, 2014). Also, an assumption is usually made that teachers are aware of pragmatics and just need to pass information and these insights onto their students. However, English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers who themselves are Non-Native Speakers (NNSs) and who are not necessarily highly competent in the target language (TL) have not understood the importance of teaching pragmatics, let alone know much about pragmatics in the TL context (Wyner & Cohen, 2015). This being said, the necessity of teaching a second language from a pragmatic perspective need not be underestimated and its valuable significance outside the classroom need not be frowned upon (Neddar, 2012). Given that appropriate use of language is the case of L2 pragmatics, it has been recommended that language teachers be aware of this need in learners (Farrokhi & Atashian, 2012). On a similar note, teachers should have acquired rich pragmatic skills as well as conduct teaching and learning research that can assist them in carrying out teaching tasks easily and successfully (Shen, 2013).

While communicative language teaching remains to be an important approach to language teaching, there seems to be a deficiency in its practice as evidenced by the limited inclusion or complete absence of pragmatics instruction (Caturay, 2018). Muthusamy and Farashaiyan (2016) explain that pragmatic instructions include instructional approaches and techniques that instructors use to teach interlanguage pragmatics. Research shows, as supported by Krulatz (2014), that language learners may not be able to notice that target language pragmatic norms are different from those in their first language, and can, therefore, benefit from pragmatics-focused activities. Consequently, the role of teachers cannot be underestimated since pragmatics can be challenging for learners to acquire on their own (Cohen, 2016). It can be argued, though, that pragmatic instructions regardless of type speeds up the process of learning and should be considered by language teachers as one of the ways in which learners can most



efficiently develop pragmatic competence (Ebadi, 2015), which is why there is a need to revisit and recalibrate pragmatic instructions of English teachers in the Philippines to adequately communicate the competencies required of students.

This presents a pedagogical model for the integration of pragmatic competence in the language classroom by following an inductive or deductive approach (Martínez-Flor & Beltrán-Palanques, 2013). This means that the flow of the lesson could either be from specific to general or general to specific depending on what the facilitator deems fitting in his/her context.

The pragmatic awareness approach to teaching aims at developing a gradual awareness of the mismatch between the second-language-learners' performance and that of proficient users of the language (Povolná, 2012). Through awareness-raising activities, students acquire information about the pragmatic aspects of a language. The aim is to expose learners to the pragmatic aspects of language (L1 and L2) and provide them with the analytical tools they need to arrive at their own generalizations concerning contextually appropriate language use (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005). The techniques include explicit teaching, form-focused instructions, videos, games, guests from foreign cultures, becoming a model to students, teachers using their knowledge and field of experience, student discovery, and using translation and first language,

These techniques are used for the production of pragmatic outputs. The learners practice speech acts to enhance their pragmatic competence, to engage them to share their ideas and information, and to practice language functions (Muthusamy & Farashaiyan, 2016). In particular, the techniques are discussions, computer-assisted language learning, pair work, group work, role plays, and discourse completion tasks.

Corrective feedback does not only emphasize the form of a language just like in traditional teaching methods, but it also draws students' attention to linguistic forms (Quinto & Cacanindin, 2022) as they arise incidentally during lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication (Öztürk, 2016). Corrective feedback (CF) has shown to be an effective way of developing learners' pragmatic awareness and subsequently pragmatic competence (Shirkhani, 2017). The techniques are recast, explicit correction, repetition or error, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, denial, and ignoring.

Culture is the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the member of one group or category of people from other groups or categories (Welzer et al., 2017). Nguyen (2017) explained that the important role of culture as an interlinked part of language and the necessity of incorporating culture into language teaching and learning has been recognized worldwide. These culture teaching techniques involve sharing cultural information, asking cultural information, asking students to conduct cultural research, videos of other cultures, showing pictures of other cultures, discussion of socially and culturally appropriate language and behavior.

Overall, the core intention of this study was to investigate the pragmatic instructions employed by senior high school English teachers in their Oral Communication in Context classes in one private senior high school in Baguio City, Philippines.

## **2. Method**

### **2.1 Research Design**

A quantitative – descriptive research design was employed since it aimed to accurately and systematically describe pragmatic instructions as a phenomenon (McCombes, 2020) to address the research queries. On another note, the researcher employed classroom observations for data triangulation.

### **2.2. Population and Locale**

The researcher selected the entire population of English teachers, a cohort of 22, who taught Oral Communication in Context in the first trimester of S.Y. 2019 – 2020 in one private senior high school



in Baguio City, Philippines. The subjects for the classroom observation were chosen on the basis of lottery method or fish bowl sampling technique. The lottery method of creating a simple random sample means that a researcher randomly picks numbers, with each number corresponding to a subject or item, in order to create the sample (Crossman, 2020). The eligible participants for classroom observation belonged to one of the following: one teacher with less than 5 years of teaching, one teacher with 5 – 10 years of teaching experience, one teacher with 11 – 15 years of teaching experience, one teacher with a Bachelor's degree, one teacher whose master's degree is in progress, one teacher with a master's degree, and one teacher whose doctorate degree is in progress, the highest educational attainment of faculty members in the senior high school department during the conduct of the study. Seven English teachers all in all were included in the classroom observation who were assigned as teachers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

### **2.3 Data Gathering Instrument**

The instruments used in the study were a modified questionnaire from the study of Muthusamy and Farashaiyan (2016) and an observation checklist. The questionnaire is composed of part 1 – demographic information section which identified the years of service and educational attainments of the English teachers and part 2 (a 4-point Likert scale) – pragmatic instructions section consisting of 30 items which identified the extent of use of pragmatic instructions in their Oral Communication in Context classes. The researcher conducted a pilot test with 15 respondents, which is more than the minimum of 12 subjects as Julious (2005) suggested. The researcher also asked permission in the use of the tool from the authors through an email.

The respondents for the pilot testing were teachers who taught Oral Communication in Context in one private university in Baguio City and another private university in La Trinidad, Philippines. The results from Cronbach's Alpha showed that the questionnaire's internal consistency in the English teachers pragmatic awareness-raising techniques section (9 items) was 0.816 interpreted as good, communicative practice techniques section (5 items) was 0.747 interpreted as acceptable, corrective feedback techniques section (8 items) was 0.735 interpreted as acceptable, and culture teaching techniques section (6 items) was 0.817 interpreted as good. As a whole, the pragmatic instructions questionnaire (30 items) had an excellent reliability coefficient of 0.977.

The observation checklist was based on the questionnaire consisting of English teachers' instructional pragmatic approaches, pragmatic awareness-raising techniques, pragmatic communicative practice techniques, pragmatic corrective feedback techniques, and culture teaching techniques with a total of 30 items.

### **2.4 Data Gathering Procedure**

The researcher needed to ask permission from the Principal and English teachers who taught Oral Communication in Context through permission letters for the distribution of questionnaire and classroom observation. The questionnaire was distributed to all English teachers during their free time to be retrieved the day after as per school policy or once they finished addressing all items. The classroom observation was conducted to seven randomly selected English teachers, 2 meetings each (1 hour per meeting) with their preferred schedule of classes, to capture their pragmatic instructions in their Oral Communication in Context classes.

### **2.5 Data Analysis**

To measure the extent of use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers in their Oral Communication in Context classes, mean was used. The statistical mean, or statistical average, gives a very good idea about the central tendency of the data being collected (Kalla, 2009). To determine the difference in the use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers when grouped according to years of service and according to educational attainment, two separate analysis one-way ANOVA was used.



Since the grouping of the variable of years of service consists of 3 groups and educational attainment consists of 4 groups, it is appropriate to use ANOVA. For the classroom observation in the use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers in their Oral Communication in Context classes, weighted mean was used, since certain factors count more than others or are of varying degrees of importance.

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 The Extent of Use of Pragmatic Instructions

The first problem answered is the extent of use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers in their Oral Communication in Context classes along instructional pragmatic approaches, interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques, interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques, interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques, and culture teaching techniques. The mean scores and the descriptive equivalence are shown in table 1.

**Table 1 Pragmatic Instructions**

Pragmatic Instructions	Mean	Interpretation
Instructional Pragmatic Approaches	3.04	Moderate Extent
Interlanguage Pragmatic Awareness-Raising Techniques	3.07	Moderate Extent
Interlanguage Pragmatic Communicative Practice Techniques	3.11	Moderate Extent
Interlanguage Pragmatic Corrective Feedback Techniques	2.96	Moderate Extent
Culture Teaching Techniques	3.22	Moderate Extent
Mean	3.08	Moderate Extent

With a grand mean of 3.08, the table shows that English teachers used pragmatic instructions in a moderate extent. The table also points out that English teachers integrated the use of culture teaching techniques (3.22), interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques (3.11), interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques (3.07), instructional pragmatic approaches (3.04), and interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques (2.96) in a moderate extent.

#### a. Instructional Pragmatic Approaches

The foremost item dealt with is extent of use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers in their Oral Communication in Context classes under instructional pragmatic approaches. The mean scores and the descriptive equivalence are shown in table 2.

**Table 2 Instructional Pragmatic Approaches**

Instructional Pragmatic Approaches	Mean	Interpretation
Deductive	3.04	Moderate Extent
Inductive	3.04	Moderate Extent
Mean	3.04	Moderate Extent

The data show that English teachers used instructional pragmatic approaches in pragmatic instructions in Oral Communication in Context with a grand mean of 3.04 in a moderate extent.

#### b. Interlanguage Pragmatic Awareness-Raising Techniques

The second item that was addressed is the extent of use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers in their Oral Communication in Context classes under interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques. The mean scores and the descriptive equivalence are shown in table 3.



**Table 3 Interlanguage Pragmatic Awareness-Raising Techniques**

Interlanguage Pragmatic Awareness-Raising Techniques	Mean	Interpretation
Explicit Teaching	3.70	Great Extent
Form-focused Instructions	3.22	Moderate Extent
Videos	3.09	Moderate Extent
Games	2.96	Moderate Extent
Guests from Foreign Cultures	1.74	Not at All
Becoming a Model to Students	3.17	Moderate Extent
Teachers Using their Knowledge and Field of Experiences	3.70	Great Extent
Student Discovery	3.30	Great Extent
Using Translation and First Language	2.78	Moderate Extent
Mean	3.07	Moderate Extent

Collectively, the table reveals that interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques with a grand mean of 3.07 is used in a moderate extent. To narrow it down, the data from the table shows that English teachers used explicit teaching (3.70), their knowledge and field of experiences (3.70), and student discovery (3.30) in a great extent. Also, English teachers used form-focused instructions (3.22), becoming a model to students (3.17), videos (3.09), games (2.96), and translation and first language (2.78) in a moderate extent. However, English teachers did not invite guests from foreign cultures with a mean score of (1.74).

**c. Interlanguage Pragmatic Communicative Practice Techniques**

The third item dealt with is the extent of use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers in their Oral Communication in Context classes under interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques. The mean scores and the descriptive equivalence are shown in table 4.

**Table 4 Interlanguage Pragmatic Communicative Practice Techniques**

Interlanguage Pragmatic Communicative Practice Techniques	Mean	Interpretation
Discussions	3.52	Great Extent
CALL Programs	2.17	Limited Extent
Pair Work and Group Work	3.30	Great Extent
Role Plays	3.39	Great Extent
Discourse Completion Task	3.17	Moderate Extent
Mean	3.11	Moderate Extent

Overall, English teachers used interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques with a grand mean of 3.11 in a moderate extent. From the data, it can also be seen that English teachers used discussions (3.52), role plays (3.39), and pair work and group work (3.30) in a great extent. Meanwhile, discourse completion task (3.17) was used in a moderate extent. To say the least, English teachers used Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) programs (2.17) in a limited extent.



#### d. Interlanguage Pragmatic Corrective Feedback Techniques

The fourth item dealt with is the extent of use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers in their Oral Communication in Context classes under interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques. The mean scores and the descriptive equivalence are shown in table 5.

**Table 5 Interlanguage Pragmatic Corrective Feedback Techniques**

Interlanguage Pragmatic Corrective Feedback Techniques	Mean	Interpretation
Recast	3.30	Great Extent
Explicit Correction	3.35	Great Extent
Repetition of Error	2.87	Moderate Extent
Elicitation	3.39	Great Extent
Metalinguistic Feedback	3.22	Moderate Extent
Clarification Request	3.35	Great Extent
Denial	2.61	Moderate Extent
Ignoring	1.61	Not at All
Mean	2.96	Moderate Extent

From the data in the table, it is also apparent that English teachers used elicitation (3.39), clarification request (3.35), explicit correction (3.35), and recast (3.30) in a great extent. In a moderate extent, English teachers used metalinguistic feedback (3.22), repetition of error (2.87), and denial (2.61). In unison, English teachers never ignored their students with a mean score of 1.61 interpreted as not at all.

#### e. Culture Teaching Techniques

The fifth item that was addressed is the extent of use of pragmatic instructions used by English teachers in their Oral Communication in Context classes under culture teaching techniques. The mean scores and the descriptive equivalence are shown in table 6.

**Table 6 Culture Teaching Techniques**

Culture Teaching Techniques	Mean	Interpretation
Sharing Cultural Information	3.43	Great Extent
Asking Cultural Information	3.52	Great Extent
Asking Students to Conduct Cultural Research	2.87	Moderate Extent
Videos of Other Cultures	3.09	Moderate Extent
Showing Pictures of Other Cultures	3.04	Moderate Extent
Discussing Socially and Culturally Appropriate Language and Behavior	3.35	Great Extent
Mean	3.22	Moderate Extent

With regard to culture teaching techniques, English teachers integrated them with a grand mean of 3.22 in a moderate extent. From the table, it can also be seen that English teachers asked cultural information (3.52), shared cultural information (3.43), and discussed socially and culturally appropriate language and behavior (3.35) in a great extent. In addition, they showed videos of other cultures (3.09),



showed pictures of other cultures (3.04), and asked students to conduct cultural research (2.87) in a moderate extent.

Overall, English teachers used pragmatic instructions in a moderate extent which means that English teachers used pragmatic instructions in a reasonable manner. They sometimes incorporated at least one from the approaches and techniques in every lesson in their Oral Communication in Context classes. The result implies that other techniques are preferred more than others. The results also point out that English teachers integrated the use of culture teaching techniques, interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques, interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques, instructional pragmatic approaches, and interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques in a moderate extent. This denotes those English teachers used pragmatic instructions in a reasonable manner which means that they sometimes incorporated at least one from the approaches and techniques in every lesson in their Oral Communication in Context classes with the greatest emphasis on culture teaching techniques and the least emphasis on interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques. When it comes to pragmatic instructions in Oral Communication in Context, the result implies that English teachers have a considerable inclination in teaching cultures of the target language and less inclination in giving corrective feedback when students commit errors in the classroom. In this case, Ross (2018) shared that there is no magic technique. It might or might not help some students which means that there is no panacea in education. Consequently, Hunt (2018) stated that a teacher needs to have his/her favorite techniques, methods, and technologies that s/he uses on a consistent basis but not the same exact way every day to keep the class interesting and productive.

Putting everything together, teachers' perceptions as revealed by the results of the questionnaire and classroom practice as revealed by classroom observations seem to be at odds. It implies that English teachers have their own reasons why there is an incongruity between their perceptions and their actual teaching. Such differences have been viewed as an undesirable or a negative phenomenon and described using terms such as incongruence, mismatch, inconsistency, and discrepancy (Salteh & Sadeghi, 2015). To explain, teachers are so much constrained by contextual factors like their own personal experience, micro context, and the lack of resources that their real classroom behavior naturally deviates from their beliefs (Tamimy, 2015). In addition, Park (2015) remarked that nobody is free from a gap between the ideal world and real world. He wonders if there is one teacher in the world who could pompously say that her/his pedagogical ideals are 100% reflected in practice.

The results during the classroom observation revealed that English teachers never used inductive approach at all in actual teaching in their Oral Communication in Context classes. In contrast, they thought that they used the approach in a moderate extent in the questionnaire. This implies that there exists an inconsistency between English teachers' beliefs and their actual classroom teaching. In addition, there generally exists a mismatch between English teachers' perceptions and their actual teaching with regard to the extent of use of interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques in pragmatic instructions in Oral Communication in Context specifically along explicit teaching, teachers using their knowledge and field of experiences, student discovery, form-focused instructions, becoming a model, videos, games, and translation and first language.

On another note, there seems to be a gap between what English teachers used based on the classroom observation and what they believed that they have used in the classroom based on the questionnaire under interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques specifically along discussion, role plays, pair work and group work, Discourse Completion Task, and Computer-Assisted Language Learning program.

There also seems to be a disparity between teachers' perceptions and actual teaching practices regarding the interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques in their Oral Communication in Context classes (Quinto, 2020) specifically along elicitation, clarification request, explicit correction, recast, repetition of error, denial, and ignoring.



Lastly, English teachers' perceptions in the use of the techniques and their teachings in the classroom seem to contrast based on the results from the questionnaire and the classroom observation in culture teaching techniques specifically along asking cultural information, sharing cultural information, showing videos of other cultures, showing pictures of other cultures, and conducting cultural research.

### 3.2 The difference in the use of pragmatic instructions

The second problem answered is the difference in the use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers when grouped according to years of service and educational attainment.

#### a. Years of Service

The foremost item dealt with is the difference in the use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers when grouped according to years of service. The pragmatic instructions, years of service, mean, interpretation, and P-value are shown in table 7.

Table 7 Years of Service

Pragmatic Instructions	Years of Service	Mean	Interpretation	P-value
Instructional Pragmatic Approaches	Less than 5 years	2.91	Moderate Extent	0.301ns
	5-10 years	3.19	Moderate Extent	
	11-15 years	3.13	Moderate Extent	
Interlanguage Pragmatic Awareness-Raising Techniques	Less than 5 years	2.92	Moderate Extent	0.056ns
	5-10 years	3.19	Moderate Extent	
	11-15 years	3.25	Great Extent	
Interlanguage Pragmatic Communicative Practice Techniques	Less than 5 years	2.96	Moderate Extent	0.208ns
	5-10 years	3.23	Moderate Extent	
	11-15 years	3.30	Great Extent	
Interlanguage Pragmatic Corrective Feedback Techniques	Less than 5 years	2.94	Moderate Extent	0.484ns
	5-10 years	2.92	Moderate Extent	
	11-15 years	3.09	Moderate Extent	
Culture Teaching Techniques	Less than 5 years <sup>a</sup>	3.00	Moderate Extent	0.023*
	5-10 years <sup>ab</sup>	3.27	Great Extent	
	11-15 years <sup>b</sup>	3.71	Great Extent	

\*Significant at  $p \leq 0.05$

Chiefly, the table indicates that there is no difference in the use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers when grouped according to years of service along instructional pragmatic approaches (0.301), interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques (0.056), interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques (0.208), and interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques (0.484). However, there lies a significant difference in the use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers when grouped according to years of service along culture teaching techniques with a P-value of 0.023.

To narrow it down, it is clear from the table that English teachers with 5-10 years of service (3.19), 11-15 years (3.13), and less than 5 years (2.91) used instructional pragmatic approaches in a moderate extent. Next, English teachers with less than 5 years (3.19) and 5-10 years (3.19) used interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques in a moderate extent. In a different way, English teachers with 11-15 years used the techniques (3.25) in a great extent. Even though the P-value (0.056) shows that there is no difference in the use of interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques when grouped according to years of service, English teachers with 11-15 years of service used the techniques more compared to English teachers with 5-10 years and less than 5 years.



Thirdly, English teachers with 5-10 years (3.23) and less than 5 years (2.96) used interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques in a moderate extent. Despite this, English teachers with 11-15 years (3.30) used the techniques in a great extent.

Fourthly, the table points out that all English teachers regardless of years of service used interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques in a moderate extent. However, English teachers with less than 5 years (2.94) garnered a higher result when it comes to the use of corrective feedback techniques compared to English teachers with 5-10 years (2.92). To add, the P-value (0.484) shows that there is no difference in the use of interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques when grouped according to years of service. Nevertheless, English teachers with 11-15 years of service had the highest result (3.09) in the use of corrective feedback techniques.

Finally, English teachers with 11-15 years (3.71) and with 5-10 (3.27) years used culture teaching techniques in a great extent, while English teachers with less than 5 years (3.00) used culture teaching techniques in a moderate extent. Another important finding was that the P-value (0.023) revealed that there is a significant difference between English teachers with 11-15 years of service and English teachers with less than 5 years of service when it comes to the use of culture teaching techniques.

English teachers with less than 5 years of service used the instructional pragmatic approaches the least which means that English teachers with more years of service used the approaches more in pragmatic instructions in Oral Communication in Context. Consistent to the years of service, several studies have found a positive effect of experience on teacher effectiveness (Rice, 2003). These successful experiences contribute to strengthening the teachers' sense of efficacy in a cyclical nature, in that, when they succeed in accomplishing a task, they gain greater efficacy which leads to greater efforts and persistence (Akbari & Moradkhani, 2010). English teachers with 11-15 years of service used interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques more compared to English teachers with 5-10 years and less than 5 years. As Biesta (2015) believes, teachers can continue to grow in their educational wisdom through the years. English teachers with 11-15 years used the interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques in a great extent which means that they used the techniques in a substantial manner. These English teachers always incorporated at least one from the techniques in every lesson in their Oral Communication in Context classes. According to Ladd and Sorensen (2016), teachers continue to develop long into their teaching careers. This connotes that wealth of experience has permeated the practical wisdom they offer in the classroom (Tierney, 2010). English teachers with 11-15 years of service had the highest result in the use of corrective feedback techniques which implies that they corrected their students' errors more compared to those who have fewer years in the service. In the study of Junqueira and Kim (2013), the experienced teacher generated more teacher-learner interactions and more types of corrective feedback, which were also more balanced across linguistic targets. It was revealed that there is a significant difference between English teachers with 11-15 years of service and English teachers with less than 5 years of service when it comes to the use of culture teaching techniques. This suggests that English teachers with 11-15 years of service utilize culture teaching techniques more compared to English teachers with less than 5 years of service. To add, this means that English teachers' cultural pedagogy is enhanced as they gain more classroom experience.

## **b. Educational Attainment**

The second item dealt with is the difference in the use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers when grouped according to educational attainment. The pragmatic instructions, educational attainment, population, mean, interpretation, and P-value are shown in table 8.

**Table 8 Educational Attainment**

Pragmatic Instructions	Educational Attainment	Mean	Interpretation	P-value
Instructional Pragmatic Approaches	Bachelor's Degree	3.00	Moderate Extent	0.125ns
	Master's Degree in Progress	2.88	Moderate Extent	
	Master's Degree	3.00	Moderate Extent	
	Ph.D. in Progress	3.40	Great Extent	
Interlanguage Pragmatic Awareness-Raising Techniques	Bachelor's Degree	2.93	Moderate Extent	0.403ns
	Master's Degree in Progress	3.01	Moderate Extent	
	Master's Degree	3.06	Moderate Extent	
	Ph.D. in Progress	3.27	Great Extent	
Interlanguage Pragmatic Communicative Practice Techniques	Bachelor's Degree	2.93	Moderate Extent	0.251ns
	Master's Degree in Progress	3.18	Moderate Extent	
	Master's Degree	2.94	Moderate Extent	
	Ph.D. in Progress	3.36	Great Extent	
Interlanguage Pragmatic Corrective Feedback Techniques	Bachelor's Degree	2.83	Moderate Extent	0.799ns
	Master's Degree in Progress	3.00	Moderate Extent	
	Master's Degree	2.96	Moderate Extent	
	Ph.D. in Progress	2.98	Moderate Extent	
Culture Teaching Techniques	Bachelor's Degree	3.00	Moderate Extent	0.723ns
	Master's Degree in Progress	3.19	Moderate Extent	
	Master's Degree	3.21	Moderate Extent	
	Ph.D. in Progress	3.40	Great Extent	

\*Significant at  $p \leq 0.05$

The table pinpoints that there lies no difference in the use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers when grouped according to educational attainment along instructional pragmatic approaches (0.125), interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques (0.403), interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques (0.251), interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques (0.799), and culture teaching techniques (0.723). To narrow it down, it is apparent from the table that English teachers with bachelor's degree (3.00), master's degree (3.00), and master's degree in progress (2.88) used instructional pragmatic approaches in a moderate extent. With a P-value of (0.125), there is no difference in the use of instructional pragmatic approaches when grouped according to educational attainment.

Next, the table shows that English teachers with master's degree (3.06), master's degree in progress (3.01), and bachelor's degree (2.93) used interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques in a moderate extent. Notwithstanding, English teachers with Ph.D. in progress (3.27) used interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques in a great extent.

Thirdly, under interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques, English teachers having a master's degree in progress (3.18), master's degree (2.94), and bachelor's degree (2.93) integrated them in a moderate extent. Then again, English teachers having a Ph.D. in progress (3.36) utilized the techniques in a great extent. This being the case, the P-value (0.21) denotes that there is no difference in the use of interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques when grouped according to educational attainment.



Fourthly, based on the results, English teachers with master's degree in progress (3.00), Ph.D. in progress (2.98), master's degree (2.96), and bachelor's degree (2.83) incorporated interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques in a moderate extent. With a P-value of 0.799, it reveals that there is no difference in the use of interlanguage pragmatic corrective feedback techniques when grouped according to educational attainment.

Lastly, English teachers with master's degree (3.21), master's degree in progress (3.19), and bachelor's degree (3.00) utilized culture teaching techniques in a moderate extent, but English teachers with Ph.D. in progress (3.40) utilized culture teaching techniques in a great extent. Though the P-value (0.723) shows that there is no difference in the use of culture teaching techniques when grouped according to educational attainment, English teachers with advanced degrees especially those with Ph.D. in progress integrated the techniques more than English teachers with bachelor's degrees.

There is no difference in the use of instructional pragmatic approaches when grouped according to educational attainment. Nonetheless, English teachers with advanced degrees especially those with Ph.D. in progress used the approaches more than those with bachelor's degrees. All these data imply that English teachers with advanced degrees especially those with Ph.D. in progress use more instructional pragmatic approaches in Oral Communication in Context classrooms. Klett (2018) has corroborated that teachers who earn their advanced degrees demonstrate a deep level of understanding and commitment to the profession, allowing them to modify curriculum goals, and better equip students to thrive in an academic setting. English teachers with advanced degrees especially those with Ph.D. in progress utilized interlanguage pragmatic awareness-raising techniques more than English teachers with bachelor's degrees. A benefit of pursuing an advanced degree is an expanded base of knowledge, intellect, and practical applications. As a person attends graduate school, he or she becomes an expert in the field (Harrison, 2013). English teachers with advanced degrees especially those with Ph.D. in progress integrated interlanguage pragmatic communicative practice techniques more than English teachers with bachelor's degrees. The results from the study of Dial (2008) depict that teachers with advanced degrees have a higher percentage of students scoring advanced and proficient on the communication arts. English teachers with bachelor's degrees used the least when it comes to corrective feedback techniques which implies that English teachers with advanced degrees corrected students' errors more. While the inconsistency is apparent in that the teachers correct fewer errors in the classroom than they say they do, complexities of the second language classroom and the challenge of integrating the novice teachers' technical and practical knowledge due to inexperience are suggested as possible reasons for the inconsistency (Kartchava, 2006). Finally, English teachers with advanced degrees especially those with Ph.D. in progress integrated culture teaching techniques more than English teachers with bachelor's degrees.

#### **4. Conclusion**

In light of the findings, the following conclusions were drawn: first, the researcher has found that the integration of pragmatic instructions by English teachers in their Oral Communication in Context classes is used in a reasonable manner in which English teachers sometimes incorporated at least one from the approaches and techniques in every lesson in their Oral Communication in Context classes. Furthermore, there is a mismatch between what teachers perceived in the questionnaire, and what they delivered in the classroom; finally, there exists a significant difference between English teachers with less than 5 years of service and 11 – 15 years of service in the use of culture teaching techniques. To put everything in a nutshell, there is enough evidence to suggest that English teachers integrate more approaches and techniques as they accumulate more years in the English teaching profession and as they obtain advanced degree even if there is no significant difference in the use of pragmatic instructions by English teachers when grouped according to years of service and educational attainment.



Based on the findings, the researcher arrived at the following recommendations: first, further investigations are needed to determine why English teachers' answers in the questionnaire and what they delivered in the classroom are at odds; next, the relationship between years of service and pragmatic instructions and educational attainment and pragmatic instructions could be analyzed; lastly, a bigger population could be recruited to add more literature regarding pragmatic instructions in the Philippines.

## References

- Akbari, R., & Moradkhani, S. (2010). Iranian English teachers' self-efficacy: Do academic degree and experience make a difference? *Pazhuhesh-e Zabanha-Ye Khareji*, (56), 25–47.
- Berowa, A. M. C., & Mendoza, H. B. (2017). Suggesting a suggestion: Insights into strategies from Maranao ESL learners. In *Proceedings, International Conference on Arts, Social Sciences, Humanities and Interdisciplinary Studies*. <http://uruae.org/siteadmin/upload/UH0917154.pdf>
- Biesta, G. (2015). How does a competent teacher become a good teacher?: On judgement, wisdom and virtuosity in teaching and teacher education. In *Philosophical Perspectives on Teacher Education* (pp. 1–22). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118977859.ch1>
- Caturay Jr, W. (2018). *Cebuanos' and Americans' realizations of complaints: A cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatic study* [Doctoral dissertation, Assumption University of Thailand]. <https://repository.au.edu/home>
- Cohen, A. D. (2016). The teaching of pragmatics by native and nonnative language teachers: What they know and what they report doing. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(4), 561. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.4.2>
- Crossman, A. (2020). Simple random sampling. *ThoughtCo*. Retrieved from <https://www.thoughtco.com/random-sampling-3026729>
- Dial, J. C. (2008). *The effect of teacher experience and teacher degree levels on student achievement in mathematics and communication arts* [Doctoral dissertation, Baker University]. [http://www.bakeru.edu/images/pdf/SOE/EdD\\_Theses/Dial\\_Jaime.pdf](http://www.bakeru.edu/images/pdf/SOE/EdD_Theses/Dial_Jaime.pdf)
- Ebadi, M. R. (2015). *The effects of recasts and metalinguistic corrective feedback on grammar acquisition of postgraduate ESL learners*. University of Malaya (Malaysia). <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2848781472?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20&%20Theses>
- Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal*, 59(3), 199–208. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci039>
- Farrokhi, F., & Atashian, S. (2012). The role of refusal instruction in pragmatic development. *World Journal of Education*, 2(4), 85–93. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v2n4p85>
- Farrell, T. S. (2019). 'My training has failed me': Inconvenient truths about second language teacher education (SLTE). *TESL-EJ*, 22(4), n4. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1204578>



- Harrison, J. (2013). 4 good reasons you should pursue an advanced degree. *Black Enterprise*. Retrieved from <https://www.blackenterprise.com/4-good-reasons-to-pursue-graduate-school-advanced-degree/>
- Hilliard, A. (2017). Twelve activities for teaching the pragmatics of complaining to L2 learners. *English Teaching Forum*, 55(1), 2–13. [https://proxy.cau.ac.kr/ Lib Proxy Url/http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1137786&lang=ko&site=eds-live](https://proxy.cau.ac.kr/Lib Proxy Url/http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1137786&lang=ko&site=eds-live)
- Hunt, J. (2018). Why do teachers not want to adopt new teaching methods and techniques? *Quora*. Retrieved from <https://www.quora.com/Why-do-teachers-not-want-to-adopt-new-teaching-methods-and-techniques>
- Julious, S. (2005). Sample size of 12 per group rule of thumb for a pilot study. *Pharmaceutical Statistics*, 4(4), 287–291. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227684670>
- Junqueira, L., & Kim, Y. (2013). Exploring the relationship between training, beliefs, and teachers' corrective feedback practices. A case study of a novice and an experienced ESL teacher. *Canadian Modern Language Review/ La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 69(2), 181-206. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265935628>
- Kalla, S. (2009). Statistical mean. *Explorable*. Retrieved from <https://explorable.com/statistical-mean>
- Kartchava, E. (2006). *Corrective feedback. Novice ESL teachers' beliefs and practices* [Master's Thesis, Concordia University]. <https://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/8938/>
- Klett, L. M. (2018). Teacher shortage crisis: Why an advanced degree in education makes a big difference. *The Christian Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.christianpost.com/sponsored/teacher-shortage-crisis-why-an-advanced-degree-in-education-makes-a-big-difference.html>
- Krulatz, A. (2014). Integrating pragmatics instruction in a content-based classroom. *ORTESOL Journal*, 31, 19–25. [https://search.proquest.com/docview/1940941245?accountid=15181%0Ahttp://openurl.york.ac.uk/openurl/44YORK/44YORK\\_services\\_page?url\\_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft\\_val\\_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&genre=article&sid=ProQ:ProQ%3Allba&atitle=Integrating+Pragmatics+In](https://search.proquest.com/docview/1940941245?accountid=15181%0Ahttp://openurl.york.ac.uk/openurl/44YORK/44YORK_services_page?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&genre=article&sid=ProQ:ProQ%3Allba&atitle=Integrating+Pragmatics+In)
- Ladd, H., & Sorensen, L. (2016). Returns to teacher experience: Student achievement and motivation in middle school. *The King's Fund*, 87. <https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP>
- Lu, L. (2019). Pragmatic failure in interpretation and the development of students' pragmatic competence in interpreting. *English Language Teaching*, 12(3), 37. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n3p37>
- Martínez-Flor, A., & Beltrán-Palanques, V. (2013). Teaching refusal strategies in the foreign language classroom: A focus on inductive-deductive treatments. *Journal of English Studies*, 11(1), 41–67. <https://doi.org/10.18172/jes.2616>



- McCombes, S. (2020). Descriptive research. *Scribbr*. Retrieved from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/descriptive-research/>
- Meihami, H., & Khanlarzadeh, M. (2015). Pragmatic content in global and local ELT textbooks: A micro analysis study. *SAGE Open*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015615168>
- Mohammad-Bagheri, M. (2015). The status of pragmatics among Iranian EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 8(4), 67–79. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n4p67>
- Muthusamy, P., & Farashaiyan, A. (2016). How Iranian instructors teach L2 pragmatics in their classroom practices? A mixed-methods approach. *English Language Teaching*, 9(5), 166. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n5p166>
- Myers, L. (2018). Incidental instruction of English oral request pragmatics: Why and how. *ORTESOL Journal*, 35, 17–26. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1180081>
- Neddar, B. A. (2012). Short notes on discourse, interlanguage pragmatics and EFL teaching: Where do we stand? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 5687–5692. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.498>
- Nguyen, T. T. T. (2017). Integrating culture into language teaching and learning: Learner outcomes. *The Reading Matrix*, 17(1), 145–155. [https://web.archive.org/web/20180421130009id\\_/http://www.readingmatrix.com/files/16-lm7civ98.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20180421130009id_/http://www.readingmatrix.com/files/16-lm7civ98.pdf)
- Öztürk, G. (2016). An investigation on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(2), 22-37. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jlls/issue/36115/405539>
- Park, J. (2015). How do teachers deal with mismatch between belief and practice? *The Education University of Hong Kong*. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/post/How\\_do\\_teachers\\_deal\\_with\\_mismatch\\_between\\_belief\\_and\\_practice](https://www.researchgate.net/post/How_do_teachers_deal_with_mismatch_between_belief_and_practice)
- Povolná, R. (2012). Pragmatic awareness in teacher education. *Acta Academica Karviniensia*, 12(1), 148–158. <https://doi.org/10.25142/aak.2012.014>
- Quinto, J. B. (2020). Corrective feedback in oral communication. *Journal of International Education*, 2(1), 1-19. [https://www.jiesuwon.com/files/ugd/2e610a\\_45db014d096e4a209ac133e5e9bf7477.pdf](https://www.jiesuwon.com/files/ugd/2e610a_45db014d096e4a209ac133e5e9bf7477.pdf)
- Quinto, J. B., & Cacanindin, M. R. (2022). ISCORE model: Formative feedback is core in synchronous classes. *Innovations*, 71(5), 727-737. <https://journal-innovations.com/assets/uploads/doc/18afb-727-737.16255.pdf>
- Rice, J. (2003). Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes. *Economic Policy Institute*. Retrieved from [https://www.epi.org/publication/books\\_teacher\\_quality\\_execsum\\_intro/](https://www.epi.org/publication/books_teacher_quality_execsum_intro/)



- Ross, G. (2018). Why do teachers not want to adopt new teaching methods and techniques? *Quora*. Retrieved from <https://www.quora.com/Why-do-teachers-not-want-to-adopt-new-teaching-methods-and-techniques>
- Salteh, M. A., & Sadeghi, K. (2015). What writing teachers say and what they actually do: The mismatch between theory and practice. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(4), 803. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0604.12>
- Shen, Q. Y. (2013). The contributing factors of pragmatic failure in China's ELT classrooms. *English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 132–136. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n6p132>
- Shirkhani, S., & Tajeddin, Z. (2017). Pragmatic corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: Investigating EFL teachers' perceptions and instructional practices. *Teaching English Language*, 11(2), 25-56. [https://www.teljournal.org/article\\_53182.html](https://www.teljournal.org/article_53182.html)
- Siddiqui, A. (2018). The principle features of English pragmatics in applied linguistics. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(2), 77. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aial.v9n.2p.77>
- Sioson, I. C. (2011). Ano ba talaga ang “ano”? Exploring the meanings of “ano” in conversation. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 6, 46–65.
- Sorour, N. (2018). Examining Egyptian ESL learners' grammatical and pragmatic awareness. *Arab Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(1), 78–104. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1207971>
- Tamimy, M. (2015). Consistencies and inconsistencies between teachers' beliefs and practices. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(8), 1234–1259. <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mohammad-Tamimy/publication/282742206>
- Tierney, R. D. (2010). *Insights into fairness in classroom assessment: Experienced English teachers share their practical wisdom* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa]. <https://ruor.uottawa.ca/handle/10393/30029>
- Welzer, T., Družovec, M., Überwimmer, M., Gaisch, M., Füreder, R., & Costa, Y. (2017, May). Cultural awareness in research and teaching. In *Proceedings Cross-Cultural Business Conference* (pp. 289-296). <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Martina-Gaisch/publication/317202188>
- Wyner, L., & Cohen, A. D. (2015). Second language pragmatic ability: Individual differences according to environment. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(4), 519. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2015.5.4.2>