

Applied Pragmatics Use in Post-Pandemic of English Language Learning

Farid Noor Romadlon¹,
Universitas Muria Kudus, Indonesia
farid.noor@umk.ac.id

Abdulhamid Badru²,
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia
[DOI: 10.35974/acuity.v11i2.3078](https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v11i2.3078)

Abstract

The importance of meaning in communication is significant, and they can be classified into two categories: Verbal and non-verbal. Various circumstances, the dynamic between speakers, and social elements all have a role. The four language abilities of language acquisition reading, writing, listening, and speaking do not occur in isolation in communicative texts or activities, hence pragmatics in English language learning is crucial. For the language student, developing good pragmatic competence should be taken into account. The study investigated how pragmatics in post-pandemic of English language learning was implemented. Case study was chosen to conduct the research with 24 students from English education department as the participants. The result showed that pragmatic aspects still play a significant role in communication between speakers as they can prevent misunderstandings and errors during conversation. English-speaking users, both native and non-native, should speak clear, understandable and educated English, as this facilitates communication and reduces the risk of misunderstandings in social situations. Although technology has been widely used after pandemic, a conversation which applies pragmatic competencies involving context of situation promotes more successful message transfer, especially in cross-cultural communication. In conclusion, pragmatics becomes a unity in communication so it is essentially needed in any ways to make the information understandable and achieve the meaningful communication.

Keywords: Applied Pragmatics, English language learning, language competencies.

Introduction

Covid-19 has highlighted a number of pre-existing patterns and tendencies. On the one hand, people have been made aware of a number of errors and vulnerabilities, including the escalation of inequality, the risks involved in privatizing education, and the degree to which the public was unprepared for a substantial shift toward online and remote learning. Society is seeing personally the ingenuity, dedication, and inventiveness of the many educators, families, and kids who are collaborating to produce extraordinary educational opportunities. Even after the pandemic attacks, academic executives need to find ways for English Language Learning (ELL) effectively. Therefore, the appropriate pragmatics need to establish due to the issue establishment. A set of abilities called pragmatics enables one to communicate effectively in a particular setting, such as an ELL, by knowing what to say, to whom, and how to say it

(Aprianto, 2020).

Furthermore, A key area of linguistics research is pragmatics, which identifies how speakers and writers use linguistic form to further their own concealed meanings. Along with its user, it is said. A contextual meaning is typically given importance within pragmatics. English becomes a truly global language from that point on and has maintained its favoured position among other world languages into the twenty-first century, particularly in the post-pandemic era (Cohen, 2016).

One of the most crucial aspects of pragmatics is the speaker's desire to communicate the hearer's context to them in light of the given circumstance. Pragmatics is the study of how language is managed so that we can select the words from a variety of options that will satisfy our needs whenever they are employed in social interactions and how those words affect other people (Goodman & Frank, 2016). Therefore, sound pattern and the meaning we are making by presenting the vocabulary through the planned method as a means of communication are pragmatic elements that influence our choice of grammatical structure (Sykes & Cohen, 2018). As a result, pragmatics is studied with an emphasis on how people's word choices and social contexts relate to the meanings of the words they use.

Additionally, the term "pragmatics" refers to a branch of study that focuses on phenomena related to various aspects of speech situation. According to Leech 1983 in (Siddiqui, 2018) pragmatics is the study of meaning and the relationship between a speech and any provided situations. It also looks at how to speak in a given circumstance, and it sets the way for figuring out whether it works with semantic or pragmatic phenomena as its guiding principle. The more important pragmatics components have demonstrated the applicability of meaning analysis to speech-making contexts. Here are the five essential elements that pragmatics emphasizes most (Mazulfah, 2019) :

- a Addressers or Addressees (speakers and listeners);
- b A contextual utterance would involve relevant speech in physical and social settings, but it focuses more on contextual information relevant to the context;
- c The objectives of a statement as well as the significance of the intention behind making it;
- d In terms of pragmatics, the verbal utterance might also be conducted like an act to satisfy the requirements of a specific circumstance.
- e The language used in enclosed verbal acts often identifies words as sentences or tokens that, in reality, are not sentences. However, it is also possible for language to be used in both short and long single sentences.

The study of pragmatics focuses on meaning and includes a fundamental way of thinking about meaning and how it relates to reality. Similar theories of meaning, which view symbols in language as a system for distinguishing a range of unique entities, hold this to be true. Semantic truth which focuses on the meaning of a sentence and its aim, it also deals with apparent meaning and considers many forms of meaning formally (Lorino, 2018). However, the contextual definition is absent. Semantics, to put it simply, related to the general organization of sentences. In addition, it determines the lexical state of the text and forms meaningful data from other sources to feed it. One language can handle more instrument, such as cognitive instrument and social action instrument. Therefore, the key terms that can be defined as falling under the umbrella of pragmatics are as follows.

1. The words used;

2. The sentence's structure;
3. The context of the dialogue in the area where it is used;
4. The senses of the start in that setting;
5. The use of gestures to convey meaning.

A context utterance which provides background information to send along a message of information for other participants in the conversation, like any written text, is one of the most important things that comes from these sources.

Language Competencies

Language competencies can be divided into the following sub-abilities (Zúñiga, 2019) :

- a) Grammatical competence: This refers to a person's understanding of vocabulary, morphology, syntax, and phonology.
- b) Communication ability: A well-known model of communication skills that takes sociolinguistic proficiency into account.
- c) Sociolinguistic competence: The understanding of how to use language in a context-appropriate manner;
- d) Discourse competence: The understanding of how to achieve coherence and coherence in oral or written communication;
- e) Strategic competence: The ability to employ communication techniques to address issues with communication and enhance communication.

The knowledge needed to use language is also comprehensively described by Bachman's 1990 in (Sabet, 2017) model of communicative competence. Knowing how language is used to accomplish specific communicative goals is part of communicative competence, which also includes knowledge of grammar rules. He divides organizational competence and pragmatic competence into categories for language proficiency. Organizational competence, which is further broken down into grammatical competence (vocabulary, syntax, morphology, and phonology), and textual competence (cohesion/coherence, rhetorical organization), concerned with the speaker's control over the formal components of the language. This can also be seen from (Hymes, 1972b; Wright, 2010) in Zúñiga article the use of language competence and communicative ability requires to know how language is used to accomplish specific communicative goals. According to Niezgoda & Rover in (Al-Abdali & Maniam, 2020) sociolinguistic and illocutionary competence are subcategories of pragmatic competence.

Pragmatics competence

Pragmatic linguistics and social pragmatics are the two main subfields of pragmatics. In addition, pragmatic knowledge is about the use of language in relation to language users and the context of language use (Sykes, 2017). The study of pragmatic techniques, such as the application of routines, linguistic constructions, and semantic formulae, can be used to make communication more or less direct, gentler, or more intense. Socio pragmatics is concerned with social conduct and how members of a certain group understand and carry out a communicative act. As stated by Leech 1983 in (Culpeper et al., 2018) ,socio pragmatics is

primarily focused on the social-cultural end of pragmatics while pragmatic linguistics concerned with the linguistic/grammatical features of a language.

As stated by Thomas 1995 in (Al-Abdali & Maniam, 2020), competency in pragmatics refers to the capacity to use language in socially acceptable ways and to comprehend both implicit and explicit meaning in light of context. Since the middle of the 1970s, the primary goals of language education and assessment have been to help students become fluent in the target language by focusing on their communicative competence and their pragmatic and linguistic understanding of language use.

This method is supported by Bachman 1990 in (Liu & Pan, 2019), who defines language capacity in its broadest sense as the ability to utilize language communicatively. He offers two models in his model, which has two components: language proficiency and tactical prowess. Organizational comprehension and pragmatic comprehension are both parts of language knowledge. He uses the terms "functional knowledge" and "sociolinguistic knowledge" to describe pragmatic knowledge, which takes into account the appropriateness of a given communicative objective. Rose and Kasper in (Hashemi & Daneshfar, 2020) describe communicative capacity and pragmatics as "the study of communicative action in its socio-cultural environment." Speech acts, such as requests, denials, apologies, compliments, and suggestions, are also examples of communicative action. Depending on the level of acquaintance between the interlocutors, variations in social rank, and level of imposition, the length and complexity of the discourse kinds that are experienced in social contexts might vary. The association between utterances, language users, and environments, according to Bachman and Palmer 1996 in (Im et al., 2019), supports the conclusions of leading researchers in the field that preceded them. Pragmatics is the study of language from the user's point of view, emphasizing the decisions they make, the limitations they face when using social relationships, and the impact of their use. use their language toward others involved in the communication process.

Pragmatics is composed of two parts: sociopragmatics and pragmalinguistics, according to Leech and Thomas (in Kasper, 2001). Pragmalinguistics designates resources that make it possible to convey meaningful interpersonal and relational behaviors. These resources include pragmatic strategies such as direct and indirect, routine, and other forms of language that can soften or enhance communicative behaviors. In an example, Kasper offers two different ways to apologize: "Sorry and I am totally devastated - can you find the courage in your heart to forgive me?" Although they are said in different situations, both expressions are ones of apology. The final apology's speaker has opted to use pragmalinguistics in this instance. Leech (1990, p. 10) defined sociopragmatics as the sociological interface of pragmatics, referring to the social perceptions underlying participants' interpretation and performance of communicative actions. Language communities vary in how they evaluate the social power and distance between speakers and listeners, as well as their rights and responsibilities and the extent to which certain communicative behaviors are imposed (Holmes, 2001). The study of sociopragmatics focuses on proper social conduct. The learners must understand the ramifications of choosing pragmatism.

Speech act (Searle in Mey, 2003) is the basic or minimal unit of linguistic communication. The language we utilize, particularly the verbal acts we articulate, is totally subordinate on the setting in which those acts are performed. Discourse acts are discourse acts. When performing a discourse act, the speaker does something verbally; having the performance of an action brings around a change within the show state of issues. As stated on page 236 of

Levinson (1983): (i) A locutionary act is when a sentence is spoken with a specific meaning and reference. (ii) An illocutionary act is when someone makes a claim, an offer, a promise, etc. while speaking a sentence because of the customary force behind it (or its explicit performative paraphrase). (iii) Perlocutionary act: the process of using words to create unique effects on listeners that are specific to the utterance situation. Austin promotes the idea that illocutionary acts and locutionary acts are distinct from one another, allowing for the free exploration of meaning to be supported by the theory of illocutionary acts. According to Mey (2003), when we talk about language, we mean the actions we take when we speak. As in the phrase "It's cold here." It is supposed to be cold and nothing more relevant. The speaker simply said that it was cold. The linguistic aspect implies a power in that an action is performed through speech. Therefore, when pronouncing here it is cold, there is an action stating the weather. The perfunctory aspect concerns the effect or effects caused by the utterance. The utterance cold can create a closing effect for the listener. Searle (in Levinson, 1983, p. 240) lists the following five categories of utterances to illustrate the five fundamental actions that a person can carry out when speaking: (i) delegates, who bind the speaker to the veracity of the proposition they have stated (paradigm cases: stating, concluding, etc.) (ii) Directives: These are the speaker's attempts to persuade the addressee to take action (paradigm cases: asking, questioning, etc.). (iii) Commissive, which binds the speaker to a plan of action for the future (examples: making promises, making threats, making an offer). (iv) expressive, expressing a mental state (examples: expressing gratitude, regretting, extending a warm greeting, and expressing congratulations). (v) declarations, which tend to rely on complex extra-linguistic institutions and bring about instant changes to the institutional state of affairs (paradigm cases: excommunication, war declaration, christening, termination from employment).

English speaking class. According to Brown (2001), there are certain issues with teaching verbal communication abilities, such as conversational speech, pronunciation, accuracy and fluency, affective factors, and communication effects, which can help to put things into point of view. Conversational speech, in Brown's view, requires demonstrating the ability to achieve pragmatic goals through interactive speech with speakers of other languages. The goals and techniques of teaching conversation depend on the learner, teacher, and classroom setting. As a result, a conversation class may cover anything from drilling to unstructured, unrestricted discussion. The question of whether pronunciation plays a useful role in interactive, communicative classrooms is brought up by pronunciation. Throughout the second half of the 20th century, pronunciation instruction changed. The top-down method of pronunciation used today prioritizes stress, rhythm, and intonation—the three most crucial aspects of pronunciation (Brown, 2001). This approach emphasizes the importance of pronunciation mediation in discourse with the goal of producing clear and intelligible pronunciations. In teaching languages, accuracy and fluency are equally crucial. The primary objective of language instruction is fluency, which is attained to some extent by letting students concentrate on phonological and phonetic components, discourse, grammar, and syntax. The emotional component, or the fourth issue, is related to the linguistic ego. As a result, learners are reluctant to be judged by their listeners. Therefore, teachers should motivate learners to speak. The final issue is interaction effects. This semester, learners are encouraged to actively participate in the conversation. As participants in a conversation, students negotiate interpretation.

Teaching Strategy of Pragmatics in EFL Classes in Current Era

As stated by (Mishra et al., 2020), students must be able to illustrate their knowledge, apply information, and convincingly interpret ideas in order to succeed in today's increasingly digital and networked society when considering what pupils truly need to be studying and

what method teachers need to use in this contemporary moment. For children to achieve now and in the future, teachers must ensure that they are not only literate but also capable of using that literacy in their own information environment. Above all, applying that literacy requires the ability to read closely in order to decipher multimedia content, process information using appropriate tools, communicate ideas through practical and technical skills, be aware of the ethical concerns of "information" development, and use multimedia with comprehension.

“What is the function of language teaching in the information technology society?” was a very intriguing question posed, and it is still relevant today” (Zheng et al., 2016). The response to this query, in his opinion, opens up fresh pedagogical possibilities for English language instruction. Beginning with realistic assignments and problem-solving activities that learners will really need in the future, English language educators must create activities that engage students in learning. By requiring students to work on complex projects that require negotiation, teamwork, goal-setting, meaningful communication, and the creation of difficult products, this kind of engagement can be attained. As a result, children need to learn how to build a wide variety of English language literacy skills, including new internet technologies for reading, writing, and communicating. The utilization of learner-centered collaborative projects, in which students collaborate with peers and people worldwide using variety of technological tools, is something that English teachers must do specifically. The New London Group (1996) made the following recommendation in (Yeh, 2018) suggesting that those initiatives incorporate four fundamental components.

Table 1. Four Basic Elements of Interactive Teaching Based on Yeh (2018)

Immersion in Situated Practice	Overt Instruction	Critical Framing	Transformed Practice
Practice in real-world communication scenarios that resemble those students will face outside of class.	Possibilities for explicit analysis of the communication's content, coherence, structure, and pragmatics.	Utilizing online networks' information effectively by critically interpreting cross-cultural communication	Pursue higher levels of performance or make good use of experience in new social and cultural contexts.

Teachers and students can work with either multiliteracy or multimodal communicative competence to improve the EFL classroom with 21st century skills (Hoff, 2020). Critical understanding of the relationships among texts, discourse conventions, and social and cultural contexts is a component of cross-cultural competence, contributing to the enlargement of the standard language definition of literacy, which concentrates on reading and writing skills.

With such skills, students are more equipped to engage in a variety of discourse communities and develop the critical thinking skills they need to plan their social futures. In this sense, today's language learners must be able to handle a wide variety of texts, such as interactive, linear and non-linear texts, texts with multiple interpretations, texts that are presented orally, visually or on paper, as well as texts incorporating one or more semiotic systems. But as (Setyono & Widodo, 2019) emphasizing that EFL teachers should not only

use a variety of texts, language structures, and discourse; they should also explicitly teach the conventions that underlie each speech so that students can learn to transition from one speech to another and develop a critical awareness of the characteristics depicted.

(Heggernes, 2022) on the contrary, argues that EFL lessons should focus more on cultivating students' multimodal communicative competence in light of the recent changes in communication modes and practices. According to Heggernes, educators should start concentrating on and developing students' visual literacy skills as well as creating a pedagogical metalanguage to support these skills when spoken and written language are combined with visuals. Multimodal communicative competence is defined in this way as the understanding and application of language in relation to the visual, gesture, auditory, and spatial components of communication, including computer-mediated communication. It is believed that exposing EFL students to different multimodal texts and their semiotic meanings will better prepare them for encounters with native and non-native English speakers must be native in professional and social contexts (Cocchetta, 2018). More specifically, combine interpretive analysis and visual discussion with task or content-based training might encourage EFL students to view images as sociocultural creations and, as a result, improve their English-learning abilities.

Method

This study used a qualitative design with case study method to investigate students' thought due to the application of pragmatics after pandemic. The data was collected through questionnaire distributed to 24 English education department students which were chosen as participants. The questionnaire which was adapted from Locastro (2003) consist of three indicators; the importance of language functions than language forms (3 items), the importance of context in any forms of learning, online and offline (3 items), and the importance of communicative activities to promote fluency in communication (2 items). Four associate professors who are expert in ELT validated the questionnaire from the following categories;

1. The language in questionnaire
2. The clearness of the statements in questionnaire
3. The statements simplicity due to the issue

The questionnaire was distributed to the students via G-form in the middle of semester then the indicators of it was analyzed through elaborating each item from the categories.

Results and Findings

After processing the questionnaire which covers the use of language based on context and function, the appropriateness of its use, and the significance of language function, context, and pragmatic competence in any forms of learning process, online and offline, the study finds an interesting result as it is showed in the following table 2;

Tabel 2. Questionnaire Result of Pragmatics Use in Language Learning

Items	SA	A	NS	D	SD	Σ
Category 1						
Language functions should be exposed more during learning process	14 (58.3)	5 (20.8)	2 (8.3)	3 (12.6)	0	24 (100%)
The language compatibility should be the	19 (79.2)	3 (12.5)	1 (4.2)	1 (4.2)	0	24 (100%)

concerned of teacher's interaction						
Context-based language should be applied during the class activities	16 (66.7)	4 (16.7)	3 (12.6)	1 (4.2)	0	24 (100%)
Category 2						
Exposure and interaction should be given more in online and offline class	14 (58.3)	6 (25)	1 (4.2)	2 (8.3)	1 (4.2)	24 (100%)
Students should be exposed English out of classroom through projects-based learning	3 (12.6)	12 (50)	2 (8.3)	5 (20.8)	2 (8.3)	24 (100%)
Students are strongly suggested to improve the contextual language use through authentic sources, e.g. songs, films, Youtube videos, etc.	5 (20.8)	15 (62.5)	0	3 (12.6)	1 (4.2)	24 (100%)
Category 3						
Students need to be exposed more about strategies in communication	5 (20.8)	17 (70.8)	2 (8.3)	0	0	24 (100%)
Drilling students with contextual activities is beneficial to promote their communication skills	10 (41.7)	12 (50)	1 (4.2)	1 (4.2)	0	24 (100%)

In Category 1, the first statement about “language function should be exposed more during the learning process” revealed that 19 (79.1%) of the students agreed that language function must be exposed during the learning process. This highlights how beneficial the communicative approach is for EFL students. However, 3 students (12.6%) who were questioned disagreed with this statement. Meanwhile, the second statement “The language compatibility should be the concern of teacher’s interaction” indicated that 22 (91.7%) of students were in the same thought about teachers should adjust of language used during the interaction. However, 1 (4.2%) student seems not agreeing with it. In the last statement of the first category about “Context-based language should be applied during the class activities” reflected the result that regarding the requirement that the focus of the class be on context-based language, the majority of students (20) (83.4%) agreed with the statement. This means that in order to meet the needs of their students and fulfill their desire to learn a language through appropriate language use in a variety of contexts, teachers must create instructional materials that represent the various forms of language.

Category 2, statement 1 about “Exposure and interaction should be given more in online and offline class” resulted 20 (83.3%) the students agreed for students to become more proficient in using the language in the classroom, they must have opportunities to engage with the teachers and other students during the session. In statement 2 about “Students should be exposed English out of classroom through projects-based learning” illustrated the result students feel doubt about it. Only 15 (62.6%) students agreed with the statement while the rest are in their doubt feeling and disagreement. The third statement about “Students are strongly suggested to improve the contextual language use through authentic sources, e.g. songs, films, Youtube videos, etc.” in fact that not all students stood for a very clear and supportive statement. There were still 4 (16.8%) students who disagreed with it.

The last category (3) reflected students’ responses from its two statements. Statement 1 about “Students need to be exposed more about strategies in communication” shown that 22 students (91.6%) had a definite agreement. This suggests that the majority of kids understand the value

of communication techniques including asking, ordering, condoling, apologizing, refusing, and even thanking someone. They also understand how to welcome others and make courteous promises, among other things. The second statement about “Drilling students with contextual activities is beneficial to promote their communication skills” resulted similar finding that 22 (91.7%) students were in line with it. This requires teachers to instruct students in using the target language for interpersonal communication, which can be accomplished through a variety of activities.

Discussion

The results of the study implies that students regard pragmatics is still needed in any forms of English language learning process, both online and offline. There must be interaction between teacher and students during the learning process which involve context of situation. Therefore, the exposure of language function is considered more important than its forms. Furthermore, the simplicity in using the language will come along the intensive exposure of its functions and the context of communication is much understandable for the students especially due to subject materials taught.

To improve students' communicative skills, they need variant of learning activities and interaction which reflect the pragmatics competence. Simple transactional dialogs such as how to ask opinion, offer a help, give opinion, invite someone, greet and say parting, apologize, and other expressions promote students' skills of communication strategies. Regarding to it, teachers should design interactive and communicative teaching process both in online and offline meeting with proper language adjusted to the situation and level of students' ability so the learning goals are achieved.

Pragmatism is essential in the teaching of English since the four language abilities of language learning, such as reading, writing, listening, and speaking, do not happen apart from communicative texts or activities, especially during phase COVID-19. Numerous factors contribute to pupils' poor academic performance, one of them is the pandemic online learning method (Gomez-Laich, 2016). The individuals' academic performance is then adversely impacted in varying degrees. This result is in line with earlier studies showing that pandemic has a major impact on students of different degrees, particularly those who needed to engage in practical learning at various levels. As a result, there is a dearth of communication throughout the pandemic, particularly between teachers and their students.

Taking online college classes rather than conventional in-person courses has been connected to a decline in students' development and achievement, as examined. Taking online college courses has been found to have a negative impact on students because students did not have direct connection from teacher to students and students to teacher. According to (Glazier et al., 2020) have lower success rate for students to learn during an online-session activity in learning process. In-person learning, it has been determined, develops intimate relationships between students and teachers as well as between students and their peers. It also provides direct access to the full spectrum of academic and co-curricular opportunities provided by the university. English language learners are among those who are affected by covid-19's disruptions to in-person learning the most, according to past research. The opportunity for EFL students to participate in English language discussions with professors and classmates, as well

as get intensive language instruction on a regular basis, has frequently been replaced by virtual learning (Mohammadi et al., 2019). The epidemic made it harder for families of English learners to support their children's academic progress because of added linguistic barriers and limitations. Therefore, pragmatics is the exposed more in post-pandemic era during the teaching and learning process even though conducted virtually. Based on the result of this study, there are some factors need to be taken into account when developing the language learner's pragmatic competence.

1. The objective of a language course should be to meet the needs of language learners and improve their communication skills. The primary goal of learning a second language is to be able to communicate accurately and fluently, so both the language teacher and the student should focus on creating communicative activities that encourage the development of communicative competence. According to Stern 1983 in (Arnold, 2019), "competence" in language education is as follows.

An intuitive comprehend of the social, linguistic, cognitive, affective, and affective meanings conveyed by language forms; the capacity to use a language with some attention to form and a high focus on communication linguistic use that is inventive. To accomplish complete and accurate communication for both teachers and students, it is obvious that the word competency aims to build linguistic and sociolinguistic abilities.

2. A variety of exercises can help develop practical competence. Additionally, they should to increase the students' awareness of the significance of this proficiency in the process of learning the target language. "Linguistic behavior involves social behavior," claims (Mey, 2016). In the widest sense of the word, people interact to socialize, whether for entertainment, to express themselves to others, or for more "serious" purposes such as building a house, concluding a business deal, resolving a crisis, etc.
3. The course materials should be created by the language teacher to actively include students in the practical, logical, and useful applications of language in communication. Additionally, studying how language is utilized is part of the functional study of language. For example, making an effort to comprehend the precise functions that language fulfills for us as well as the ways in which speakers, readers, writers, and listeners within a language community generate and react to these functions. The learner's pragmatic competence needs to be well-developed in order for him or her to be able to conduct communication accurately. The ability to build coherence and be responsive under a variety of conditions indicates a high level of functional competence (Takkaç Tulgar, 2016). It is not a good idea to teach the grammar of the target language separately from how to use it. The educated should be able to apply their linguistic abilities in practical settings.

CONCLUSION

Teachers and students can interact with multilingual or multimodal communication capabilities to enrich the EFL classroom with 21st century capabilities in the post-pandemic era. Additionally, there is a dearth of communication throughout the pandemic, particularly between teachers and their students. This communication problem can happen because there was a gap of communication between students and teacher when doing online conversation or online class making learning activity collide with daily activity. Additionally, virtual learning

frequently eliminates opportunities for EFL students to participate in English language discussions with instructors and peers and to receive frequent, intensive language instruction. Therefore, the exposure of language functions, the simplicity of language use, and the intensive application of communicative activities during the learning process due to pragmatics use will promote students' communication skills. These three pragmatic competences must be taken into account in the post-pandemic period; (1) linguistic behavior, an innate understanding for the sociocultural, affective, cognitive, and linguistic meanings conveyed through language, (2) master the intuition about using language to communicate, and (3) the design of the course material are all important components.

REFERENCES

- Al-Abdali, A. I. E., & Maniam, Dr. M. (2020). The Necessity of Teaching Pragmatics in the Iraqi EFL Context: Focus on Secondary Schools. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.54.28>
- Aprianto, D. (2020). Need Analysis in English Language Learning (ELL) Curriculum Developments. *Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching) Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa & Seni Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP*. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v3i2.2431>
- Arnold, J. (2019). The Importance of Affect in Language Learning. *Neofilolog*. <https://doi.org/10.14746/n.2019.52.1.2>
- Brown, D.H. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education Company.
- Cocchetta, F. (2018). Developing university students' multimodal communicative competence: Field research into multimodal text studies in English. *System*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.01.004>
- Cohen, A. D. (2016). Teaching and learning second language pragmatics. In *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315716893>
- Culpeper, J., Mackey, A., & Taguchi, N. (2018). Second language pragmatics: From theory to research. In *Second Language Pragmatics: From Theory to Research*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315692388>
- Glazier, R. A., Hamann, K., Pollock, P. H., & Wilson, B. M. (2020). Age, Gender, and Student Success: Mixing Face-to-Face and Online Courses in Political Science. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 16(2), 142–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2018.1515636>
- Gomez-Laich, M. P. (2016). Second language learners' divergence from target language pragmatic norms. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2016.6.2.4>
- Goodman, N. D., & Frank, M. C. (2016). Pragmatic Language Interpretation as Probabilistic Inference. In *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.08.005>
- Hashemi, A., & Daneshfar, S. (2020). An overview of pragmatism and pragmatism assessment. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1005.12>
- Heggernes, S. L. (2022). Intercultural learning through Peter Sís' *The Wall*: Teenagers reading a challenging picturebook. In *Exploring Challenging Picturebooks in Education: International Perspectives on Language and Literature Learning*.
- Hoff, H. E. (2020). The evolution of intercultural communicative competence: Conceptualisations, critiques and consequences for 21st century classroom practice. *Intercultural Communication Education*. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ice.v3n2.264>
- Im, G. H., Shin, D., & Cheng, L. (2019). Critical review of validation models and practices in

- language testing: their limitations and future directions for validation research. In *Language Testing in Asia*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0089-4>
- Leech, G. (1990). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, J., & Pan, M. (2019). *English Language Teaching in China: Developing Language Proficiency Frameworks*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58542-0_28-1
- Lorino, P. (2018). Pragmatism and organization studies. In *Pragmatism and Organization Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198753216.001.0001>
- Rose, K.R and G. Kasper. (2001). Pragmatics in Language Teaching pp.1-9 in Rose, K.R. and G. Kasper (eds). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mazulfah, M. (2019). The Future and challenge of Pragmatics in English Language Teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v1i2.156-165>
- Mey, J.L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Malden: Balckwell Publishing.
- Mey, J. L. (2016). Pragmatics seen through the prism of society. In *Perspectives in Pragmatics, Philosophy and Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43491-9_6
- Mishra, M., Gunturi, V. R., & Maity, D. (2020). Teaching–learning-based optimisation algorithm and its application in capturing critical slip surface in slope stability analysis. *Soft Computing*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-019-04075-3>
- Mohammadi, J., Barati, H., & Youhanaee, M. (2019). The Effectiveness of Using Flipped Classroom Model on Iranian EFL Learners’ English Achievements and Their Willingness to Communicate. *English Language Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n5p101>
- Sabet, M. K. M. Tavakoli. (2017). Metaphorical Competence: A Neglected Component of Communicative Competence. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.4n.1p.32>
- Setyono, B., & Widodo, H. P. (2019). The representation of multicultural values in the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture-Endorsed EFL textbook: a critical discourse analysis. *Intercultural Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2019.1548102>
- Siddiqui, A. (2018). “The principle features of English Pragmatics in applied linguistics.” *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.9n.2p.77>
- Sykes, J. M. (2017). Technologies for Teaching and Learning Intercultural Competence and Interlanguage Pragmatics. In *The Handbook of Technology and Second Language Teaching and Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118914069.ch9>
- Sykes, J. M., & Cohen, A. D. (2018). Strategies and interlanguage pragmatics: Explicit and comprehensive. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssl.t.2018.8.2.9>
- Takkaç Tular, A. (2016). The Role of Pragmatic Competence in Foreign Language Education. *Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.32959/tojelt.229304>
- Yeh, H. C. (2018). Exploring the perceived benefits of the process of multimodal video making in developing multiliteracies. *Language Learning and Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.125/44642>
- Zheng, B., Warschauer, M., Lin, C. H., & Chang, C. (2016). Learning in One-to-One Laptop Environments: A Meta-Analysis and Research Synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316628645>
- Zúñiga, C. E. (2019). Supporting “Pedagogical” Spanish Language Competencies: Bilingual Teacher Education en la Frontera. *Teacher Education Quarterly*.

- Al-Abdali, A. I. E., & Maniam, M. (2020). The necessity of teaching pragmatics in the Iraqi EFL context: Focus on secondary schools. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 5(4), 123–130. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.54.28>
- Aprianto, D. (2020). Need analysis in English language learning (ELL) curriculum developments. *Jo-ELT: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 120–130. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v3i2.2431>
- Arnold, J. (2019). The importance of affect in language learning. *Neofilolog*, 52(1), 23–37. <https://doi.org/10.14746/n.2019.52.1.2>
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
- Cocchetta, F. (2018). Developing university students' multimodal communicative competence: Field research into multimodal text studies in English. *System*, 72, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.01.004>
- Cohen, A. D. (2016). Teaching and learning second language pragmatics. In *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 1–20). Routledge.
- Culpeper, J., Mackey, A., & Taguchi, N. (2018). *Second language pragmatics: From theory to research*. Routledge.
- Glazier, R. A., Hamann, K., Pollock, P. H., & Wilson, B. M. (2020). Age, gender, and student success: Mixing face-to-face and online courses in political science. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 16(2), 142–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2018.1515636>
- Gomez-Laich, M. P. (2016). Second language learners' divergence from target language pragmatic norms. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 219–239. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssl.2016.6.2.4>
- Goodman, N. D., & Frank, M. C. (2016). Pragmatic language interpretation as probabilistic inference. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(11), 818–829. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.08.005>
- Hashemi, A., & Daneshfar, S. (2020). An overview of pragmatism and pragmatism assessment. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 10(5), 523–530. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1005.12>
- Heggernes, S. L. (2022). Intercultural learning through *The Wall*: Teenagers reading a challenging picturebook. In *Exploring challenging picturebooks in education*. Routledge.
- Hoff, H. E. (2020). The evolution of intercultural communicative competence: Conceptualisations, critiques and consequences for 21st century classroom practice. *Intercultural Communication Education*, 3(2), 55–75. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ice.v3n2.264>
- Im, G. H., Shin, D., & Cheng, L. (2019). Critical review of validation models and practices in language testing. *Language Testing in Asia*, 9(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-019-0089-4>
- Leech, G. (1990). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, J., & Pan, M. (2019). *English language teaching in China: Developing language proficiency frameworks*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58542-0_28-1
- Lorino, P. (2018). *Pragmatism and organization studies*. Oxford University Press.
- Rose, K. R., & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mazulfah, M. (2019). The future and challenge of pragmatics in English language teaching. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 1(2), 156–165. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v1i2.156-165>
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.
- Mey, J. L. (2016). Pragmatics seen through the prism of society. In *Perspectives in pragmatics, philosophy and psychology* (pp. 123–140). Springer.
- Mishra, M., Gunturi, V. R., & Maity, D. (2020). Teaching–learning–based optimisation algorithm and its application in capturing critical slip surface. *Soft Computing*, 24, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-019-04075-3>
- Mohammadi, J., Barati, H., & Youhanaee, M. (2019). The effectiveness of using flipped classroom model. *English Language Teaching*, 12(5), 101–115. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v12n5p101>
- Sabet, M. K., & Tavakoli, M. (2017). Metaphorical competence: A neglected component. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 4(1), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.4n.1p.32>
- Setyono, B., & Widodo, H. P. (2019). The representation of multicultural values. *Intercultural Education*, 30(2), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2019.1548102>
- Siddiqui, A. (2018). The principle features of English pragmatics. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 9(2), 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.s.v.9n.2p.77>

- Sykes, J. M. (2017). Technologies for teaching and learning intercultural competence. In *The handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning*. Wiley.
- Sykes, J. M., & Cohen, A. D. (2018). Strategies and interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(2), 381–402. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.9>
- Takkaç Tulgar, A. (2016). The role of pragmatic competence in foreign language education. *Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.32959/tojelt.229304>
- Yeh, H. C. (2018). Exploring the perceived benefits of multimodal video making. *Language Learning & Technology*, 22(3), 28–37.
- Zheng, B., Warschauer, M., Lin, C. H., & Chang, C. (2016). Learning in one-to-one laptop environments. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1052–1084. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316628645>
- Zúñiga, C. E. (2019). Supporting pedagogical Spanish language competencies. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 46(3), 45–63.
- Locastro, V. (2003). *An introduction to pragmatics: Social action for language teachers*. University of Michigan Press.