THE DHAKA UNIVERSITY JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS
@2025 Department of Linguistics

Vol. 18, No. 35, June 2025, P. 117-136
ISSN : 2789-3014, eISSN : 2075-3098
http://dx.doi.org/10.70438/dujl/1835/0005

Analysing Critical Pragmatic Incidents: A Reflective Model for Teaching Pragmatics to EFL and ESL Learners

Mst. Anjuman Ara*

Abstract: This paper discusses the use of Critical Pragmatic Incident Analysis (CPIA) for teaching pragmatics to the learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) and English as a second language (ESL). The concept of CPIA is taken from the Critical Incident Analysis (CIA) technique, which has been employed in various fields since 1954 to promote reflective practice and evaluation. In language education, its (CIA) application has been limited to pre-service and in-service teachers' training, education and professional development while leaving out its potential for L2 learners' language development. Informed by the constructivist theories of learning, this paper argues that a critical analysis of the past incidents of following or flouting linguistic and social norms that EFL/ESL learners experienced or witnessed, can provide authentic pedagogical tools for developing their pragmatic competence in English. A CPIA model is designed for L2 teachers and learners to illustrate the techniques of analysis. Potential challenges of the model and their mitigation strategies are also discussed.

Keywords: Critical (Pragmatic) Incidents, Critical (Pragmatic) Incident Analysis, Pragmatic competence, Pragmatic awareness, Reflective pragmatic model

1. Introduction

Reflective practice in language education has been encouraged since the 1930s distinctively by Dewey (1933) and Schön (1983) who warned teachers of repeating teaching methods and materials and failing to reflect and interpret their impacts on students' behaviours and performance. It is argued that reflection intrigues teachers to

*Associate Professor, Department of English, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh
E-mail : anjuman@du.ac.bd

interrogate their teaching practices and beliefs, and record evidence of what happens in class, which in turn help them "assess their professional growth, develop informed decision-making skills, and become proactive and confident in their teaching" (Farrell, 2018, p. 2). Critical Incident Analysis (CIA), which involves examining past incidents by critically reflecting on what happened, why it happened, and what else could have done, has emerged as a resourceful and practical technique in, among other fields, qualitative educational research and teacher training and education programmes (Farrell, 2023a, 2023b; Halquist & Musanti, 2010). The term critical incident was first coined by Flanagan (1954) to evaluate the performance of fighter pilots. Substantial studies have explored the utility of critical incidents for teachers' professional development (Almacioglu & Yalcin Arslan, 2024; Pourhassan & Nazari, 2023) and identity construction (Kiliç & Cinkara, 2020; Senel, 2021), critical thinking and reflective practice (Lithoxoidou & Papadopoulou, 2024), assessment (Babaii, et al., 2021), and corrective feedback (Britton & Austin, 2020). Research that involved using critical incidents from students' perspectives are apparently limited to the investigation of learners' perceptions of service failures in academic institutions (Msosa & Govender, 2019), coping strategy use by adult learners during cross-cultural immersion programmes (Arthur, 2001), and impacts of academic and non-academic events on students' future learning (Finch, 2010). In these studies, CIA was employed only as a research, rather than a teaching, tool to stimulate learners' retrospection on their academic and non-academic issues. Although Eslami-Rasekh (2005, p. 203) used the terms "potentially challenging incidents" and "potentially problematic interactions" to illustrate evidence of "pragmatic peculiarity" for EFL/ESL learners to raise their pragmatic awareness, the researcher did not specify the techniques of, such as those in CIA, how these incidents or interactions could be anatomised.

Thus, the areas of language development through CIA vis-à-vis CPIA remain relatively unexplored. To bridge the gaps, this essay argues that analysing the incidents of pragmatic success and failures, termed Critical Pragmatic Incidents (CPIs) in this paper, can help

learners self-discover the essential components of pragmatic competence and develop their skills of appropriate language use. It aims to acknowledge the emergence of multilingual and multicultural societies in English and non-English speaking countries that has propelled the global use of English as a lingua franca for trade and commerce, among other purposes, inducing the importance of teaching pragmatics to EFL and ESL students and developing their pragmatic competence and awareness (Fang, 2024; Sánchez-Hernández & Barón, 2022). Taguchi and Roever (2017, p. 261) argue that "pragmatic competence in intercultural settings can be viewed as a constituent of intercultural competence". Decades ago, Blum-Kulka, et al. (1989, p. 10) claimed that even "advanced" learners may "fail to convey or comprehend the intended illocutionary force or politeness value" and speak or write in a way which is grammatically accurate, but contextually inappropriate or impolite. Studies show that teaching of L2 pragmatics, compared to other skills, is neglected in schools and teacher education programmes as a result of which non-native TESOL teachers are unable to equip their L2 learners with "relevant [intercultural and pragmatic] skills, knowledge and information" (Schauer, 2024, 147) or integrate L2 pragmatics into their classroom practices (Ton-Nu, 2024).

Hence, formal instructions and classroom activities are considered vitally important, particularly for those EFL/ESL learners, who have limited, or none, direct contact with L2 native speakers in their day to day life, and have to depend on classroom teaching for learning. Kasper (1996, p. 148) opines that input and tasks provided by the teachers of pragmatics should be "pertinent" and give learners "ample opportunity to develop a high level of control". Various strategies have been suggested and studied to promote pragmatic competence in English, but none of them focuses on the potential of CIA, or more specifically CPIA, which, as it is argued in this paper, can provide EFL and ESL learners with pragmatically authentic and meaningful materials and tasks.

2. Method

This theoretical paper builds on a review of the principal approaches to teaching pragmatics and explaining the gaps in and the rationale for integrating CPIA into teaching by following the constructivist theory of learning. Finally, a CPIA model is designed for teaching pragmatics to ESL/EFL students. Before the main discussion, however, the terms pragmatic competence and critical (pragmatic) incidents are explained further to facilitate the discussion that follows.

2.1 Pragmatic competence

Unlike linguistic competence, which relates to an ability to use grammatically correct language and is concerned with semantic meaning or the locutionary force of an utterance, pragmatic competence refers to an ability to use contextually appropriate language and is involved with the illocutionary force, that is, the intended meaning of an utterance (Bachman, 1990). Because the same linguistic expressions convey different meanings in different contexts, an inability to comprehend their implicit message may cause what Thomas (1983) terms pragmatic failure. Grammatically accurate and well-structured sentences/utterances may also cause such failures due to the inappropriate language use. Pragmatic competence, therefore, forms an integral part of communicative competence.

There are two components of pragmatic competence, namely pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic. The former deals with using various linguistic devices including, among others, word choice, direct and indirect speech acts, modals and hedges, while the latter choosing these linguistic elements according to the different sociocultural variables such as age, relations, and rank of the interlocutors (Franch, 1998). An inability to match the two causes pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic deficits or failures. Brown and Levinson (1978) in their pioneering work on politeness identified social distance and power as the universal politeness values that affected an interlocutor's choice of pragmalinguistic and

sociopragmatic features. However, post-structuralist scholars decline the set or universally acknowledged dichotomies of pragmatic norms as "right" or "wrong" and focus on, instead, "preferred, suitable, or desirable" ways of communications in a given context because "pragmatic norms vary across languages and cultures or even within a single language, language variety, or culture and can dynamically change over time and across contexts" (Ishihara & Cohen, 2022, p. 2).

2.2 Critical incidents and critical pragmatic incidents

Critical Incidents (CIs) are past events which a person has experienced and/or observed, and reflections on which help him/her realise their underlying meaning. Brookfield (1990, p. 84) defines critical incidents as any "vividly remembered event which is unplanned and unanticipated". Tripp (1993) notes that incidents are not critical on their own, but they become critical only when reflected and analysed. The technique for analysing critical incidents follows a reflective process of recalling an incident from life, analysing it by asking what exactly happened and why it happened, and finally inferring what it means for future applications or improvement. Following these conceptions, Critical Pragmatic Incidents (CPI) are defined in this paper as any noticeable, but unplanned, actions or interactions which either follow or flout, partially or wholly, pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic norms.

Thiel (1999) categorises CIs into high or positive and low or negative incidents, the former of which produces desirable outcomes whereas the latter undesirable consequences. Following Thiel (1999), CPIs can also be divided into positive and negative incidents. The positive ones would include the instances of appropriate use of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features, while the negative ones of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic deficits or failures.

2.3 Review of L2 pragmatics teaching

There are three dominant instructional approaches to developing learners' pragmatic competence: teaching metapragmatic concepts, designing naturalistic tasks, and using technology mediated tools and materials. The first method aims to explicitly introduce learners to the pragmatic features of hedging, discourse moves, discourse markers, and politeness markers used in speech acts. House (1996, p. 249) argues that explicit instructions help reduce "negative pragmatic transfer" and enhance learners' "pragmatic fluency". Aydin's (2023) Turkish EFL learners also benefitted more from the explicit teaching of L2 metapragmatics than the implicit one. However, this mode of teaching is often found limited as it promotes rather declarative knowledge (conscious knowledge of *what* pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic features to use) than procedural knowledge (*how* to process them into subconscious knowledge) as a result of which L2 learners may be unable to process the given input into intake or enhance their output (Taguchi, 2011).

Consequently, a major shift in the teaching approaches was noticed in the 1990s as learners were now engaged in problem solving tasks such as role plays, discourse completion tasks (DCT), translation, and stylistic analysis, which encouraged them to think critically, choose proper syntactic and lexical resources according to given contexts, and evaluate the impacts of the chosen features on the audience (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Róg, 2024. Woldemariam, 2015). The purpose was to make their learning more implicit, task-oriented and practical and develop procedural knowledge. Murray (2012, p. 323) even argues that Grice's (1967) four maxims of quantity, quality, relation, and manner, as suggested in his (Grice) Cooperative Principle can provide practical clues to the "choices" of pragmatic devices and "promote student reflection" on what to say and how. Finally, the advancement of technology has initiated various web-based and computer mediated tools and materials for teaching pragmatics. These include web-based curriculum consisting of exercises and audio samples (Ishihara, 2007), audio-visual materials (Barón & Celaya, 2022), and films (Noviyenty, 2023),

which also facilitate task-based and hands-on learning of pragmatics. Ghadiri, et al.'s (2024) research-based online instructions in Skyroom illustrates how learners could be engaged online to perform the activities of DCTs and role plays relating to the speech acts of, for example, requests and refusals.

These three approaches could be viewed as more complementary than contrasting. If students' activities are mediated with computer technology, and teacher feedback is associated with explicit metapragmatic discussions on what went wrong in their performance and why, it can intrigue their critical thinking and strengthen their knowledge of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic competence (Yousefi & Nassaji, 2024). In the recent years, for example, DCTs are integrated with role plays and followed by discussions in order to engage learners in multiple ways of thinking, performing, noticing and reflecting on the given discourses, thus, raising their pragmatic awareness to a greater effect (Fath Pour Pakzad & Sarkhosh, 2022). In a similar vein, Derakhshan and Eslami (2020) found that incorporating metapragmatic information with technological tools of video, translation and discussion increased learners' understanding of pragmatic components for successful communications. However, little attempts have been made to incorporate CIA in any of the approaches to facilitate learners' language development. Because they are retrieved from personal experiences and/or observations, CPIs have enormous potential to foster reflective practice and develop pragmatic awareness (Farrell, 2008, 2019). The potential of CPIA is discussed below in detail following the constructivist theory of learning.

3. Rationale for using CPIA

3.1 Constructivist theory of learning

Constructivists view language development as an unstable psychological activity that operates on one's cognitive and metacognitive abilities of thinking, planning, noticing and analysing

to process linguistic input and re(form) meanings. Unlike behaviourists, the constructivists acknowledge the changeable traits of language according to context, human capacity to adapt and evolve, and learners' agency in creating meanings rather than memorising chunks of language structures and vocabulary. Piaget (1957 & 1962) argues that whenever children encounter new linguistic elements, they break down the new knowledge, analyse it, compare it with what is already known, construct new or extended meanings, and finally accommodate it to their existing knowledge and reach a stage of equilibration, which remains stable until new challenges appear. Children, thus, work on their cognitive faculties to reconstruct their knowledge to adjust to their linguistic environment. Vygotsky (1978) provides a sociocognitive perspective to language education, suggesting that learning a language is as much social as cognitive because the collaborative efforts of processing input with peers and teachers enhance the chances of developing knowledge to a level which might be difficult or even impossible to achieve through learners' individual cognitive endeavours. In brief, the constructivist theory emphasises the role of naturalistic and contextualised input and tasks, and learners' agency (individual and collaborative efforts) for effective language learning. The use of CPIs and CPIA seems very viable in all of these aspects as discussed below.

3.2 CPIs offer authentic input

CPIs provide authentic and engaging input as they are taken from real life and/or fiction. Babaii, et al. (2020) note that the known environment and people, including colleagues, students, parents and teachers, form the principal sources of CIs. Because pragmatics involves social functions of language, the scope of CPIs extends further to family, friends/classmates, strangers met in streets or shops, media persons from TV programmes, distinguished personalities, and even characters from literature and movies. Students may recall from these sources any incident which is relevant to the class activity in terms of, among others, speech acts types and modal expressions. Thus, learners enjoy greater control and autonomy over selecting and reporting the incidents. Provided

that simulated pragmatic incidents are found very effective for raising learners' pragmatic awareness (Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei, 1998), CPIs can function as even more motivating and useful because of their practical references. In particular, given their age and maturity, grown up L2 learners can cite from their multiple anecdotes, such as wanting to disagree on an issue or to refuse a proposal or an invitation, but being unable to articulate it politely in English, and reflect on how their language offended the interlocutor and vice versa, or broke the communication. The stories altogether will make substantial input and help learners realise the pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic variables of pragmatic competence.

3.3 CPIA promotes reflective input processing tasks

The act of critically analysing incidents is very much cognitive and retrospective in nature as it involves thinking, reflecting and noticing relations between form, context and function and assigning significance to an incident (Finch, 2010). By recalling and reflecting on an incident from their past, learners reminisce about not only an event, but also a contextualised chapter of their experience, which was created in a particular socio-cultural setting and had positive or negative consequences on the interlocutors. According to Bardovi-Harlig and Dörnyei (1998, p. 236), anecdotal evidence shows "a relationship between what learners notice and what they acquire". Schmidt (1990) argues that even adult learners are often unaware of the gap in their knowledge and performance and that "what learners notice in input is what becomes intake for learning" (Schmidt, 1995, p. 20). I agree with Schmidt's noticing hypothesis on the grounds that the act of noticing pragmatic success and/or deficits in an incident by dissecting its illocutionary forces may lead to an insightful and long-lasting understanding of contextual use of language, which might otherwise go unnoticed or unknown.

3.4 CPIA facilitates self and collaborative investigation of pragmatic features

Developing pragmatic competence is associated more with understanding what factors contribute to successful or failed communications than merely memorising a list of fragmented linguistic structures such as modals and hedging or theoretical concepts like flouting. That is to say, learners need useful narratives with interpretations of what happened, when, where, how, and why (Murray, 2012, p. 320). Literature on raising learners' awareness suggests that engaging learners, individually and collaboratively, in self-analysing and discovering target features is more effective than transmitting knowledge from teachers to students (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Fogal, 2024; Schmidt, 1990; Vattøy & Gamlem, 2024). Self and peer assisted interpretations provide students with perceptive "clues" to the ways of how language is used in natural situations, which encourage them to be self-critical of their own language use (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005, p. 206). Poststructuralists argue that when teachers exclusively prioritise native English standards, overlooking their EFL/ESL learners' changing subjective experiences and pluralistic identities (socio-economic, ethnic, and linguistic), they (teachers) promote cultural stereotyping and imposition (Taguchi, 2011). In this respect, collaborative and self-generated CPIA provides learners with hands-on learning insights into what is pragmatically essential for the particular society in question.

4. Proposed reflective pragmatic model

The model proposed in this essay is based on the frameworks designed by Tripp (1993) and Farrell (2008) for teacher training and education. Tripp (1993) offers a two stage model of using critical incidents: detailed description of an incident (in writing), and an explanation of the meaning of the incident. Farrell (2008, p. 9) also builds on the processes of description and interpretation, but he adds more collaborative, novice learner teacher-centred and detailed tasks to his model. The teacher educator or trainer in his model acts mostly as a facilitator or mediator for organising and conducting pair and group activities on CIA. Farrell's model comprises the following steps:

a) Description of an incident (in writing) by focusing on what happened, when, where and with whom: this is an individual activity of recalling and narrating an incident from teacher participants' practical experience, while avoiding yet making early interpretations.
b) Interpretation of the incident by explaining why it happened, what consequences it had before and after, how teachers reacted: this is still done individually and in writing.
c) Sharing the description of the incident with a partner: trainee teachers exchange their stories in pairs and ask for an interpretation without sharing their own. Next, the pair shares and compares the two analyses, notes down the points of similarities and differences of their opinions and collaboratively draws inferences.
d) The incidents are finally shared with the entire class. The purpose is to familiarise novice teachers with various positive and negative experiences and build meanings from the incidents for their future actions.

Thus, Farrell's (2008) model seems to provide more freedom and concrete guidelines to learner teachers for analysing and building meanings of the reported incidents primarily on their own and later collaboratively with peers. The entire process is guided and organised, and interpretations are not imposed on the students at any stage by their instructor or peers, but collaboratively constructed. However, it should be noted that the teacher educators' role is very implicit in Tripp's and Farrell's models, provided the interactions happening between novice teachers and seasoned educators/trainers. But I believe that the instructor's description and interpretation of a sample incident deems imperative for L2 learners to understand and perform CPIA because they are not as grown up or experienced as the learner teachers in Tripp's (ibid.) and Farrell's (ibid.) cases. In this regard, I agree with Eslami-Rasekh (2005, p. 230) who argues that a teacher's personal experiences and observations provide learners with rich samples,

illustrating "real-life violations of pragmatic norms and their consequences". Therefore, ESL/EFL teachers need to play a leading role when introducing the concept of CPIA and giving instructions on what to do and how. Based on these ideas, I suggest the following model for using CPIs in ESL/EFL classes:

4.1 *Teacher-initiated CPIA*

When introducing CPIA-based activities, the teacher orally describes and analyses an incident of pragmatic success and/or failures to exemplify which linguistic and social norms were maintained or violated in the incident, why it happened, and how the interlocutors vis-à-vis the communication were affected. The selection of the incident might be guided by the aims and objectives of the activities including the nature of flouting (linguistic and social), the kind of speech acts (e.g. invitations, refusals, disagreements, and requests), and the degree of formality (social distance and relations between interlocutors). The teacher's illustration helps students understand their task and motivates them to share similar stories from life.

4.2 *Learner-initiated CPIA*

4.2.1 Description

First, students individually recall an incident preferably in writing to reduce the challenges of their short term memory and keep their narration consistent. The description should be made as accurate and clear as possible. If needed, students should be allowed to reflect on L1 incidents given their limited exposure to L2 outside class, and in such cases, teachers may primarily aim to raise their pragmatic awareness and ask them to translate the L1 features into L2. The class can be divided into two groups to generate positive and negative incidents. To facilitate retrieving and describing CPIs by students, the teacher may provide a list of the possible speech act types such as requests, offers, invitations, refusals, bargains, defence, seeking and giving advice, asking for and giving information or directions, and expressing opinions and apologies. The teacher also provides a list of questions as follows to guide their description:

1. What exactly happened?
2. Who was/were involved?
3. Where and when did it happen?
4. What speech acts were performed?

4.2.2 Analysis

Students individually delve into the incident more critically by exploring the following analytic questions:

1. Which of the following features were used and how?
    1. linguistic structures including modal expressions, phrases, word choice, conversation moves such as giving excuses to avoid disagreement,
    2. gesture (facial expressions, and body movement)
    3. socially and culturally accepted politeness markers
2. Were the interlocutors happy or hurt? How did they react?
3. Do you think it was a successful interaction? Why or why not?
4. If it was not successful, what linguistic and/or social norms were violated or flouted? What else could have been done or said to save the communication?
5. If the reported incidents involved L1, how would they be properly delivered in English in similar situations?

These questions aim to identify and examine the context of the incidents and deduce implications for future applications. The last question invites learners to compare their L1 pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects with that of English and draw their conscious attention to the significance of and the differences in what Murray (2012, p. 320) terms “social grammar” between L1 and L2. The critical and retrospective interpretations will help learners gain insights into the reasons for using particular markers and moves and become aware of negative pragmatic transfer.

It is notable that teachers need to phrase the questions in plain English and avoid using technical terms or jargons such as

pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic so that learners understand the questions and the tasks easily. Additionally, teachers should clarify at the very beginning which cultural and social norms to follow for analysis because different cultures have different social norms. For example, overt offers and requests (e.g. "Have some more"), which mark politeness values in collective cultures, may threaten interlocutors' face in individualistic cultures because of the imposition and conflict of interest involved in the direct speech acts (Ara, 2010).

4.2.3 Collaboration

Students exchange their written description, not the analysis yet, of the incident with a partner, who offers an interpretation of his/her own by addressing the same questions given for analysis. Once the peer has finished, the students compare their self and peer analysis to see how the reported incident epitomises successful and failed communication acts. Then they make a list of the linguistic and body language features (pragmalinguistic) and related social norms of their incidents to identify the causes of pragmatic success and failures. Teachers may provide a checklist as follows:

Table 1: Checklist for successful and failed interactions

Purpose of communication (e.g. requests, defence)	Time and place	Relations between speakers	Linguistic features and body language	Expected (formal/informal) social norms of the culture	Consequences (e.g. Successful/ Failed communication

4.2.4 Share

Finally, students report their collaborative CPIA to class and exchange opinions and questions with others. The teacher acts as a moderator and asks students to re-evaluate their analysis, and revise their checklist (i.e. Table 1) of the linguistic and social features that save or destroy communications.

5. Evaluation of the model

The model suggested above outlines a process-oriented and learner-centred reflective model for critically analysing pragmatic incidents. Learners are required to interpret an incident from self and others' perspectives, which makes the task of analysis collaboratively reflective, enjoyable and insightful. The specific turns from teachers' description and analysis (DA) to learners' description, analysis, collaboration, and share (DACS) and from individual to pair activities make the process easier to follow. Hence, students do not feel "lost" or "frustrated" during their activities that researchers often accuse constructivism of (Kirschner, et al., 2006, p.6).

Nevertheless, the model has certain limitations. It deems more appropriate for secondary and tertiary students than young learners because children may lack maturity and proficiency in selecting relevant incidents and following the steps of analysis. But studies show that children can also actively respond to emotions as adult learners do (Richards, 2022). Therefore, when teaching younger learners, teachers should provide clear instructions and reduce the complexity of tasks. Instead of asking them to write detailed description and interpretation of an incident, teachers may give clues to possible interactions (e.g. asking for or refusing to share a toy) with parents, friends, teachers, and others, and invite them to orally recall and briefly describe them. Teachers may need to ask them small reflective questions to fill in the gap of their stories and focus more on sociopragmatic aspects and children's feelings about the incidents (e.g. how they felt; why they behaved this way; what else they could have done or said) than asking them to scrutinise some linguistic features.

Regardless of age, the reported incidents may threaten students' emotions and self-image, and even destroy peer relations. They might be reluctant to share in class the stories of their family, friends and relatives, particularly the negative ones, for the fear of

being judged and harassed by peers (Richards, 2022). The risks, however, can be minimised by adopting the following techniques:

- Avoiding using specific names, references or relations; pseudonyms can be used instead.
- Narrating the incidents from a third person (plural) viewpoint rather than a first person's for the sake of anonymity (e.g. 'he', 'she', 'they' instead of 'you', 'I', 'we')
- Avoiding gender specific pronouns and using third person plurals instead (e.g. 'they' instead of 'he', 'she');
- Highlighting more the aim of the activities and the form and function of the incidents than the real identities of the people involved;
- Doing the entire activity alone or with the teacher, and not imposing students to report and share it with peers if they are unwilling to.

6. Conclusion

This paper discussed why and how L2 learners can be engaged in analysing the incidents of pragmatic success and failure, termed Critical Pragmatic Incidents (CPIs), to develop their pragmatic competence. The arguments are based on the constructivist theory of developing language skills through the cognitive processes of noticing, assimilating and accommodating new language features. A reflective pragmatic model of four phases was proposed following Tripps' (1993) and Farrell's (2008) frameworks of Critical Incident Analysis (CIA). The first two phases include individual activities of describing and analysing CPIs, while the third involves exchanging and comparing analysis with peers. Students in the final stage share their collaborative analysis with the entire class and make an inventory of the linguistic and social causes or features of successful and failed interactions in a given context. Although the model has certain limitations with regard to learners' age, level, and face, the problems can be minimised by simplifying the tasks, choosing pseudonyms, using third person narratives, avoiding gender specific terms and, if needed, giving learners freedom to work individually instead of in groups.

References

Almacioglu, G., & Yalcin Arslan, F. (2024). Turkish EFL teachers' professional learning: reflections on critical incidents. *Teaching Education*, 1-22.

Ara, A. (2010). Politeness principle: Being polite in language use. *Spectrum: Journal of the Department of English*, University of Dhaka, *6&7*, 97-106.

Arthur, N. (2001). Using critical incidents to investigate cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25, 41–53.

Aydin, F. (2023). Effects of implicit and explicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *TESOL Communications*, *2*(1).

Babaii, E., Molana, K., & Nazari, M. (2021). Contributions of assessment-related critical incidents to language teacher identity development. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *15*(5), 442-457.

Bachman, L. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. and Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do Language Learners Recognize Pragmatic Violations? Pragmatic versus Grammatical Awareness in Instructed L2 Learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), pp. 233-262.

Barón, J., & Celaya, M. L. (2022). 'May I do something for you?': The effects of audio-visual material (captioned and non-captioned) on EFL pragmatic learning. *Language Teaching Research*, *26*(2), 238-255.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Britton, E. R., & Austin, T. Y. (2020). "That's Just How We Say it": Understanding L2 Student Writers' Responses to Written and Negotiated Corrective Feedback Through Critical Incidents. *TESL Canada Journal/ Revue TESL du Canada*, *37*(2), 103-127.

Brookfeld, S. D. (1990). Using critical incidents to explore learner's assumptions. In J. Mezirow (Ed.), Fostering critical refection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning (pp. 177–193). Jossey-Bass management series. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (No. 4). Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Derakhshan, A., & Eslami, Z. (2020). The effect of metapragmatic awareness, interactive translation, and discussion through video-enhanced input on EFL learners' comprehension of implicature. *Applied Research on English Language*, *9*(1), 25-52.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal*, *59*(3), 199-208. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci039

Fang, X. (2024). Making refusals via English as a lingua franca: Chinese English speakers' strategies and sequences. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *230*, 1-14.

Farrell, T. S. (2018). Reflective Practice for Language Teachers. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching, 1–6.*

Farrell, T. S. (2019). Reflective practice in L2 teacher education. In S. Walsh & S. Mann (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teacher education* (pp. 38-51). Routledge.

Farrell, T. S. (2023a). From doctor to facilitator: Reflecting on the metaphors of early career EFL teachers. *Reflective Practice*, *24*(1), 14-26.

Farrell, T. S. (2023b). Reflective Practice for TESOL Teachers:"What, Why, When and How". *JALT journal: the research journal of the Japan Association for Language Teaching*, *45*(1), 122-137. https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTJJ43.2-1

Farrell, T. S. C. (2008). Critical incidents in ELT initial teacher training. *ELT Journal,* 62(1), 3-10.

Fath Pour Pakzad, A., & Sarkhosh, M. (2022). Enhancing EFL learners' Pragmatic Performance: The Case of Suggestions. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, *10*(42), 67-85.

Finch, A. (2010). Critical incidents and language learning: Sensitivity to initial conditions. *System*, *38*(3), 422-431. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.05.004

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, *51*(4), 327-358. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0061470

Fogal, G. G. (2024). Raising learner awareness of L2 writing spaces: supporting researchers, teachers, and learners through system mapping. *Language Awareness*, *33*(3), 528-549. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2023.2298202

Franch, P. B. (1998). On Pragmatic Transfer. *Studies in English Language and Linguistics 9*, 5-20.

Ghadiri, S., Tajeddin, Z., & Alemi, M. (2024). Teachers' Means of Scaffolding L2 Learners' Pragmatic Production in Online Instruction. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *12*(2), 19-38.

Halquist, D., & Musanti, S. I. (2010). Critical incidents and reflection: Turning points that challenge the researcher and create opportunities for knowing. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 23(4), 449–461. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2010.492811

House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *18*(2), 225-252. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100014893

Ishihara, N. (2007). 'Web-based for pragmatic instruction in Japanese as a foreign language: An explicit awareness-raising approach. Language Awareness, *16*(1), 21-40.

Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2022). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Kasper, G. (1996). Introduction: Interlanguage pragmatics in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *18*(2), 145-148.

Kılıç, M., & Cinkara, M. (2020). Critical incidents in pre-service EFL teachers' identity construction process, *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *40*(2), 182-196, doi: 10.1080/02188791.2019.1705759

Kirschner, P., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why unguided learning does not work: An analysis of the failure of discovery learning, problem-based learning, experiential learning and inquiry-based learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *41*(2), 75–86.

Lithoxoidou, A., & Papadopoulou, V. (2024). Critical incidents analysis in teacher education: Assessing student-teachers' critical thinking. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *51*, 101476.

Msosa, S. K., & Govender, J. P. (2019). Service failure in higher education institutions: A case study in diagnosing students' evaluation of critical incidents. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *34*(1), 45-55.

Noviyenty, L. (2023). Non-Native EFL Lecturers' Strategies in Building Their Pragmatics Competence. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, *7*(2), 376-395. https://doi.org/10.33369/jeet.7.2.376-395

Piaget, J. (1957). *Construction of reality in the child*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Piaget, J. (1964). Part I: Cognitive development in children: Piaget development and learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *2*(3), 176–186.

Pourhassan, A., & Nazari, M. (2023). Teachers learn to use critical incidents as a professional development tool in teaching young English learners. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, *17*(1), 32-46.

Richards, J. C. (2022). Exploring emotions in language teaching. *RELC Journal*, *53*(1), 225-239.

Róg, T. (2024). Teaching L2 pragmatics: The effects of different types of task implementation vs a PPP framework. *Neofilolog*, *62*(2), 502-520.

Sánchez-Hernández, A., & Barón, J. (2022). Teaching second language pragmatics in the current era of globalization: An introduction. Language Teaching Research, *26*(2), 163-170.

Schauer, G. A. (2024). *Intercultural competence and pragmatics*. Springer Nature: Switzerland AG.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 127-158. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language teaching and learning (Technical Report No. 9)* (pp. 1-64). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Senel, M. (2021). Exploring ELT Students' Professional Identity Formation through the Perspectives of Critical Incidents. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *10*(2), 629-640.

Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *31*, 289-310. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000018

Taguchi, N., & Roever, C. (2017). *Second language pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thiel, T. (1999). Reflections on critical incidents. *Prospect*, *14*(1), 44-52.

Thomas, J. A. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 91-111.

Ton-Nu, A. (2024). Why is L2 pragmatics still a neglected area in EFL teaching? Uncovered stories from Vietnamese EFL teachers. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, (0). https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2023-0172

Tripp, D. (1993). *Critical Incidents in Teaching: Developing Professional Judgement*. London: Routledge.

Vattøy, K. D., & Gamlem, S. M. (2024). Students' experiences of peer feedback practices as related to awareness raising of learning goals, self-monitoring, self-efficacy, anxiety, and enjoyment in teaching EFL and mathematics. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, *68*(5), 904-918.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Woldemariam, H. Z. (2015). The development of pragmatic competence (PC) through pragmatics stylistics (PS). *NAWA Journal of Language and Communication*, *9*(1), 46-88.

Yousefi, M., & Nassaji, H. (2024). The Impact of Corrective Feedback on L2 Pragmatics Production in Face-to-Face and Technology-Mediated Settings. *Language Teaching*