

*Тіл мен әдебиетті оқыту әдістемесі / Methods of teaching language and literature /  
Методика преподавания языка и литературы*

IRSTI 16.31.51+

14.01.07

Article

**Sh.T. Zhanysbekova***Kazakh National Agrarian Research University**Almaty, Kazakhstan.**(E-mail: sh\_zhanysbekova@mail.ru)***Teaching Pragmatic Competence: Strategies fo Error Correction in  
Language Instruction**

**Abstract.** This integrative literature review aims to improve the quality of language teaching through the systematic analysis of error correction strategies related to pragmatic competence. In current language teaching practice, pragmatic competence often does not receive sufficient attention, as priority is given to correcting grammatical and lexical errors. However, success of oral communication is not based solely on linguistic structures, it requires the appropriate use of speech acts within their social and cultural contexts. In this article, the authors review 20 academic articles published between 2020 and 2025 in the Scopus and Web of Science databases. Based on these studies, pragmatic error correction strategies, including direct, indirect, and metapragmatic approaches, are examined comparatively. At first, the collected literatures were coded through critical analysis, and then the common trends and contradictions that take place in the corrective strategies of teachers were identified. The results of the study showed that the methodological models currently in use have limitations in their adaptation to multicultural contexts. In this regard, the article presents a pedagogical structure based on intercultural flexibility to improve the quality of pragmatic learning. The proposed structure is recommended for use in language courses and multilingual educational institutions and can be used to improve teacher training programs. Based on the shortcomings identified in this study regarding correction and feedback, the authors propose the Culture-Adaptive Pragmatic Correction Frame (CAPCF) model that adapts to the culture. The model considers pragmatic error correction to situational diagnostic context, learner factors, and coping strategies and is seen as culturally based decision-making.

**Keywords:** pragmatic competence, error correction, language instruction, intercultural communication, metapragmatic strategy, teacher feedback

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.71078/z9pamw14>

Received: 18.02.2026; Accepted: 27.03.2026; Available online: 04.04.2026.

**Introduction**

Pragmatic competence is a language learner's ability to communicate appropriately in the target language accordance with social norms and context. This competence is considered one of the three main components of language proficiency (grammatical, lexical, and pragmatic). Kasper and Rose (Rose & Kasper, 2001) describe pragmatic competence as «the ability to understand and apply social norms that govern language use.» In modern curricula, this element often remains secondary, and teachers prioritize grammatical correctness (Taguchi, 2015b). However, the correct use of language structures cannot facilitate communication when there is a pragmatic discrepancy. For example, saying «Shut the window?» instead of the polite request «Could you shut the window!» is a pragmatic error (Ishihara & Cohen, 2014).

Pragmatic errors directly affect the speaker's communicative image, their social role, and the effectiveness of interaction. Several error correction strategies aim to correct such errors – direct, indirect, and metapragmatic. However, they are often considered within isolated context and are limited in providing a comprehensive interpretation of teachers' actions in an intercultural environment (Diez-Itza et al., 2025; Hasan, n.d.).

The relevance of this study lies in the need for a conscious systematization of approaches to pragmatic correction. If this component is ignored, the learner's language development remains at a purely formal level and limits socio-functional flexibility.

The study aims to critically analyze strategies for correcting pragmatic errors in multilingual and intercultural contexts and to present an integrative pedagogical structure. According to the goal of the study, the following objectives are proposed:

1. To determine the types and causes of pragmatic errors
2. To systematize existing correction methods (direct, indirect, metapragmatic)
3. To identify factors that influence a teacher's choice of strategy
4. To propose a pedagogical model recommended for use in language teaching

## Materials and methods

### *Methods*

**Type of study** This study is based on the Integrative review of literature. This method is not simply descriptive in nature, but also seeks to come up with novel findings by examining congruencies and discrepancies between earlier research (Torraco, 2016). Through an integrative review, we can examine all the latest research conducted in relation to the correction of a pragmatic mistake and suggest a pedagogical model that may directly impact Language Teaching practice. Unlike narrative reviews, this work adopts a structured integrative approach for the sake of analytical transparency and coherence.

### *Criteria for selecting sources*

Eligible materials were peer-reviewed journal articles (published from 2020 and up to 2025) in the Scopus, and Web of Science contained under key words related to pragmatic competence and feedback in L2 setting. The criteria for exclusion were as follows: studies that had no direct relation to pragmatic issues; research that discussed lexical or grammatical take-up only; dissertations, book chapters, and opinion essays.

The search was conducted on the below mentioned academic platforms and databases:

Scopus, Web of Science;  
SpringerLink;  
Taylor and Francis Online;  
Cambridge Core;

Initial search yielded 87 articles. Following review for Inclusion/Exclusion criteria, 20 articles were included in the final review. Thematic Analysis For the analysis, we used Thematic method of analysis (the thematic analysis) as suggested by Braun and Clarke (Braun et al., 2006) The method also allows the researcher to organize frequently occurring patterns, topics, or problems from good quality data. 6 stage scheme used. First, get acquainted with the data; second, marking source codes; third, creating themes; fourth, checking themes; fifth, naming themes; sixth, writing The Conclusion.

### *Reliability and Validity*

The articles used for the present study were published in high-impact-factor international journals and peer-reviewed internationally. Structure of the review was reviewed by two methodological experts during analysis and neutrality in data interpretation was ensured. Themes were also validated for relevance and relationship to the objectives of research, and interpretive bias was reduced by returning to original material and corroborating with thematic categories.

### *Ethical Considerations*

This study does not require ethical approval, as there were no empirical data or human subjects. The references quoted in this article are all collected following the international academic norms.

### *Limitations*

This was a review conducted on secondary sources (literature-based). There is no empirical study under real classroom conditions, so the proposed model needs more verification in practice. The review may have also missed out on certain pragmatic issues that are confined to regional and non-English speaking contexts, considering only English publications.

### **Literature review**

Pragmatic competence was initially introduced by Canale and Swain (Canale & Swain, 1980) as one aspect of communicative competence and, later studies (Bachman, 1990; Rose & Kasper, 2001) have shown this competence to be significant and independent. Kasper (2001) classified pragmatic competence into two types:

Pragmalinguistic – using linguistic structures to perform functions such as politeness, advice, and requests;

Sociopragmatic – using linguistic norms in accordance with cultural norms.

This sorting opens the way to a better comprehension of errors, and while pragmatic correction is one of the teacher's habitual skills it more frequently stays on the background of learning activities.

The practical fallacy is the one committed by the language learner when they engage in speaking in a manner that does not conform to society. The underlying causes behind these errors could be that the learner is ignorant of the target culture's conventions or translates their speech patterns directly from L1 (Ishihara & Cohen, 2014). Bardovi-Harlig & Dörnyei (1998) refer to this as 'pragmatic transference' and note the effect of negative transfer from the native language structure at the pragmatic level in the target language. Such a shift is particularly evidenced in courtesy and offer and rejection strategies (Bardovi-Harlig et al., 1998). Helen Leppik's work, «Ingliskeelse kõne ajal tehtavate vead [Pragmatic deviance in spoken EFL],» discusses errors of pragmatic deviance. Errors of pragmatic deviance are interpersonally much more complex than communicative grammatical errors, as they are implicit (covert), culturally relative, and often remain unnoticed. Lowen and Philp (2006) demonstrated that correction is beneficial for students at a beginner language level. The teacher isolates the mistake and provides the correct form (Loewen & Philp, 2006).

Ellis et al. (2009) describe the indirect amendment as «recasts» and «clarification requests.» This method allows the student to realize their mistake, but if it is too subtle, the student may not recognize the error (Taguchi, 2015a, 2015c). Ishihara emphasizes the importance of metapragmatic strategy (Ishihara, 2024). In addition to correcting the error, this method aims to explain why it is wrong. Such an approach increases pragmatic thinking and understanding of the cultural context. Different strategies have different effects on students of varying levels and cultures. Choosing a strategy is a decision that needs to be adapted to an intercultural context, rather than a mechanical one. Rose & Kasper noted the need to reflect the characteristics of pragmatic learning that are inherent in each culture (Rose & Kasper, 2001). Communication style, attitude towards hierarchy, and norms of politeness all determine the context of pragmatic mistakes (Soler & Pitarch, 2022). Diez-Itza et al. showed in a study with Spanish and French students that the same corrective approach by the teacher produced two different effects in both groups (Diez-Itza et al., 2025). This proves that pragmatic learning requires more adaptive strategies than universal models. More recent work supports adaptive, context-dependent models of the teaching of pragmatics which consider sociocultural as well as cognitive and affective issues. Yet the literature tends to examine corrective mechanisms

in isolation from one another rather than as integrated components of a decision process. Strategies for understanding and correcting pragmatic errors are closely related to nationality, culture, and communication norms. That is why the position of «one approach – for all» is not valid in this area. In a survey conducted by Yates of ESL teachers in Australia, it was shown that only 35% of them are confident in teaching pragmatics (Yates et al., 2019). This is due to their lack of professional training and the shortage of specific training materials. Ishihara & Cohen state that a teacher's intercultural sensitivity plays a crucial role in pragmatic learning (Ishihara & Cohen, 2014). In addition, textbooks should also be directed by teachers; however, in most cases, textbooks do not contain fully pragmatic content. This void ultimately provides an opportunity to develop an integrative, culture-specific correction model which amalgamates disparate strands of corrective feedback research within a unified educational framework. The pragmatic competence of the teacher and the ability to adapt interculturally are the main determinants of corrective effectiveness. Although research has shown that there are different approaches to correcting a pragmatic error, it is not enough for them to adapt to the context. A deep understanding of the essence of pragmatic errors, an assessment of the role of cultural transfer, and the choice of strategy in accordance with the characteristics of the student should become the basis of methodological recommendations for teachers. New models should be based on the role of the teacher and the predisposition to the cultural context.

### **Results and discussion**

The most general trend that has emerged in the light of an integrated literature review is that even though both teachers and researchers are aware of the importance to counteract pragmatic errors, their systematic treatment in particular methodological books continues to be restricted. For instance, while many research studies have applied Lyster and Ranta (1997)'s feedback model, only rarely is this model implemented in an adapted form for pragmatic context (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). This illustrates the difference between correcting formally and correcting pragmatically.

According to Taguchi (2019), pragmatic correction is more complicated than grammatical correction, as it relies on the cultural background (Taguchi, 2015c). This was also supported by a number of studies found during the search that were included in this review: teacher's cognitive-social training and his/her contextual adjustment are crucial (Diez-Itza et al., 2025; Hasan, n.d.).

Immediate feedback is more precise and quicker, therefore it is more effective with low-level learners of a language (Loewen et al., 2006). However, adopting this approach also has the potential to divert the student's attention away from interaction and end up with feelings of embarrassment and negative self-perception or reduced language engagement (Hasan, n.d.). The speaker's face-saving culture is not considered by many teachers when applying this technique.

Indirect feedback is a means of intimating pragmatic errors subtly. Allowing the student to see their own mistake also allows them to spot where they went wrong themselves (Ellis et al., 2006). A few studies, however, have reported the extent to effectiveness of the technique as being reliant on cognitive style and rapport with teacher.

Metapragmatic correction involves the learner recognizing the error and understanding why it is an error and how to correct oneself. Ishihara (2022) and Diez-Itza et al. argue that this practice has a lasting influence on the development of pragmatic competence. But of course most teachers are unprepared to use that approach, they have no special preparation.

The instruction and feedback of pragmatic competence is intimately linked to intercultural dynamics. According to Rose and Kasper (2001) the comprehension – assessment of speech acts is regarded as a function of various national cultural aspects. One culture's acceptable speech may come off as impolite, inconsiderate or unfitting to other.

Pragmatic miscommunication between teachers in Spanish and students in Chinese was particularly salient, for instance, in Soler and Pitarch, where had misunderstandings about feedback based on cultural differences (Alcón et al., 2010). This scenario is evidence for low level of value flexibility by the teacher. The research evidence suggests that the provision of correction may not have an equal effect for all language levels, cultural backgrounds and teacher readiness.

There is no one-to-one model for (un)repairing pragmatic errors here. It is not enough for the teacher to decide how best a correction should be performed but they must also take the student's language use environment into account and consider individual personality traits (Ishihara & Cohen, 2014). The efficiency of practical correction is determined by the teacher's level of professional training and cultural awareness. Yates 20% of native-English-speaking teachers reported experiencing confident teaching pragmatics in the ESL classroom (Yates et al., 2019). Pragmatics is often regarded as an "add-on" and taught after the error has been committed. Moreover, the teacher's selection of a treatment is also based on communicative styles that are culturally grounded in the teachers' own culture. Indeed, formal and hierarchical compared to informal and horizontal teachers appear to prefer the use of direct versus reflective correction (Barron, n.d.). Practical rectification ought rather to be regarded as a culturally mediated form of decision-making, not merely as a technique.

In this article we systematise different corrective strategies for pragmatic errors and compare these in an intercultural perspective. Despite, these topics have been individually addressed in previous literature, efforts to integrate them together were scarce. This lack of evidence would indicate the necessity for a more flexible approach to pragmatic feedback. Such a model as outlined in this paper (Integrative culturally flexible correction model) may enable teachers to make analyses based decisions on the choice of strategy. The above findings also suggest that we need to attach more importance to the pragmatics teaching in language learning. This might mean incorporating pragmatic error correction strategies into teacher training programmes as well as using real-life situations as concrete examples of intercultural contexts.

Recommendations to teachers are made including employing alternatives to methods which could cause face threat when remediating pragmatic errors, modelling examples of multicultural mediated interaction in the classroom and taking care to ensure that their feedback is presented in a clear manner motivated by politeness rather than informed by culture. Pragmatic EC is a highly intricate pedagogical process. It's not just focused on displaying the correct form but using language in its social and cultural context. Studies indicate that there is no one best way to do this, and several strategies may work successfully depending on teachers' decisions, learners' cultural background, and the situational context.

The CAPCF is an integrative pedagogical model that seeks to draw on two constructs (sociocultural theory and intercultural pragmatics) along with a research agenda from teacher cognition. It treats pragmatic repair as a culturally informed professional judgment and not merely the reduction of error. It is posited that corrective feedback constitutes scaffolded interaction within the Zone of Proximal Development of a learner, highlighting that idea pragmatic appropriateness is culturally-bound. The pragmatic correction made by teachers depends on their attitudes and cultural belongings, which turns the process of pragmatic correction into a dynamic Intercultural mediation. The model is applied in a structured decision making process. The teacher analyses the nature of this pragmatic deviation and its cultural association, avoiding overcorrection and ranking according to intercultural risk. The teacher then takes into account the learner-related variable proficiency and cross-cultural awareness to select the most suitable correction strategy, matching methods with situational and emotional factors. CAPCF is recursive and responsive: the teacher puts appraisals into action, attends to learner reactions, and responds accordingly. This articulation positions pragmatic correction

as a reflective ongoing practice. CAPCF is unique in that intercultural risk assessment and strategy choice are combined with a focus on teacher cognitions. It is based on a theoretically rich, multilingual classroom model and the implications for teacher education programs focused on intersubjectivity and strategic flexibility are discussed, as well as opportunities for future empirical validation of the argument through classroom-based interventions.

### **Conclusion**

This integrative review of literature sought to provide a critical overview of the complex emergence of pragmatic competence, which is often neglected in modern approaches to language instruction. In the educational field, and especially with regard to second language courses at all levels of school instruction, there is a significant focus on teaching the basic pattern of grammar and a large vocabulary without attention to the essential elements of pragmatics that support communication. However, otherwise the effectiveness of communication is inevitably related to the appropriateness of pragmatic use across contexts.

Some of the findings were emerging from this detailed literature review and have been clearly identified. Pragmatic errors, first and foremost, are considered to be a hidden behavior which is greatly influenced by cross-cultural factors. In this respect these errors are more complex than grammatical or lexical mistakes, as they are thirdly determined by the perception of social roles and face-to-face settings. As a result, their correction of such pragmatic errors requires specific methodological training and sensitivity to such sociocultural dimensions.

A second point is that the success of pragmatic error correction strategies, be they direct, indirect or metapragmatic, is very context-contingent. It has been suggested (Hasan, n.d.; Ishihara, 2024; Taguchi, 2015a) in studies that the effect of such strategies varies depending on learners' proficiencies and their intercultural adaptability as well as teachers' professional attitudes to teaching. This variation highlights the need for individualized pragmatic instruction and feedback.

Third, the teacher is also seen as a key factor in pragmatic competence. In order to develop this kind of competence, teachers need to plant themselves in both roles of language teacher and intercultural mediator. The correction tactics used should be tactfully planned to keep the learners from losing face, and instead concentrate on explaining the cultural and contextual distinctions of pragmatic behaviors.

This, then, brings us to the conclusion that pragmatic error correction is not just following routine, but an advanced form of practice which requires sensitive intercultural decision-making. The metapragmatic approach to correction that is offered in this study constitutes a help on teachers' part towards conscientious, context-embedded and comprehensible corrective gestures to learners within the general framework of language instruction.

In short, this article adds significantly to how language is taught in order to strengthen the pragmatic aspects of it and develop the role of teacher as intercultural mediator. It further creates methodological bases for ongoing empirical research.

Moreover, the current study synthesizes the pragmatic error correction literature and reframes corrective feedback as culturally adaptive mediation. It advances the Culturally Adaptive Pragmatic Correction Framework (CAPCF) that moves away from models which focus only on form and situates pragmatic correction within intercultural decision-making. This is potentially important in multilingual educational contexts where pragmatic norms demand culturally specific answers. The investigation contributes to the theoretical advancement of instructed pragmatics with a focus on teacher cognition and ICR.

In a practical sense, the framework is applicable in teaching / in the teaching of language and teacher education, where it provides flexible means for choosing between corrective strategies according to the context at hand; learner factors. The glossary may be applied for teacher training, in service professional development as well as multilingual classrooms to support

pragmatic sensitivity and intercultural awareness. Through the lens of adaptive pedagogical mediation, the paper offers educators a means to enhance communicative effectiveness and avoid culturally induced misunderstanding in L2 teaching.

### References

- Alcón, E., Josep, S., Pitarch, G., Soler, E. A., & Guzman, J. (2010). The Effect of Instruction on Learners' Pragmatic Awareness: a Focus on Refusals. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(1), 65–80. <https://doi.org/10.6018/IJES/2010/1/113981>
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford university press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Dörnyei, Z., & Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Do Language Learners Recognize Pragmatic Violations? Pragmatic versus Grammatical Awareness in Instructed L2 Learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(2), 233. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587583>
- Barron, A. (n.d.). *Developing pragmatic competence in a study abroad context*. <https://doi.org/10.48548/pubdata-161>
- Braun, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Taylor & Francis*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706QP063OA>
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). *Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing*. <https://www.sid.ir/paper/534264/en>
- Diez-Itza, E., Marrero-Aguiar, V., Auza, A., & Aguilar-Mediavilla, E. (2025). New trends in typical and atypical language acquisition. *Frontiersin.Org E Diez-Itza, V Marrero-Aguiar, A Auza, E Aguilar-MediavillaFrontiers in Psychology, 2025*•*frontiersin.Org*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2025.1573869/FULL>
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Cambridge.OrgR Ellis, S Loewen, R ErlamStudies in Second Language Acquisition, 2006*•*cambridge.Org*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141>
- Hasan, N. A. (n.d.). Empowering Pragmatic Competence in ELT: Leveraging Digital Intercultural Communication through Moderated Online Communities and Cross-Cultural. *Ijassh.Org*, 19(19), 65–77. Retrieved December 22, 2025, from <https://ijassh.org/admin1/upload/06%20Niaam%20Ali%20Hasan%2001317.pdf>
- Ishihara, N. (2024). Fostering a translingual framework in teacher education focused on pragmatics: Identity and the multilingual turn in pragmatics pedagogy. *System*, 125, 103457. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2024.103457>
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics: Where Language and Culture Meet*, 1–370. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833842>
- Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the adult English L2 classroom: Characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness. *Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 536–556. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1540-4781.2006.00465.X>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND LEARNER UPTAKE: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Rose, K., & Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. <https://www.academia.edu/download/19382096/bookreviews.pdf>
- Taguchi, N. (2015a). “Contextually” speaking: A survey of pragmatic learning abroad, in class, and online. *System*, 48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.001>
- Taguchi, N. (2015b). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching*, 48(1), 1–50. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1017/S0261444814000263>
- Taguchi, N. (2015c). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were,

are, and should be going. In *Language Teaching* (Vol. 48, Number 1). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000263>

Torraco, R. J. (2016). Writing Integrative Literature Reviews. *Human Resource Development Review*, 15(4), 404–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316671606>

Yates, L., Davies, L. M. L., Buzacott, L., Doecke, B., Mead, P., & Sawyer, W. (2019). School English, literature and the knowledge-base question. *Curriculum Journal*, 30(1), 51–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2018.1543603>

### **Ш.Т. Жанысбекова**

*Қазақ Ұлттық Аграрлық зерттеу университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан*  
(E-mail: [sh\\_zhanysbekova@mail.ru](mailto:sh_zhanysbekova@mail.ru))

## **Прагматикалық құзыреттілікті оқыту: тілдік оқытудағы қателерді түзету стратегиялары**

**Аңдатпа.** Бұл интегративті әдебиеттерге шолу прагматикалық құзыреттілікке негізделген қателерді түзету стратегияларын жүйелі талдау арқылы тілді оқыту сапасын жақсартуға бағытталған. Тілдерді оқытудың қазіргі тәжірибесінде прагматикалық құзыреттілікке жеткілікті көңіл бөлінбейді, өйткені басымдық грамматикалық және лексикалық қателерді түзетуге беріледі. Алайда, ауызша қарым-қатынас тек тілдік құрылымдарға негізделмейді, ол сөйлеу әрекеттерін олардың әлеуметтік және мәдени контекстерде орынды қолдануды талап етеді. Бұл мақалада авторлар 2020-2025 жылдар аралығында Scopus және Web Of Science мәліметтер базасында жарияланған 20 академиялық мақаланы қарастырады. Осы зерттеулердің негізінде прагматикалық қателерді түзету стратегиялары, соның ішінде тікелей, жанама және метапрагматикалық тәсілдер салыстырмалы түрде зерттеледі. Алдымен жиналған әдебиеттер сыни талдау арқылы кодталады, содан кейін мұғалімдердің түзету стратегияларында орын алатын жалпы тенденциялар мен қайшылықтарды анықтайды. Зерттеу нәтижелері қазіргі уақытта қолданылып жүрген әдістемелік модельдердің көпмәдениетті контекстерге бейімделуінде шектеулер бар екенін көрсетті. Осыған байланысты мақалада прагматикалық оқыту сапасын жақсарту үшін мәдениетаралық икемділікке негізделген педагогикалық құрылым ұсынылған. Ұсынылған құрылым тілдік курстарда және көптілді білім беру ұйымдарында қолдануға ұсынылады және мұғалімдердің біліктілігін арттыру бағдарламаларын жетілдіру үшін қолданыла алады. Бұл зерттеуде түзету мен кері байланысқа қатысты анықталған кемшіліктерге сүйене отырып, авторлар Мәдениетке бейімделетін прагматикалық түзету шеңбері (CARCF) моделін ұсынамыз. Модель прагматикалық қателерді түзетуді ситуациялық диагностикалық контекстті, оқушы факторларын және күресу стратегияларынескереді және мәдени негізделген шешім қабылдау ретінде қарастырылады.

**Түйінді сөздер:** прагматикалық құзыреттілік, қателерді түзету, тілдік оқыту, мәдениетаралық коммуникация, метапрагматикалық стратегия, мұғалімнің кері байланысы

### **Ш.Т. Жанысбекова**

*Казахский Национальный Аграрный исследовательский университет,*  
*г. Алматы, Казахстан.*  
(E-mail: [sh\\_zhanysbekova@mail.ru](mailto:sh_zhanysbekova@mail.ru))

## **Обучение прагматической компетенции: стратегии исправления ошибок при обучении языку**

**Аннотация.** Этот комплексный обзор литературы направлен на повышение качества преподавания иностранного языка посредством систематического анализа стратегий исправления ошибок, связанных с прагматической компетентностью. В современной практике преподавания иностранных языков прагматической компетентности часто не уделяется достаточного внимания, поскольку приоритет отдается исправлению грамматических и лексических ошибок. Однако процесс устного общения основан не только на лингвистических структурах, он требует соответствующего использования речевых актов в их социальном и культурном контексте. В этой статье авторы делают обзор 20 научных статей, опубликованных в период с 2020 по 2025 год в базах данных Scopus и Web of Science. На основе этих исследований проводится сравнительный анализ стратегий исправления прагматических ошибок, включая прямые, косвенные и метапрагматические подходы. Сначала собранная литература была подвергнута критическому анализу, а затем были выявлены общие тенденции и противоречия, которые имеют место в корректирующих стратегиях учителей. Результаты исследования показали, что используемые в настоящее время методологические модели имеют ограничения в их адаптации к мультикультурным контекстам. В связи с этим в статье представлена педагогическая структура, основанная на межкультурной гибкости для повышения качества прагматического обучения. Предлагаемая структура рекомендована для использования на языковых курсах и в многоязычных учебных заведениях и может быть использована для совершенствования программ подготовки учителей. Предлагаемая структура рекомендуется для использования на языковых курсах и в многоязычных организациях образования и может использоваться для улучшения программ повышения квалификации учителей. Основываясь на выявленных недостатках в отношении коррекции и обратной связи в этом исследовании, мы представляем модель прагматической структуры коррекции (САРСФ), которую авторы адаптируют к культуре. Модель использует прагматическое исправление ошибок для определения ситуационного диагностического контекста, факторов учащегося и стратегий выживания и рассматривается как культурно обоснованное принятие решений.

**Ключевые слова:** прагматическая компетентность, исправление ошибок, обучение языку, межкультурная коммуникация, метапрагматическая стратегия, обратная связь с преподавателем.

**Information about author:**

**Zhanysbekova Shaizat Turakbaevna** – PhD, senior lecturer of the Kazakh National Agrarian Research University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2744-6734>

**Авторлар туралы мәлімет:**

**Жанысбекова Шайзат Туракбаевна** – PhD, Қазақ ұлттық аграрлық зерттеу университетінің аға оқытушысы, Алматы, Қазақстан. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2744-6734>

**Сведения об авторе:**

**Жанысбекова Шайзат Туракбаевна** – PhD, старший преподаватель Казахского национального аграрного исследовательского университета, Алматы, Казахстан. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2744-6734>



Бұл жұмыс Creative Commons Attribution-Коммерциялық Емес 4.0 Халықаралық лицензиясы бойынша лицензияланған.  
This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License