

Received: 06/01/2026

Accepted: 21/04/2026

Published: 11/06/2026

Soumia BEGHCHICH * 1

Badji Mokhtar –Annaba University, (Algeria)

Email s.beghchich@univ-skikda.dz

Khadidja BELFARHI 2

Badji Mokhtar –Annaba University, (Algeria)

Email : khadidja.belfarhi@Univ-annaba.dz

12. P.O.Box. 23000 Annaba. Algeria.



Abstract :

This article explores strategies for developing learners' pragmatic abilities through the analysis of dramatic texts. Research indicates that pragmatic analysis of literary works, particularly dramatic texts, can significantly enhance learners' pragmatic skills. To investigate this, the research employed an experimental design, beginning with a diagnostic test to assess the initial pragmatic competence of two learner groups. Subsequently, a pragmatic test was administered to both the experimental and control groups. The experimental group was provided with a pragmatic analysis of a passage from Shakespeare's Hamlet, followed by a pragmatic test on the extract. In contrast, the control group analyzed the same passage using a traditional literary analysis approach, which is familiar to them from their literature sessions. The same group completed the same pragmatic test. Each group comprised 20 learners enrolled in a literature course at Skikda University. The study utilized an independent samples T-test to assess performance differences between the two groups across six distinct pragmatic abilities. The results demonstrate that the experimental group, which employed the pragmatic model in text analysis, exhibited superior performance in all six measured abilities compared to the control group. These findings suggest that integrating pragmatic analysis into the study of dramatic texts is more effective than traditional literary analysis in enhancing EFL learners' pragmatic competence. Thus, this approach offers a valuable strategy for promoting pragmatic awareness and competence in EFL classroom.

Keywords: Dramatic texts; EFL learning; pragmatic competence; pragmatic abilities.

1. Introduction

Though it has been said that the learning of drama as a literary genre is beneficial for language communication, learners in general and non-native learners in particular encounter many challenges and problems when dealing with the dramatic texts and contexts. As the EFL learners, even the EFL teachers may face handicaps that may hinder the teaching of drama in the EFL classrooms. First, shy and introvert learners find the teaching of drama frustrating as they have problem to speak in public and interact with others. Even the teacher usually needs an extra time to design the course rigorously, a task which is complex and demanding. In this case, the teacher should employ such feedback techniques for correcting mistakes, which do not interrupt and discourage the learner during the drama performance. In spite of the handicaps that face both learners and teachers when learning and teaching drama in the EFL classroom, one cannot deny the fact that dramatic texts can be essentially an act of communicating meaning where learners are actively engaged in contextualized situations, which will develop their interactional skills and personal performance and raise their self-esteem. Hence, this study seeks to provide an answer to the following research problem. How does the pragmatic analysis of drama as a literary genre in the EFL classroom enhance learners' pragmatic competence, a key component of communicative competence?

2. Literature Review

Drama is a literary genre that has to do with the acting and performance of characters on a stage where textual elements are enacted and mingled with verbal and non-verbal dimensions. Klarer (2020) highlights that dramatic texts integrate dynamic elements such as stage settings, scenic transitions, facial expressions, gestures, makeup, props, and lighting to create a multidimensional experience. Similarly, Sugianto et al. (cited in Daira, 2020) view dramatic texts as intricately designed linguistic structures intended for theatrical enactment. Their reflective quality mimics real-life interactions through contextualized features like body language, facial cues, costumes, and sets, immersing audiences in lifelike scenarios that deepen linguistic comprehension and cultural connection. Henceforth, for these two authors, dramatic texts are seen as a representation of real life scenarios where the actors are performing daily life routines on the stage in an artistic way.

Since Drama, as a literary genre, is a reflection of real-world communicative acts and contexts, it has been considered as a unique literary genre that intensifies one's interactional and creative abilities, in the sense that dramatic texts tend to develop the EFL learner communicative and critical capacities as they are based on dialogues and scenarios similar to his real life situations. In this sense, researchers such as Boudreault (2010) and Klarer (2020) argue that the dramatic text is a fertile ground for applying pragmatics

and discourse analysis for its formula is based on conversations and authentic dialogues. Henceforth, frameworks like Speech Act Theory and implicature analysis can be applied in this type of texts to enhance its understanding by deciphering the implicit and explicit meanings conveyed. Applying these methods also help to unravel the intentions of playwrights and deepen learners' interpretive skills, aligning dramatic engagement with the nuanced realities of human communication.

Many researchers assumed that dramatic texts have many pedagogical potentials in the sense that when applied as teaching tools in the EFL classroom, they have the capacity to create authentic and communicative instances, which help both the teacher and the learner in many ways. Accordingly, Klarer (2005) and Boudreault (2010) bring out the benefits of using dramatic texts as a teaching tool:

- Enhancing EFL learners' fluency through the meaningful and purposeful interaction in the target language.
- Providing EFL learners with context-rich learning of pronunciation, prosody, vocabulary, and grammar through the different speeches, performances of the characters in the target language texts and contexts.
- Increasing EFL learners' critical thinking and stimulating creativity and independency when dealing with the literary text in general and dramatic texts in particular.
- Raising learners' self-esteem and Building self-confidence and reducing anxiety during language learning through the authentic dialogues.

Additionally, Boudreault (2010) observes that the use of dramatic texts in the EFL classroom can also serve educators, by switching them from being informative into supportive agents where role-playing activities empower learners to gain communicative competence and self-assurance. Drama, in this sense, serves as a dynamic platform for both linguistic and personal development.

Pragmatic competence as a term is used to bridge the grammatical proficiency with the functional communication. Within this framework, Chomsky conceptualized the term "pragmatic competence" as "the knowledge of conditions and manners of appropriate language use aligned with various purposes" (as cited in Rueda, 2006, p. 244). In other words, for Chomsky, the term is linked with the purposeful and appropriate use of language, which is related to specific circumstances. Contrary to grammatical competence which is concerned with the mastering of linguistic forms and meanings. Subsequent researchers such as Canale & Swain (1980); Bachman (1990) positioned pragmatic competence as a vital component to their models of communicative competence. Canale and Swain (1980), for instance, correlate pragmatic competence with sociolinguistic awareness as they emphasize the contextually

appropriate language use. Bachman, however, widens its scope to include interpreting the illocutionary intent in sociocultural contexts (as cited in Deda, 2013, p.67). Bialystok (1993) delineates pragmatic competence into three key abilities:

- **Purposeful Language Use:** The speaker's ability to adapt language for specific functions (e.g., requesting, informing, or greeting).
- **Interpretive Skills:** The listener's ability to discern underlying meanings in nuanced language use (e.g., sarcasm, indirect speech acts).
- **Discourse Coherence:** Understanding the organizational rules that structure conversation and written communication effectively.

Taguchi (2009) introduced pragmatic competence in second and foreign language learning and defines it as "the ability to use the target language appropriately in corresponding social contexts" (p. 14). In the same token, Fraser (2010) refers to pragmatic competence as "the ability to communicate intended messages with all the nuances in any socio-cultural context". Both authors explain pragmatic competence in relation to the appropriate and contextualized language use in relation to sociocultural norms. Moreover, Fraser extends its interest to the decoding of literal and implied meanings in speech. This dual focus—on production and reception—echoes Hymes' communicative competence (1972), underlining the socio-pragmatic nature of effective communication. Pragmatic competence, therefore, encompasses visible and invisible "rules" of interaction (Thomas 1983 & Croset 2003, as cited in Grossi, 2009), making it integral to navigating the complexities of human discourse.

Thomas and Leech (1983) consider pragmatic competence as two dimensions (cited in Kasper, 1992, p.6):

- **Sociopragmatics:** Concerned with social norms, roles, taboos, and context-sensitive behaviors influencing language use (Fernandez-Guerra et al., cited in Kozlova, 2006).
- **Pragmalinguistics:** Focused on the linguistic tools available for executing pragmatic functions, such as politeness forms, idiomatic expressions, and context-specific phrasings (Leech, 1983).

These complementary dimensions underline the interdependence of social and linguistic knowledge in achieving meaningful and contextually appropriate communication. In the EFL classroom, integrating both aspects provides learners with the ability to navigate language's social and functional intricacies effectively.

3. Methodological Framework: To conduct this study and accept or reject the null hypothesis, the present research opted for the experimental method to explore the relative effectiveness of the pragmatic method in analyzing dramatic texts. The same pragmatic test was given to both the experimental and control groups. A kind of analogy is made between the results of both groups to show

the difference between the pragmatic method and traditional teaching materials in analyzing the same dramatic text (i.e., Hamlet extract) using an independent T. Test sample.

The population of the study consists of second year learners in the English department at Skikda University (Algeria). Forty students from two classes were taken as the sample of this study.

3.1 Description of the Test: in this study, there are three tests. The first test which is a diagnosis test is meant to detect the forty EFL learners' pragmatic abilities before conducting the experiment. The second and the third tests are pragmatic tests which are given to both experimental and control group. These two tests have been used to test the null hypothesis which denotes that the use of pragmatic model in analyzing dramatic text does not affect EFL learners' pragmatic competence; that is, there is no significant difference between the results of both groups (experimental and control group) at the ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) level when analyzing the dramatic text. These two tests are divided into two sections in relation to six pragmatic abilities. The first ability is meant to explore whether learners are able to understand the thematic and symbolic elements. The second ability refers to grasping characterization and relationship. The third ability is about interpreting language and dialogue. The fourth ability is about contextualization. The fifth ability detects learners' critical thinking and his personal engagement. The sixth ability is meant to explore learners' understanding of literary devices and speech acts.

3.2 Pre-testing Phase

Before conducting the experiment, the researcher opted for a diagnostic test to explore learners' pragmatic abilities. Forty learners are chosen randomly to investigate their abilities before the experiment. The test is composed of three sections. The first section includes different statements to investigate learners' abilities in inferring meaning from context. The section includes three options where learners are required to tick the appropriate box in relation to the context. The second section includes different speech acts where the learners are intended to select the adequate speech act formula in relation to the context, speaker and hearer's relationships as well as their background knowledge. The third section is about a discourse completion task where the learner is intended to use the appropriate strategy when dealing with different situations and with different interlocutors.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Results of the pre test (Diagnostic Test)

The results of the pretesting phase are shown in the following table :

Table(1) : Learners' Scores in the Diagnostic Test

Abilities N. students	Ability to guess the implied meaning from context	Ability to interpret implicit Meanings in Context	Ability of Expressing and recognizing specific speech acts in context	Ability of Developing and using extended discourse strategies	Overall Score /20
One	2	4	1	0	7
Two	2	3	1	1	7
Three	2	2	2	0	6
Four	2	2	2	1	7
Five	3	2	2	2	9
Six	1	2	0	2	5
Seven	1	2	2	2	7
Eight	2	4	3	3	12
Nine	2	1	1	3	7
Ten	2	2	2	0	6
Eleven	1	0	2	1	4
Twelve	1	3	2	2	8
Thirteen	2	3	2	0	7
Fourteen	2	5	2	0	9
Fifteen	3	1	1	2	7
Sixteen	3	1	1	2	7
Seventeen	2	2	2	2	8
Eighteen	2	3	2	2	9
Nineteen	2	1	2	2	7
Twenty	2	3	1	2	8
Twenty one	2	3	0	2	7
Twenty two	2	5	1	0	8
Twenty three	1	4	2	0	7
Twenty four	2	2	1	3	8
Twenty five	2	2	1	3	8
Twenty six	2	2	1	0	5
Twenty seven	2	1	2	1	6
Twenty eight	2	1	2	2	7
Twenty nine	2	1	0	1	4
Thirty	2	2	1	0	5
Thirty one	1	4	2	5	12
Thirty two	3	3	1	2	9
Thirty three	2	3	1	1	7
Thirty four	2	3	1	4	10
Thirty five	2	2	2	2	8
Thirty six	1	2	3	2	8
Thirty seven	3	1	1	2	7
Thirty eight	1	2	0	2	5
Thirty nine	2	2	1	1	6
Forty	2	2	1	2	7
Mean scores	1.92	2.32	1.42	1.6	7.26

As the main aim of the diagnostic test is to detect learners' pragmatic awareness by giving a test composed of key pragmatic abilities such as interpreting implied meanings, producing and recognizing speech acts, drawing

conversational inference and managing discourse in various situational contexts. Results show that learners are not aware of pragmatics and pragmatic abilities and even their answers are spontaneously given referring to their background knowledge about English usage in their daily life conversations. As a matter of fact most of the abilities are not covered by the learners. However, the results of the diagnostic test give insights about learners' actual abilities and so build a solid background that will help in its turn to explore the effectiveness of the method used in analyzing literary texts in subsequent section.

4.2 Interpretation of the Diagnostic Test Results

Table (2): Results of mean scores and standard deviations of Learners in the pragmatic abilities before conducting the experiment

Pre test (diagnostic test)	N.students	Students’ abilities	Mean scores	Std deviations
	40	Ability one	1.92	0,572332161
		Ability two	2.32	1,141018438
		Ability three	1.42	0,74721706
		Ability four	1.6	1,172331
			7.26	1,73925271

As shown in table (2) after giving the forty learners the same activities that were primarily designed to detect learners' pragmatic abilities which are: guessing meaning from context, deriving implied meaning in context, recognizing and expressing the speech act appropriately and using and extending discourse strategies adequately. Results show that the mean scores in the four abilities are below the average; the first ability mean score is (1.92) with a standard deviation (0.57), the second ability, the mean score is around (2.32) with a standard deviation (1.14), the third ability, the mean is (1.42) and the standard deviation (0.74), in the fourth ability, the mean is (1.6) with a standard deviation around (1.17). These results give the insight that there is no large variability of performance among the learners, in the sense that the majority of learners have pragmatic failures when dealing with aforementioned abilities. Accordingly, results also show that the distance between the standard deviation of each ability is closer to its mean; that is, the scores are tightly clustered around the mean, and so a small standard deviation is noticed in the scores. Consequently, most learners scored similarly in the four abilities, which indicate

that learners, before conducting the experiment, are unaware neither of pragmatics nor of the pragmatic analyses when reading literary texts.

4.3 The Testing Phase

In this phase, both the control group and the experimental group have been taught the dramatic extract of Hamlet using two different teaching methods. The control group has been taught using the traditional literary techniques while the experimental group has been taught using the pragmatic method.

4.3.1 Analysis of Dramatic Test Results (Control and Experimental group)

Table 3: Results of Control Group Pragmatic Test (Dramatic text)

	Ability of understanding of thematic and symbolic elements /10			Ability to grasp characterization and relationships/10			Ability to interpret language and dialogue/10			Ability to contextualization /10			Ability to critical thinking and personal engagement /10				Understanding of literary devices and speech acts/10			Results of scores						Overall score/60
Qs	Q1	Q 4	Q 6	Q 2	Q 5	Q 6	Q 3	Q 5		Q 1			Q 5	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10			S1	S 2	S3	S 4	S 5	S6	
Qs																										
A	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	2		0			2	2	2	2	2			6	8	5	3	8	5	35
B	2	2	2	3	3	2	4	2		3			3	3	2	2	2			5	8	6	3	8	2	32
C	2	2	2	2	3	2	4	3		3			3	3	2	2	4			6	7	7	3	9	4	36
D	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	5		2			3	2	2	2	2			5	8	5	2	9	2	31
E	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	4		2			2	2	1	2	2			6	7	5	2	7	2	29
F	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	5		3			3	3	1	2	4			6	7	7	3	9	4	36
G	2	2	2	2	3	3	1	5		3			3	2	2	2	2			6	8	6	3	9	2	34
H	2	2	2	2	2	3	4	5		2			2	3	2	2	3			6	7	8	2	9	3	35
I	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	5		2			2	1	1	2	2			5	6	7	2	6	2	28
G	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	5		2			3	2	1	2	2			6	7	6	2	8	2	31
K	2	2	2	2	3	2	4	5		3			3	0	2	2	2			6	7	8	3	7	2	33
L	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	5		2			3	2	2	2	2			6	7	6	2	9	2	32
M	2	2	1	3	3	2	1	5		2			3	3	0	0	2			5	8	6	2	6	2	29
N	2	2	2	1	3	2	4	5		2			3	0	2	2	3			6	6	8	2	7	3	32
O	2	1	2	0	3	2	1	5		2			2	2	2	2	4			5	5	6	2	8	4	30
P	2	2	1	2	2	0	1	5		0			2	2	0	2	3			5	4	6	0	6	3	24
Q	2	2	2	2	3	0	1	5		0			2	0	0	2	0			6	5	6	3	4	2	26
R	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	5		0			2	0	0	2	0			6	7	6	0	4	3	26
S	2	2	2	3	2	2	1	4		0			2	3	0	0	2			6	7	5	0	5	2	25
T	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	5		2			1	1	1	1	0			5	5	6	0	4	2	22
Total 20																										.3 0. 20

Enhancing EFL Learners' Pragmatic Competence Through the Pragmatic Analysis of Drama

As shown in table (3), all the learners got the score between 5/10 and 6/10, which denotes that the majority of them lack understanding the deeper meaning of the thematic and symbolic elements as suggested by the two characters in the conversation. For instance, students fail to recognize Hamlet's implied reason why he orders Ophelia to "to get to a nunnery". Instead, they only give the literal suggestion, and so all of them choose the first option (a- he really wants her to be a nun), which is not the case.

Concerning the second ability, the majority of learners get the score between (6---8), which indicates that they are able to understand the relationship between Hamlet and Ophelia as two lovers and cousins whose relationship, however, is strained by the familial problems and Hamlet's avenging plans. However, only few of them have the score between (4—5), which means that they are aware of the type of relationship between Hamlet and Ophelia but without giving details and in-depth analysis such as the referential words that explain this relationship.

Concerning the third ability, which explores the level of understanding and interpreting language and dialogues in the conversation shows that learners have a problem in this ability as only three learners get the score 8/10, that is, they give good interpretation of the dialogue and the language of the conversation. Thirteen learners get the score between (6---7); a score which reveals the inability of learners to give details about the different meanings of the statements given though they can grasp the literal meaning. Additionally, four learners get 4/10, in this ability, and so learners of this score shows their misunderstanding and misinterpretations of the statements, in the sense that they are unable to recognize the different meanings of the statements used in the conversation.

Concerning the fourth ability, all learners show their inability to contextualize the conversation, and so the scores lie between (0---3), in that there is incorrect understanding of context as a very important factor in literary competence. Some learners attempt to define the term "context" theoretically without referring to the context of conversation.

Concerning the fifth ability, six learners get the score 9/10, that is a few of them have good critical thinking and personally engaged with the text by giving in-depth analysis and interpretation as well as personal insights about the performances of both Hamlet and Ophelia. Ten learners get the score between (6---7); a score that reveals the critical thinking and personal engagement of these learners without giving details and personal evaluation of the performances in the conversation. Four learners, however, have the score between(4---5), which shows the inadequate and missing interpretations of the characters' behaviors and reactions with each other.

Concerning the sixth ability, all learners fail to understand the literary devices and detect the number of speech acts used in the conversation. A lack in this ability denotes that learners are unaware of the characters' intentions and emotions and so they are unable neither to interpret the different intentions of the characters nor the different meanings of the language, nor so fail to understand the intentions of the whole narrative.

Table 4: Results of Experimental Group Analysis of Dramatic Test

Ability of understanding of thematic and symbolic elements /10			Ability to grasp characterization and relationships/10			Ability to interpret language and dialogue/10			Ability to contextualization /10			Ability to critical thinking and personal engagement /10				Understanding of literary devices and speech acts/10			Results scores						Overall score /60
Q1	Q4	Q6	Q2	Q5	Q6	Q3	Q5		Q1			Q5	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10			S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	
3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3		6			3	2	2	2	6			8	9	6	6	9	6	44
2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3		6			2	3	2	2	7			7	8	6	6	9	7	43
2	1	2	3	2	3	2	3		4			2	2	2	3	6			5	8	5	4	9	6	36
2	2	1	2	3	3	2	3		5			2	2	2	2	6			5	8	5	5	8	6	37
3	2	2	2	3	3	1	3		4			2	3	1	2	7			7	8	4	4	6	7	36
2	2	2	4	3	3	2	2		5			3	3	1	2	8			6	10	4	5	9	8	42
2	2	2	2	3	2	2	4		4			2	1	2	2	8			6	7	6	4	7	8	38
2	2	2	2	3	2	4	3		5			2	2	2	3	9			6	7	7	5	9	9	43
2	2	3	2	2	2	2	3		2			3	2	2	2	10			7	6	5	2	9	7	36
3	1	1	2	2	2	2	3		2			2	1	1	2	7			5	6	5	2	6	7	31
1	3	1	2	3	3	2	4		2			3	3	2	0	6			5	8	5	2	8	6	34
2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3		8			2	2	2	2	7			6	7	5	8	8	7	41
2	2	1	2	2	2	2	3		2			3	1	1	1	2			5	6	5	2	6	2	26
2	1	1	1	3	2	4	5		2			3	0	2	2	2			4	6	9	2	7	2	30
1	2	3	4	2	2	2	5		2			1	2	2	2	5			6	8	7	2	7	5	35
2	2	2	4	2	2	2	3		4			2	2	2	3	7			6	8	5	4	9	7	39
2	1	2	2	3	2	1	4		5			2	3	2	2	2			5	7	5	5	9	2	33
2	2	2	2	3	2	2	3		4			3	2	2	2	4			6	7	5	4	9	4	35
2	2	2	2	2	2	1	4		6			2	3	2	2	4			7	6	5	6	9	4	37
1	2	1	2	2	1	1	3		5			2	3	1	2	3			4	5	4	5	8	3	29
																									36,25

As shown in table (4) only one learner shows understanding of themes and symbols of Hamlet and Ophelia when interacting with each other. For instance, he selects more than one option in question six, when Ophelia says: “Oh heavenly! Restore him”. This learner shows that this statement has more than one meaning by selecting both options (b- she is praying for Hamlet’s

Enhancing EFL Learners' Pragmatic Competence Through the Pragmatic Analysis of Drama

safety) and (c- she feels pitiful to his state of mind). Additionally, eleven learners get the score between (6---7), which reveals that these learners are able to understand the themes and symbols without giving details and multilayered meanings from the statements. The score of eight learners lie between(4---5), which denotes that they are not aware of thematic and symbolic elements, especially with the gaps and missing details in the analysis.

In the second ability, learners show awareness towards Hamlet and Ophelia's relationship, and so nine of them get the score between (8---10); scores that reveal students' good comprehension and understanding of characters' relationships and dynamics. These learners consider the relationship unhealthy and paradoxical as both Hamlet and Ophelia appear emotionally confused for the problems and mistrust they feel, especially on the part of Hamlet who seems obsessed with revenge and avenging plans and that what turn him mad. Ten learners show understanding of the relationship but without giving details and in-depth analysis such as the referential words and the problems both characters are suffering from. Only one learner gets 5/10 in this ability as he is unable to grasp the type of relationship between Hamlet

As far as the third ability is concerned, only one learner is aware of the different meanings of the statements stated in the conversation and so he gets 9/10, in the sense that he selects more than one option in the first question when Hamlet orders Ophelia to get to "nunnery". He selects option (b- he wants to protect her from men's evil) and option (c- he does not want her to know anyone else). The two options explain Hamlet's intentions and emotions towards Ophelia. Five learners get the score between (6---7), which shows that they are able to basically understand the different meanings of the statements without giving in-depth analysis and thorough interpretation of the statements used in the conversation. Fourteen learners get the scores between(4---5), which means that learners show misunderstanding and many gaps in the interpretation of the statements used in the conversation.

Concerning the fourth ability, one learner get the score 8/10, which means that he understands the concept "context" and situates the conversation by giving details and interpretation. For instance, that learner gives the "palace" as the context of conversation "where a confrontation between Hamlet and Ophelia takes place". He says. He gives referential words to refer to that context. Three learners get the score 6/10, which reveals that these learners are able to contextualize the conversation without details and with some inaccuracies of some events in that context. Ten learners get the score between(4---5); a score that shows the misunderstanding of contextualizing the conversation with some gaps in the interpretation of some events and relations in the context. Six learners show inability to understand the context of the conversation by giving incorrect and superficial explanation such as "there is a

love story between Hamlet and Ophelia, Ophelia seems good but Hamlet appears aggressive.”, which is not the interpretation of the context.

Concerning the fifth ability, learners show awareness and good engagement with the conversation as fourteen learners get the score between (8---9). These learners give thorough interpretation about the characters’ performance and behavior with each other in addition to giving their personal judgments about the reaction of Hamlet with Ophelia which is described as unacceptable and does not reflect Hamlet’s social status as a noble. Besides, the learners, regarding the evaluation and lessons they learned from this confrontation mention that love is really complex but interaction and communication is the key to solve many problems in life. Six learners get the score between (6----7), which denotes that learners are able to critically engaged with the text without giving details and so lacking understanding of the characters’ intentions and mixed emotion especially on the part of Hamlet who appears suffering and angrily planning to avenge his father’s death and that what makes him lose balance and self-control while interacting with Ophelia.

As far as the sixth ability is concerned, the majority of learners show awareness towards the literary devices and speech acts used in the conversation, and so the scores in this ability lie between (6-----9) and only a few of them get the scores between (2---5). Concerning the first group of learners, three learners get the score (8---9), which means that they are able to grasp and understand the different literary devices and speech acts the characters use when they interact with each other.

Table 5: Comparison of both Control Group and Experimental Group Mean Score and Standard Deviation After Conducting the Experiment:

After the conducting the experiment	Group	N	Mean	Std deviation	T. value	df	sig
	control	20	30,30	4,118	4,143	38	0,000
	experimental	20	36,25	4,929			

After implementing the pragmatic method, the Independent Samples T-Test was conducted again to determine whether the means of the two groups significantly differed after the experiment. The descriptive statistics of each group in the sample, as it is represented in the table; the mean score of the control group is (30,30) with standard deviation (4,11) , however, the mean of the experimental group is higher than the control group (36,25) with a standard deviation(4,92). A comparison between the two groups reveals a significant improvement in the pragmatic competence of the experimental group because of

the new method of teaching the dramatic text (Hamlet’s extract). In other words, this difference in means of both groups is a strong indicator to the fact that the pragmatic method is effective in that it helps learners in the experimental group to move up their pragmatic abilities which are statistically described in the subsequent section.

Table 6: Results of the pragmatic Method on Pragmatic Abilities

Results of the dramatic text									
Pragmatic abilities	Control group				Experimental group				Mean difference
	mean	Std	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std	Minimum	Maximum	
1	1,0	0,1567	1,67	2	1,02	0,22	1,22	2,67	0,0167
2	2,2222	0,201	1,33	2,67	2,42	0,402	1,67	3,33	0,19
3	2,28	0,61	2,5	4,5	2,72	0,505	2	4,5	-0,555
4	1,75	1,11	0	2	4,15	1,725	2	8	2,4
5	1,8125	0,49	1	2,5	2,04	0,26	1,5	2,25	0,225
6	2,15	1,18210	0	4	5,8	2,22	2	10	3,65

As shown in table 6, there is a wide difference between the control group and experimental group which can be interpreted as follows:

Mean Comparison

- Abilities 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 showed improvements in the experimental group compared to the control group. Concerning the first, second abilities, the mean difference is small because even the control group is familiar with the abilities since both literature and pragmatics are concerned with the interpretation of thematic and symbolic elements and characters’ relationships in the literary text. However, the control group interprets the abilities from a literary point of view as “themes”, “figurative language” and “characters” while the experimental group interprets these abilities in relation to the two interlocutors who are interacting and performing different speech acts, most of the time implicating while speaking with each other in a particular context which is the palace.
- In Ability 3, however, there is improvement in the ability in the control group rather than the experimental though the improvement is so small this indicates that students in the control group acquired this ability

before as the main concern of literature is to work on the language and the literary devices to a wide extent as the literature teacher, in analyzing any literary text, focuses on the language of the literary piece as well the literary devices used to describe events in an artistic way.

- The greatest improvements were seen in Ability 6 (+3.65) and Ability 4 (+2.40), indicating that the pragmatic method had a strong positive effect on developing these abilities, in the sense that learners become aware of the key pragmatic concepts while reading the dramatic text as they contextualize the text events and extract the speech acts that the characters perform while interacting with each other on the stage.

Standard Deviation and Variability

- The experimental group exhibited higher variability in Abilities 4 and 6, meaning some participants improved significantly while others showed less improvement.
- The variance for Ability 6 (5.432) and Ability 4 (2.976) was much higher in the experimental group than in the control group, suggesting a wider range of performance levels.

Minimum and Maximum Values

- The maximum scores in the experimental group were significantly higher, especially for Ability 4 (8.00) and Ability 6 (10.00), compared to the control group's maximum scores (3.00 and 4.00, respectively).

The minimum scores were also slightly higher in the experimental group for certain abilities. These results show that teaching the dramatic text through the pragmatic method help learners to develop the pragmatic abilities, especially the sixth ability where learners are able to especially in relation to the speech act theory as the majority of learners give different speech act verbs and most importantly they are able to give the different classification as explained in the introductory session

4.3.2 Discussion of the Results

After investigating the effect of using a pragmatic approach to analyze a dramatic text (an extract from *Hamlet*) on participants' pragmatic competence, the study found significant progress among EFL learners in the experimental group. These learners demonstrated increased pragmatic awareness, as the majority outperformed the control group in pragmatic competence. This improvement was evident during the two instructional sessions in which the teacher applied the pragmatic method. Most learners in the experimental group answered the pragmatic test questions appropriately, drawing on key concepts introduced in the initial session—particularly speech act theory. They were able to identify various speech act verbs and classify them according to Austin and Searle's typologies.

Additionally, there was much improvements in the experimental group's pragmatic awareness after being taught the dramatic text (Hamlet's extract) using the pragmatic method with reference to six abilities which are: understanding thematic and symbolic elements, grasping characterization and relationship, interpreting language and dialogue, contextualizing, critical thinking and personal engagement and understanding and recognizing speech acts and literary devices. Results show that applying the pragmatic method in teaching dramatic text helped EFL learners to acquire some pragmatic abilities, especially in Abilities 4 and 6. This suggests that the intervention had a strong positive impact on learners' pragmatic competence.

The pragmatic gains are also evident in the minimum and maximum scores of both groups. As shown in the table, the minimum score in the experimental group is higher than that in the control group, further indicating an improvement in pragmatic awareness among the experimental group participants. This also reflects the positive impact of applying the pragmatic model in analyzing the dramatic text. Regarding the mean difference in pragmatic abilities between the two groups, the results show that students in the experimental group developed their pragmatic competence more effectively than those in the control group, as reflected in the mean score differences.

Consequently, the null hypothesis—which states that there is no significant difference between the pragmatic competence of the experimental group and the control group due to the method of teaching (pragmatic method vs. traditional method) used to analyze the dramatic text (an extract from *Hamlet*)—is rejected. The Independent Samples t-Test indicated that before the experiment, there was no significant difference between the two groups. However, following the intervention, a significant difference emerged in favor of the experimental group. Therefore, at the 0.05 significance level ($p \leq 0.05$), the null hypothesis is rejected. Based on these findings, the alternative hypothesis is supported: using the pragmatic method to analyze dramatic texts is more effective in developing EFL learners' pragmatic competence.

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to examine the effectiveness of using the pragmatic method in analyzing dramatic texts—specifically, an extract from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*—to enhance EFL learners' pragmatic competence. An independent samples t-test was employed to determine whether this method had a measurable impact on learners' ability to understand and apply key pragmatic principles. Prior to the intervention, a pragmatic test was administered to the entire sample, revealing that most learners struggled with key areas such as inferring meaning and identifying speech acts. Subsequently, participants were divided into a control group and an experimental group. The control group analyzed the *Hamlet* extract using traditional literary techniques, while the experimental group engaged in a pragmatic analysis focusing on the interaction between Hamlet and Ophelia. The results showed a significant improvement in the experimental group, particularly in the fourth and sixth pragmatic abilities—those most closely associated with pragmatic awareness. These learners outperformed their peers in both mean scores and standard deviation, indicating a meaningful development of their pragmatic competence. In sum, the findings demonstrate that applying the pragmatic method in the analysis of dramatic texts can significantly enhance EFL learners' ability to recognize and interpret pragmatic features. The development of pragmatic awareness observed in the experimental group highlights the pedagogical value of integrating pragmatics into literary analysis, especially in the EFL context.

References

- Bialystok, E. (1993). Symbolic representations and attentional control in pragmatic competence.
- In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 43–57). Oxford University Press.
- Boudreault, C. (2010). The benefits of using drama in the EFL/ESL classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 16(1). <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Boudreault-Drama.html>
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Daira, S. (2020). The significance of using literary texts in EFL classrooms. *Journal of Arabic Language Sciences and Literature*, 12(2).
- Deda, M. (2013). The role of pragmatics in English language teaching: Pragmatic competence. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(4).
<https://doi.org/10.5901/ajis.2013.v2n4p63>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Measuring implicit and explicit knowledge of a second language. In R. Ellis, L. S. Loewen, C. Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philp, & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing, and teaching* (pp. 4–27). Multilingual Matters.
- Fraser, B. (2010). Pragmatic competence: The case of hedging. In *New approaches to hedging*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Grossi, V. (2009). Teaching pragmatic competence: Compliments and compliment responses in the ESL classroom. *TESL Canada Journal*, 24(2).
- Huan, Y. (2012). Pragmatics, perceptions, and strategies in Chinese college. *English Learning Center for Learning Innovations*.
- Ionel, S. (2011). Pragmatic competence: Essential to developing business students' communicative skills. *The Bucharest Academy of Economic Studies*.

- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Longman.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL*, 11(1), 134.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. R. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Klarer, M. (2005). *An introduction to literary studies* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Kozlova, I. (2006). Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching. In A. Martínez-Flor, E.
- Usó-Juan, & A. Fernández-Guerra (Eds.), *Pragmatic competence and foreign language teaching* (pp. xxx-xxx). Universitat Jaume I. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.05.003>
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Rueda, T. Y. (2006). Developing pragmatic competence in a foreign language. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 8, 184–198. <https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085177>
- Salhi, M. (2013). The effect of instruction on the development of pragmatic competence. *International Journal of Social Science Research*, 1(2), 86–97. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijssr.v1i2.3912>
- Taguchi, N. (2009). Pragmatic competence in Japanese as a second language. In N. Taguchi (Ed.), *Pragmatic competence* (pp. 1–22). Mouton de Gruyter.

L