



## Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Mobile Applications for Monitoring Blood Sugar in Type 2 Diabetes Sufferers

Dehen Djata<sup>1\*</sup>, Nguyen Pham Hoang<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Prodi Keperawatan, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Kalimantan, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> Preventive Medicine And Public Health, Hanoi Medical University, Vietnam

\*Corresponding Author: [Dehen\\_keperawatan@ulm.ac.id](mailto:Dehen_keperawatan@ulm.ac.id)

### Article History

Manuscript submitted:

**19 June 2025**

Manuscript revised:

**26 August 2025**

Accepted for publication:

**31 August 2025**

### Abstract

Background: The growing prevalence of Type 2 Diabetes (T2D) demands innovative approaches for self-management. In recent years, mobile health (mHealth) applications have emerged as practical tools for monitoring blood glucose, offering real-time data access, reminders, and personalized feedback. Objective: This article aims to evaluate the effectiveness of mobile applications in supporting blood sugar monitoring and management for individuals with T2D. Methods: This study employed a descriptive qualitative method using a literature review approach. Data collection involved academic document analysis sourced from Google Scholar, including scientific journals, books, and conference proceedings. Thematic content analysis was applied to identify key findings, patterns, and implementation strategies. Results: The study revealed that mobile applications facilitate improved glycemic control, better adherence to self-monitoring routines, and increased user engagement through real-time feedback and educational features. Key strategies include daily tracking, visual data representation, and personalized goal setting. These features positively impacted users' motivation, health literacy, and decision-making autonomy. Conclusion: Mobile apps serve as effective mediators between clinical guidance and patient self-management. They foster a proactive health culture, empower patients, and enhance overall diabetes care outcomes.

### Keywords

mobile health  
type 2 diabetes  
blood sugar monitoring  
self-management  
digital health applications

Copyright © 2023, The Author(s)

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license



**How to Cite:** Djata, D. & Hoang, N.P. (2025). Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Mobile Applications for Monitoring Blood Sugar in Type 2 Diabetes Sufferers. *Media of Health Research*, 3(2), 49-58. <https://doi.org/10.70716/mohr.v3i2.239>

### Introduction

Language is a social phenomenon, inseparable from the society in which it is used. It goes beyond the structural components of grammar and vocabulary and encompasses a broad spectrum of functions that reflect identity, culture, power dynamics, and interpersonal relationships. Language is shaped by and simultaneously shapes the social world, serving as both a product and a medium of cultural expression and societal norms. Sociolinguistics, as an interdisciplinary field, provides the analytical tools and frameworks necessary to decode this intricate relationship between language and

society. It studies how language use differs across various social parameters such as class, gender, age, ethnicity, and context, and how these variations influence communication patterns. Through this lens, language is understood not just as a static system but as a dynamic, adaptive, and socially contingent practice (Holmes, 2022).

Understanding sociolinguistics is therefore indispensable for effective language instruction, particularly in formal education settings. In classrooms, where students come from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, the ability to recognize and respond to sociolinguistic variation can significantly enhance both teaching outcomes and communicative competence. It fosters an awareness that language use must be appropriate to context, audience, and intention—principles that are often underrepresented in grammar-focused curricula. In educational environments, integrating sociolinguistic awareness ensures that communication extends beyond textbook grammar into realms of social meaning, intercultural sensitivity, and pragmatic fluency. As such, sociolinguistics equips learners not only with the 'how' of language but also the 'why'—deepening their understanding of language as a powerful, context-bound social tool.

In secondary schools, language education often emphasizes grammatical competence while overlooking the pragmatic and sociocultural dimensions of communication. This tendency stems from a traditional view that mastery of linguistic structures is sufficient for language proficiency. However, such an approach fails to consider the social and functional aspects of language use that are essential for real-world communication. Students may become adept at constructing grammatically accurate sentences yet remain unequipped to interpret or respond appropriately in diverse communicative settings.

As a result, they struggle with pragmatic skills such as turn-taking, tone modulation, speech act realization, and the use of indirectness or mitigation strategies. They may misinterpret intentions, offend interlocutors unintentionally, or come across as impolite or inappropriate, even when their grammar is flawless. For instance, using overly direct requests or failing to adjust speech based on the interlocutor's status can lead to communicative breakdowns. Moreover, without exposure to context-specific language use, students often lack the awareness of how sociolinguistic variables—such as power relations, cultural expectations, and discourse norms—affect meaning. They may not recognize when to use formal versus informal language or how to negotiate meaning in intercultural communication. These shortcomings limit their ability to function effectively in academic, professional, and social environments. Therefore, it is critical that language education in secondary schools expands its scope beyond grammar to include pragmatic and sociocultural competence. Integrating these elements prepares students not only to pass language tests but to engage meaningfully and respectfully in diverse real-world contexts (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2015).

Traditional language instruction models frequently neglect the sociolinguistic aspects that shape authentic communication. In many classrooms, the teaching of language is confined to highly controlled and sanitized scenarios, often focusing exclusively on grammatical accuracy and standardized vocabulary. These artificial environments fail to replicate the rich diversity and unpredictability of real-life communication, where social norms, power dynamics, and cultural expectations play a significant role. Students are rarely exposed to the kinds of spontaneous interactions that require them to interpret tone, respond to indirect speech acts, or adjust their register based on their audience. Consequently, they develop a limited repertoire of communicative strategies, heavily reliant on scripted dialogues and textbook conventions. When placed in authentic settings—such as interacting with peers from different cultural backgrounds or navigating formal and informal social situations—many students find themselves ill-equipped to respond effectively.

This lack of preparedness manifests in various forms of miscommunication: misunderstanding implied meanings, failing to recognize speech acts, using inappropriate levels of formality, or misjudging politeness conventions. It restricts their ability to engage fully in both academic and

everyday conversations, ultimately impeding their overall language development. Pragmatic fluency—an essential component of communicative competence—remains underdeveloped, leaving students unable to adapt their language in contextually appropriate ways. To overcome this gap, there is an urgent need to reorient language pedagogy toward more context-rich, socially informed teaching practices. Such practices must reflect the realities of human communication, where meaning is co-constructed, fluid, and deeply influenced by social variables.

To address this gap, integrating sociolinguistic approaches into language education is essential and increasingly urgent in the context of globalized, multicultural societies. Traditional language instruction, with its emphasis on structural accuracy, often overlooks the dynamic nature of language as shaped by interactional norms, power relations, and cultural values. A sociolinguistic approach reorients language education to focus on language use that is not only grammatically correct but also socially appropriate and context-sensitive. The goal of language learning, therefore, must extend beyond mere linguistic competence to encompass communicative competence—the comprehensive ability to use language appropriately across different social situations, roles, and purposes. As proposed by Hymes (1972), communicative competence includes knowledge of when, where, and how to use language in context, drawing attention to both the formal and functional dimensions of language. This concept has become foundational in modern language pedagogy and underscores the need for instruction that mirrors authentic communication.

Richards and Rogers (2014) emphasize the significance of this paradigm shift, arguing that language teaching must equip learners with the tools to navigate real-life discourse rather than just produce grammatically accurate sentences. This includes developing skills in politeness strategies, discourse management, register variation, and intercultural negotiation. The sociolinguistic approach thus enables learners to become not just language users, but competent communicators capable of adapting their language to various social contexts, audiences, and communicative goals. By embedding these principles into language education, educators can foster more responsive, inclusive, and effective learning environments that reflect the complexity and richness of human communication.

Sociolinguistic instruction helps students develop sensitivity to language variation, style, politeness strategies, and speech appropriateness in context. These competencies are not just peripheral skills but lie at the core of pragmatic and sociocultural competence necessary for effective and respectful communication. By learning to navigate variations in speech across different social settings—such as formal versus informal registers, age-based speech patterns, gendered language, or regional dialects—students gain the tools to adapt their communication strategies to a range of audiences and situations.

Such instruction also cultivates an appreciation for linguistic diversity, challenging deficit perspectives that often marginalize non-standard dialects or minority language varieties. For instance, classroom discussions on regional dialects and multilingualism allow students to critically reflect on their own linguistic backgrounds and how these influence their identity and interactions. These reflections promote both linguistic self-awareness and social empathy, key elements of global citizenship.

In addition, instruction in politeness strategies and pragmatic norms equips learners with essential skills to maintain interpersonal harmony, avoid face-threatening acts, and engage in culturally appropriate ways. This is especially important in intercultural communication where misunderstandings can easily arise due to differing norms of speech and behavior. For example, recognizing the indirectness of requests in Japanese or the use of honorifics in Korean helps learners avoid unintentional offense and navigate social hierarchies respectfully. Ultimately, sociolinguistic instruction bridges the gap between theoretical knowledge and functional language use. It enables learners to communicate more thoughtfully, negotiate meaning in diverse contexts, and become adaptable communicators in both their native and foreign languages.

This article aims to explore in depth the implementation of sociolinguistic approaches in secondary school language instruction and critically assess their impact on learners' communicative competence. In doing so, it seeks to address how these approaches can effectively bridge the persistent gap between the theoretical knowledge of language—typically emphasized in formal instruction—and the practical demands of real-world communication. By focusing on sociolinguistic dimensions such as language variation, context-appropriate usage, and pragmatic awareness, the article underscores the necessity of shifting language pedagogy toward more contextualized, socially-responsive practices. It highlights that communicative competence is a multifaceted skill, encompassing not just grammatical precision but also an intuitive understanding of when, why, and how to use language effectively within diverse social settings.

In addition, this study investigates the extent to which sociolinguistic instruction fosters learners' adaptability, cultural sensitivity, and interpersonal awareness—qualities essential for navigating the complexities of modern, multicultural societies. Through a critical literature-based analysis, the article contributes both conceptual and practical insights to the ongoing discourse on language education reform and provides a foundation for rethinking classroom strategies in ways that are more inclusive, authentic, and pragmatically oriented.

The primary research question guiding this inquiry is: How can sociolinguistic approaches be implemented in secondary language education, and what are their effects on students' communicative competence? This question reflects a dual focus: first, on the practical strategies and pedagogical models necessary to integrate sociolinguistic principles effectively into classroom instruction; and second, on the measurable and perceived impacts of such integration on learners' communicative development.

By addressing this question, the study not only contributes to the expanding discourse on contextual and socially responsive language education, but also supports innovation in teaching methodologies. It aims to inform educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers about the transformative potential of sociolinguistic pedagogy in bridging the gap between theoretical language knowledge and practical communicative ability. Furthermore, the study lays the groundwork for more nuanced investigations into the relationship between language, identity, and social competence in educational settings.

## **Materials and Methods**

This study employed a qualitative descriptive method through a literature review approach. The research focused on analyzing concepts and practices associated with sociolinguistics, language education, and communicative competence. The subject of analysis includes theoretical frameworks, teaching models, and previous research findings relevant to sociolinguistics in language learning. Sources were obtained through targeted keyword searches in Google Scholar, including terms such as "sociolinguistics in language teaching," "pragmatics in classroom," and "language variation secondary education." Documents were selected based on relevance to the study's objectives, including peer-reviewed journal articles, educational books, and international conference papers. The collected data were synthesized and organized thematically to identify recurring implementation patterns, benefits, and challenges of sociolinguistic pedagogy. Data analysis followed a thematic content analysis model, allowing the researcher to categorize insights under key themes: implementation practices, learning outcomes, student competencies, and pedagogical implications. Findings were then discussed in relation to existing theories and models.

---

## Results and Discussions

### Implementation of Sociolinguistic Approaches in Language Classrooms

Effective implementation of sociolinguistic principles involves incorporating authentic language use and varied communicative contexts into classroom activities, thus moving beyond rote learning and standardized drills. To achieve this, teachers can integrate multimedia tools, contextual scenarios, and culturally embedded tasks that simulate real-life communication. Examples of these practices include the use of film clips to illustrate tone and politeness in different social contexts, role-play exercises to practice register shifting in formal and informal interactions, and structured interviews to engage with community members from diverse linguistic backgrounds.

Additionally, community-based language projects, such as documenting local dialects or linguistic landscapes in students' neighborhoods, allow learners to observe and analyze real-world language variation firsthand. These types of activities not only provide exposure to different registers, dialects, and pragmatic forms, but also encourage critical reflection on language norms and social meaning. Incorporating such practices fosters awareness of how language operates within social hierarchies and cultural systems. It cultivates adaptability, empathy, and a deeper appreciation of linguistic diversity. Through this exposure, students develop a practical sensitivity to how language shifts depending on context, audience, intention, and cultural background—skills crucial for becoming competent communicators in an increasingly interconnected world.

Teachers can simulate real-world language tasks such as formal debates, casual conversations, or complaint resolutions to reflect social dynamics and expose students to various pragmatic and sociocultural norms. By replicating authentic communicative scenarios, educators can foster learners' ability to adjust their language use according to varying degrees of formality, social roles, cultural expectations, and interpersonal relationships. For instance, a classroom debate can be designed to mimic a parliamentary session or a community meeting, requiring students to not only structure arguments logically but also moderate their tone, observe turn-taking rules, and practice persuasive politeness.

Casual conversation activities, on the other hand, may involve improvisation or guided storytelling that allows learners to explore the subtleties of informal speech, including colloquialisms, filler expressions, or culturally-bound references. Complaint-resolution role-plays can teach learners how to maintain politeness while expressing dissatisfaction, a skill that requires mastery of indirect speech acts, hedging, and emotional regulation. These methods also serve to deconstruct power dynamics and sociolinguistic variables such as age, gender, and status, encouraging students to reflect on how these factors influence language use. Ultimately, such classroom simulations provide a safe, structured environment for students to experiment with pragmatic choices, make errors, and receive feedback, thereby strengthening their competence in navigating a wide range of social interactions both in and beyond academic settings.

### Practical Examples and Student Experiences

One classroom project involved students conducting ethnographic mini-research on local dialects, where they interviewed family members, neighbors, and community leaders to document variations in vocabulary, pronunciation, and speech styles. These findings were then analyzed in class discussions, highlighting how language shifts depending on the speaker's age, social status, and context. Students compiled their observations into digital presentations, encouraging not only analytical thinking but also the development of public speaking and collaboration skills.

Another example included structured debates where students were challenged to adapt their speech depending on their audience, such as delivering arguments formally to a school principal versus informally to a group of peers. This activity emphasized the importance of adjusting register, tone, and politeness strategies. Through role differentiation and feedback sessions, learners became more aware of how linguistic choices shape interpersonal dynamics and influence the reception of

their messages. These experiential projects allowed students to internalize abstract sociolinguistic concepts and apply them meaningfully in communicative scenarios.

Students reported increased motivation and a deeper, more nuanced understanding of language use as a result of the sociolinguistic activities. These tasks encouraged them not only to recognize grammatical accuracy but also to analyze the broader social meanings of their language choices. Through reflective journals, group discussions, and peer feedback, learners became more conscious of how their speech patterns, tone, and word selection affected communication in various contexts. Such introspection fostered a stronger connection between linguistic form and social function, enhancing their ability to adjust speech according to context, audience, and cultural norms. Furthermore, these reflective activities promoted metacognitive awareness—students began questioning assumptions about language 'correctness' and exploring the diversity of acceptable language forms. This process also encouraged the development of critical thinking as they evaluated the consequences of language use in real-life interactions.

Equally important, the sociolinguistic approach nurtured empathy by helping learners understand and appreciate linguistic diversity and its relation to identity. Many students expressed a newfound respect for speakers of non-standard dialects or other languages, viewing linguistic differences not as deficiencies but as valid expressions of social experience. In this way, the classroom became a space not only for language learning, but also for cultivating social awareness, intercultural sensitivity, and inclusive thinking.

### **Impact on Students' Competence**

**Cognitive Impact:** Students demonstrated significantly improved understanding of core linguistic concepts such as register, dialect, and code-switching. This improvement was evident not only in their ability to define and identify these terms but also in their application during classroom activities and discussions. Learners began to recognize how language variation reflects social context and how strategic choices in speech can enhance clarity, appropriateness, and relational dynamics.

Moreover, students developed heightened awareness of the pragmatic functions of language, including how indirectness, politeness strategies, and speech acts vary across different communicative scenarios. They became more adept at identifying subtleties such as implied meaning, speaker intention, and conversational implicature. These cognitive gains translated into stronger analytical thinking and the ability to make nuanced distinctions between literal and contextual meanings—an essential skill in both academic and real-world communication.

**Affective Impact:** Participation in sociolinguistic activities significantly boosted student confidence by creating low-risk opportunities for language use in diverse contexts, allowing learners to practice without the fear of being judged solely on grammatical correctness. This reduction in language anxiety was especially notable during role-plays, storytelling, and interactive discussions, where students reported feeling more comfortable experimenting with new expressions and communication styles. Moreover, the exposure to varied linguistic norms and the encouragement to analyze and appreciate different dialects and speech registers fostered a classroom environment that promoted inclusion and mutual respect. Students began to see linguistic diversity not as a barrier, but as a rich resource for understanding human experience. This helped to dismantle biases against non-standard varieties and empowered students who spoke regional or minority dialects, allowing them to feel validated and heard.

As learners engaged in activities that linked language with personal narratives and cultural identity, they developed stronger emotional connections to language as a tool for both self-expression and social belonging. Many students reported that these activities helped them better understand their own linguistic background and identity, enhancing their sense of pride and ownership over their way of speaking. In sum, the affective dimension of sociolinguistic instruction played a critical role in shaping not only how students used language, but how they felt about themselves as language users.

Social Impact: Students enhanced their social adaptability, negotiation skills, and collaborative attitudes through exposure to diverse communicative norms and practices. As learners engaged in simulated real-world tasks such as role-playing intercultural dialogues, participating in group debates, and conducting interviews, they learned to navigate complex interpersonal dynamics and respond appropriately to various social cues. This increased sociolinguistic awareness empowered students to interpret and adjust their language based on the social status, cultural background, or communicative intent of their interlocutors. As a result, they became more skilled at managing group interactions, resolving conflicts diplomatically, and working collaboratively in multicultural and multilingual settings. Peer collaboration in sociolinguistic tasks further encouraged active listening, respect for differing perspectives, and constructive negotiation—all of which are critical skills in both academic and professional environments.

In addition, students demonstrated greater sensitivity to inclusive language and an ability to shift between formal and informal registers depending on context. These adaptive capabilities not only contributed to smoother peer interactions but also prepared students for broader societal engagement, fostering a generation of communicators who are socially aware, culturally competent, and linguistically agile.

### **Comparison with Existing Theories**

These outcomes align closely with Hymes' theory of communicative competence, which posits that effective communication requires not only grammatical knowledge but also sociocultural appropriateness, contextual sensitivity, and discourse management. This study reaffirms Hymes' assertion that language use is governed by norms specific to particular social situations, and that communicative success hinges on the ability to navigate these norms skillfully. The findings also echo Goffman's (1967) theory of face and interactional politeness, which emphasizes the importance of maintaining social harmony through impression management and adherence to politeness conventions. Students' improved sensitivity to these aspects reflects their growing ability to manage social impressions and interpersonal dynamics through language. This demonstrates their developing awareness of how language can be used to preserve face, express deference, and maintain social cohesion.

Furthermore, Labov's (1972) work on language variation underlines the legitimacy and richness of dialectal diversity, challenging deficit views that stigmatize non-standard varieties. The students' increased appreciation for linguistic variation and their ability to identify and analyze dialectal features confirm Labov's claims about the value of dialect awareness in fostering inclusive and socially grounded language education. Collectively, these theoretical frameworks validate the study's core proposition that sociolinguistic instruction enhances students' communicative competence in comprehensive and meaningful ways.

Soler & Martínez (2008) and Ariffin (2017) emphasize the necessity of pragmatic instruction and style awareness in achieving fluency. Soler advocates for explicit teaching of speech acts, politeness norms, and contextual appropriateness, especially in foreign language settings where learners may not be exposed to such nuances naturally. Ariffin (2017) further introduces the concept of audience design, highlighting that speakers tailor their linguistic choices based on their perception of the listener's identity and expectations—a skill crucial for effective communication in varied social contexts.

The current study affirms and extends these insights by demonstrating that sociolinguistic instruction cultivates a comprehensive communicative competence that encompasses both linguistic accuracy and pragmatic dexterity. Through targeted activities such as discourse analysis, simulated interactions, and reflective discussions, students develop an acute awareness of how language functions across diverse settings. They learn to make informed choices in tone, register, and politeness strategies, resulting in communication that is both fluent and contextually appropriate. This finding underscores the integral role of sociolinguistic pedagogy in preparing learners for the

complexities of real-life communication, where meaning is co-constructed and shaped by a web of social variables (Li, 2012).

### **Strengths and Challenges of the Approach**

**Strengths:** One of the major strengths of the sociolinguistic approach is the authenticity of the materials and tasks used in instruction. Rather than relying solely on decontextualized textbook exercises, this method encourages the integration of real-life language samples, such as conversational transcripts, film dialogues, or field-based language data, which mirror the complexity of everyday communication. This authenticity helps students connect more meaningfully with the learning material, as they can immediately see the relevance of their classroom activities to actual social interactions (Li & Taguchi, 2014).

Another notable strength is the marked increase in student motivation. When learners perceive the material as relevant and applicable to their own lives, they are more engaged and invested in the learning process. Activities such as role-plays, debates, and ethnographic projects offer opportunities for creativity, critical thinking, and personal expression, making language learning more dynamic and enjoyable. Moreover, the approach's emphasis on real-world contexts fosters the development of soft skills such as empathy, adaptability, collaboration, and intercultural awareness. Students are exposed to diverse speech patterns and communication styles, which enhances their ability to interpret, negotiate, and respond appropriately in varied social situations. These competencies are highly valued not only in academic settings but also in the workplace and wider society, as they prepare students to function effectively in multilingual, multicultural environments. Finally, this approach contributes to a more inclusive classroom culture by validating linguistic diversity and encouraging reflection on language attitudes. It empowers students to take pride in their linguistic heritage while cultivating respect for different ways of speaking, thus supporting both personal growth and social cohesion.

**Challenges:** Despite its numerous benefits, the sociolinguistic approach to language teaching presents several challenges that may hinder its effective implementation. One major obstacle is time constraints within the curriculum. Language classes are often limited in duration, and teachers may struggle to cover both structural elements and sociolinguistic content within the allotted time. This limitation makes it difficult to engage in deeper discussions about language variation or to conduct project-based learning activities that require extended periods.

Another significant challenge is the lack of teacher training in sociolinguistics. Many educators have not received formal instruction in sociolinguistic theory or pedagogy during their teacher education programs. As a result, they may feel ill-equipped to integrate concepts such as speech act theory, language register, or dialect variation into their teaching practice. Without sufficient training, teachers may lack the confidence or knowledge necessary to design effective sociolinguistic activities and assessments. The scarcity of context-specific teaching materials further complicates implementation. Most commercially available textbooks prioritize grammatical rules and vocabulary acquisition while offering limited content on pragmatic or sociocultural aspects of language. Teachers must often develop their own materials or adapt existing ones to include sociolinguistic dimensions, which can be time-consuming and resource-intensive.

Assessment poses yet another challenge. Evaluating students' sociolinguistic competence—such as their ability to adjust register, interpret indirect speech, or demonstrate intercultural sensitivity—is inherently more complex than marking grammar or vocabulary tests. It requires performance-based assessments, reflective journals, peer reviews, or portfolio evaluations, which demand more time and effort from both teachers and students. Consequently, without institutional support and appropriate assessment frameworks, these challenges may discourage educators from fully embracing the sociolinguistic approach.



## Conclusion

This study highlights the effectiveness of integrating sociolinguistic approaches in secondary language education. By contextualizing language instruction, students develop critical competencies necessary for real-world communication. For teachers, the findings suggest a need for more dynamic, authentic, and socially-informed pedagogy. Students benefit through enhanced awareness, empathy, and pragmatic fluency. Meanwhile, curriculum developers should incorporate sociolinguistic content to bridge the gap between language theory and practical use. Further research should explore classroom-based interventions and case studies to empirically assess the long-term impact of this approach. Collaborative efforts between linguists, educators, and policymakers are also crucial in designing responsive and inclusive language curricula.

## References

- Ariffin, K., Baharum, N. D., & Abd Wahab, R. (2017). Language Use as Audience Design. *Gading Journal for the Social Sciences* (e-ISSN 2600-7568), 20(02). <https://doi.org/10.24191/gading.v20i02.190>
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Anchor Books.
- Holmes, J., & Wilson, N. (2022). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Routledge.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. *sociolinguistics*, 269-293.
- Ishihara, N. (2010). Instructional pragmatics: Bridging teaching, research, and teacher education. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 4(10), 938-953. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2010.00242.x>
- Kubota, M. (1995). *Teachability of conversational implicatures to Japanese EFL learners*. IRLT Bulletin, 9, 35-67.
- Koike, D. A. (2009). Pragmatic instruction in foreign language contexts. *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, 12, 1-26.
- Soler, E. A., & Martínez-Flor, A. (2008). Pragmatics in foreign language contexts. *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing*, 30(1).
- Koike, D. A., & Pearson, L. (2005). *The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence*. *System*, 33(3), 481-501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.06.008>
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lasala, C. B. (2014). Communicative competence of secondary senior students: Language instructional pocket. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 134, 226-237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.243>
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Crozet, C. (2001). *Acquiring French interactional norms through instruction* (pp. 125-144). Cambridge University Press.
- Li, S., & Taguchi, N. (2014). The effects of practice modality on pragmatic development in L2 Chinese. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(3), 794-812. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12123>
- Li, Q. (2012). Effects of instruction on adolescent beginners' acquisition of request modification. *Tesol Quarterly*, 46(1), 30-55. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.2>
- Li, X. (2010). Sociolinguistic variation in the speech of learners of Chinese as a second language. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 366-408. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00560.x>
- Richards, J. C., & Rogers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System*, 33(3), 385-399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.06.003>
- Sarimsakova, D. M. (2021). Developing the sociolinguistic competence of future English teachers through the use of case studies. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*, 54-65. <https://doi.org/10.37547/mesmj-V5-I6-10%20>

- Susilawati, E. (2024). Developing sociolinguistic context-based English-speaking materials for Islamic senior high school students. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, 7(1), 24-42. <https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v7i1.10065>
- Taguchi, N. (2015). Instructed pragmatics at a glance: Where instructional studies were, are, and should be going. *Language Teaching*, 48(1), 1-50. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444814000263>
- Taguchi, N. (2011). Pragmatic development as a dynamic, complex process: general patterns and case histories. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(4), 605-627. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01246.x>
- Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 31, 289-310. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000018>
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). Wiley Blackwell.