Comprehensive Journal of Science
Volume (10), Issue (39), (March, 2026)
ISSN: 3014-6266

مجلة العلوم الشاملة
المجلد (10) العدد 39 مارس 2026
ردمد: 3014-6266

التباين البراغماتي في الخطاب الأكاديمي الليبي باللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية: دراسة وصفية قائمة على مدونة لغوية للمعنى السياقي

نوال محمد عياد السائح
كلية التربية- العجيلات -جامعة الزاوية
n.asayh@zu.edu.ly
سهام عمران عاشور
كلية التربية -العجيلات-جامعة الزاوية
si.omran@zu.edu.ly

Pragmatic Variation in Libyan Academic Discourse in English as a Foreign Language: A Descriptive Study Based on a Linguistic Corpus of Contextual Meaning

Nawal Mohamed Ayad Al-Sayeh
Faculty of Education - Al-Ajilat - University of Zawiya
Siham Omran Ashour
Faculty of Education - Al-Ajilat - University of Zawiya

تاريخ الاستلام:2026/01/01 –تاريخ المراجعة: 2026/01/25– تاريخ القبول: 2026/02/05– تاريخ للنشر:25/02/ 2026

الملخص باللغة العربية:

تهدف هذه الدراسة الوصفية القائمة على تحليلات من كوربوس إلى استكشاف التباينات البراغماتية في اللغة الإنجليزية الأكاديمية المستخدمة من قبل دارسي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في ليبيا. تركز الدراسة على المعنى السياقي عبر تحليل نماذج من كتابات الطلاب وتفاعلاتهم الأكاديمية المنطوقة. تكشف النتائج عن أن المتعلمين الليبيين غالباً ما يستخدمون ميزات براغماتية مثل أجهزة التحفّظ وعلامات التعابير الفوق نصية وتباينات الأفعال الكلامية، بطرق تختلف عن المعايير الأكاديمية الأصلية، مما يعكس تأثير اللغة الأولى وسياق التعلم. تشير النتائج إلى ضرورة تعزيز تعليم الكفاءة البراغماتية في المناهج التعليمية الليبية، خصوصاً في السياقات الأكاديمية التي يتحدد فيها المعنى من خلال السياق الاجتماعي والتواصل. تسهم هذه الدراسة في فهم أعمق لكيفية تأثير السياق على المعنى في خطاب اللغة الإنجليزية الأكاديمي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الخطاب الأكاديمي للمتعلمين، التباين البراغماتي، المعنى السياقي، دراسة قائمة على الكوربوس، الدارسون الليبيون.

Abstract

This descriptive corpus-based study investigates how pragmatic variation appears in academic English used by Libyan English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. Focusing on contextual meaning, the research examines patterns of language use that convey social and communicative functions beyond grammatical accuracy. By analysing a compiled corpus of student writing and spoken academic interactions, this study identifies frequent pragmatic features such as hedging, metadiscourse marking, and speech act variation. The findings demonstrate that Libyan EFL writers often adopt pragmatic patterns that diverge from native academic norms, reflecting influences of first language sociopragmatic frameworks and educational context. These results highlight the need for pedagogical emphasis on pragmatic competence in EFL instruction in Libya, particularly in academic settings where contextual meaning conveys disciplinary and interpersonal meaning. The research contributes to a better understanding of

how context shapes meaning in EFL academic discourse and supports curriculum development geared towards communicative competence.

Keywords: EFL academic discourse, pragmatic variation, contextual meaning, corpus-based study, Libyan learners

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of the Study

In recent decades, research in applied linguistics has moved beyond grammatical accuracy to examine how language is used appropriately in context. This shift has placed pragmatics at the centre of second and foreign language research, particularly in academic settings where meaning is often implicit and socially negotiated. Pragmatics focuses on how speakers and writers convey intended meaning in relation to context, audience, and purpose, rather than relying solely on literal linguistic forms (Taguchi, 2021).

Academic discourse represents a highly conventionalised form of language use. Writers are expected to position their claims carefully, show awareness of disciplinary norms, and manage interpersonal relations with readers through pragmatic choices such as hedging, stance markers, and metadiscourse devices (Hyland, 2022). For learners of English as a Foreign Language, mastering these pragmatic conventions is often more challenging than learning grammatical rules, especially when exposure to authentic academic English is limited.

In the Libyan context, English is taught primarily as a foreign language within formal educational institutions. Most learners encounter English mainly through textbooks and classroom instruction, with limited opportunities for natural academic interaction in English. As a result, Libyan EFL students often develop strong awareness of grammatical forms but face difficulties in using language pragmatically in academic writing and spoken discourse. These difficulties may appear in how arguments are framed, how certainty and caution are expressed, and how writers engage with their readers.

Corpus-based research offers an effective descriptive approach for examining such pragmatic variation. By analysing naturally occurring texts, corpus linguistics allows researchers to identify recurring patterns of language use and relate them to contextual factors such as culture, educational practices, and disciplinary norms (Biber, Conrad, and Reppen, 2021). When applied to pragmatics, corpus analysis provides empirical evidence of how meaning is constructed in real academic discourse rather than relying on intuition or isolated examples.

This study situates itself within this research tradition by descriptively analysing pragmatic variation in Libyan EFL academic discourse. It focuses on contextual meaning as realised through recurring pragmatic features in learner-produced academic texts.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Despite the growing emphasis on communicative competence in EFL pedagogy, pragmatic competence remains underrepresented in many Libyan English language curricula. Academic writing courses often prioritise structure, grammar, and vocabulary, while pragmatic aspects such as stance, politeness, and reader engagement receive limited explicit instruction.

As a result, Libyan EFL students may produce texts that are linguistically accurate but pragmatically marked when compared with established academic norms. Such variation does not necessarily indicate deficiency, but rather reflects the influence of first language pragmatics, local academic traditions, and instructional practices. However, without systematic description, these pragmatic patterns remain underexplored and are often misinterpreted as simple errors.

There is a clear need for descriptive, data-driven research that documents how Libyan EFL learners actually use pragmatic resources in academic contexts. Addressing this gap can provide a more balanced understanding of learner language and inform pedagogical practices grounded in empirical evidence rather than prescriptive assumptions.

1.3. Aim of the Study

The main aim of this study is to describe pragmatic variation in Libyan EFL academic discourse through a corpus-based analysis of contextual meaning. Rather than evaluating learner language against native norms, the study seeks to document and explain patterns of pragmatic use as they naturally occur in academic settings.

1.4. Research Objectives

The study pursues the following objectives:

1. To identify common pragmatic features used in Libyan EFL academic discourse.
2. To describe how contextual meaning is constructed through these pragmatic features.
3. To examine patterns of variation in relation to academic communicative purposes.
4. To contribute descriptive evidence that can support EFL academic instruction in Libya.

1.5. Research Questions

This descriptive study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What pragmatic features are most frequently used in Libyan EFL academic discourse?
2. How do these features contribute to the construction of contextual meaning?
3. In what ways does pragmatic use vary within academic contexts produced by Libyan EFL learners?

1.6. Significance of the Study

This study holds significance at both theoretical and pedagogical levels. From a theoretical perspective, it contributes to the growing body of research on interlanguage pragmatics by providing empirical data from an underrepresented EFL context. Libyan learner discourse remains relatively unexplored in corpus-based pragmatic research, particularly in academic settings.

Pedagogically, the findings can inform EFL curriculum design and academic writing instruction in Libyan universities. By highlighting actual patterns of pragmatic use, educators can move beyond surface-level correction and develop instructional strategies that raise learners' awareness of contextual meaning and academic interaction. This aligns with recent calls for integrating pragmatics more explicitly into EFL instruction (Ishihara and Cohen, 2022).

1.7. Scope and Delimitation

- **Scope:** The study focuses on academic discourse produced by Libyan EFL learners, including both written assignments and recorded spoken presentations from university courses.
- **Delimitation:** The study does not examine informal conversational English or language use outside academic contexts. It also focuses on descriptive analysis rather than evaluating learner proficiency or instructional outcomes.

1.8. Key Terminology

- **Pragmatics:** The study of how context influences the interpretation of meaning in language (Taguchi, 2021).
- **Pragmatic variation:** Differences in the use of pragmatic features such as hedges, politeness strategies, and speech acts across learners or contexts.
- **Contextual meaning:** The meaning derived from the interaction between language and the social, cultural, or academic situation in which it is used.
- **Corpus-based study:** Research methodology that uses systematically collected collections of authentic texts to identify patterns of language use (Biber et al., 2021).
- **Hedging:** The use of linguistic devices to express caution or uncertainty (Hyland, 2022).

- **Metadiscourse:** Language used to guide the reader through the text or comment on the writer's stance (Hyland, 2022).
- **EFL (English as a Foreign Language):** Learning English in a context where it is not the primary language of communication.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews relevant literature on pragmatic variation, corpus-based studies in academic discourse, and the specific challenges faced by Libyan EFL learners. The review is organized into three main sections: (1) Pragmatic variation in academic English, (2) Corpus-based approaches to pragmatics, and (3) Contextual challenges in Libyan EFL settings. The theoretical framework underpinning the study is also presented to guide the descriptive analysis.

2.2. Pragmatic Variation in Academic English

Pragmatic variation refers to differences in how language is used to perform communicative functions across speakers, contexts, and cultures (Taguchi, 2021). In academic discourse, variation often appears in the form of hedging, metadiscourse, speech acts, and politeness strategies.

- **Hedging** allows writers to present claims cautiously and avoid overgeneralization. For example, expressions like "may suggest," "it seems that," or "possibly" help writers manage uncertainty (Hyland, 2022). Studies have shown that EFL learners often underuse hedges compared to native speakers, which can make their arguments appear overly assertive or blunt.
- **Metadiscourse** guides the reader through the text and reflects the writer's stance. It includes transitions, frame markers, and engagement markers (Hyland, 2022). Proper use of metadiscourse is essential for coherence and reader orientation in academic writing.
- **Speech acts** such as requests, suggestions, or acknowledgments can vary across cultures. Learners' first language often influences their choice of politeness strategies, leading to pragmatic patterns that diverge from target norms (Taguchi, 2021).

In sum, pragmatic variation is a natural feature of learner language, reflecting both linguistic knowledge and sociocultural influences. Documenting these patterns is crucial for understanding how learners construct contextual meaning in academic discourse.

2.3. Corpus-Based Approaches to Pragmatics

Corpus-based research provides empirical evidence of language use by analyzing large collections of authentic texts. This approach enables researchers to identify frequent pragmatic features, patterns, and variations across contexts (Biber, Conrad, & Reppen, 2021).

- **Descriptive corpus studies** examine naturally occurring texts to highlight learner tendencies without imposing normative judgments.
- **Frequency analysis** allows researchers to identify which hedges, metadiscourse markers, or speech acts are most common among learners.
- **Contextual analysis** helps link language patterns to communicative functions, revealing how learners negotiate meaning within academic interactions (Mauranen, 2021).

Recent studies in EFL contexts have successfully used corpus-based methods to document pragmatic variation. For instance, research in Middle Eastern universities shows that students frequently adopt first-language pragmatic patterns in English academic writing, which may affect hedging, politeness, and engagement strategies (Al-Zahrani, 2020).

2.4. Challenges in Libyan EFL Academic Discourse

Libyan EFL learners face specific sociocultural and educational challenges that influence pragmatic variation:

1. **Limited exposure to authentic English**: Most students interact with English primarily in the classroom, reducing opportunities to observe or practice native academic conventions.
2. **First language influence**: Arabic, as the learners' first language, has distinct sociopragmatic norms that shape politeness strategies, indirectness, and hedging patterns (Al-Abdulkareem, 2021).
3. **Curricular constraints**: Libyan university curricula focus heavily on grammar and vocabulary, with limited emphasis on pragmatic instruction or corpus-informed learning activities.

These factors contribute to pragmatic patterns that differ from native norms but are internally systematic within the Libyan EFL context. Understanding these patterns is critical for developing targeted pedagogical strategies.

2.5. Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP), which examines how language learners develop pragmatic competence in a second or foreign language (Taguchi, 2021). ILP emphasizes:

- The role of learner input and exposure in shaping pragmatic forms.
- The influence of first language sociopragmatic rules on learner language.
- The importance of contextual factors in shaping how learners express meaning and perform speech acts.

By applying ILP in a corpus-based descriptive study, this research documents patterns of pragmatic variation without evaluating learners against native speaker norms. The framework highlights that variation is a natural part of language acquisition shaped by cognitive, cultural, and educational contexts.

2.6. Summary

This chapter has reviewed literature on pragmatic variation, corpus-based approaches, and the Libyan EFL context. It established the theoretical foundation of Interlanguage Pragmatics to guide the study. The review shows that Libyan learners are likely to exhibit systematic pragmatic patterns that differ from native norms due to L1 influence, classroom exposure, and sociocultural factors. A corpus-based descriptive approach is therefore appropriate for analyzing these patterns and understanding how contextual meaning is constructed.

3. Methodology

3.1. Introduction

This chapter outlines the research design, methodology, data collection procedures, and analysis methods used to investigate pragmatic variation in Libyan EFL academic discourse. The study adopts a descriptive corpus-based approach, focusing on naturally occurring learner texts and spoken academic interactions. Ethical considerations and the delimitation of the study are also addressed.

3.2. Research Design

A descriptive research design was employed to systematically document pragmatic features without attempting to manipulate variables or measure causal effects. Descriptive research is appropriate for this study because the aim is to identify and describe patterns of pragmatic variation as they naturally occur in learner-produced academic discourse (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The research is corpus-based, using a collection of written and spoken academic texts produced by Libyan university students. Corpus-based methodology allows for empirical analysis of frequency, distribution, and contextual use of pragmatic features, providing robust evidence of interlanguage patterns (Biber, Conrad, & Reppen, 2021).

3.3. Participants

The participants were fifty Libyan undergraduate students enrolled in English language programs at two universities in Tripoli. Participants were selected using purposive sampling based on their enrollment in academic writing and presentation courses. All participants were aged between 19 and 24 years, had at least six years of formal English instruction, and represented a range of academic majors including linguistics, education, and sciences.

Participation was voluntary, and all students provided informed consent for their written assignments and recorded presentations to be used in the study.

3.4. Corpus Compilation

The corpus for this study consisted of:

1. **Written texts**: 120 academic essays, reports, and assignments produced during the 2024–2025 academic year. Each text ranged between 800–1,200 words.
2. **Spoken texts**: 40 recorded student presentations (8–12 minutes each), transcribed verbatim.

The corpus was carefully anonymized to ensure participant confidentiality, and all data were stored securely in password-protected files.

3.5. Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected in three steps:

1. **Obtaining consent**: Students were informed about the purpose of the study, confidentiality procedures, and the voluntary nature of participation.
2. **Gathering written texts**: Essays and assignments were collected from course submissions with instructor permission.
3. **Recording spoken interactions**: Student presentations were recorded during classroom sessions using a high-quality digital recorder. Transcriptions followed standard conventions, including noting pauses and repetitions relevant to pragmatic analysis.

3.6. Data Analysis Procedures

The study focused on descriptive analysis of pragmatic features in learner texts. Analysis included the following steps:

1. **Identification of pragmatic features**: Hedging expressions, metadiscourse markers, and speech acts were systematically identified using established criteria from Hyland (2022) and Taguchi (2021).
2. **Frequency analysis**: The occurrence of each pragmatic feature was counted to identify patterns across the corpus.
3. **Contextual analysis**: Each instance was examined to determine how it contributed to **contextual meaning** within the academic discourse, including interpersonal, evaluative, and informational functions.
4. **Comparative observations**: Patterns were compared across written and spoken texts to detect similarities and variations in pragmatic use.

All analysis was descriptive, avoiding normative judgments about correctness, and focused on documenting learner strategies and tendencies.

3.7. Ethical Considerations

Ethical procedures were strictly followed:

- Participation was voluntary, with informed consent obtained.
- All personal identifiers were removed to maintain confidentiality.
- Students were assured that their academic evaluations would not be affected by participation.

- Data were securely stored and used exclusively for research purposes.

These procedures align with established ethical standards in applied linguistics research (Dörnyei, 2020).

3.8. Delimitation of the Study

- The study is limited to Libyan undergraduate EFL students and does not generalize to other populations.
- Only academic discourse (essays, reports, and presentations) was analyzed; casual or informal English was excluded.
- The study is descriptive and does not attempt to measure learner proficiency gains or pedagogical effectiveness.

3.9. Summary

Chapter Three presented the methodology for this descriptive corpus-based study. The research design, participant profile, corpus compilation, data collection procedures, and analysis methods were detailed. Ethical considerations and study delimitations were also addressed. The chosen approach allows systematic documentation of pragmatic variation in Libyan EFL academic discourse and provides a robust basis for the subsequent analysis presented in Chapter Four.

4. Results and Analysis

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the corpus-based analysis of Libyan EFL academic discourse. The focus is on descriptive patterns of pragmatic variation in written essays, reports, and spoken presentations. Analysis is structured around three main categories of pragmatic features: hedging, metadiscourse, and speech acts. Frequency counts, examples from the corpus, and contextual interpretations are provided to demonstrate how Libyan learners construct meaning in academic contexts.

4.2. Hedging in Libyan EFL Academic Discourse

Hedging is a key pragmatic device in academic writing that allows writers to express caution, uncertainty, or tentativeness (Hyland, 2022). In the corpus, hedging occurred frequently in both written and spoken texts but varied in form and frequency compared to standard academic norms.

Table 4.1: Frequency of Hedging Expressions in Written and Spoken Texts

Hedging Type	**Written Essays (N=120)**	**Spoken Presentations (N=40)**	**Total Frequency**	**Example from Corpus**
Modal verbs (may, might, could)	145	50	195	"This result may indicate a trend…"
Lexical hedges (possibly, perhaps)	98	35	133	"It is possibly due to cultural factors…"
Introductory phrases (it seems that, it appears)	72	28	100	"It seems that students prefer this method…"

Observations:

- Modal verbs were the most frequent hedging devices, often overused in spoken presentations.
- Lexical hedges were less common but showed learners' awareness of cautionary expression.
- Phrases like *it seems that* were used inconsistently, sometimes creating ambiguity.

- Overall, hedging patterns reflected L1 influence, as students frequently applied direct equivalents from Arabic that do not match standard English academic conventions (Al-Abdulkareem, 2021).

4.3. Metadiscourse in Written and Spoken Texts

Metadiscourse refers to linguistic elements that guide the reader or listener and indicate the writer's stance or organizational structure (Hyland, 2022).

Table 4.2: Frequency of Metadiscourse Markers

Metadiscourse Type	**Written Essays**	**Spoken Presentations**	**Total Frequency**	**Example from Corpus**
Transitions (however, therefore)	220	60	280	"Therefore, the results support the hypothesis…"
Frame markers (in conclusion, to summarize)	85	30	115	"In conclusion, the study confirms…"
Engagement markers (note that, it should be noted)	40	12	52	"Note that the survey included 100 participants…"

Observations:

- Transitions were the most frequently used metadiscourse devices, showing learners' effort to maintain cohesion.
- Frame markers were less common, suggesting limited explicit awareness of text structuring conventions.
- Engagement markers were rarely used, particularly in spoken discourse, indicating that learners focused more on content than on interaction with the audience.

4.4. Speech Acts in Academic Discourse

Speech acts are actions performed through language, such as stating, suggesting, or requesting (Taguchi, 2021). In the corpus, common speech acts included stating facts, making suggestions, and providing justifications.

Table 4.3: Frequency of Speech Acts

Speech Act	**Written Essays**	**Spoken Presentations**	**Total Frequency**	**Example from Corpus**
Stating	310	120	430	"The data shows a significant difference…"
Suggesting	90	45	135	"It is recommended that future studies include…"
Justifying	70	25	95	"This approach is valid because it accounts for…"

Observations:

- Learners frequently used statements but were less consistent in justifying claims or making nuanced suggestions.
- Suggestive forms often mirrored direct Arabic structures, occasionally producing pragmatically unusual expressions in English.
- Overall, speech acts reveal that learners attempt to fulfill academic functions but often rely on first-language pragmatic patterns.

4.5. Comparative Analysis: Written vs Spoken Academic Discourse

Analysis of pragmatic variation across modalities reveals some consistent patterns:

1. **Hedging**: More frequent in written essays than in spoken presentations, likely due to more time for reflection in writing.
2. **Metadiscourse**: Written texts contained more structural markers (transitions, frame markers), while spoken presentations relied more on content delivery than audience engagement.
3. **Speech acts**: Spoken discourse showed more interactive features (questions, clarifications) but less formal justification of claims.

These findings suggest that contextual constraints and modality influence pragmatic choices among Libyan EFL learners.

4.6. Discussion

The descriptive results demonstrate that Libyan EFL learners exhibit systematic pragmatic variation shaped by L1 influence, limited exposure to authentic academic discourse, and educational practices. Key observations include:

- Hedging is used but not always strategically, reflecting partial awareness of cautious expression.
- Metadiscourse markers are employed primarily for cohesion, but interactive engagement is underrepresented.
- Speech acts are often performed directly, showing L1 transfer in academic interactions.

These patterns align with previous research in Middle Eastern EFL contexts, which highlights the importance of explicit instruction in pragmatics for improving learner awareness of contextual meaning (Al-Zahrani, 2020; Ishihara & Cohen, 2022).

4.7. Summary

Chapter Four presented the descriptive analysis of pragmatic variation in Libyan EFL academic discourse. Hedging, metadiscourse, and speech acts were analyzed across written and spoken texts, revealing systematic patterns influenced by L1, modality, and educational context. The findings provide a detailed picture of how Libyan learners construct contextual meaning and offer a foundation for pedagogical recommendations in Chapter Five.

5. Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

5.1. Introduction

This chapter summarizes the key findings of the study, draws conclusions regarding pragmatic variation in Libyan EFL academic discourse, and provides pedagogical recommendations. The chapter concludes with suggestions for future research.

5.2. Summary of Key Findings

The descriptive corpus-based analysis in Chapter Four revealed systematic patterns of pragmatic variation among Libyan EFL learners:

1. **Hedging**: Learners frequently used modal verbs (may, might, could) and lexical hedges (possibly, perhaps), with greater frequency in written texts. However, strategic use was inconsistent, and some forms reflected direct L1 transfer from Arabic.
2. **Metadiscourse**: Transitions and frame markers were employed primarily for cohesion. Engagement markers were rare, particularly in spoken presentations, indicating limited interactive awareness.
3. **Speech Acts**: Stating facts was the most common speech act, while justifying claims and making suggestions were less frequent. Spoken discourse included more interactive speech acts but fewer structured justifications than written texts.
4. **Modality Differences**: Written discourse exhibited more hedging and structural markers, whereas spoken discourse emphasized immediate content delivery with limited hedging and metadiscourse.

Overall, Libyan EFL learners demonstrated contextually influenced pragmatic patterns, shaped by L1 sociopragmatic norms, limited exposure to authentic English academic discourse, and educational practices focused on grammatical accuracy rather than pragmatic competence.

5.3. Conclusion

This study concludes that:

- Pragmatic competence is a distinct component of communicative ability that Libyan learners develop differently from grammatical competence.
- Pragmatic variation is systematic, not random. Patterns of hedging, metadiscourse, and speech acts reflect both learner strategies and cultural influences.
- Modality matters: written and spoken academic discourse show complementary but distinct pragmatic tendencies.
- Pedagogical focus on pragmatics is essential for developing learner ability to convey contextual meaning and participate effectively in academic discourse.

These findings align with prior research in interlanguage pragmatics, emphasizing that descriptive analysis of learner language provides valuable insight into contextualized meaning-making (Taguchi, 2021; Ishihara & Cohen, 2022).

5.4. Pedagogical Implications

Based on the findings, the study offers the following recommendations for EFL teaching in Libya:

1. **Integrate Pragmatic Instruction into Academic Writing Courses**: Explicit teaching of hedging, metadiscourse, and speech acts can help learners produce contextually appropriate texts. Teachers can provide authentic examples from academic corpora and encourage learners to analyze and practice these features.
2. **Raise Awareness of Modality Differences**: Instructors should highlight how written and spoken discourse differ in pragmatic expectations. Exercises can include comparing essay excerpts with recorded presentations to demonstrate appropriate hedging, transitions, and engagement strategies.
3. **Encourage Corpus-Based Activities**: Learners can examine corpora of native and non-native academic texts to identify common pragmatic patterns and reflect on their own usage. This approach supports inductive learning of pragmatic norms.
4. **Promote Interactive Practice**: In classroom presentations and group discussions, learners can practice using engagement markers, polite suggestions, and justifications to enhance spoken academic interaction.
5. **Address L1 Transfer Explicitly**: Awareness-raising activities can help learners recognize when Arabic pragmatic patterns may influence English usage and guide them toward contextually appropriate alternatives.

5.5. Limitations of the Study

- The study was limited to undergraduate students in Tripoli and may not generalize to other regions or proficiency levels.
- Only academic discourse was analyzed; informal or professional English contexts were excluded.
- The study was descriptive; it did not measure improvement in learner pragmatics over time.

5.6. Recommendations for Future Research

1. Conduct longitudinal studies to track the development of pragmatic competence among Libyan EFL learners.
2. Investigate teacher perceptions of pragmatic instruction and its integration into EFL curricula.

3. Expand corpus-based analysis to include graduate-level students and professional discourse for broader generalization.
4. Explore the impact of technology-assisted corpus tools in teaching pragmatics in Libyan EFL classrooms.

At the end, this study has provided a descriptive account of pragmatic variation in Libyan EFL academic discourse. Learners demonstrate systematic patterns in hedging, metadiscourse, and speech acts, shaped by L1 influence, educational exposure, and modality. The findings highlight the importance of integrating pragmatic instruction into EFL curricula to develop learners' ability to convey contextual meaning effectively. By focusing on real learner language and context, the study contributes to understanding how Libyan students navigate the complex interplay of language, culture, and academic norms.

References

Al-Abdulkareem, A. (2021). Sociopragmatic transfer in EFL writing: Evidence from Arabic-speaking learners. *Journal of Pragmatics, 182*, 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.03.002

Al-Zahrani, S. (2020). Investigating pragmatic markers in EFL academic writing: A corpus-based study. *Arab World English Journal, 11*(2), 45–60. https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no2.4

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (2021). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108677910

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198845200.001.0001

Hyland, K. (2022). *English for academic purposes: Research and teaching implications*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003184278

Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2022). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003102647

Mauranen, A. (2021). *Exploring academic English: Linguistic research and applications*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.90

Taguchi, N. (2021). The pragmatics of second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 41*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719052100003X