

ADOPTING PRAGMATIC COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES BY UNIVERSITY LECTURERS FOR EFFECTIVE ENGAGEMENT WITH GEN Z STUDENTS

Chijioke Edward (Ph. D) and Tyokor Emmanuel Tor

Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Godfrey Okoye University, Thinkers Corner, Emene, Enugu State.

Abstract: This paper examines the adoption of pragmatic communication strategies by university lecturers for effective engagement with Generation Z students in higher education. Grounded in pragmatic theory, the study explores how classroom discourse functions as a site of meaning negotiation shaped by speech acts, relevance, and politeness. It argues that traditional lecturer-centered communication often creates gaps in interaction due to misalignment with the communicative expectations of Generation Z learners, who prioritize clarity, immediacy, and contextual relevance. Drawing on a critical review of existing literature, the paper identifies key sources of pragmatic breakdown, including misinterpreted instructional intent, lack of relevance, and rigid power dynamics in lecturer–student interaction. It further proposes pragmatic communication strategies such as the use of context-sensitive speech acts, relevance-driven instruction, politeness and relational awareness, and multimodal engagement techniques. The paper demonstrates conceptually that effective teaching in contemporary classrooms requires not only content expertise but also communicative adaptability. It concludes that integrating pragmatic competence into pedagogical practice can enhance student participation, understanding, and overall learning outcomes. The study contributes to the intersection of linguistics and pedagogy by foregrounding communication as a central element of teaching effectiveness in the Gen Z classroom.

Keywords: Pragmatics, classroom discourse, Generation Z, speech acts, pedagogical communication

Introduction

The contemporary university classroom is undergoing a significant transformation as Generation Z students redefine expectations of teaching and learning through their distinct communicative orientations. Unlike previous cohorts, these students are deeply shaped by digital interaction, immediacy, and participatory culture, which influence how they interpret and respond to instructional discourse. Effective engagement in this context requires more than content delivery; it demands sensitivity to how meaning is constructed

within interaction. Cain et al. (2022) emphasize that engagement with Gen Z depends largely on how educators adapt communication practices to align with students' technological and interactional preferences. This suggests that communication itself, rather than merely instructional content, has become central to pedagogical success. The shift calls for a reconsideration of how lecturers speak, respond, and structure classroom dialogue. Consequently, pragmatic communication emerges as a crucial framework for understanding and enhancing lecturer–student engagement.

The key to this transformation is the realization that classroom talk is not objective but is guided by assumptions about relevance, coherence, and relating. Gen Z students like a direct, relatable, and contextual communication style and can easily be bored by a formal or strict approach to teaching. According to Lochner (2025), students will be more interested in participating when lecturers are seen as friendly and responsive to communication. This establishes the relevance of interpersonal communication tactics in determining the learning outcomes. Similarly, Danu et al. (2025) emphasize the importance of lecturers to go beyond one-way communication to interactive and dialogic communication. These changes show that successful pedagogies are also becoming related to communicative flexibility. Thus, it is necessary to know the negotiation of meaning in classroom interaction to be effective in pedagogy.

The multimodality and immediacy of meaning-making practices in Generation Z are also seen in the communicative preferences of the generation. The students are used to dynamic, visually-driven, and quick-reaction environments in communication and this is contrasted with the traditional lecture-based methods. Here, according to Tsaqilan and Sumarlan (2025), the only way to align the teaching styles with such expectations is to implement multimodal and interactive communication approaches. That is not only using digital tools but also reorganising verbal communication to facilitate engagement. On the same note, Cutillas et al. (2025) emphasize the efficiency of participatory methods to keep students involved in various fields. All these views are leading towards the fact that lecturers must re-evaluate the organizational and presentation methods of classroom discourse. Consequently, pragmatic

awareness is one of the obligatory elements of teaching in modern higher education.

In addition, the practical approach towards education by Generation Z is also indicative of the exposure of this generation to socio-economic uncertainties and a dynamic environment in the world. Their communicational patterns are frequently efficiency, clarity, and practicality orientated and this determines their interpretation of instructional messages. According to Mayildurai et al. (2024), Gen Z is very pragmatic and resilient and prefers communication that has a direct link to real-life applications. This orientation compels the lecturers to be mindful to make sure that their lecture is not only informative but also significant to the students in the context of their experience. Hammad (2025) also indicates that interaction based on students will improve the interaction as it will make the teaching process more relevant to the expectations and feelings of learners. These observations indicate that communication should also be sensitive to both cognitive and affective aspects of learning. Therefore, practical approaches come in handy in filling the divide between teaching and learning.

Considering these advances, the necessity to embrace practical communication approaches in teaching at universities is all the more obvious. Pragmatics as a science of meaning in the context offers a good perspective through which the issue of clarity, relevance, and interpersonal connection in the classroom can be explored by the lecturers. Dronia (2022) emphasizes the fact that it is necessary to train pragmatic competence to enhance communication efficiency among the users of languages. The same point of view can be applied to the context of pedagogy where lecturers are the main knowledge-sharing agents. Suyitno et al. (2025) also show that

the communicative trends followed by teachers influence the level of responsiveness and engagement of students. Combined, these roles highlight the importance of pragmatics to the modern pedagogy. This paper thus examines how pragmatic communication practices may be embraced by lecturers in universities to improve their interaction with Generation Z students.

Generation Z and Communication Dynamics in Higher Education

Generation Z students bring into the university environment a distinct set of communication expectations shaped by digital culture, social interaction, and evolving educational experiences. Their preference for interactive and responsive communication challenges traditional lecture formats that prioritize monologic delivery. Hammad (2025) explains that Gen Z learners tend to disengage from passive learning environments, favoring approaches that allow active participation and immediate feedback.

This conversion is indicative of a general transition in the knowledge access and processing. Cain et al. (2022) also reveal that technology-based communication has socialized the students to view flexibility and responsiveness in the instructional environments. Consequently, lecturers are bound to change their manner of communication to suit such dynamic expectations. The classroom is then a place of interaction as opposed to being a one-way flow.

Much of the communicative behavior of Generation Z can also be defined through a highly favorable trend towards relatability and authenticity in lecturer-student interaction. Lecturers show openness, empathy, and clarity in their communication to students which increases the chances that students will respond positively. According to Binabise et al.

(2024), Gen Z students appreciate teachers who support their expectations in communicating with each other and making classrooms inclusive. This means that good teaching is more than just about subject knowledge and interpersonal competence. The same view is echoed by Lochner (2025) who notes that students are more involved when lecturers are friendly and willing to assist them. The above findings indicate that the style of communication is very crucial in determining classroom interaction. Thus, it is necessary to know such preferences to conduct a successful pedagogical practice.

Moreover, Gen Z has a different communication style due to their experience with various media and the high-speed flow of information. This has enhanced the preference for short, relevant, and contextually appropriate communication. As Suyitno et al. (2025) note, the reaction of the students in classroom interactions is conditioned by the expectations of clarity and promptness. According to Tsaqilan and Sumarlan (2025), lecturers should use the communication strategies that are in line with such patterns in order to maintain engagement. Examples such as the use of relatable examples, interactive questioning, and adaptive language use are such strategies. These are the signs of a more pragmatic and audience-oriented approach to communication. As a result, lecturers will have to be more aware of the reception and interpretation of their discourse.

Additionally, the dynamics of communication of Generation Z underline the increasing significance of correspondence between the teaching process and the expectations of students. According to Cutillas et al. (2025), participatory and collaborative methods prove to be more effective in terms of involving Gen Z learners in the disciplines. Danu et al. (2025) also

emphasize the fact that meaningful engagement implies the use of communication strategies that promote connection and interaction. These views support the fact that learning outcomes revolve around communication. Failure to adapt the traditional style of teaching to modern expectations of students is a major cause of disconnection and misunderstanding. To cover this gap, it is essential to pay conscious attention to communication as a pedagogical instrument. Accordingly, the communication patterns of Gen Z demand the redesign of the lecturer activities in university education.

Pragmatic Dimensions of Classroom Discourse

Pragmatics offers a critical approach to the meaning construction and interpretation in classroom interactions. It dwells on the way in which the context of the communication, the motive behind the communication, and the knowledge that the people share influence their communication beyond the actual meaning of the words. This translates into the classroom at the university in that successful teaching should not be relied on by what is said but how it is said and comprehended. According to Dronia (2022), pragmatic competence helps people to apply the language accordingly in certain situations, which is why it is critical to have a meaningful interaction. This becomes especially applicable in the teaching field where the lecturers will always need to modify their communication to accommodate the various student needs. Cain et al. (2022) also indicate that the adaptation to the expectations of the audience is also interconnected with communication effectiveness. Thus, pragmatics is used as a key to instructional success.

The application of speech acts as one of the principal computational areas of pragmatics in the classroom

discourse displays the intentions of utterances, including questioning, instructing, or clarifying. Lecturers use these acts to facilitate learning, control the interaction process, and communicate expectations. The success of such speech acts, however, relies on the interpretation of the same by students. According to Suyitno et al. (2025), the engagement of students depends on their perception and reaction to teacher questions and instructions. Tsaqilan and Sumarlan (2025) also mention that it is necessary to develop communication strategies that conform to the interpretive frameworks of the students. This indicates that lecturers should be keen on the way they express their intentions and the manner in which they are perceived. Accordingly, speech acts are not only functional but also very relational and situational.

Relevance is another significant element of the pragmatic classroom discourse that defines the manner in which students acquire and give priorities to information. Perceived relevant communication will be more likely to attract attention and lead to comprehension. According to Danu et al. (2025), the students of Gen Z need to be able to receive directly related communication in relation to their experiences and interests. The same is observed by Mayildurai et al. (2024) who observe that pragmatic learners tend to like information with an evident practical worth. This puts a burden on the lecturers to make sure that what they are saying is significant in the cognitive and social background of the students. Relevance, then, is a major element as far as maintaining engagement is concerned. In its absence, well-organized teaching might not have the desired effects.

The politeness strategies are also important in influencing the interaction in the classroom,

especially, in the power relation between lecturers and students. Communication between the teacher and the learner is successful when there is an effective balance between authority and approachability to establish a negative learning environment. Binabise et al. (2024) underscore that respectful and inclusive teachers receive positive responses from the students. Lochner (2025) also adds that approachability increases students' desire to engage in the classroom. These lessons underline interpersonal sensitivity as a key to teaching. Pragmatic competence, therefore, entails clarity, relevance, and relational awareness. By doing so, the classroom discourse becomes a location where meaning, power, and interaction overlap to affect the learning outcomes.

Lecturer–Student Communication Gaps and Pragmatic Breakdown

The existence of communication barriers between lecturers and Generation Z students frequently results in the clash of expectations, interpretative frames, and types of interaction. Though lecturers can choose to teach with traditional academic language, students are learning to be very demanding in terms of clarity, immediate and relevance in context. According to Lochner (2025), the students will not spend much time interacting with their lecturers when they feel the latter are far or cannot be approached. This implies that failure to communicate does not just happen as a result of what is being delivered but through a breakdown in the relationship. Cain et al. (2022) also note that the inability to match communication with student preferences may reduce engagement in the presence of technological instruments. These gaps usually translate into less involvement, misunderstanding instructions, and non-involvement. As a result, the classroom turns

into a place of partial communication and not mutual understanding.

One of the biggest causes of pragmatic failure is the distortion of speech acts between lecturers and students. When lecturers communicate such utterances, they may be willing to teach, explain, or guide; however, students can comprehend such utterances in different ways depending on their communicative expectations. Suyitno et al. (2025) emphasize that the answers to teacher questions by students would depend on the manner in which these questions are framed and seen through interaction. According to Tsaqilan and Sumarlan (2025), poor styles of communication may impede the understanding and involvement. This misunderstanding usually leads to silence, little actions, or wrong performance of the tasks. The question, however, is not whether there is no communication, but whether the intended meaning has not been effectively created. The pragmatic awareness is critical in making sure that there are proper intentions of instruction that are aligned with student interpretations.

Relevance is also important in communication failure especially when students feel that classroom conversation is unrelated to their experiences. Students of Generation Z are prone to the disengagement process when communication is not applicable or contextually meaningful in the moment. Danu et al. (2025) suggest that the level of engagement depends on how communication appeals to the realities of students. The same can be noted by Mayildurai et al. (2024), who note that learners focus more on information that is practical and useful. Failure by lecturers to achieve such relevance would make the students view instruction as being abstract or inapplicable. This brings a disconnection between

teaching will and learning acceptance. Consequently, even properly organized lessons can never reach a significant engagement level.

Civility and interpersonal relations also lead to pragmatic failure in the lecturer-student dialogue. Formality and strictness may cause psychological distance as they may restrain the willingness of students to engage. Binabise et al. (2024) point out that the more inclusive and respectful the communication style is, the better the student will react positively to it. The issue of approachability in the development of interaction is also emphasized by Lochner (2025). Students might refuse to participate actively if they feel that the communication is dismissive or too authoritative. This brings out the issue of power and access in the classroom discussion. Pragmatic failure is therefore usually a failure of relational agreement, rather than clarity in language.

Pragmatic Communication Strategies for Effective Engagement

To solve the communication discrepancies, the conscious application of practical approaches is needed to balance the instructional discourse and student expectations and interpretive patterns. One of the strategies can be the deliberate application of clear and context-sensitive speech acts that decrease the uncertainties and increase comprehensiveness. The lecturers should make sure that the instructions given, questions, and explanations are put in a form that can be easily understood within the communicative context of the students. Dronia (2022) points out that pragmatic competence is the capacity to apply language when addressing a particular situation in a correct and effective manner. Suyitno et al. (2025) also demonstrate that properly designed questioning is a way to make students more

active and understandable. This implies that teaching requires clarity and a purpose in communication. In this way, lecturers will be able to minimize misinterpretation and enhance interaction.

The other key strategy relates to relevance, which can be improved by relating the instructional content to the experiences that students have lived and what they want to become in the future. A message that appeals to the reality of students will have higher chances to keep their attention and lead to better comprehension. Danu et al. (2025) emphasize that Gen Z learners need to be provided with meaningful and practical communication. Mayildurai et al. (2024) also state that learners who are pragmatists react well to materials that exhibit practical usefulness. It may be accomplished through the help of the relatable example, real-life application, and communication between lecturers and the audience. This will make the classroom discourse a relevant presentation and not just a receipt of information. Relevance, consequently, is one of the main engagement tools.

Relational awareness and politeness strategies are also very essential in establishing successful communication. The lecturers should embrace communication modes that are authoritative yet approachable so that the students will feel well-valued and respected. Binabise et al. (2024) stress the importance of inclusive communication as it improves student motivation and involvement. Lochner (2025) further explains that approachability stimulates students to be more involved in the activities of learning. This involves sensitivity to tone, response, and interactional clues. Through the provision of a supportive communicative atmosphere, lecturers can empower the relational

aspect of education. These strategies will result in long-term engagement and better learning results.

Also, interactive and multimodal communication methods can be integrated to a considerable extent to improve interaction with Generation Z students. According to Tsaqilan and Sumarlan (2025), multimodal strategies correspond with the preferences of the digital-native learners in communication. Another way of active engagement is the effectiveness of participatory approaches that are also pointed out by Cutillas et al. (2025). These tools are the utilization of digital tools, collaborative work, and dialogic pedagogies. Cain et al. (2022) also add that flexibility and adaptability regarding communication are the main features of attracting modern learners. Through these strategies, the lecturers will be in a position to make classroom environments dynamic and responsive. Pragmatic communication is therefore a connection between linguistic theory and the pedagogical practice.

Theoretical and Pedagogical Implications

In theory, the given research supports the applicability of pragmatics as a framework for the interpretation of classroom dialogue in modern higher education. It shows that instructional meaning is never predetermined and that it is constructed in interactions, which are context-driven, intentional, and meaning-driven. Dronia (2022) emphasizes that pragmatic competence is a crucial element of effective communication, and it goes beyond linguistic correctness to the contextual level. Cain et al. (2022) also indicate that the effectiveness of communication is based on the flexibility to meet the requirements of the audience. These insights make pragmatics an important critical tool to analyze the discourses of pedagogy. The research hence informs the incorporation of linguistic theory into an

educational practice. It also increases the use of pragmatics in the discussion of generational communication dynamics.

Pedagogically, the results highlight the necessity of the change where conventional, lecturer-oriented communication should be replaced by more interactive and student-oriented forms of communication. Hammad (2025) underlines that learning is stimulated by the fact that teaching is synchronized with the communicative preferences and the learning needs of the students. The same can be applied to Cutillas et al. (2025) who propose the use of participatory strategies that promote active engagement. This means that good teaching does not just happen without subject knowledge but also communicative competence. The lecturers should be trained to identify and act on the pragmatic aspect of classroom communication. This change has consequences for the curriculum development, education of teachers, and instruction. Finally, pedagogy needs to change in accordance with the communicative realities of modern learners.

Conclusion

The paper has explored the significance of practical communication approaches to effective communication with Generation Z students in university classrooms. It has been demonstrated that the pragmatic breakdown can be caused by the difference in expectations, interpretation, and styles of interaction. Through the primary dimensions, which include speech acts, relevance, and politeness, the research reveals that the negotiation of meaning occurs in the classroom discourse. The results indicate that successful interaction requires that the lecturer be able to communicate with the students on the basis of the pragmatic orientations of the students. This calls for a change of direction towards clarity,

relevancy, and relational awareness of teaching practices. The research finds that pragmatics provides an effective platform that can be used to facilitate a greater level of communication and increase the success rate of learning in higher education.

Recommendations

1. University management should organize regular training programs to develop lecturers' pragmatic communication competence for improved classroom interaction.

References

Binabise, N. J. P., Cariaga, J. A. S., Peralta, E. A., et al. (2024). My ideal teacher: The Gen Z's choice. *Diversitas Journal*.

Cain, C. C., Morgan Bryant, A., Buskey, C. D., et al. (2022). Generation Z, learning preferences, and technology: An academic technology framework based on enterprise architecture. *The Journal of the Association for Information Systems*.

Cutillas, A. L., Balili, E. E., Rellin, E. C., et al. (2025). Teaching strategies and activities across all disciplines that appeal to Gen-Z learners. *Journal of Educational and Social Psychology*.

Danu, R. T., Sabrina, A. R., Arindra, F. (2025). From clicks to connections: Understanding the strategic communication needs of Gen Z learners. *KnE Social Sciences*.

Dronia, I. (2022). Communicating with Generation Z: The development of pragmatic competence of advanced Polish users of English. CEEOL.

2. Lecturers should adopt clear, relevant, and student-centered communication strategies that align with the interpretive expectations of Generation Z learners.

3. Curriculum developers should integrate pragmatic communication components into teacher education and professional development programs.

4. Educational policymakers should establish guidelines that promote interactive and communicative teaching practices in higher education institutions.

Hammad, H. S. (2025). Teaching the digital natives: Examining the learning needs and preferences of Gen Z learners in higher education. *Transcultural Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*.

Lochner, A. (2025). Student-lecturer interactions: Do traditional methods appeal to Generation Z students? *Perspectives in Education*.

Mayildurai, R., Karthik, K., Ashokkumar, R., et al. (2024). Teaching methodologies for engaging Generation Z learners: Strategies, challenges, and implications. In *Innovative Teaching and Learning*.

Suyitno, I., Fawzi, A., Arista, H. D. (2025). Language attitudes of Generation Z in responding to teacher questions in learning interactions. *CoDAS*.

Tsaqilan, F. Q., Sumarlan, I. (2025). Reconstructing teachers' communication styles in teaching Generation Z: A digital pedagogy perspective. *Fast in Humanities*.