Journal of Educational Research & Social Sciences Review (JERSSR)

Instructional Pragmatics in Pre-Service English Teaching Programs at Pakistani Universities in Lahore

1.	**Dr. Muhammad Aslam**	Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Linguistics, IER, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan. Email: aslam.ier@pu.edu.pk
2.	**Farzana Khan**	(Corresponding Author) English Language Lecturer at Riphah International University Islamabad. Email: Farzana.khan@riphah.edu.pk
3.	**Shumaila Naureen**	PhD Linguistics Scholar at International Islamic University, Islamabad. Email: shumailaafzalkhan@gmail.com

Abstract

This study was designed to explore the opinions of prospective English teachers studying at Pakistani universities about the extent to which their teacher education programs provided training for Instructional Pragmatics. For this purpose, survey methodology was used. By employing criterion purposive sampling technique, data was collected through closed item questionnaires from 173 prospective teachers of English from three public and three private universities of Lahore offering Master's in teaching of English. The data was analysed statistically for comparison of perceptions on teach-ability of pragmatics, subject-matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, knowledge of learners, and pragmatics specific teaching skills. The analysis provided evidence of difference in perceptions in the sample regarding Instructional Pragmatics. The study has important implications for second language teacher education programs in Pakistani universities. It is recommended that awareness be developed among the teacher educators that training in general methodology cannot be extended to specialized areas like instructional pragmatics. The findings of the study also have implications for university department heads and the faculty. For achieving the goal of communicative language teaching, the study recommends that Instructional Pragmatics be introduced as a compulsory part of second language acquisition, language skills, language testing, ELT methodology, and syllabus design in pre-service language teacher education in universities.

Keywords: Sociolinguistic Approach to SLA, Instructional Pragmatics, Second Language Teacher Education, Pragmatics-Focused Pedagogy.

Introduction

This survey study was conducted to describe and compare the perceptions of university teachers and prospective teachers regarding adequacy of pre-service teacher education for teaching pragmatics of communication. Pragmatic competence is "an understanding of the relationship between *form* and *context* that enables us, accurately and appropriately, to express and interpret intended meaning" (Murray, 2010, p. 293). It is easy to understand that development of pragmatic competence of non-natives cannot be overlooked if their language learning aims at communicative competence. Non-natives especially in foreign language context, usually lack in pragmatic ability (Kasper &Yuriko, 2002), but it can be developed among them (Thornbury, 2005) through instruction (Cenoz, 2007; Chen, 2009).

To understand the place of instructed pragmatics learning, a concise overview of the field is required. When second language teaching aims at communication, it becomes part of social pragmatics and this combination is called "Pedagogical Pragmatics" (Murray, 2010, p. 294) or "Instructional Pragmatics" (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010, p. 22). Instructional Pragmatics can also be bracketed with instructed second language acquisition (Rose, 2005) and it refers to "L2 teaching applications related to fostering pragmatic competence in language learners' (Vasquez & Sharpless, 2009, p.17). If English is taught for communication, pragmatics teaching should be introduced right from the start of pre-service teacher education. Pragmatics, however, remains a neglected area in the

pre-service Language Teacher Education (LTE onwards) and even where it is included; it is not adequately covered and is introduced as a segment of Sociolinguistics, Methods or SLA. Very few programs have included it with clear objectives in their teacher preparation courses (Vasquez & Fioramonte, 2011).

Majority of the MA TESOL programs in America include pragmatics in teacher education curriculum, but they largely ignore instructional pragmatics, and teach theoretical pragmatics. This situation can be understood in the context of the problems faced by the LTE offering American institutes (Velez-Rendens, 2002): Failure of the programs to provide prospective language teachers with the required level of language proficiency; Lack of co-ordination among training institutes and Lack of consensus about teacher certification.

There is another problem that concerns with the teacher educators themselves. Most of them assume that if teacher graduates know pragmatic theories, they can conduct instruction without any training (Vasques & Sharpless, 2009). Besides, many teacher educators themselves have not studied pragmatics during their own studies at the university (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

The situation in Pakistan is not different with reference to preparation for instructional pragmatics. As far as the sufficiency of pre-service teacher education for English teaching is concerned, the teachers are not able to facilitate learners in their acquisition of English (Nawab, 2012). They are trained like other subject teachers. Private sector institutes do not require or recognize even any pre-service teacher education provided at state sector training institutes (Memon, Joubish, & Khurram, 2010). These institutes think that communicative competence largely compensates teacher training. It was this background that motivated the researchers to explore perceptions of future teachers and teacher educators regarding various aspects of Instructional Pragmatics in the context of Pakistan.

Literature Review

Most scholars in the field of second language teaching agree that the main goals of language teaching are "development of language proficiency and cultural awareness" (Wing, 1993 as cited in Velez-Rendens, 2002, p. 462). It means that SLTE will have to be specific for the achievement of these goals. So, the particular components of pragmatics focused SLTE are suggested as: knowledge of pragmatic variation; pragmatic norms of the target language; knowledge of theoretical framework for pragmatic analysis; knowledge of pedagogy for second language pragmatics including instructional techniques, assessment, knowledge of learner characteristics (identity, culture); knowledge of curriculum development for pragmatics and constraints on the teaching of pragmatics in different educational contexts (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010 on the basis of several scholars).(See also Eslami,2011)

One suggestion is that the subject matter knowledge in this domain should include (Lafayette, 1993 as cited in Velez-Rendens, 2002): Language proficiency; Civilization and culture and Language analysis. About cultural component, the researcher explains that it does not only refer to sensitivity of cultural content of the materials but more importantly, it also means "… helping students gain awareness of themselves as cultural beings and thus of others, a process that hopefully will make them more accepting of people and things unfamiliar to them" (Velez-Rendens, 2002, p. 462). Exploring further the component of language analysis, the author includes "communicative competence" as essential part of the pre- service teachers' knowledge.

Another proposal about the teacher competencies required for pragmatics is that SLTE should emphasize "how learners learn languages, language development stages, learning styles, strategy training for language learning, structuring the classroom environment for language acquisition to occur and effective use of language materials and technology" (Wing, 1993 as cited in Velez-Rendens, 2002, p. 462). Clearly, this proposal makes SLA and classroom teaching skills as main components of SLTE. Besides other pedagogical skills, specifically, the language teachers should have competency in "preparing and implementing communicative oriented activities…" (Velez-Rendens, 2002, p. 462). The domains, general SLTE and pragmatics oriented SLTE, can also be combined (Wright, 2010):

- The user domain --- it includes "awareness of the social and pragmatic norms" which is decisive in appropriate use of language.
- The analyst domain --- knowledge of grammar, vocabulary and phonology.
- The teacher domain---how to present language in classroom.

_____

The foregoing discussion of domains implies a theory practice divide that is regarded as "misleading dualism" (Hedgcock, 2002, p.308). But for the ease of analysis, this division will be retained. The order of argument to be followed will be the "what", "where" and "how" of pragmatics inclusive SLTE.

The "What" of Pragmatics inclusive SLTE

The "what" of pragmatics related SLTE comes from communicative competence, the idea that is usually associated with Hymes (1971). The terms sociolinguistic or socio-cultural competence that is defined as "the speaker's pragmatic knowledge i.e. how to express messages appropriately within the overall social and cultural context of communication. This includes knowledge of language variation with reference to socio-cultural norms of the target language" (Hymes, 1971, p. 46). Now, the knowledge base for teachers who are being prepared for teaching communication in English should include the above pragmatic knowledge. It is a challenge for ESL/EFL teachers because they themselves lack in pragmatic knowledge and when they come to teaching, they find it difficult to make learners "change native verbal behaviour" (Celce-Murcia, 2007, p. 46).

The "Where" of Pragmatics inclusive SLTE

The ESL /EFL divide. The "where" side refers to the learning contexts: ESL/native/natural setting versus EFL/non-native/instructed setting. The influence of settings cannot be separated from the language teaching process (Velez-Rendens, 2002). The settings are important because different contexts allow different levels of acculturation (Roever, 2009). ESL settings are those in which the surrounding community is English speaking while EFL settings are those in which surrounding community is not English speaking (Rose, 1994). EFL is used in its obvious sense but ESL is used in two senses (Bhaskaran, 1997): (a) the situation where L2 is not mother tongue, it does have some internal social function and this sense applies to multilingual states, (b) it refers to the following native situations: ESL is acquired in native setting (tutored or untutored); when the goal is integration with the target community and ESL is acquired for some social responsibility and self-enhancement

The author, however, suggests that this is not a linguistic dichotomy; it is socio-politically motivated division that is often associated with native and non-native categories. He thinks that instead of ESL/EFL, today's learning contexts worldwide can better be represented by EAL (English as additional language). (See also Ellis, 1994; Roever, 2009).

The conclusion of this section is that understanding of learning contexts and choice of teachers in these contexts should be part of SLTE because all the pedagogical planning is based on this understanding (Hall, 2011). This leads to the discussion of the "how" side.

The "How" of Pragmatics inclusive SLTE

The next aspect of "how" side is to see if pragmatics needs instruction, is it teachable? A large number of scholars agree that it is instruct-able and direct instruction has often positive effects on L_2 pragmatic development (e.g., Cenoz, 2007; Kasper &Yuriko, 2002; Kasper & Rose, 1999; Dewaele, 2007).The "how" side of pragmatic training will be incomplete if it does not include practicum and micro teaching for practice in all the pedagogical skills specifically required for teaching pragmatics in actual classrooms (Wright, 2010). But practice teaching should include action research training for reflective teaching and reconceptualising teacher as learner (Jourdenais, 2009). One major and accessible resource centre for teacher training in pragmatics can be CARLA website maintained by University of Minnesota. (For further exploration of this part of pragmatics training, see for example, Jourdenais, 2009; Thorne &Qiang, 1996; as cited in Velez- Rendens, 2002).

This discussion of pragmatics inclusive SLTE clearly shows a knowledge base and skills that are different from those of general SLTE. This specific nature requires specialized training and curriculum focused on pragmatics (Ishihara, 2011) and has laid foundation of what has come to be known as instructed or instructional pragmatics (ibid.).

Instructional Pragmatics in Pre-Service Teacher Education

Instructional or pedagogical pragmatics is "L2 teaching application related to fostering pragmatic competence in language learners" (Vasquez &Sharpless, 2009, p.17). Though effects of instructional pragmatics as part of language teacher education are not yet fully researched, the few studies conducted in this area have found it useful. (e.g., Eslami & Eslami Rasekh, 2008; Eslami Rasekh, 2005; Ishihara & Cohen 2010, Vellenga, 2011). Instructional pragmatics is considered part of instructed second language acquisition via inter-language pragmatics (Ellis, 1994, Kasper & Schmidt, 1996; Rose, 2005). The field of SLA has accommodated it because of its recent (1990s onwards)

inclination to social explanations of second language acquisition (though still relevance of cognitive/universalistic psychological models is recognized) (Kasper, 2001; Tateyana & Kasper, 2008). The holistic approaches to SLA that provide theoretical groundings for the "what" and "how" of instructional pragmatics discussed above are: speech accommodation theory; Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory and language socialization (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

Though instructional pragmatics is recognized in SLA, it is still a neglected area in classrooms, teacher training institutes and academic research. Teachers may not be incorporating pragmatics in their lessons and methodology because they might think that it does not require instruction like grammar and vocabulary, and may be indirectly learnt in the classroom (Amaya, 2008; Roever, 2009). Other possible reasons may be time and curricula constraints, paucity of instructional materials, teachers' reluctance for pragmatics because it requires different teaching strategies and their deficiency in technology based teaching. (Ishihara, 2011; also Eslami, 2011).

This neglect of instructional pragmatics in classrooms entails neglect in pre-service and in-service training and even in research in language teacher education (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Vasquez & Sharpless, 2009). The same is reflected from the few publications available on instructional pragmatics. Some mentionable publications that can be used for training include Ishihara and Cohen (2010). Lack of training is pointed out by several scholars (e.g., Vasquez & Sharpless, 2009; Eslami &Eslmai-Rasekh 2008; El-Okda, 2011; Ishihara & Cohen, 2010).

The intensity of this gap can be gauged from the results of a study conducted on pre-service language teacher education provided at universities of USA. (Vasquez & Sharpless, 2009). The study surveyed 104 programmes and reported that majority of MA TESOL programmes in USA included pragmatics in their curriculum but they largely ignored instructional pragmatics (44%) and focused on theoretical pragmatics (56%) or it was integrated with other pedagogy courses. The programmes where instructional pragmatics was integrated even with other courses produced teachers with significantly different performance. (e.g.,Eslami & Eslami–Rasekh,2008;Eslami,2011;Vasquez &Fioramonte,2011). But inclusion in training is not sufficient unless it is imparted effectively. If training is not sound,socialization into professional practice may eliminate its effects (Brouwer & Korthangan,2005).

It was also found that teacher educators perceived that instruction in pragmatics did not need any or special training in pre-service training. The study also discovered that teacher educators were enthusiastic about pragmatics training but they were confused about its place in the training curriculum. Another study reported that the textbooks for prospective teachers gave little space to Instructional Pragmatics (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). The findings also showed that most teacher educators themselves were not trained in Instructional Pragmatics during their own pre-service education at universities. This inadequate treatment of pragmatics instruction in pre-and, in-service programs is found almost in all parts of the world (EI-Okda, 2011). Even theoretical pragmatics is not offered in any of the 8-semester BS-Applied Linguistics program of a large state university in Lahore (BS English courses: http://www.hec.gov.pk).

The present study was designed to empirically explore perceptions of prospective English teachers, and their trainers at public and private sector Pakistani universities about the extent their training programs had prepared the would- be teachers for Instructional Pragmatics.The researchers hoped to find out the gap between the training and practices of teaching English for communicative purposes.

Statement of the Problem

Some of the universities in public and private sectors located in Lahore city, offer pre-service teacher education programmes with different titles like MA ELT, MA ELTL, MA TESL, MA TEFL, MA TESOL etc. These programmes (as is noted from the official websites of the universities) require coursework, thesis and practicum. All of these universities appear to aim at producing teachers for communication based English teaching. But the prospective teachers of these universities can be expected to teach English for communicative purposes if they are provided with the knowledge and skills needed for teaching pragmatics of communication in English. The programme structures of these universities show a mismatch between the expectations of these programs and the measures being taken to meet them.

The purpose of the present study was to explore this problem through the perceptions of prospective teachers of public and private universities in Lahore, Pakistan.

Research Questions

1.   How far do prospective teachers of English perceive that pre-service teacher education is adequate for L2 pragmatics teaching?
2.   Is there difference in perceptions of public and private universities' prospective teachers of English?

The rationale of comparison on the basis of public-private status is based on the fact that private sector is significantly contributing to education at all tiers in Pakistan (Memon, Joubish & Khurram, 2010).

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it surveyed the opinions of the prospective teachers about the adequacy of these programmes regarding one important component of communicative competence--- pragmatic competence. It is assumed that the findings of this study are likely to sensitize prospective teachers, language teacher educators, policy makers, teacher development professionals and researchers in the area of language teacher education about the need of pragmatics in English language teaching; the need of teacher preparation, particularly at pre-service stage, for instructional pragmatics;;the awareness of possible components of knowledge base for pre-service teacher education for non-native English teachers; the pedagogical skills required for teaching of pragmatics in the context of non-naïve instructed second language learning; and some of the unexplored areas for research in the pedagogy of English language pragmatics.

METHOD

As the study aimed at exploring the perceptions of the participants, survey methodology was used. Closed questionnaire was constructed for data collection. The target population of this study was nine universities of Lahore offering Master's in language teacher education. From the six accessible universities (3 Public, 3Private), 173 prospective teachers of English were selected by employing criterion purposive sampling technique (Morgan, 2014). University B, being largest in the sample, had greater proportion in the sample (56%). The sample is described in Table 1 below:

Table 1
Description of the Sample of Prospective Teachers of English

Private Universities	n(%)	Public Universities	n(%)
A	3(1.35)	B	96(56)
E	10(5.78)	C	9(5.20)
F	13(7.51)	D	42(24)
Total	26(25%)		147(85%)

Data collection procedure

For collecting data, a questionnaire was administered. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. Sections A and B of questionnaire sought opinion about the knowledge base, and section C elicited opinion about pedagogical skills perceived to be developed during the pre-service training at the selected universities.

Items in section A were related with basic assumptions about teach-ability of pragmatics in non-native instructed settings where often grammar dominated pedagogy was used. Items in section B were related with different aspects of knowledge base concerning subject matter knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and knowledge of learners, curriculum development and educational contexts. Section C was based on questions seeking information on pedagogical skills including microteaching; action research; use of technology for teaching and testing; materials development; and task designing for pragmatics teaching.

Data analysis procedure

The data used in the following analysis is adopted from the unpublished research work by the first author. Two types of statistics were employed for two purposes. For summarizing data, mean (M), and standard deviation (SD) was calculated. For testing significance of difference in perceptions of prospective teachers and teacher educators, t-test for independent samples was run. To assess practical importance of the magnitude of difference in perception, Cohen's d was calculated using *t* values as suggested by Connolly (2007, pp. 206-207).

Results

Results of the statistical analysis of data are displayed in tables below. Table 2 shows results about research question 1 and Table 3 presents results about research question 2.

Table2. *Means and Standard Deviations for Prospective Teachers' Perceived Adequacy of L2 Pragmatics Teaching in Pre-Service Teacher Education at Universities*

No.	Statements	Public		Private	
		n	M(SD)	n	M(SD)
1	L2 pragmatics is teachable like grammar, vocabulary, etc.	147	3.2(1.27)	24	3.79(1.114)
2	L2 pragmatics also requires direct teaching like grammar, vocabulary, etc.	147	3.25(1.25)	23	3.57(1.04)
3	Non-native teachers can also teach pragmatics of English.	148	3.16(1.41)	24	3.46(1.1)
4	Pragmatics of first language may help in teaching second language pragmatics.	148	3.25(1.27)	24	3.67(0.64)
5	English speakers follow typical conventions of social interactions.	146	2.07(0.82)	24	2.58(0.65)
6	English speakers use more than one expression for different communicative acts (requesting, thanking, etc.).	148	2.14(0.89)	24	2.54(0.72)
7	Different cultures perform communicative acts differently.	146	2.05(0.85)	24	2.71(0.69)
8	Theories about acquiring L2 pragmatics are taught to the prospective teachers.	148	2.39(0.77)	23	2.57(0.79)
9	Methods of teaching performance of communicative acts are taught.	146	2.3(0.81)	24	2.71(0.55)
10	Methods of teaching interpretation of communicative acts are taught.	144	2.24(0.77)	22	2.64(0.58)
11	Learning strategies (planning, monitoring, etc.) for pragmatic competence are taught.	147	1.96(0.87)	23	2.57(0.66)
12	Procedures for assessing pragmatics are taught.	145	1.66(0.74)	24	2.13(0.8)
13	Criteria for evaluating performance in pragmatics are taught.	144	1.83(0.85)	24	2.044(0.91)
14	The learner characteristics (attitude to English language and culture, personal and social identity, etc.) are taught.	145	2.05(0.85)	24	2.46(0.66)
15	The ways of learning preferred by learners (visuals, real interactions, etc.) are taught.	143	2.09(0.85)	23	2.26(0.69)
16	Curriculum development for designing pragmatics oriented courses is taught.	146	1.76(0.82)	24	2.29(0.86)
17	Principles for developing materials for teaching pragmatics are taught.	148	1.82(0.85)	24	2.17(0.82)
18	Procedures of materials adaptation (deletion, addition, etc.) are taught.	145	1.87(0.85)	23	2.17(0.98)
19	Difference in teaching pragmatics in EFL and ESL contexts is discussed.	148	2(0.84)	24	2.13(0.95)

20	Difference in learning pragmatics in classroom and in natural settings is explained.	147	2.29(0.75)	24	2.46(0.83)
21	The effects of constraints (time, resources, credit hours etc.) on pragmatics teaching are discussed.	148	2.22(0.79)	24	2.29(0.86)
22	Pragmatics based lesson planning is introduced.	149	2.05(0.87)	24	1.92(0.88)
23	Pragmatics inclusive micro-teaching is conducted.	149	1.93(0.88)	24	1.96(0.91)
24	Classroom based research projects on pragmatics teaching are assigned.	143	1.89(0.86)	23	1.87(0.87)
25	Technology enhanced lessons (using online chats, YouTube, corpus software etc.) are practiced.	149	1.99(0.86)	24	1.83(0.76)
26	Practice in pragmatics based assessment is encouraged.	149	1.87(0.86)	24	2(0.88)
27	Computer assisted testing of pragmatics is practiced.	146	1.61(0.79)	24	1.75(0.85)
28	Activities for practicing pragmatics (role plays, talking with native guests, online chats etc.) are conducted.	149	1.95(0.84)	24	2.08(0.83)

Table 2 presents perceptions of prospective teachers of English about knowledge and skills provided to them in their degree programs. The first four items are indicators of perceptions about teach-ability of pragmatics. The prospective teachers of public universities were undecided on these indicators whereas those of private universities agreed on the first, second and fourth indicators. However, the participants were undecided about non-native teachers' ability to teach pragmatics (M = 3.46, SD= 1.10). Items 5 to 21 are indicators of perceptions about knowledge required for pragmatics teaching. Prospective teachers of public universities were of the view that they were provided with fairly adequate subject matter knowledge but those of private universities indicated that it was provided adequately.

Pedagogical-content knowledge was fairly adequate for the public prospective teachers, but for those of the private sector, it was adequate about indicators 8 to 11 and fairly adequate about pragmatics testing and evaluation criteria. Knowledge of learners was fairly adequate for prospective teachers of both sectors. Prospective teachers of both sectors perceived that knowledge of pragmatics related curriculum development was provided fairly adequately.

Prospective teachers of public universities perceived that they were provided with fairly adequate knowledge of educational contexts, but those of private universities believed that it was fairly adequate about ESL/EFL contexts (M=2.13, SD = .95) and was adequate for indicators 20 and 21. Items 22 to 31 are indicators of perceptions about pedagogical skills for pragmatics teaching. Prospective teachers of both sectors believed they were adequately trained in pedagogical skills for pragmatics teaching.

Table3. *Comparison of the Mean Scores of Prospective Teachers' Responses on the Basis of Sector (Public & Private)*

	Public University		Private University				
Components	n	M(SD)	n	M(SD)	t-value	df	p-value
Awareness about teach ability of pragmatics	148	12.81(4.29)	24	14.33(3.27)	-1.66	170	.098
Subject matter knowledge	149	6.16(2.11)	24	7.83(1.74)	-4.24	171	<.001
Pedagogical content knowledge	149	12.12(3.32)	24	14.21(2.64)	-2.93	171	.004
Knowledge of learners	148	4.03(1.5)	24	4.63(1.21)	-2.17	36	.066
knowledge of curriculum	148	5.39(2.01)	24	6.54(2.47)	-2.52	170	.013

development for pragmatics							
Knowledge of educational context	149	6.45(1.79)	24	6.88(2.15)	-1.05	171	.295
Pedagogical skills for teaching of pragmatics	149	18.68(5.97)	24	19.46(6.66)	-0.58	171	.563
Total	146	65.4(15.7)	24	73.88(14.75)	-2.47	168	.015

Table 3 shows difference in perceptions of prospective teachers of English. Using *t*-test for independent samples, statistically significant difference was found in perceptions of public and private sector prospective teachers about subject matter knowledge (t = -4.24, df=171,p<.05), pedagogical content knowledge (t= -2.39,df =171, p <.05), and knowledge of curriculum development (t =0.013, df=170,p =.013). But the size of this difference is weak (Cohen's d = .19) for knowledge of curriculum development, and slightly important (Cohen's d= .31) for subject matter and pedagogical content knowledge (Cohen's d = .27). Overall, there is significant difference in perceptions of the two groups (t= -2.47, df = 168, p=.015), the size of difference is weak (Cohen's d = .19).

Discussion

The analysis revealed that prospective teachers of both sectors perceive that their pre-service teacher education provides them with fairly adequate knowledge of Pragmatics. However, public sector prospective teachers are unsure if second language pragmatics can be taught explicitly by the non-native teachers and that L1 plays positive role in it. These results contradict with those of Vellenga (2011), El- Okda (2011), Roever (2009), Vasquez and Fioramonte (2011), and Vasquez and Sharpless (2009), which point out that there has been neglect of Instructional Pragmatics in teacher education programs. But the results about awareness of teach-ability of pragmatics in non-native instructed setting are consistent with other studies (e.g., Rueda, 2006; Chen, 2009, Amaya, 2008, Kasper, 2001).

In addition, the prospective teachers of both sectors tend to have slightly different perceptions about provision of subject matter and pedagogical content knowledge required for teaching pragmatics. But the difference in perceptions is very weak regarding knowledge of curriculum development. Overall, too, the difference is negligible. The teacher learners of both sectors seem to agree that the knowledge base of their pre-service education includes fairly adequate knowledge of pragmatics related subject matter and pedagogical content but the area of curriculum development does not provide sufficient knowledge base for pragmatics specific syllabus design. These results are comparable with Ishihara and Cohen (2010), Canale and Swain (1980), Vasquez and Fioramonte, (2011), and Ishihara (2011). The findings imply that Pakistani universities do not have a uniform framework for teacher education programs.

Another important finding to be discussed is that private university teachers perceive that their degree programs do not provide skills required for computer based testing of pragmatic knowledge. It implies that prospective teachers are conscious of the role of technology in English language teaching and testing. They tend to believe that use of technology is no more whimsical, rather, it supplements text based teaching with authentic contextual information in foreign language settings like Pakistan (see Warschauer, 2002; Kern, 2006; Eslami, 2011; Aquino 2011). Tateyano and Kasper's (2008) views also support the findings of the study as they think that the use of online resources is based on Vygotsky's social interactionism or mediation theory that underpins communicative language teaching in both native and non-native contexts.

Conclusion

Pre-service second language (L2) teacher education provides fairly adequate knowledge of subject matter, theories of teaching, learner's cultural identity, syllabus design, learning in /EFL contexts, and teaching skills for pragmatics instruction. However, prospective teachers of English are uncertain about their awareness that direct instruction is also possible in second language Pragmatics and that Pragmatics can be taught by the non-native teachers. They do not express their opinion about the positive L1 (first language) pragmatic transfer to L2Pragmatics. Teacher learners of both sectors also feel that pre-service teacher education is inadequate for curriculum development with emphasis on knowledge of Pragmatics.

The respondents tend to believe that teacher education programs of public universities are adequate for developing awareness about teach-ability of pragmatics except cultural norms of the target community and cultural variation. But they perceive that public universities' programsare inadequate for training in Pragmatics focused learning strategies and assessment techniques. Surprisingly, with a uniform syllabus and teaching-learning styles, respondents from private

_____
universities tend to think that their universities provide exposure to technology supported teaching skills.

The researchers avoid being overambitious about findings of this exploratory study with only six universities in Lahore (Pakistan). The study, therefore, strongly suggests that more research should be conducted on issues such as influence of learners' culture and identity on learning of L2 Pragmatics in the classroom. Another important problem need to be researched is the material development for training and teaching of L2 Pragmatics as a supplement to the prescribed books. Research on testing in Pragmatics and technology enhanced pragmatics teaching in Pakistani context is also strongly recommended. As a concrete step, HEC (Higher Education Commission) of Pakistan should urge the universities to include Instructional Pragmatics/Applied Pragmatics as a core subject in BS English.

Recommendations

For teacher educators: Universities should integrate instructional pragmatics with pedagogy courses being currently offered in pre-service teacher education programmes. For stakeholders and policy makers: Workshops should be organized by universities for practicing teachers, principals, department heads, education personnel, textbook writers and materials developers to apprise them of the specialized nature of pragmatics based pedagogy. For test developers: Special courses are designed for the training of teacher educators and test developers in the area of pragmatics assessment. Such training should include computer based test construction as a main component. For reflective teacher education: Universities should promote practical teaching both in labs and actual classrooms on the principles of reflective language teaching. For curriculum planners: Social pragmatics should be made part of school and college curriculum and be made part of public exams so that as a positive wash back, all involved with the planning, teaching and learning of second language education are made aware of its importance and specific requirements, especially for culturally sensitive and culturally responsive pedagogy.

References

Amaya, L.F. (2008). Teaching culture: Is it possible to avoid pragmatic failure? *RevistaAlicantinade EstudiousInglesse, 21,* 11-24. Retrieved fromhttps://rua.ua.es/dspace/handle/10045/10393

Aquino, L. B (2011). Study habits and attitudes of freshmen students: Implications for academic intervention programs *.ku•nal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(5),1116- 1121. http://doi:10.4304/j1tr.2.5.1116-1121

Bhaskaran, N. (1997). ESL/EFL dichotomy today: Language politics or pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly. 31*(1), 9-37. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/3587973

Brouwer, N. &Korthangan, F. (2005). Can teacher education make a difference? *American Education Research Journal*, *42*(1), 153-224. Retrieved June 25, 2012, from www.jstor.org/skble/ 3699458

Cenoz, J. (2007). The acquisition of pragmatic competence and multilingualism in foreign language contexts. In E.A Solar, & M. P. S. Jordan. (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 123-140). Springer

Cohen, L. Manion, L. Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). London: Routledge

Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E.A Solar,.& M. P. S Jordan. (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning*(pp. 45-57). Springer

Chen, Y. (2009). Learner perception of instruction in La pragmatics. *Language Teaching, 2*(4*).* Retrievedfromhttps://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1083728.pdf

Connolly, P. (2007). *Quantitative data analysis in education: A critical introduction using SPSS.* London: Routledge.

Dewaele, J. (2007). Context and L$_2$ users' pragmatic development. In Z.Hua, P. Seed-house L. Wei & V. Cook (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching as social interaction* (pp. 163-184). Palgrave.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford*:* OUP

El-Okda, M. (2011). Developing pragmatic competence: Challenges and solutions. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly, 13*(2). Retrieved fromhttps://asian-efl-journal.com/PDF/June_2011.pdf#page=169

_____

Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal, 59*(3*).* http://doi:10.1093/elt/eciO39

Eslami Z.R. &Eslami-Rasekh, A. (2008). Enhancing the pragmatic competence of non-native English speaking teacher candidates in EFL context. In E.A. Solar& A. Mortinez-Flor (Eds.),

Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing (pp. 178-197). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Eslami, Z.R. (2011). In their own voices: Reflections of native and non-native English speaking TESOL graduate students on online pragmatic instruction to EFL learners. *TESL-EJ, 15*(2). Retrieved fromhttps://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ945403

Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring English language teaching: Language in action.* Routledge.

Hedgcock, J.S. (2002). Toward a socioliterate approach to second language teacher education. *The Modern Language Journal*, *86*(3). Doi:10.1111/1540-4781.00151

Hymes, D.H. (1971). On communicative competence. In J. Pride & J. Holms (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Penguin

Ishihara, N. & Cohen, A.D. (2010). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet.* London: Pearson

Ishihara, N. (2011) Co-constructing pragmatic awareness: Instructional pragmatics in EFL teacher development in Japan. *TESL-El, 15*(2). Retrieved fromhttps://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ945400

Jourdenais, R. (2009). Language teacher education. In M.H. Long& C.J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching*. (pp. 647-658. Willey-Blackwell.

Jourdenais, R. (2009). Language teacher education. In M.H. Long& C.J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching*. (pp. 647-658. Willey-Blackwell

Kasper, G. & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in inter-language pragmatics. *SSLA, 18,* 1 4 9 - 1 6 9 . Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100014868

Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development, *Applied linguistics 22,* 50502-503. Retrieved fromhttps://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.4.502

Morgan, D. L. (2014). Motivations for using mixed methods research. *Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods: A pragmatic approach*, 63-84.

Menton, O.R., Joubish, M.F.,&Khurrum, M.A. (2010). Education in Pakistan. The key issues, problems and the new challenges. *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research, 6*(6*),* 672-677. Retrieved from idosi.org/mejsr/mejsr6(6)/22.pdf

Murray, N. (2010) Pragmatics awareness raising and the co-operative principle. *ELT journal, 64*(3*)* http://doi:10.1093/elt/ccp056

Nawab, A. (2012). Is it the way to teach language the way we teach language? English language teaching in rural Pakistan. *Academic Research, International, 2*(2*).* Retrieved from https://ecommons.aku.edu/pakistan_ied_pdcc/9/

Rose, K.R. (1994). Pragmatic consciousness raising in an EFL context. *Pragmatics and Language Learning Monograph Series5*, 52-63, Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED398740

Richards, J. C. (2008) Second language teacher education today. *RELC Journal, 39*(2), 158-177. https://doi:10.1177/0033688208092182

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching (*3^(rd) ed.). Cambridge: CUP

Roever, C. (2009) Teaching and testing pragmatics. In M.H. Long & C.J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language leaching* (pp. 560-577). Wiley-Blackwell

Rose, K. R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System,* 33, 385399. https://doi:10.1016/i-system.2005.06.003

Rueda, Y.T. (2006). Developing pragmatic competence in a foreign language. *Columbian Applied Linguistics Journal,* 8, 169-182. Retrieved from http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?pid=S0123-46412006000100009&script=sci_arttext&tlng=en

Tateyama, Y.,& Kasper, G. (2008). Talking with a classroom guest: Opportunities for learning Japanese pragmatics. In E.A. Solar & A.Matinez-Flor (Eds.), *Investigating Pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing,* (pp. 45-71). Bristol:Multilingual Matters.

Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to leach speaking.* Longman

Thorne, C.,&Qiang, W. (1996). Action research in language teacher education. *ELT Journal, 50*(3*)*, 254-262. doi:10.1093/elt/50.3.254

Vellenga, H. (2011). Teaching L2 pragmatics: Opportunities for continuous development.*TESL-EJ*, *15*(2). Retrieved fromfile://G:/teaching%20L2%pragmatics%20%20opportunities%20for%20 continuing%20professional%20development.htm.

Vasquez, C.&Sharpless, D). (2009). The role of pragmaticsin the Master's TESOL curriculum: Findings from a nationwide survey. *TESOL Quarterly*, 43 (1), 5-28. Retrievedfromhttps://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2009.tb00225

Vasquez, C, &Fioramonte, A. (2011). Integrating pragmatics into the MA TESL program: Perspective from former students. *TESL-EJ, 15* (2). Retrieved from www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/volume 15/

Velez-Rendens, G. (2002). Second language teacher education: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals,35*(4). Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/ doi/abs/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2002.tb01884.x

Wright, T. (2010). Second language teacher education: Review of recent research on practice. *Language Teaching*, *43*(3), 259-296. doi:10.1017/50261444810000030

Warschauer, M. (2002). A developmental perspective on technology in language education. *TESOLQuarterly, 36*(3), 453-475. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/ 3588421

Yi- Young, J. (2002). Issues in acquisitional pragmatics. *Working papers in TESOL & AppliedLinguistics2*(3), 1-34. Retrieved fromhttps://journals.library.columbia.edu/ index.php/SALT/article/view/1642