Annals of Human and Social Sciences
www.ahss.org.pk

An Investigation into Pakistani EFL Learners' Perceptions of Pragmatics in Learning English Language

[1]Dr. Asra Irshad* [2] Dr. Zafeer Hussain Kiani

1. Assistant Professor, Department of English, Riphah International University, Islamabad, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Muzaffarabad, Pakistan

| ***Corresponding Author** | asra.irshad@riphah.edu.pk |

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the pragmatic perceptions of EFL learners in learning English language in Pakistan. This study also highlights the significance of adding the use and practice of pragmatic aspects in English language learning. The understanding of intended meaning focusing on the context is essential for English language learners in Pakistan. The perceptions of English language learners can create an impact on their perspectives of learning English and thus can help in creating better opportunities to reformulate their curriculum. A total of 200 Pakistani university students participated in the study. The data were collected using a questionnaire and focus group interviews focusing on the pragmatic insights of ESL learners during their English language learning process. The results reveal that Pakistani EFL learners completely understand the pragmatic aspects of language, but they feel that such aspects are mostly ignored in their curriculum. The learners of English in Pakistan are desirous to learn English pragmatic knowledge in their English language classrooms in order to attain pragmatic competence as English language users. The findings of this study are expected to provide a guideline to curriculum developers for revising syllabus of English for Pakistani EFL learner.

Introduction

English language has been an integral part of the educational, official, economic, and social life in Pakistan since its creation in 1947 (Mahboob, 2009). In Pakistan, it has a privileged position due to which it not only has the status of an official language but is also considered as a second language (Warsi, 2004; Akram & Mahmood, 2007; Farooq, Uzair-Ul-Hassan, & Wahid, 2012). The constitution and laws of Pakistan are written in English, and it is used by several public and private educational institutions as an instructional tool. The learning of English language is usually linked with authority, success, and honor for Pakistanis (Rahman, 2006).

The learning of a second language learning is a challenging mission (Nawaz, Amin, & Tatla, 2015), and such circumstances necessitate the learners to be skilled in both linguistic and pragmatic abilities to avoid communication failures, therefore, the role of English is very significant in Pakistani educational institutions. According to a study, the current share of the current Pakistani population with functional abilities in both oral and written English is estimated as less than two percent (Khalique, 2008). According to the educational policies of the country, English is an optional subject from class one to class five and a compulsory subject from class sixth onwards (National Curriculum, 2002). It is compulsory for students in Pakistan to learn English from their first class in school until the attainment of their first university degree (Jalal, 2004). According to National Curriculum (2002), the teachers in Pakistan can understand the pedagogy of English as Second/Foreign language and efficiently communicate in English (p. 54). However, despite its worth in Pakistan, several students are not able to learn English effectively and are incapable to understand, write, speak, or read

English competently (Warsi, 2004). Therefore, many researchers have discussed the problems of learning English in Pakistan and have also focused on the requirements of Pakistani students in learning English properly (Rahman, 1990; Mansoor, 2005; Shamim, 2008; Asif, Deng, Hussain, & Rasool, 2019).

In a non-native context such as Pakistan, language instruction requires not only appropriate teaching and learning environment and opportunities, but also a considerate technique for the teaching of different components of language in general. According to National Curriculum (2002), after 18th Amendment to the Constitution, the provinces in Pakistan are responsibilities of curriculum and textbooks development and associated focusses like medium of instruction. Considering the needs of the learners according to the local contexts is not an easy task. In the 1970s an approach was introduced that held the importance of the learning of communicative functions of a language. Presently, applied linguists are of the view that the efficacy in only linguistic skills is not a guarantee to communicative ability (Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; Meier, 1997). It is significant for learners of second or foreign language to obtain an understanding of the cultural norms and the ability to use language in accordance with the context in cross-cultural communication. The interculturalists specify the skill for the efficient use and suitable knowledge of cultural norms in the target culture as culture-specific knowledge (Waugh, 2014), whereas the experts of second language acquisition (SLA) call it as pragmatic competence (Bachman, 1990).

Pragmatics is the achievement of interpersonal objectives through the intended use of a language (Abbeduto & Hesketh, 1997). The present era has noticed a great attention in Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP). ILP is a recent approach in the field of second language acquisition (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996), that is associated with the knowledge and learning of pragmatic abilities of the second or foreign language learners. Pragmatic features of a language are teachable (Salemi, Rabiee, & Ketabi, 2012), and different studies have identified constructive effects of such teaching in the second language (L2) classroom (Koike & Pearson, 2005). Similarly, it has been indicated by Neizgoda & Rover (2001) that the ESL learners can learn pragmatic features of a language by raising their pragmatic perceptions.

The linguists have emphasized the necessity of teaching pragmatic elements in English in second language contexts (Krisnawati, 2011; Da Silva, 2003; Eslami-Rasekh, 2005), along with the instruction of grammatical and lexical aspects for an appropriate use of the language. The most widely used teaching method in Pakistani language classrooms is Grammar Translation Method (GTM), which contains of rote memorization of grammatical patterns and vocabulary items. In contrast, the real language needs to be creative and culture sensitive to aid the communicative functions. Subsequently, the essential elements of language that play role in making a language user proficient are not considered in language classroom in Pakistan. Hence, Pakistani ESL learners often fail to recognize the intended meanings of language and are not confident in speaking English in both educational and social settings (Mansoor, 2005; Rahman, 2004). It has been discussed in a review of National Curriculum that it is not the students who lack the capacity to learn but the total academic setting needs a lot of improvement (Asghar, 2014). One of the major reasons of this incapability is the lack of proper curriculum for teaching pragmatic features of English in classrooms in Pakistan. Pragmatic perceptions include the way by which pragmatics is regarded, understood, or interpreted by the learners. The research shows a significant relationship between pragmatic perceptions of ESL learners and their pragmatic competence (Schauer, 2006). However, no specific research has been conducted to explore the pragmatic perceptions of Pakistani ESL learners. This study attempts to fill in the gap by examining the perceptions of Pakistani EFL learners regarding pragmatics in learning English language.

Literature Review

Pragmatics

According to Crystal (1997) pragmatics is the field of language learning that studies the intentions of the speakers, focuses on the choice of language forms, the limits of language use in social interaction, and the impacts of the use of language on the addressees in a communicative act (p. 379).) The goal of studying pragmatics is to understand the notions connected to the association of the meaning of a sentence and the intended significance of the speaker (Sperber & Wilson, 2002, p. 3).

Pragmatics and Language Learning

Pragmatic aspects are usually investigated considering the ways of non-native speakers to acquire, use, and interpret linguistic patterns in a second language in view of Interlanguage Pragmatics (ILP). Language learning especially in second or foreign language learning settings cannot be considered complete without inclusion of pragmatic elements. Instruction for second language learners is important for better processing of input and can offer the knowledge that is apparently accessible for production (VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993). Similarly, Banerjee and Carrell (1988) maintained that as pragmatics cannot be detached from other aspects of language teaching, so it can be taught along with grammatical aspects such as prepositions, modals, question forms, conditionals, passive voice, and imperatives. Pragmatics focuses on the language in use and unites the knowledge of grammar with the knowledge of the world in a speaker's utterance (Thomas, 1983). The positive effects of teaching pragmatic knowledge in English language classroom for developing pragmatic awareness of the second language learners (Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005). The requirement of adding pragmatic knowledge into language classroom can be fulfilled with the combined diligence of professionals involved in varied endeavours associated to pragmatics (Bardovi-Harlig, 1998). It is the obligation of the instructor to explain the second language learners of English to not only what they are saying but also to whom they are saying it, so as to make them understand the fine shades of meaning along with learning and the use of various syntactic structures (Banerjee & Carrell, 1988). The correction of both grammatical or pragmatic errors needs care and understanding on the part of the instructor.

Importance of Pragmatic Instruction

The instruction on second language (L2) pragmatics is important even for high language proficiency learners (Salemi, Rabiee, & Ketabi, 2012). The utility of pragmatic instruction in language learning has fortified its consideration in the fields of language pedagogy and second language acquisition (Martínez-Flor & Soler, 2007). Such studies have exposed two chief indications as (a) most of the pragmatic aspects are teachable and such instruction has beneficial effects on the learners' pragmatic development, and (b) there are particular instructional methods that provide better educational results than the others (Jeon & Kaya, 2006; Takahashi, 2010). Pragmatic instruction in an appropriate environment with adequate opportunities for pedagogical intervention helps a second/foreign language learner to perform in a better way than those who are devoid of such instructions (Rose, 2005).

Pragmatic Competence

Communicatively appropriate interaction requires ability in both grammatical and sociolinguistic aspects in every language (Canale & Swain, 1980). Pragmatic ability is an important constituent of communicative competence (Gu, 2014). The chief apprehension of pragmatic competence is having a skill to produce and interpret pragmatic meaning in a definite context (Ahmadi, Kargar, & Rostampour, 2014). Pragmatic competence involves the ability that demands substantial knowledge and understanding of linking utterances

according to their locally set contexts (Kim & Hall, 2002, p. 332). Pragmatic competence is vital for interaction in a second language contexts to enable a learner to use language appropriately in numerous situations (Hilliard, 2017).

Pragmatic competence is needed for effective communication, and it also deals with the knowledge of a language other than grammar (Thomas, 1983). The skill to transfer the proposed message along with the requirements of that social or cultural setting and to infer the message of the speaker as it was proposed is known as pragmatic competence (Fraser, 2010). The development of pragmatic competence in a target language is essential for successful communication in that language (Kasper, 1997). The understanding of pragmatic rules of language use is crucial for English language learners in order to develop pragmatic competence.

Studies Highlighting Effectiveness of Considering Perceptions

Takahashi (2001) pointed out that pragmatic competence of the language learners can be developed by encouraging them to acquire perceptions of pragmatics. This can be done by creating conducive classroom environment while teaching pragmatic perceptions to the ESL learners. The role of ESL learners is also very much significant in this regard (Alcon-Soler, 2005; Bardovi-Harlig & Griffin, 2005). These aspects have not been focused in the context of language teaching in Pakistan.

Rose (1994) has discussed the instant need for the learning and teaching of special variety of English with pragmatic system that is indigenized in the community and is often used by its members. However, Pakistani learners of English have to cope with difficulties in learning English mainly because of lack of opportunities and settings to practice their English outside the language classroom. There are several issues that affect the functional proficiency of Pakistani students in English and make them hesitant in speaking, writing, and reading English (Shahzadi, Zahabia, Shabana, Rehman, & Zahra, 2014). In a review of National Curriculum of English language, it is claimed that the opportunities provided to the learners for improving their linguistic structure, vocabulary, and style in diverse contexts of use, both in academic and social settings are less (Asghar, 2014). Pragmatics and intercultural communication skills cannot be easily acquired without instruction (Waugh, 2014). Therefore, proper attention should be paid on pragmatic competence development in the instruction of English as a second language. It is therefore recommended that for teaching English language special focus should be given to the development of pragmatic competence. Pragmatic perceptions include the way by which pragmatics is regarded, understood, or interpreted by the learners. Although, limited opportunities are available for learners of English language on both higher and professional levels to attain near native proficiency in spoken English, it is encouraging that universities have begun to promote the teaching and learning of English in Pakistan. In a country like Pakistan, it is generally considered that the development of academic proficiency in English is more important for success in education, but pragmatic competency plays a significant role when the learners have to use the language especially in spoken mode with their instructors and outside in the world. Even it has been declared by the government that the listening and speaking skills of the students are to be developed in the classroom context (Asghar, 2014). However, in Pakistan, the grammar accuracy of the learners of English is mainly stressed, and thus the communicative function of language seems neglected. In other words, the understanding of pragmatics is ignored in curriculum in Pakistan. Therefore, the present study explores perceptions of Pakistani university students of English regarding pragmatics in English language learning.

Material Methods

The study involved 200 students at intermediate level (100 males and 100 females), enrolled in the Higher Secondary School Certificate program from seven different colleges in Pakistan.

According to National Curriculum (2002), after 18th Amendment to the Constitution, responsibilities of curriculum and textbooks development and associated focusses like medium of instruction have been given to the provinces. Now provinces are in charge to make curriculum and textbooks considering their local context and needs.

Considering the differences of textbooks and cultures in different provinces, at least one college was selected from each province and region namely, Punjab, Sindh, KP, Baluchistan, Azad Jammu and Kashmir and Islamabad.

The students of the intermediate level were chosen because at this level the perceptions of the students are mature, and they are proficient enough in English to be taken as the participants of the research. For data collection samples, 18 students (9 male and 9 female) were chosen as participants of the focus group interviews. They were informed about the meaning of linguistic terms, such as 'pragmatics,' 'pragmatic knowledge,' 'pragmatic competence, by the researcher prior to the study. This was done to make them aware of the research content and address any misunderstandings beforehand.

Data Collection

The consent of the students was first taken. The participants were informed about the study. The purpose of the study was explained to the students. With the help of their teachers, the notion of pragmatics was clarified, and pragmatic skills were described considering cultural and social differences to the participants. The items in the questionnaire were read and explained well. The way of filling the questionnaire was also explained. Similarly, the volunteers for interview were asked different questions and responses were noted. All the collected data were codified and analysed using descriptive statistics and frequencies.

Instrumentation

Questionnaire

The research tools used for the present study include a questionnaire and focus group interviews. The questionnaire consisted of 5 five multiple-choice closed-ended questions and 2 open-ended questions to explore students' perceptions of pragmatics in familiar situations, following (Yuan, Tangen, Mills, & Lidstone, 2015). The questions were asked focusing on previous literature. The raw data were statistically analysed to transform it into frequency tables. The two open-ended questions were asked with an aim to seek personal opinions of the participants concerning English pragmatics in language learning process.

Focus Group Interviews

The major aim of the focus group interviews was to seek the opinions of the participants about pragmatic competence in English language learning. The questions which were included in the interview were adapted from past literature (Hudson, 2001; Takahashi, 2001; Martínez-Flor & Alcón-Soler, 2007; Yılmaz, 2010; Zheng & Huang, 2010).

Results and Discussion

The following section contains the data in the form of frequencies that were calculated through the questionnaire and focus group interviews. The tables are presented considering different questions.

Table 1 exhibits the perceptions of the students regarding linguistic knowledge and pragmatic knowledge considering the first two questions of the questionnaire. It has been observed that less than 40% of the students agreed with the first statement that considers English learning as the learning of English grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. More

than 60% students were of the view that acquiring other knowledge besides linguistic knowledge is equally important in learning English language.

Table 1
The vies of the participants about linguistic and pragmatic knowledge

Question No.	SD	D	N	A	SA
1	16.87%	40.51%	5.91%	29.54%	7.17%
2	10.97%	21.10%	2.53%	50.63%	14.77%

Table 1 shows the interest of the students in learning pragmatic knowledge. The participants recognized that knowledge other than linguistic knowledge is important in learning English language. These data were supported by the interview data in which two students stated: "Pragmatic knowledge is as useful as linguistic knowledge and they are closely linked and thus, cannot be separated" (Ali, pseudonyms).

The above findings show that the perceptions of Pakistani learners related to the importance of pragmatics are different from the linguistic knowledge that they get from English language textbooks. It was noted in the interviews that students considered the learning of English only for enhancing their linguistic competence. Such students had no awareness related to the development of pragmatic skills. One of the interviewers said that he was never exposed to the learning of cultural aspects in English language classroom.

The students in their priorities about language skills focused more on the communicative competence. It was observed that more than 50% of the respondents were keen to acquire communicative skills. Similarly, under 20% of the respondents showed interest in acquiring knowledge about using English for communicative purposes. The data in the following table also shows that less than 15% of the respondents showed interest in cultural knowledge and around 11% were found interested in learning linguistic knowledge.

Table 2
The knowledge that the students want to get in the English classroom

Question No.	Linguistic knowledge	Cultural information	Communicative abilities	Knowledge regarding the use of English
11	11.39%	13.08%	56.54%	18.99%

The data in the following table shows that a large number of the respondents showed their interest to attain the communicative skill in order to communicate with the people. On the other hand, only 5% of them showed their preference to gain ability translation ability. Those who wanted to learn English for better examination performance were around 17% while around 12% desired to gain the skill to read resources.

Table 3
Abilities that the respondents desire to gain in English learning

Question No.	Skill to communicate with people	Skill to do well in examinations	Skill to read materials	Ability to translate
12	66.24%	17.30%	11.81%	4.65%

It has been observed that the students at intermediate level got concerned in becoming communicatively competent language users. It seems that the intermediate learners were aware of the learning needs of English language in their context along with the recognition of the importance of pragmatic competence.

The following table presents the views of the respondents on two questions. Question 3 aimed to examine the learners' purpose of learning English. Only around 30% of the respondents commented that the purpose of learning English was to excel in the examination. The outcomes of this question differ from those of the similar study (Shi, 2000) where majority of the English students at Chinese college pointed out that major goal of their learning English was to pass the examinations. Question 5 investigated the students' views on their desire to learn native like English. It is interesting to note that more than 75% of the students showed the desire to speak like native English speakers. They were also found keen to imitate native English speakers in the pronunciation.

Table 4
The views of the respondents on learning outcomes

Question No.	SD	D	N	A	SA
3	18.14%	51.48%	0.42%	19.41%	10.55%
5	11.39%	12.24%	1.27%	37.12%	37.98%

The above findings were supplemented by the results of the interview data that "increase in pragmatic competence supports the students to perform well in different English-speaking opportunities and also assists in their future study and careers" and "the people who can effectively communicate with others in English can have better job opportunities in Pakistan". This expresses those Pakistani students understand the socio-cultural uses of English language learning in their context and they want to become competent in pragmatic knowledge. This also suggests that if such environment is provided to Pakistani students, it would encourage them to enhance their pragmatic competence.

As shown in the following table, the students believe that they can acquire pragmatic competence through communicative language instruction and appropriate practices. Fewer than 20% of the students considered the communicative activities useless. Majority of the students expressed that the major focus of the English class must be on communicative activities with slight description of necessary grammatical functions. It has been observed that more than 80% of the respondents preferred that the language teachers should concentrate on such strategies that can facilitate them to communicate with people and expressed their concerns in the use appropriate activities in English language classrooms...... However, the results of Question 6 presented a weak impact as less than 20% of the students indicated that communicative activities in the English class were a waste of time. In contrast, nearly 80% of the students held the opposite view. These results exhibit the realization of Pakistani students about inclusion of CLT and practice in the classroom.

Table 5
Students' views on communicative language instruction and practices

Question No.	SD	D	N	A	SA
6	39.66%	40.09%	0.84%	11.81%	7.60%
7	6.74%	7.60%	5.06%	40.09%	40.51%
8	9.70%	16.88%	3.80%	40.93%	28.69%

The findings highlight that Pakistani learner at intermediate level want to acquire pragmatic knowledge to enhance their communication skill in English language. The results support the findings of the literature that the pragmatic competence of the students can be developed thought communicative language teaching and assigning learning tasks to the students of the target language (Salmani-Nodoushan, 2007). The students were given a list of tasks and asked to mark at least two tasks which they considered significant to acquire communicative ability in English. The results are presented in the following table.

Table 6
Activities to improve communicative skill

Tasks	Percentage
1. Watching English movies and videos	82.70%
2. Reading English text	76.79%
3. Group discussions	75.11%
4. Debates	45.15%
5. Pair-work	43.04%
6. Learning to sing English songs	40.93%
7. Role-play	30.38%
8. Presentations	10.55%

The data in table 6 shows that 82% of the students were of the view that communicative ability could be improved by watching English movies and videos. The results show that more than 75% of the respondents believed that reading English text and participating in group discussion could be helpful to improve communicative ability. Similarly, 45% students preferred to opt debates, 43% opted pair-work as significant tasks to improve the communicative ability. Around 40% of the respondents believed that they could get their communicative enhanced by learning English songs. The role-play and presentations were also thought to be helpful in this regard by 30% and 10% students respectively.

The students were asked to give justifications for listing the tasks. More than 50% of the respondents explained the necessity of exposure to authentic English materials in the form of videos, written texts, songs on other teaching or learning materials. Cai (2007) has also stressed on the use of materials and activities for the development of communicative ability.

These finding of the questionnaire were further supported by the interview responses, signifying that the students want to be exposed to authentic learning materials. They desire to practice "native speaker's pronunciation and intonation", and "learn to use the colloquial English language from shows and movies". Some suitable strategies for enhancing both linguistic and pragmatic knowledge are watching English shows and movies and reading newspaper or magazine. Some students expressed that they can comprehend the target language used in specific contexts in a better way through visual images and music, and that they might have more benefits by learning a language with different materials. A few students also talked about the use of newspapers and magazines for providing versatile data on every aspect of life, and this will be beneficial as students can learn English well if they have good interest in reading different texts of English language.

The results demonstrate that the students highlighted the different tasks like group discussions, pair-work, role-plays, and debate which could be help them to increase confidence to use English. Fushino (2010) also pointed out that the confidence among the students can be built by engaging them in group discussions, pair-work and debates because the individual differences help the learners to overcome their deficiencies. A few students commented that they became nervous in formal presentation and committed mistakes while they felt comfortable in the discussions with fellow learners.

The interview data also yielded the similar preferences by the students. Pakistani learners at intermediate level liked to perform tasks in groups owing to the lack of confidence in using English language. This is because they are not pragmatically competent and working in groups made them feel secure and confident.

The respondents were asked to identify the tasks most commonly used by the English teachers at intermediate level aiming to enhance pragmatic competence of the students. The students pointed out that role play is the least commonly used task in this

regard whereas group discussions, pair-work and debated are used by the teachers with equal focus. The following table shows the frequencies of the said tasks.

Table 7
Pragmatically focused tasks used in classroom at intermediate level

Question No.	Group discussion	Pair-work	Role-play	Debate
15	27.43%	27.85%	16.45%	28.27%

The students were asked to share their views on the role of the tasks in using the language appropriately. Majority of the students disagreed with the utility of the class tasks. They seemed to believe that these tasks did not help them in learning the suitable use of English language. In response to question 10, around 50% of the students specified their dislike for "grammar translation" and "vocabulary translation" methods. The following table presents the responses of the students on these questions.

Table 8
The views of the respondents on the utility of classroom tasks

Question No.	SD	D	N	A	SA
9	10.13%	56.97%	6.74%	16.46%	9.70%
10	10.55%	40.93%	0.84%	37.98%	9.70%

As exhibited by the results, most of the students showed discontent with the currently employed pedagogical methods at intermediate level. According to them, the current methods tend to be teacher-cantered and do not aim to develop the pragmatic competences of the learners. English teachers at intermediate level spend most of their time in class discussing linguistic knowledge, for example grammar, vocabulary, and syntax, etc. The students were devoid of the probabilities to exercise their English language capability in the classroom. Furthermore, the students considered English language teaching to be examination oriented. It was preferred because the students at intermediate level need to get high grades to qualify for pre-tests of different professional institutions like medical colleges and engineering universities. Therefore, both teachers only focus on grammatical competence for making their students get good grades to qualify the merit of renowned professional institutions in the country, as one of the students asserted, 'our focus is more on getting grades and we get grades by practicing grammatical skills and thus we lack in pragmatic abilities" (Alia, pseudonym). Thus, it can be said that the contribution of such teaching in developing the pragmatic competence is of no visible help, and this might be the fact at university level the students get more concerned in gaining this competence.

The results of the present study this study reveal that Pakistani ESL learners at intermedia are concerned about the significance of pragmatic competence. The goal for learning English learning at intermediate level is just to pass examinations in good grades as English is a mandatory subject. Though the learners are interested to turn out to be competent English users, but their curriculum and teaching methods are not supportive. As the students showed their disappointment with the existing English teaching at intermediate level in Pakistan, there should be some modifications in the existing curriculum to help effectively in the improvement of their pragmatic competence. As requested by the students, the curriculum should contain the material which could help the learner to develop their pragmatic competence and improve their capability of using English for communicative purposes.

Conclusion

The study was conducted to examine the pragmatic perceptions of the Pakistani ESL learners at intermediate level and to observe how these students perceive pragmatic knowledge. The results reveal that the pragmatic perceptions of the Pakistani ESL learner at intermediate level have been transformed significantly. The learners should realise the

significance of the language use for communicative purposes. They need to be taught the varying functions of language in social interactions. The students consider the pragmatic knowledge equally important to the learning of linguistic knowledge. Pakistani students also realize that pragmatic competence plays significant role in the process of English language learning, and it helps in learning the language for communicative purposes. The lack of pragmatic competence among the students is the result of inappropriate instruction materials and pedagogical methods. The conventional teaching methods focus on the examinations rather than the development of pragmatic competence. They study stressed the inclusion of pragmatic tasks in the learning materials.

The findings of the present study provide empirical evidence for curriculum developers in Pakistan to realize the necessity of inclusion of task-based activities in the curriculum which should develop the pragmatic perceptions among the students in learning English as a foreign language. Pakistani EFL instructors also need to attain more pragmatic knowledge and improve their pragmatic competence. They should also adopt the pedagogical methods which are more learner-centred and less examination-oriented. It is essential to provide the Pakistani EFL learners with effective assistance of curriculum and teaching techniques is necessary to make the pragmatically competence. This research study implicates that further research for development of appropriate curriculum and teaching pedagogies to maximize learning outcomes.

References

Alcon-Soler, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System*, *33*(3), 417-435.

Asghar, J. (2014). Review of reading goals in the national curriculum of English language (grades 11-12) in Pakistan. *Academic Research International*, *5*(3), 292.

Bachman, L. (2004). *Statistical analyses for language assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L., & Palmer, A. (2010). *Language assessment in practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Dornyei, Z. (1998). Do language learners recognize pragmatic violations? Pragmatic versus grammatical awareness in instructed L2 learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(2), 233-262.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Griffin, R. (2005). L2 pragmatic awareness: Evidence from the ESL classroom. *System*, *33*(3), 401-415.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). Introduction to teaching pragmatics. *English Teaching Forum, 7*, 37-39.

Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bolton, K. (2003). *Chinese Englishes: A sociolinguistic history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Crosscultural Psychology*, *1*, 185-216.

Cai, J. (2007). On principles of College English textbook writing. In D. Qiu & J. Cai (Eds.), *The Exploration and Prospective of College English Textbook* (pp. 148-174). Shanghai: Fudan University Press.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to language pedagogy. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 2-27). London: Longman.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical aspects of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 1-47.

Chang, J. Y. (2006). Globalization and English in Chinese higher education. *World Englishes*, *25*(3), 513-525.

Chen, M. L. (2009). Influence of grade level on perceptual learning style preferences and language learning strategies of Taiwanese English as a foreign language learners. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *19*(2), 304-308.

Ersozlu, Z. N. (2010). Determining of the student teachers' learning and studying strategies. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 5147-5151.

Fushino, K. (2010). Causal relationships between communication confidence, beliefs about group work, and willingness to communicate in foreign language group work. *TESOL Quarterly*, *44*(4), 700-724.

He, D., & Zhang, Q. Y. (2010). Native speaker norms and China English: From the perspective of learners and teachers in China. *TESOL Quarterly*, *44*(4), 769-789.

He, Z. (1988). *A survey of pragmatics*. Changsha: Hunan Education Press.

Hiep, P. H. (2007). Communicative language teaching: Unity within diversity. *ELT Journal*, *61*(3), 193-201.

Hoegl, M., & Gemuenden, H. G. (2001). Teamwork quality and the success of innovative projects: A theoretical concept and empirical evidence. *Organization Science*, *12*(4), 435-449.

Hudson, T. (2001). Indicators for pragmatic instruction: Some quantitative tools. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 283-300). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-285). Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Ji, P. (2008). *Pragmatics and pedagogy in College English teaching*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Jiang, Y. (2002). China English: Issues, studies, and features. *Asian Englishes*, *5*, 4-23.

Keshavarz, M. H., Eslami, Z. R., & Ghahraman, V. (2006). Pragmatic transfer and Iranian EFL refusals: A cross-cultural perspective of Persian and English. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, C. Felix-Brasdefer & A. S. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics Language Learning* (pp. 359- 402). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Liu, S. (2004). Differences between NS and NNS in pragmatics. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, *8*, 14-18.

Martínez-Flor, A., & Alcon-Soler, E. A. (2007). Developing pragmatic awareness of suggestions in the ELF classroom: A focus on instructional effects. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(1), 47-76.

Men, M., & Liu, Q. (2000). A research report on university students' pragmatic competence. *Journal of Xi'an Foreign Languages University*, *8*(4), 92-94.

Niezgoda, K., & Rover, C. (2001). Pragmatic and grammatical awareness: A function of the learning environment. In K. R. Rose & K. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 1-12). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nureddeen, F. A. (2008). Cross cultural pragmatics: Apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *40*(2), 279-306.

Roever, C. (2010). Researching pragmatics. In B. Paltridge & A. Phakiti (Eds.), *Continuum Comparison to Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 240-255). London, New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Salmani-Nodoushan, M. A. (2007). A framework for task-oriented language instruction. *I-manager's Journal on School Educational Technology*, *3*, 5-16.

Savignon, S. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL Quarterly*, *25*, 261-277.

Schauer, G. A. (2006). The development of ESL learners' pragmatic competence: A longitudinal investigation of awareness and production. In K. Bardovi-Harlig, C. Felix-

Brasdefer & A. S. Omar (Eds.), *Pragmatics Language Learning* (pp. 135-164). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Shen, H., & Yuan, Y. (2013). Reframing research and teaching of English in China: Perception, practice, and paradigm. *Foreign Language Learning: Theory and Practice, 1*, 1-7.

Shi, Y. (2000). Investigation into Chinese College English students' learning motivations. *Foreign Language Teaching, 4*, 8-11.

Taguchi, N. (Ed.). (2009). *Pragmatic competence*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 171- 199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tateyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatic routines: Japanese Sumimasen. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 200-222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tuncer, U. (2009). How do monolingual and bilingual language learners differ in use of learning strategies while learning a foreign language? Evidences from Mersin University. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *1*(1), 852-856.

Wang, Y. (2010). Application of pragmatics theories in College English teaching. *Language and Literature Learning*, *7*, 127-128.

Widdowson, H. G. (1992). *Communication, community, and the problem of appropriate use*. Paper presented at the Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow: Longman Pearson Ed.

Wu, Q. (2017). A Research into the Reform of College English Teaching Based on Cultivating" Critical Thinking Skills". In *2017 International Conference on Innovations in Economic Management and Social Science (IEMSS 2017)* (pp. 1091-1095). Atlantis Press.

Yuan, Y., & Shen, H. (2009). Pedagogy, practice and students' motivation: Voices from College English classrooms. In H. Shen & Y. Yan (Eds.), *Developments and Prospects of English Teaching in China* (pp. 21-43). Shanghai: Fudan University Press.

Yuan, Y., & Shen, H. (2013). Analysis and evaluation of Chinese English language learning websites. *Foreign Language Education in China*, *6*(1), 41-49.

Yuan, Y., Tangen, D., Mills, K. A., & Lidstone, J. (2015). Learning English Pragmatics in China: An Investigation into Chinese EFL Learners' Perceptions of Pragmatics. *TESL-EJ*, *19*(1), 1-16.

Zhang, H. (2008). Strategies on how to help Chinese students walk out of deaf and mute English. *China Education Innovation Herald*, *23*, 22-23.

Zhang, X. (2002). College English teaching and development of pragmatic competence. *Journal of South China University of Technology (Social Science Edition)*, *4*(1), 73-78.

Zhao, Y. (2009). The relationship between deaf and mute English and the foreign language learning. *Education Science and Culture Magazine*, *1*, 111-112.

Zheng, L., & Huang, J. (2010). A study of Chinese EFL learners' pragmatic failure and the implications for College English teaching. *Polyglossia*, *18*, 41-54.