

Relationship of Medium and Method of Instruction with L2 Speaking Proficiency in Pakistani Classrooms

Sidra Bukhari¹, Aleem Shakir²

¹PhD Scholar, Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

Correspondence: bukhari.sidra@yahoo.com

²Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

Email: almsha@yahoo.com

Abstract

In Pakistan, the greater gains English proficiency promises has led to its usage as a medium of instruction in schools. Based on Krashen's input Principal, this research compares speaking proficiency of L2 learners taught with the help of summaries, translations and meaning of difficult words in L1 with those who were taught by direct immersion in L2. L2 learners (n=159) aged 25-30 (males and females) from public and private institutions were selected through convenient sampling. They were administered a 25-item questionnaire based on their schooling background. Same students took a speech test identical to British Council IELTS speech test. Two well experienced IELTS Examiners, rated them using British Council rubric for IELTS Speech Test. Correlations were found out using independent sample t test, one-way ANOVA and Post Hoc test. Respondents taught by direct immersion in (second language) L2 scored higher. This research urges teachers to give huge input to the students which will improve their speaking proficiency.

Keywords: method of teaching, medium of teaching, L2 speaking proficiency, huge input

1. Introduction

English proficiency is viewed as an essential expertise that native and nonnative Learners from various dialect foundations are required to acquire (Fleckenstein, Leucht, Pan, & O Köller, 2016). The status of English can be ascribed to its strength in the assortment of global monetary and social fields (Vodopija-Krstanović & Marinac, 2019). English is right now spoken in more than 70 nations as a first dialect or as an official (second) dialect; around 380 million individuals talk English as a first dialect (L1). In addition, one billion people learn English worldwide. The Outer Circle and Expanding Circle nations utilize English to a great extent to impart with the individuals who don't share a comparative social and phonetic foundation (Zoghbor, 2018). In the last decade there has been a growing body of research that has had L2 Learner's spoken proficiency

and various aspects in relationship with it as its focus (Aiello, 2015; Wyk, Mostert, & Hui, 2016; Veivo, Porretta, Hyona, & Jarvikivi, 2018). This includes wide research on methodologies to teach L2 and role of teacher in the proficiency of L2 Learner (Samaranayake, 2016). This research focuses on the methods used by L2 in Pakistani classrooms to acquire L2 by comparing speaking proficiency of L2 learners who were taught English with the help of summaries, translations and meaning of difficult words in L1 with those who were taught English by direct immersion in L2.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Teaching L2 proficiency: A Contextual Construct

Theoretical framework taken for this study is ‘The Input Principle’ (Krashen, 1982). This Principle accomplishes that that acquisition occurs when learners get understandable messages or input in the target language. This language input is either in the form of listening or reading. Of these two reading is more effective in the process of language acquisition. This principal maintains that we should give huge amount of understandable input to our students if we want them to get engaged in L2 output i.e., speaking and writing (Patrick, 2019).

2.2 Teaching L2 Proficiency in Pakistani Classrooms

Schooling has a wide effect on various aspects of achievement of L2 Learner (Cliffordson & Gustafsson, 2008). In schools however as found by Samaranayake (2016) who conducted research in the rural context of Sri Lanka the method used by English teachers for teaching does not provide the learners with sufficient input of the target language to improve their oral communication skills. This resulted in that most of the students from rural schools in Sri Lanka showed a limited or a low proficiency level in oral communication in English. This can be extended to Pakistani classrooms where majority of the L2 learners have low proficiency. Siddiqui and Gorard (2017) differentiate schools as Government and Private schools. According to Rehman (2015), three types of schools exist in Pakistan: Private, Government and religious. The private schools can be divided according to Memon (2015) into two types, Elite and non-elite. Elite English-medium schools are small in number being very expensive and cater for a small, elite class. The elite schools have well-qualified trained teachers. The students of these schools emerge with a good command of English, due to their immersion in English-medium teaching. In addition, these children have acquisition-rich home environments; hence they are proficient English speakers, with pronunciation which better resembles native speakers, compared to private non-elitist pupils studying. The private non-elite English-medium schools are growing rapidly due to an increase in demand in recent years. There is an increase in so-called English-medium schools, even

in rural areas of Pakistan. The teachers rarely receive any in service training whereas the methods they use are not very different from the state-run schools. Memon (2015) has established that government schools can be divided into elite and non-elite. The state-influenced elitist schools are English-medium which include the top public schools. Non-elitist government schools offer teaching in the vernacular rather than in English. These government schools are mostly attended by children from poor families. These schools can be found in urban and rural areas. The teaching in these schools takes place either in Urdu or any regional language. The children do not have any exposure to English informally hence they have very low proficiency in English. Poor families either send their children to the government schools or Madrassas, as they cannot afford tuition fees of private schools.

In Pakistan methodology to be adopted in classrooms by the teacher is not mentioned in the curriculum so teachers use suitable methodology. Majority of Pakistani L2 learners come with no English background. In schools they learn English Proficiency. Public schools in Pakistan use typical method of teaching English where a topic of L2 is taught taking First Language (L1) as reference. Many research papers are present on the wide use of GTM method in Pakistani classrooms (Durrani, 2016). The teaching in these schools takes place either in Urdu or any regional language (Memon, 2015). Grammar Translation Method (GTM) according to Zhang (2014) stresses on structures and rules of grammar with more focus on reading and writing instead of focusing on oral communication. In 18th and middle of 19th Century foreign languages were majorly taught by this method. Other methods were also developing. According to Durrani (2016), GTM is used in most of the schools and colleges in Pakistan. More emphasis had been put in twentieth century on using target language in the classrooms. But a reassessment of translation which is a characteristic of GTM has begun to appear too (Scheffler, 2013) and who investigated grammar-translation task and a communicative language exchange in a study. The results show that the learners considered translating sentences equally useful. Durrani (2016) also shares that Students find GTM more useful as compared to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) despite the latter being new.

As 19th century ends, Direct Method (DM) developed with natural approach at its base. In natural approach L2 learning is considered just like L1 learning by teachers. DM was developed initially in an attempt to incorporate target language use into the classroom. Maximum usage of target language is aimed at in these class rooms. It is believed that that the students listened and as a result learn a language. Here correction of learners' speech errors is undesirable (Zhang, 2014). Cook (2013) shared that CLT relies on the functioning of second language including the meanings they wanted to express hence leading to those pedagogic exercises that made the students communicate with one another. CLT thus is known as the most effective language teaching method. Zhang

(2014). This needs to be integrated in the class rooms. One of the reasons that why CLT is not in practiced in class rooms in Punjab is the lack of professional training the other may be certain rituals of teaching which had been in practice for decades. The problem of student's lack of spoken proficiency prevails in Pakistan. The main reasons behind this include large classes, traditional style of teaching and teacher's low speaking proficiency besides other issues. CLT should be promoted in the classrooms for better spoken proficiency of the students (Panhwar, Baloch, & Khan, 2017). CLT activities frequently take the form of pair and group work (Kaharuddin, 2018).

3. Materials and Methods

It is a quantitative study based on descriptive questionnaire survey and speech test rating. Independent variables: whether or not English lesson was taught through Summaries in L1, whether or not meaning of difficult words in English lesson were told in L1, whether or not translations of English lessons in L1 is done, whether an L2 learner belong to public or private school. Dependent variables are Pronunciation score, vocabulary score, lexical resource score, fluency score and overall score (scores taken in bands). A quantitative research involves generation of knowledge and understanding the social world. It is used by social scientists and communication researchers, to observe phenomena or occurrences that affect humans. Quantitative research is a way to learn a sample population relying on data that are analyzed to examine questions about the sample population (Allen, 2017).

3.1 Participants

Through convenient sampling technique (n=159) participants were selected. Convenient sampling is also known as Haphazard Sampling or Accidental Sampling. It is a type of nonprobability or nonrandom sampling in which members of the target population are picked because they fulfill certain practical criteria e.g., easy accessibility, geographical proximity, availability at a given time, or the willingness to participate (Etikan, 2016). The participants were University students. These L2 learners (around 50% males and 50% females) were from L2 background. They belonged to different places in Punjab and were either doing or had done Master's degree from Public and private Universities all over Punjab. They lie between 25-30 years of age at the time of data collection. Data was collected from Government College University Lahore, University of Education Lahore and from Career Makers an IELTS Centre in Lahore where L2 Learners from various public and private colleges and universities of Punjab Pakistan filled the questionnaire and took the speech test.

3.2 Instruments

The instruments for this study comprise of questionnaire and a speech test. Data collected from back ground questionnaire was followed by a speech test of the same participants. Background or demographic questions allow for the characterization of the people who will participate in the interview or focus group. The questionnaire was adapted from the study by Guimarães and Sampaio (2011). Individual interviews were conducted from the students for which British Council IELTS Examination was taken as a bench mark. The sample and the instruction provided at the British Council website was utilized for conducting the interview (<https://takeielts.britishcouncil.org/prepare-test/understand-test-format/speaking-test>). All the interviews were audio recorded for rating as well as for keeping record for future reference. The interview lasted for 10-11 minutes. Because of validity and reliability as well as objectivity that come with a valid instrument IELTS Speech Test from British Council was taken as bench mark. The data was coded and subjected to SPSS software. Correlations were found out using independent sample t test, one-way ANOVA and Post Hoc test.

3.3 Data Reliability and validity

The speaking portion of the British Council IELTS Test was adapted to measure proficiency of the students keeping in view its wide usage internationally for assessment of speaking proficiency. Since it is internationally used and checked instrument so its validity and reliability were unquestionable. The questionnaire had been administered to 159 participants and was understandable for each one of them in one go hence showing face validity.

3.4 Results

The following results were found out:

Table 1

*Relationship of Method of teaching and speaking Proficiency***Correlations**

		Method	Fluency	Pronunciation	Lexical Resource	Grammar & Accuracy	Overall Bands
Method	Pearson Correlation	1	.223**	.176*	.157*	.144	.186*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.005	.027	.049	.072	.019
	N	159	158	158	158	158	158
Fluency	Pearson Correlation	.223**	1	.657**	.759**	.705**	.880**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	158	158	158	158	158	158
Pronunciation	Pearson Correlation	.176*	.657**	1	.593**	.558**	.699**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	158	158	158	158	158	158
Lexical Resource	Pearson Correlation	.157*	.759**	.593**	1	.661**	.842**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.049	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	158	158	158	158	158	158
Grammar & Accuracy	Pearson Correlation	.144	.705**	.558**	.661**	1	.828**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.072	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	158	158	158	158	158	158
Overall Bands	Pearson Correlation	.186*	.880**	.699**	.842**	.828**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.019	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	158	158	158	158	158	158
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).							
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).							

All the variables are significantly positively correlated with the method of teachings, except the Grammar and Accuracy which is positively correlated but significant at 10% level of significance. The result from Table 1 has shown that speaking proficiency is positively related with method of teaching. This means when teacher taught directly in the target language students showed better fluency, lexical resource and pronunciation.

Table 2

*Relationship of word for word translation in Urdu and Proficiency***ANOVA**

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Fluency	Between Groups	1.811	3	.604	1.452	.230
	Within Groups	64.031	154	.416		
	Total	65.842	157			
Pronunciation	Between Groups	2.451	3	.817	1.115	.345
	Within Groups	112.804	154	.732		
	Total	115.255	157			
Lexical Resource	Between Groups	1.541	3	.514	1.055	.370
	Within Groups	74.997	154	.487		
	Total	76.538	157			
Grammar & Accuracy	Between Groups	2.092	3	.697	1.446	.232
	Within Groups	74.262	154	.482		
	Total	76.354	157			
Overall Bands	Between Groups	1.017	3	.339	.867	.460
	Within Groups	60.198	154	.391		
	Total	61.215	157			

The results of the ANOVA shows that there are no significant differences between at least one groups mean as p-values are greater than 0.05. for method of instructions. This result shows that proficiency remained unaffected whether English Lesson was taught by directly immersing in the target language or by translation word for word into L1 which is Urdu for majority of the respondents.

Table 3

*Relationship of summarization of lessons into Urdu and proficiency***One-way ANOVA****ANOVA**

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Fluency	Between Groups	4.723	3	1.574	3.967	.009
	Within Groups	61.119	154	.397		
	Total	65.842	157			
Pronunciation	Between Groups	6.824	3	2.275	3.231	.024
	Within Groups	108.430	154	.704		
	Total	115.255	157			
Lexical Resource	Between Groups	2.839	3	.946	1.978	.120
	Within Groups	73.699	154	.479		
	Total	76.538	157			
Grammar & Accuracy	Between Groups	1.066	3	.355	.727	.537
	Within Groups	75.288	154	.489		
	Total	76.354	157			
Overall Bands	Between Groups	2.554	3	.851	2.235	.086
	Within Groups	58.661	154	.381		
	Total	61.215	157			

Table 4

*Post Hoc Tests***Multiple Comparisons**

LSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Q8: Would your teacher summarize the English lesson into Urdu after teaching it?	(J) Q8: Would your teacher summarize the English lesson into Urdu after teaching it?	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Fluency	Almost never	Sometimes	.2019	.2018	.318	-.197	.600
		Often	-.0750	.2300	.745	-.529	.379
		almost always	-.1892	.1961	.336	-.576	.198
	Sometimes	Almost never	-.2019	.2018	.318	-.600	.197
		Often	-.2769	.1658	.097	-.604	.051
		almost always	-.3911*	.1140	.001	-.616	-.166
	Often	Almost never	.0750	.2300	.745	-.379	.529
		Sometimes	.2769	.1658	.097	-.051	.604
		almost always	-.1142	.1588	.473	-.428	.199
	almost always	Almost never	.1892	.1961	.336	-.198	.576
		Sometimes	.3911*	.1140	.001	.166	.616
		Often	.1142	.1588	.473	-.199	.428
Pronunciation	Almost never	Sometimes	.0801	.2687	.766	-.451	.611
		Often	-.3083	.3064	.316	-.914	.297
		almost always	-.3671	.2611	.162	-.883	.149

	Sometimes	Almost never	-.0801	.2687	.766	-.611	.451
		Often	-.3885	.2208	.080	-.825	.048
		almost always	-.4472*	.1518	.004	-.747	-.147
	Often	Almost never	.3083	.3064	.316	-.297	.914
		Sometimes	.3885	.2208	.080	-.048	.825
		almost always	-.0588	.2115	.781	-.477	.359
	almost always	Almost never	.3671	.2611	.162	-.149	.883
		Sometimes	.4472*	.1518	.004	.147	.747
		Often	.0588	.2115	.781	-.359	.477
Lexical Resource	Almost never	Sometimes	.0224	.2215	.919	-.415	.460
		Often	-.1333	.2526	.598	-.632	.366
		almost always	-.2691	.2153	.213	-.694	.156
	Sometimes	Almost never	-.0224	.2215	.919	-.460	.415
		Often	-.1558	.1820	.393	-.515	.204
		almost always	-.2916*	.1252	.021	-.539	-.044
	Often	Almost never	.1333	.2526	.598	-.366	.632
		Sometimes	.1558	.1820	.393	-.204	.515
		almost always	-.1358	.1743	.437	-.480	.209
	almost always	Almost never	.2691	.2153	.213	-.156	.694
		Sometimes	.2916*	.1252	.021	.044	.539
		Often	.1358	.1743	.437	-.209	.480
Grammar & Accuracy	Almost never	Sometimes	.1410	.2239	.530	-.301	.583

		Often	.1583	.2553	.536	-.346	.663
		almost always	-.0214	.2176	.922	-.451	.408
	Sometimes	Almost never	-.1410	.2239	.530	-.583	.301
		Often	.0173	.1840	.925	-.346	.381
		almost always	-.1624	.1265	.201	-.412	.088
	Often	Almost never	-.1583	.2553	.536	-.663	.346
		Sometimes	-.0173	.1840	.925	-.381	.346
		almost always	-.1797	.1762	.309	-.528	.168
	almost always	Almost never	.0214	.2176	.922	-.408	.451
		Sometimes	.1624	.1265	.201	-.088	.412
		Often	.1797	.1762	.309	-.168	.528
Overall Bands	Almost never	Sometimes	.0513	.1977	.796	-.339	.442
		Often	-.0083	.2254	.971	-.454	.437
		almost always	-.2218	.1921	.250	-.601	.158
	Sometimes	Almost never	-.0513	.1977	.796	-.442	.339
		Often	-.0596	.1624	.714	-.380	.261
		almost always	-.2731*	.1117	.016	-.494	-.053
	Often	Almost never	.0083	.2254	.971	-.437	.454
		Sometimes	.0596	.1624	.714	-.261	.380
		almost always	-.2135	.1555	.172	-.521	.094
	almost always	Almost never	.2218	.1921	.250	-.158	.601
		Sometimes	.2731*	.1117	.016	.053	.494

		Often	.2135	.1555	.172	-.094	.521
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.							

The results of the ANOVA shows that there are no significant differences between at least one groups mean as p-values are greater than 0.05. for Lexical Resource, Grammar & Accuracy and Overall Bands. The Fluency and Pronunciation has at least one group's means significantly different as their p-values are less than 0.05 for method of instructions.

However, Fluency and Pronunciation does get affected whether lesson was taught in English only or the summaries of the lessons were given in Urdu. Since mean value of the "almost always" is much greater than "sometimes" thus for fluency as p value is 0.003 if teacher always delivers in English fluency and Pronunciation gets is improved.

Table 5

Relationship of teaching English by telling meaning of difficult words and proficiency

One-way ANOVA

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Fluency	Between Groups	3.193	3	1.064	2.616	.053
	Within Groups	62.649	154	.407		
	Total	65.842	157			
Pronunciation	Between Groups	1.939	3	.646	.878	.454
	Within Groups	113.316	154	.736		
	Total	115.255	157			
Lexical Resource	Between Groups	1.891	3	.630	1.301	.276
	Within Groups	74.647	154	.485		
	Total	76.538	157			
Grammar & Accuracy	Between Groups	1.371	3	.457	.939	.424
	Within Groups	74.984	154	.487		

	Total	76.354	157			
Overall Bands	Between Groups	1.538	3	.513	1.323	.269
	Within Groups	59.677	154	.388		
	Total	61.215	157			

The results of the ANOVA shows that there are no significant differences between at least one groups mean as p-values are greater than 0.05 for method of instructions. Significance value of fluency is 0.053 which is close to 0.05 hence this shows that fluency is improved if meaning of words are told in English and not in Urdu.

Table 6

Relationship of English and Urdu medium of instruction and speaking proficiency

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Fluency	Equal variances assumed	.995	.320	-.383	153	.702	-.0396	.1034	-.2438	.1647
	Equal variances not assumed			-.379	140.378	.706	-.0396	.1045	-.2462	.1671
Pronunciation	Equal variances assumed	.773	.381	.823	153	.412	.1138	.1383	-.1594	.3871

	Equal variances not assumed			.797	118.440	.427	.1138	.1429	-.1691	.3968
Lexical Resource	Equal variances assumed	.080	.778	-.292	153	.770	-.0327	.1119	-.2537	.1883
	Equal variances not assumed			-.292	147.848	.771	-.0327	.1120	-.2541	.1887
Grammar & Accuracy	Equal variances assumed	.030	.863	1.510	153	.133	.1699	.1125	-.0524	.3921
	Equal variances not assumed			1.492	139.871	.138	.1699	.1138	-.0551	.3949
Overall Bands	Equal variances assumed	.141	.708	.313	153	.754	.0315	.1006	-.1673	.2303
	Equal variances not assumed			.311	144.726	.756	.0315	.1012	-.1685	.2316

***Interpretation:** The result of the independent sample t tests shows that there are no significant differences (as p-value greater than 0.05) for all the variables regarding private and public sector schools. The result shows that schooling (public or private) does not affect speaking proficiency of L2 learners.

3.5 Summary of key findings

- Speaking proficiency is positively related with method of teaching. This means when teacher taught directly in the target language students showed better fluency, lexical resource and pronunciation.

- Proficiency remained unaffected whether English Lesson was taught by directly immersing in the target language or by translation word for word into L1 which is Urdu for majority of the respondents.
- Lexical Resource, Grammar & Accuracy and Overall Bands were not affected whether lesson was taught in English or summaries of the English lessons were given in Urdu. However, Fluency and Pronunciation got affected. If teacher always taught in English fluency and Pronunciation gets improved.
- Fluency is improved if meaning of words were told in English and not in Urdu.
- Schooling (public or private) does not affect speaking proficiency of L2 learners.

4. Discussion

The summary of the above findings advocate that Proficiency is improved if lessons are taught by direct immersion in the target language. The Principle of input by Krashen (1982) asserts that huge amount of understandable input should be provided to the students in the target language. This may be in the form of reading and listening (Patrick, 2019). It was found through the results of the present study that those students who were given input in the target language were more fluent speakers. Moreover, their pronunciation was also better. The above results go parallel with the teaching second language just in the way as first language is taught as shared by Zhang (2014). Samaranayake (2016) found that method adopted by teachers provides insufficient input to their students and this leads to low proficiency in L2 learners. This may be extended to Pakistani classrooms. There are different types of schools in Pakistan. Siddiqui and Gorard (2017) share there are Two types of schools (Government and Private) while Rahman (2015) shares there are three types (Government, private and religious). Memon (2015) further shares that Private schools are of two types, Elite and non-elite. Elite schools are out of reach of majority of the people in Pakistan. Children in Elite schools are given input by well trained teachers. In addition, they have facilitating home environment too. Elite schools as compared to Government schools have well educated trained teachers. Memon (2015) shares Government school do not give exposure of English to their students. The present research did not get significant relation between type of school (public and private) and proficiency of L2 learners. This means that it's not essential that a student from public schooling background is always a low proficiency speaker. This goes against observation shared by Memon (2015) that students from Elite schools have good speaking proficiency due to their immersion in English-medium teaching. However, there are other factors from schooling such as classroom practice (Riasti, 2018) and method of teaching adopted by the teacher that has significant relation with speaking proficiency. The present study for example shows positive relation of method of teaching in school and proficiency scores (Table1). Thus, schooling is ultimately related to various aspects of achievement of L2 Learner as shared by

(Cliffordson & Gustafsson, 2008). As far as method of teaching is concerned result of the present study shows that Lexical Resource, Grammar & Accuracy were not affected whether lesson was taught in English or summaries of the English lessons were given in Urdu. So as suggested in Durrani (2016) above, grammar may be taught by contrasting English and Urdu as well as contextualizing it. Durrani (2016) opposes direct immersion in target language and shares that grammar is really important in study of English to learn correct language. Since it is impossible to speak English without the knowledge of Grammar, participants in her study who were under graduates disagreed that grammar should be taught indirectly. Similarly, contrastive analysis of English with Urdu and contextualizing grammar is helpful for learning grammar. GTM is widely used method in Pakistani classrooms (Durrani, 2016) and it is Urdu or regional language used to for teaching there. Although helpful in teaching grammar GTM focuses on reading and writing more while speaking proficiency is ignored. This problem of student's lack of spoken proficiency prevails in Pakistan. Focus on target language is after all necessary to improve speaking proficiency of L2 Learners. One possible solution is to promote CLT in the traditional Pakistani classrooms (Panhwar, Baloch, & Khan, 2017). CLT activities frequently take the form of pair and group work (Kaharuddin, 2018). According to Zhang (2014), it enables language learners to exchange meaning in the target language in class and promotes the interaction between teacher and student and students and students in the target language. Based on research done by Alsaghiar (2018) some features of CLT can be mixed with GTM in for teaching. Activities in group of 3 to 4 can be introduced in class teaching grammar through GTM. Students can be made to communicate in English during activity time. Role play presentations if taken in addition to typical exam based on GTM can improve speaking proficiency of L2 learners.

Another possibility is that for traditional Pakistani classrooms DM can be used by taking aid of total physical response (Patrick, 2019) to maximize new vocabulary, increasing understanding on part of L2 learners, lowering affective filter in students and getting them indulged in learning so much so that they move from conscious effort to learn language spontaneously (and as a result acquisition occurs). Whatever method is used in the classes' language learning should be there. For this individual effort of the teacher is most important in teaching. An example quoted by Patrick (2019) is also thought provoking in this regard. He shares that he joined learning Spanish from an Indian native instructor. His Spanish teacher would introduce new vocabulary items in his class with increased class involvement. The teacher would give huge amount of target language input to his tutees and would not use a single word in English making sure at the same time that every single child in the class would understand every bit of his lecture. For this he would take help from total physical response too. The teacher would speak so much of the target language that Patrick (2019) would think in Spanish on his way home after taking class. In this way by practicing vocabulary and wherever possible

will not only bring positive wash back effect but also bring improvement in speaking proficiency of our students.

5. Conclusion

Every day L2 learners should be given huge amount of sight and sound input in the target language. Succinctly put GTM can be amalgamated with CLT to bring communication practice in the classes in case direct method cannot be used. This can be done by adding Interactive activities to GTM while teaching vocabulary and this mixing can bring better results as far as speaking a language is concerned. According to demographic details gathered from L2 Learners in this study majority of students come from lower middle-class families not grounded in English. They do not afford to go to high fee demanding private schools to learn English. In Public schools a teacher should amalgamate GTM and CLT with the focus to improve speaking proficiency of L2 learners. He can also scaffold students with no English background by teaching through DM aided by Total Physical Response. That may lead to stop people believing in the myth that the only way to improve speaking proficiency of their child is by sending him to a private school.

6. Pedagogical Implications and future recommendations

This believe that private schooling means better proficiency can be changed with a serious effort by teachers on students with no English speaking back ground. The more teacher will give understandable input in the target language and let his students practice speaking in class the more they will improve. She can take help from Total Physical Response for the students with no English background. This study urges that teachers should be professionally trained to teach target language so that they work on L2 learners' proficiency of their students. Future research can be conducted on L2 learners currently studying in schools.

References

- Aiello, J. (2015). *English language learning in Italy: A study of L2 Attitudes, L2 Motivation and Self-Perceived proficiency among Italian youth* (Order No. 3 705205). Available from ProQuest Dissertations &Theses Global. (1688757655). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1688757655?accountid=135034>
- Allen, M. (2017). *The sage encyclopedia of communication research methods* (Vols. 1-4). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc doi: 10.4135/9781483381411

- Alsaghiar, A. A. (2018). *Implementation of Communicative Language Teaching across Six Foreign Languages* (Publication No. 10871583) [Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University College of Education, Health, and Human Services]. ProQuest dissertation publishing.
- Asif, S., Afzal, I., & Bashir, R. (2020). An Analysis of Medium of Instruction Policies in the Education System of Pakistan with specific reference to English medium education. *Sjesr*, 3(2), 370–382. [https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol3-iss2-2020\(370-382\)](https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol3-iss2-2020(370-382))
- Cook, V. (2013). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Routledge, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203770511>
- Cliffordson, C., & Gustafsson, J. E. (2008). Effects of age and schooling on intellectual performance: Estimates obtained from analysis of continuous variation in age and length of schooling. *Intelligence*, 36(2), 143–152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2007.03.006>
- Durrani, H. (2016). Attitudes of Undergraduates towards Grammar Translation Method and Communicative Language Teaching in EFL Context: A Case Study of SBK Women's University Quetta, Pakistan. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(4), 168–169. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.7n.4p.167>
- Etikan, I. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11>
- Fleckenstein, J., Leucht, M., Pant, H. A., & Köller, O. (2016). Proficient beyond borders: assessing non-native speakers in a native speaker's framework. *Large-Scale Assessments in Education*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40536-016-0034-2>
- Guimarães, J., & Sampaio, B. (2011). Family background and students' achievement on a university entrance exam in Brazil. *Education Economics*, 21(1), 38–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09645292.2010.545528>
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practices of Second Language Acquisition*. Los Angeles, Pergamon.
- Kaharuddin, A. (2018). The communicative grammar translation method: A practical method to teach communication skills of english. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, 4(2), 232-254. [doi:10.24252/Eternal.V42.2018](https://doi.org/10.24252/Eternal.V42.2018).

- Memon, N. (2015). An Impact Study of IELTS in Pakistan. Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy Linguistics and English Language, The University of Edinburgh, p. 19.
<https://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk/bitstream/handle/1842/21122/Memon2015.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y>
- Riasti, J. M. (2018). Willingness to speak English among foreign language learners: A causal model. *Cogent Education*, 5: 1455332
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1455332>
- Rahman, M. S. (2015). Do Teachers and Students want CLT? A Study of Bangladeshi College Teachers' and Students' Perception of CLT. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(7), 8–21 ISSN 2055-0839
- Samaranayake, S. W. (2016). Oral Competency of ESL/EFL Learners in Sri Lankan Rural School Context. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016654202>
- Scheffler, P. I. (2013). Learners' perceptions of grammar-translation as consciousness raising. *Language Awareness*, 22(3), 255–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/>
- Siddiqui, N., & Gorard, S. (2017). Comparing government and private schools in Pakistan: The way forward for universal education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 82, 159–169. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2017.01.007
- Patrick, R. (2019). Comprehensible Input and Krashen's theory. *Journal of Classics Teaching*, 20(39), 37–44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s2058631019000060>
- Panhwar, A. H., Baloch, S., & Khan, S. (2017). Making Communicative Language Teaching Work in Pakistan. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(3), 226. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n3p226>
- Veivo, O., Porretta, V., Hyona, J., & Jarvikivi, J. (2018). Spoken second language words activate native language orthographic information in late second language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 39(5), 1011-1032. Doi: 10.1017/S0142716418000103
- Vodopija-Krstanovic, I., & Marinac, M. (2019). English as an International Language and English Language Teaching: The Theory vs. Practice Divide. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 7(2), 19-38.

- Wyk, J. V., Mostert, M. L., & Hui, K. (2016). The Influence of Mother tongue and Gender on the Acquisition of English (L2). The case of Afrikaans in Windhoek schools, Namibia, Cogent Education, 3:1, DOI: [10.1080/2331186X.2016.1210997](https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1210997)
- Zhang, N. (2014). *Bridging the gap between communicative language teaching and practice in an introductory Chinese language classroom*. Unpublished master's Graduate College of Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, United States.
- Zoghbor, W. S. (2018). *Teaching English pronunciation to multi-dialect first language learners: The revival of the Lingua Franca Core (LFC)*. *System*, 78, 1–14. doi:[10.1016/j.system.2018.06.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.06.008)