EXPLORING PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICES IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE: A CASE STUDY OF DISTRICT KARAK, PAKISTAN

Ulfat
CT teacher at karak city, Department of English, Gomal university DI khan ,KPK Pakistan
Email: ulfatktk2@gmail.com
Mohibullah khan
Department of English language and Literature, Post graduate college Bannu affiliated with university of science and technology Bannu,KPK Pakistan
Email: ullahmohib458@gmail.com
Muhammad Bilal Khan
Lecturer at Gomal University DI Khan, KPK Pakistan Department of English
Email: bilalkhan@gu.edu.pk

Abstract
English is an official and a high stakes language in Pakistan despite the conventional based classroom activities, which are founded on traditional and examination based learning, preventing the development of communicative competence (Ahmad et al., 2013; Warsi, 2004). The paper explores the kind of pedagogies being embraced by the English teachers in postgraduate colleges within the District Karak in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa as well as the extent in which the pedagogies are well integrated in the existing approaches to teaching English as a second language or ESL. It relies on the mixed-method design, and data has been collected via 12 English lecturers in each of the three forms of the classroom observations, structured questionnaire, semi-structured interview design.

The findings indicate that most educators speak English commonly in the classroom despite the integrations of using technology to provide pronunciation though the most prevalent grammar-translation and lecture style of instructions are still in use by many teachers (Chang, 2011; Jilani, 2004). Only in the case of a communicative language teaching (CLT) or blended approach to instruction, a minority of them tend to do so in a systematic way (Ahmad and Rao, 2013; Littlewood, 1981). The information that was uncovered by the questionnaires revealed that 83 percent of the teachers responded that they used English fluently in ESL classes, 83 percent responded that they use technology in the normal, and 90 percent replied that they interacted and evaluated students regularly. However, fifty percent of the teacher requirements were to continue working through the old methods and low percentage of 15 percent was reported as teachers who were utilizing the new pedagogical techniques such as CLT. Poor formal training, high classes, poor language background of the students were a few of the challenges that were exposed in the interviews (Akram and Mehmood, 2011; Kabilan and Izzaham, 2008). As the paper concludes, the special teacher education and the support of the institutions should be used to provide the equilibrium between old and new practices to promote the ESL education and ESL learning in the District of Karak.

Keywords: English as a Second Language (ESL), pedagogical practices, communicative language teaching, grammar translation method, Pakistan, District Karak

1. Introduction

English as a lingua franca and major educational, job and international communication resource is highly apparent in the global spheres (Crystal, 1997; Kachru, 1997). It is used as an official language in Pakistan and a mandatory subject since lower school levels to higher levels of education, especially in higher education institutions such as colleges and universities (Awan and Hiraj, 2016; Manan et al., 2016; Warsi, 2004). Even with this central role, the quality of English language teaching is not uniform particularly in the state sector as well as in the less developed states like

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Ahmad et al., 2013; Butt and Butt, 2013).

On the provincial level, the English language has a functional role in the school or institutions and is being instructed as a compulsory subject since intermediate level and further (GOP, 2009b; Siddiqui, 2010). However, still, some teachers stick with the grammar-translation, rote memorization, and teacher-centred lectures methods and frequently result in students that can pass their written tests but cannot use the language in real-life situations (Ahmad, Rao, 2013; Jilani, 2004; Shamim, 2008).

The area of District Karak is particularly promising to be context-relevant: it is a highly diverse linguistic context (Pashto and Urdu are its two primary local languages) and an important one in terms of education (but limited access to highly trained language instructors and contemporary pedagogical resources, as Hassan and Awan, 2018 reveal). The current research examines the real-life operation the English language as a second language (L2) in the postgraduate colleges in Karak, and how the pedagogical decisions taken by teachers assist or inhibit the achievement of communicative competence.

1.1 Research Problem

The existing literature on the topic of English teaching in Pakistan shows that methods related to teaching English are insufficient, the teachers are not trained properly, and the lack of knowledge regarding modern ESL teaching (Akram and Mehmood, 2011; Farooq et al., 2012; Rasheed et al., 2017). The problems seem to be quite similar in District Karak: teachers do not quite know the latest practices in the ESL teaching process and might lack a clear understanding of the concrete learning goals to meet the international standards (Ali, 2019; Shah, 2019).

1.2 Research Questions

This study is guided by the following questions:
1. What steps need to be taken to improve the teaching and learning of English in order to meet international standards?
2. What academic amenities or training have been made available for English teachers?
3. What methods do teachers currently use for teaching English?
4. What methods can teachers adopt for more effective ESL teaching?

1.3 Objectives

The main objectives are to:
- Determine the benefits of various pedagogies applied in teaching English as a second language.
- Point out the disadvantages of the current practices and how they can be overcome.
- Research on issues of ESL teaching by English teachers.
- Make suggestions on how to improve the thoughts and the use of curriculum by teachers which make the teaching-learning processes more effective (Breen and Candlin, 1980; Brown, 1994).

1.4 Significance of the Study

This is among the initial systematic research that dwells on the specific aspect of pedagogical practice of ESL teaching in District Karak. It offers information that can be used by teacher educators, policymakers, and institutions to plan training programmes, modify curriculum, and develop learning environments that are more promising (Manan et al., 2016; Shah, 2019). Through recording the existing practice and proposing better practices, the research will help improve the existing communicative competence among ESL learners at Pakistan in accordance with both the regional and the global trends (Baker, 2012; Talat, 2003).

2. Literature Review

The English of Pakistan is closely associated with social mobility, access to higher education and

employability. Most people consider it to be a kind of a ticket to improved career opportunities and a status symbol (Butt and Butt, 2013; Rahman, 2019; Talat, 2003). But this significance is not necessarily reflected in efficient classroom practice. Research indicates that the number of teachers who are not formally trained in TESOL/ELT, do not know modern communicative strategies, and teach in a teacher-centred, grammar-focused manner is rather higher (Ahmad et al., 2013; Farooq et al., 2012; Waseem and Jibeen, 2014).

2.1 Teaching Practices and Challenges

In Pakistan, teachers tend to have a high number, absence of materials, and language differences and fewer institutional resources (Kabilan and Izzaham, 2008; Khan et al., 2017; Rasheed et al., 2017). Such requirements promote dependence on translation, drilling and examination based with teaching, and there is limited room to use the English language communicatively (Ahmad and Rao, 2013; Shamim, 2008; Warsi, 2004).

The study has also identified the disagreements in applying Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the contexts which are informed by testing frameworks and cultural paradigms (Li, 1998; Savignon, 1991). The effectiveness of CLT can be inhibited by teacher beliefs, lack of training and curriculum limitations, particularly in the case of the public-sector institutions (Freeman and Richards, 1993; Jadoon et al., 2020).

2.2 Pedagogical Approaches

Three main pedagogical orientations frame this study:

- Grammar Translation Method (GTM): Focuses on the grammar learning rules, translation and writing accuracy, and a little attention is given to speaking or listening (Chang, 2011; Howatt, 1984).
- Direct Method (DM): It focuses on strict utilization of target language, verbal practice and inductive grammar study, which discourages the use of mother tongue (Hakim, 2019; Howatt, 1984).
- Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Directs attention to communicative competence, meaning-oriented activities, learner engagement and fluency with the teacher acting as facilitator (Breen and Candlin, 1980; Larsen-Freeman, 1986; Littlewood, 1981; Savignon, 1991).

According to the literature, there is no single approach that suffices hence blending of methods depending on the situation is more effective and suitable especially in Karak which is facing multilingualism base, limited resources and so on (Ellis, 1994; Long and Crookes, 1992; Loschky, Bley-Vroman, 1990).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research will take a mixed-method design, consisting of qualitative and quantitative designs. The qualitative data were collected over the form of semi-structured interviews and classroom observation, and the quantitative data were vanished on the basis of a structured questionnaire. This will enable triangulation and an in-depth explanation of pedagogical practices of teachers (Creswell, as cited in Hoque, 2017).

3.2 Population and Sample

These were 12 English lecturers (six male and six female) who were instructing postgraduate level in the government postgraduate colleges within District Karak. The questionnaire was filled in and the 12 teachers were followed in the classroom; six of them were interviewed in semi-structured manner.

3.3 Data Collection
Three tools were used:
1. **Questionnaire**
    o All 12 teachers took part in a closed-ended questionnaire consisting of 10 questions and using a four-point scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Very Often, Rarely). Questions centered on mother tongue or use of English, familiarity with current practices, technological usage, and practices of interaction and evaluation (based on Bhatti and Mukhtar, 2017; Kabilan and Izzaham, 2008).
2. **Classroom Observations**
    o Individually, each teacher was observed with the help of an observation sheet based on the main ideas of CLT, DM and GTM (e.g., choice of language, patterns of interaction, types of activities, using technology) being referred to an observation model developed on the principles of CLT (Breen and Candlin, 1980; Richards and Rodgers, 2001).
3. **Semi-structured Interviews**
    o They interviewed six teachers to understand the belief in ESL teaching, and perceived needs of the learners, their choice in applying various pedagogical practices and limitations (Freeman and Richards, 1993).

3.4 Data Analysis
Simple percentages and tables were used to analyze the responses provided by questionnaires. Thematic analysis was carried out on observation notes and the transcript of interviews to determine common patterns in the use of language, teaching methods, interaction, and perceived difficulties (Hoque, 2017; Zahorik, 1986).

3.5 Ethical Considerations
College authorities were given the institutional permission. All participants had their informed consent, and were guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality. The inclusion and use of data were on a voluntary basis, and it was not utilized in any commercial purpose to adhere to the general ethical provisions of conducting research in the educational field (Imam, 2005).

4. Results
4.1 Use of Mother Tongue and English
Though classrooms have their local languages (Pashto and Urdu), teachers acknowledged that intensive reliance on mother tongue is not fruitful in the achievement of ESL education. In the situation where teachers affirmed high usage of the mother language, they also cited that communicative abilities and confidence among the students in English language were still weak (Rahman, 2019; Warsi, 2004).

4.2 Classroom Language and Fluency
According to questionnaire data:
- **83%** of teachers reported using English fluently and very often in ESL classrooms.
- **17%** reported using English less frequently or only partially.

This indicates an overall high degree of mastery of English as the medium of contact in ESL classes at postgraduate level, but it was also noted that there was a strong tendency to switch to the Urdu or Pashto language to explain complicated meaning (Rahman, 2019; Talat, 2003).

4.3 Use of Technology
- **83%** of teachers reported frequent use of technology (audio, video, pronunciation tools) for teaching pronunciation and listening.
- **17%** reported rarely using technology.

According to the teachers, technology contributes to the clarification of the pronunciation and offers multi-modes input as well as maintain attention which reflects larger research on the Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) (Irshad and Ghani, 2015; Warschauer, 1996).

4.4 Pedagogical Techniques

Regarding pedagogical approaches:

- Half of the teachers were satisfied with mostly traditional approaches (mostly GTM and lecture-based methods).
- A quarter of the respondents felt that the methods of teaching need to change.
- One out of five individuals claimed to have applied most recent pedagogical techniques (e.g., CLT-oriented tasks).
- One out of ten that did not use only existing techniques said they used a mix of both existing and new techniques.

In general, the conventional approaches prevail, and innovation occurs in a few areas instead of being systematic (Ahmad and Rao, 2013; Chang, 2011; Jilani, 2004).

4.5 Interaction and Evaluation

- Practically, 90% of teachers indicated that they interacted with students very often and assessed them when lecturing.
- 1- in relative terms less frequent interaction was reported by 10 percent.

Majority of teachers were involved in interrogation, evoking responses and tracking comprehension but most of the interaction was based on the classical Initiation Response Feedback (IRF) model than on open interactive communication dominated by learners (Cazden, as discussed in Brown, 1994; Rosenshine, 1979).

4.6 Interview Themes

Thematic analysis of interviews highlighted three broad themes:

1. Perceived Importance of English - Teachers considered English to be a requirement of higher education and jobs and they believed that they should teach students communicative skills (Awan and Hiraj, 2016; Shah, 2019).
2. Strain between conventional and new Practices- A good number of the teachers liked the CLT and learner based methodology yet struggled with the needs of the exams, high classes and lack of training (Akram and Mehmood, 2011; Li, 1998).
3. Professional Development Need - The participants mentioned the deficit in professional development based on structured training of the modern ESL teaching method and demanded the workshop training on CLT, task-based learning and technology integration (Freeman and Richards, 1993; Kabilan and Izzaham, 2008).

5. Discussion

The results show that the District Karak postgraduate ESL classes present a complicated pedagogical environment. On the one hand, there is extensive use of the English as the language of classroom, substantial levels of interaction and growing use of technology- aspects of effective ESL methods (Baker, 2012; Warschauer, 1996). In contrast, the field of teaching is still strongly based on the principles of traditional grammar-translation and lecture-driven instruction and has a low level of systematic application of CLT (Ahmad and Rao, 2013; Chang, 2011; Jilani, 2004).

Progress is good and the fact that teachers are reported to have high exposure and immersion into English is positive. Nevertheless, discussing this, it is very easy to lose the chances to take meaningful communicative actions, and the importance of such activities in the South Asia context is observed in other studies of the region, as well (Farooq et al., 2012; Rahman, 2019).

The high level of technology adoption attests to the introduction of an open-minded attitude to

445

innovation, although technology is not integrated into any communicative or task-based or project-based courses but typically employed in a complementary manner (e.g. to work on pronunciation) (Irshad and Ghani, 2015; Warschauer, 1996).

The prevailing trend of the traditional approaches reflects the national trends, as assessment systems, lack of resources and curricula are forcing teachers to revert to the grammar-translation and teacher-centered approach to teaching (Ahmad et al., 2013; Jilani, 2004; Waseem and Jibeen, 2014). In the interviews, it is evident that the teachers are not close to change in principle, but they do not have structured training, institutional encouragement and practical models of the implementation of communicative and mixed methods in large multilingual classes (Akram & Mehmood, 2011; Freeman and Richards, 1993; Kabilan and Izzaham, 2008).

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusion

This research paper discussed the pedagogical nature among English teachers in post-graduate colleges in District Karak, Pakistan. It found that:

- The teachers understand the significance of the English language commonly and, as a rule, make it the primary language of discussion in the classroom (Awan and Hiraj, 2016; Rahman, 2019).
- Technology is also common, especially when it comes to the support of pronunciation and listening (Irshad and Ghani, 2015).
- Conservative approaches of teaching are still prevalent, particularly grammar translation and lectures (Ahmad and Rao, 2013; Chang, 2011).
- Even the small part of teachers adequately introduces CLT or blended methods (Littlewood, 1981; Savignon, 1991).
- Educators report that they need professional growth and better instructions on current ESL pedagogy (Akram et al., 2011; Freeman and Richards, 1993).

Altogether, the contemporary pedagogical situation can be defined as the transitional one with the aspects of modern working side by side and the deeply rooted traditional approaches. Teachers need to be supported in order to shift between being conscious of new methods and being faithfully involved.

6.2 Recommendations

1. **Teacher Training in CLT and Mixed Methods**
   o Conduct regular CLT and task-based learning workshops and methods of achieving fluency and accuracy balance such as demonstration lesson or micro-teaching (Breen and Candlin, 1980; Long and Crookes, 1992).
2. **Blended Use of Methods**
   o Ask teachers to integrate the benefits of GTM (explicit grammar focus) with communicative assignments, fitness work and problem solving activities that facilitate the use of English in the real world (Chang, 2011; Littlewood, 1981).
3. **Strategic Use of Mother Tongue**
   o Considering Urdu/Pashto as a secondary language when teaching a classroom, except English is the primary language to create confidence and fluency (Rahman, 2019; Warsi, 2004).
4. **Enhanced Use of Technology**
   o Go beyond pronunciation exercises and make the use of technology a part of entire lessons (e.g. online discussion, video-related tasks, interactive quizzes), and

institutional support of internet accessibility and devices (Irshad and Ghani, 2015; Warschauer, 1996).

5. **Curriculum and Assessment Alignment**
   o Modify college programs and examinations in line with communicative goals to avoid pushing the teacher to a more grammar-translation teaching and complete exam-focused approach (Jadoon et al., 2020; Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

6. **Further Research**
   o The future research might include the views of students, compare between the work in public and privates institutions, and research the long-term effects of teacher training on classroom activities and student achievements in the country of Pakistan (Ali, 2019; Manan et al., 2016).

References

1. Ahmad, N., Khan, F. N., & Munir, N. (2013). Factors affecting... Journal of English Language and Literature Studies, 2(2), 95–101.
2. Ahmad, S., & Rao, C. (2013). Applying the communicative approach in teaching English as a foreign language: A case study of Pakistan.
3. Akram, M., & Mehmood, A. (2011). The need of communicative approach (in ELT) in teacher training program in Pakistan. *Language in India, 11*(5), 172–178.
4. Ali, I. (2019). Teachers' beliefs and practices about teaching English in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Doctoral dissertation, University of Peshawar, Peshawar).
5. Awan, A. G., & Hiraj, A. A. (2016). Teaching English as a second language in Pakistan at secondary level. *Science International, 28*(4).
6. Baker, W. (2012). English as a lingua franca in Thailand: Characteristics and implications. *Englishes in Practice, 1*(1), 18–27.
7. Bhatti, M. S., & Mukhtar, R. (2017). Analyzing the utility of... *International E-Journal of Advances in Education, 3*(7), 60–67.
8. Breen, M. P., & Candlin, C. N. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(2), 89–112.
9. Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.
10. Butt, M. I., & Butt, M. W. (2013). Pakistani culture and learning of English. *Language in India, 13*(2).
11. Chang, S. C. (2011). A contrastive study of grammar translation method and communicative approach in teaching English grammar. *English Language Teaching, 4*(2), 13–24.
12. Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
14. Farooq, M. S., Uzair-Ul-Hassan, M., & Wahid, S. (2012). Opinion... in English language. *South Asian Studies, 27*(1).
15. Freeman, D., & Richards, J. C. (1993). Conceptions of teaching and the education of second language teachers. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(2), 193–216.
16. GOP. (2009b). *Pakistan education statistics 2007–08*. Islamabad, Pakistan.
17. Hakim, L. N. (2019). The influence of the use of Direct Method... *Teaching of English Language and Literature Journal, 7*(2), 87–100.
18. Hassan, U., & Awan, G. (2018). Effects of school environment... *Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Humanities, 4*(1), 211–223.
19. Hoque, E. (2017). An introduction to second language acquisition. *Language Acquisition*, 1–23.
20. Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
21. Imam, R. (2005). English as a global language and the question of nation-building education in Bangladesh. *Comparative Education, 41*(4), 471–486.

22. Irshad, S., & Ghani, M. (2015). Benefits of CALL in ESL pedagogy in Pakistan: A case study. *ELF Annual Research Journal, 17*, 1–22.
23. Jadoon, A. U. R., Chishti, M. I., Afzaal, M., & Afzal, T. (2020). Curriculum challenges in Pakistan. *English Language Teaching, 13*(7), 52–66.
24. Jilani, W. (2004). Conditions under which English is taught in Pakistan: An applied linguistic perspective. *SARID Journal, 1*(1), 1–9.
25. Kabilan, M. K., & Izzaham, R. I. R. (2008). Challenges faced by student teachers during teaching practice. *English Language Teaching, 1*(1), 87–95.
26. Kachru, B. (1997). English as an Asian language. *Links & Letters, 5*, 89–108.
27. Khan, T. J., Zahid, M., & Akhtar, S. (2017). Obstacles in teaching English in Pakistan. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Researches, 1*(1), 62–72.
28. Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
29. Li, D. (1998). It's always more difficult than you plan and imagine: Teachers' perceived difficulties in introducing the communicative approach in South Korea. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(4), 677–703.
30. Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
31. Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*(1), 27–56.
32. Loschky, L., & Bley-Vroman, R. (1990). Creating structure-based tasks for SLA research. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in ESL, 9*(1).
33. Manan, S. A., David, M. K., & Dumanig, F. P. (2016). English language education in Pakistan: Policies, perceptions and practices. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 219–244). Springer.
34. Rahman, T. (2019). Mother tongue education policy in Pakistan. In R. Kirkpatrick (Ed.), *English language education policy in Asia* (pp. 364–380). Routledge.
35. Rasheed, S., Zeeshan, M., & Zaidi, N. A. (2017). Challenges in teaching English in Pakistan. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 7*(4), 149–158.
36. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
37. Rosenshine, B. (1979). Content, time and direct instruction. In P. Peterson & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Research on teaching: Concepts, findings, and implications* (pp. 28–56).
38. Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative language teaching: State of the art. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*, 261–278.
39. Shah, S. W. A. (2019, April 9). Rethinking pedagogy in Pakistan. *Daily Times*.
40. Shamim, F. (2008). Trends, issues and challenges in English language education in Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 28*(3), 235–249.
41. Siddiqui, S. (2010). *Rethinking education in Pakistan: Practices & possibilities*. Karachi: Paramount Publishing Enterprise.
42. Talat, M. (2003). Pakistani English: A sociolinguistic variety. *Journal of Research (Faculty of Languages & Islamic Studies), 4*.
43. Warschauer, M. (1996). Computer-assisted language learning: An introduction. In S. Fotos (Ed.), *Multimedia language teaching* (pp. 3–20).
44. Warsi, J. (2004). Conditions under which English is taught in Pakistan: An applied linguistic perspective. *Sarid Journal, 1*(1), 1–9.
45. Waseem, F., & Jibeen, T. (2014). Anxiety amongst learners of English as a second language: An examination of motivational patterns in the Pakistani context. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 4*(3), 209–215.
46. Zahorik, J. A. (1986). Acquiring teaching skills. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(2), 21–25.