A Comparative Study of English Language Teaching Practices at the Access Program and Public Schools

Muhammad Iqbal[*] and Muhammad Shaban Rafi[**]

_____

Abstract

This study investigates English language teaching (ELT) practices used in the Access Program and public schools. Its main focus is on the effect of the Access Program and public schools ELT practices on linguistic achievement of learners. It is an experimental research in which an experimental group (Access students) was treated through Access teaching model while the controlled group (public school students) was taught through traditional method as used in public schools. All Access students and those public school students who appeared for the test to get admission in the Access Program were the population of the study. The respondents of this study were selected through cluster sampling from the Access Program and random sampling from public schools. A diagnostic test was used as a tool for data collection. The diagnostic test was comprised of two parts: written (assessing reading and writing skills) and oral (assessing listening and speaking skills) parts. It was used as pre and post-test for data collection from the respondents. Data were analyzed through SPSS using independent sample t and dependent sample t tests. There was no statistical difference between the mean scores of the Access Program and public school students in the pre-test while there was a significant statistical difference in the mean scores of the Access Program and public school students in the post-test. The Access Program students showed better linguistic competence and performance than the public school students. Hence, it can be inferred that ELT practices used in the Access Program can bring better results than those used in public schools.

Keywords: Access Program, Learning Achievement, Test Score, ELT Practices

[*] Ph.D Scholar, University of Management and Technology, Lahore. Email: me_iqbal@hotmail.com
[**] Associate Professor, University of Management and Technology, Lahore. Email: shaban@umt.edu.pk

Introduction

The English Access Microscholarship Program (hereafter Access Program) is a U. S. State Department funded program. A large amount of funds and a lot of human resources have been utilized in this program to improve the linguistic performance of students in Pakistan. This research is an endeavor to evaluate whether ELT practices used in the Access Program has some effect on students' achievement or not. The researcher has observed that this program has been producing better results, though this observation has not been proved through any research (no research has been conducted before to establish this observation). The observation suggested that within the span of two years, the program has produced confident, accurate and fluent speakers of English language as compared to the students of public schools. The mentioned observation stimulated the researcher to undertake the current study. The main objective of the study is to investigate the effect of the Access Program (AP) and public school (PS) ELT practices on linguistic achievement of students. For this very reason the prime research question was undertaken 'What is the effect of the AP and PS ELT practices on linguistic achievement of their learners?'

The U. S. Department of State funds for the English Access Microscholarship Program which is implemented in more than 80 countries. It is a scholarship program for the socio-economic disadvantageous youth of 13 – 20year-old. In this program, they learn English language skills (reading, writing, speaking and listening) in after-school classes and intensive sessions within two years. In addition to language skills, the Access students also gain an exposure to the U.S. culture and democratic values (global culture and values) through enhancement activities (guest speakers, field trips and community service etc). They are also trained in computer and critical thinking skills, which help them in getting better jobs, availing educational opportunities, participating in and competing for future exchange programs to study in the United States. In Pakistan, the Access Program started in 2004, and over 16,000 students have graduated under the program so far (U.S. Department of State, 2015).

In Pakistan, the Access Program is implemented through different non-profit organizations (hereafter provider) to strengthen local community by enhancing English language skills of local youth who have diversified ethno-linguistic background: from Karachi (Urdu speaking community) to interior Sind (Sindhi speaking community), from Balochistan (Balochi speaking community) to the Southern Punjab (Saraiki speaking community), from the Central Punjab (Punjabi speaking community) to Kashmir (Kashmiri speaking community), from Gilgit Baltistan (Balti speaking community) to Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Pashto speaking community). The selected students are always socio-economic disadvantageous of their communities.

The objectives of the program are: 1) to teach the students English language skills; 2) to give them exposure to the American (global) culture and democratic values; 3) to make them computer literate; 4) to enhance their critical thinking skills and 5) to make them participate in community service activities. While the goals of the program for the students are: 1) to get better jobs to support their families; 2) to avail educational opportunities; 3) to compete for future exchange programs in the United States, and 4) to make them better individual of the society (U.S. Department of State, 2015).

The Access Program is an after school program for two years, that requires minimum of 360 instructional hours. The providers decide with the consultation of U. S. Embassy/Consulate whether they want to conduct classes five hours or ten hours per week, but it should not be less than one hour and more than three hours per day. The intensive sessions are important opportunities to practice English language skills, build teams, gain confidence, and learn in a threat-free environment. The students enjoy this opportunity to take their learning outside their classroom for experiential learning. Intensive sessions supplement a student's two-year English language learning. It is a responsibility of the provider to consider the schedules of the students to ensure that the Access classes do not interfere with students' regular school schedules, exams, or school events (U.S. Department of State, 2015).

The Access Program is designed in such a way that the students must also get training to use modern gadgets and programs of learning and research e.g. computer (MS Word, MS Excel and Power Point), multimedia, social media and smart phone (language learning apps). English language is incorporated into the training of modern gadgets, even if it is exploring how to use a program or using presentation or word processing for projects.

Another key element of the Access Program is to familiarize students with important features of others' cultures and values. Students are encouraged to develop respect for other cultures, values, customs, and beliefs. Activities are planned to engage them in discussions (ethnic tolerance, religious harmony), dialogues (democratic values, role of civil society), games, community service, seminar on gender issues, the environment preservation etc. Personal development activities like building balanced intellectual and emotional capabilities, career counseling, future academic and professional endeavors, are regular feature of the program. The students are introduced to the available opportunities to pursue higher education, and U. S. government-sponsored exchange programs.

The community service component increases the students' awareness of issues facing their respective communities and understanding of the ways they can positively contribute to civil society. Community service indoctrinates the sense of volunteerism which is beneficial for the development of a healthy society. It involves community members – young people, adults and families – coming together to work on a community need.

The Access Program benefits talented and economically disadvantaged students. The students who are enrolled in the program come from low socio-economic background. To ensure that they are really from socially and economically disadvantageous, local government officials, school administrators, civic and religious organizations are involved. It is the responsibility of the provider to verify their social and economic status. The students are enrolled from diverse racial, ethnic, religious and geographic backgrounds. The provider makes arrangements to organize classes according to language proficiency levels and a two-year age range in one group (class). The program is always gender-balanced. Selection process includes applications, written and oral tests (U.S. Department of State, 2015).

The largest system of educational institutions is state-run institutions or public schools or main stream schools. Here the researcher uses the term public schools for all educational institutions (from primary schools to universities) which work under the Government of Pakistan (GOP). In these schools, English is taught as a compulsory subject from nursery to graduation. Majority of the students who come to these schools are from economically humble background. The public schools, where 13 – 20 year old students study, are feeding nurseries for the Access Program. They have better infra structure but lack in facilities like computer lab, multimedia, library and uninterrupted power supply (UPS) etc. The teaching staff is well qualified (having Masters to Ph. D. degrees) and well trained (B. Ed. to M. Ed.). Directorate of Staff Development (DSD) is responsible for in-service teacher training for primary school to secondary school teachers while Higher Education Commission (HEC) organizes teacher training for college and university teachers. Usually these trainings are generic type of trainings. Though specifically English language trainings are organized yet language skills based trainings are very rare.

Public school teachers prefer rote learning and use Grammar Translation Method (GTM) for teaching English language. They prepare students to perform well in examinations rather than in practical life. Students cram the content and reproduce it in their examinations. There is hardly any scope of creativity and practical use of English language. Fear of examinations and race of securing good marks in examinations kill creativity.

In public schools, English is taught as one of the major subjects like Mathematics and Science from nursery (even from play group). In these schools, students from every strata of life come to get education, but now number of students from well off families are decreasing day by day. Those who are economically stronger prefer to go to private schools (private street schools) even if these are humble in resources due to gradual down fall in quality education in public schools and so-called quality education in private schools.

Most of the students come to the Access Program from main stream schools as Access is an after school program. Students in both the systems have economically disadvantaged background. They study in mainstream schools (public schools) where they have hardly sufficient teaching facilities, but in the Access classrooms they are provided with modern teaching gadgets like multimedia, computer, CDs, white board, soft board, uninterrupted power supply (UPS) etc. The teachers in both the systems are well qualified and well trained. They receive in-service teacher training as well. In the Access Program teachers and students both are given liberty to arrange classroom according to their needs. Both are out of psychological pressure of examination too as there is no examination to pass and fail, though there is continuous assessment to gauge the students' learning. The teachers bring new teaching techniques for which they are trained not only by local trainers but also by the American trainers in Pakistan and in the United States. They teach English language through; showing movies, role plays, group work, peer work, songs, video and board games etc. which are not common in Pakistani public schools. Hence, overall Access classroom environment and teaching methods are entirely different from traditional classroom where mostly chalk and talk are used (Sultana & Zaki, 2015).

In "The Effects of Classroom Environment on Student Learning", Hannah (2013) introduces the relationship between learning and classroom environment. According to him, physical environment has a noticeable effect on learners. This non-verbal communication i.e. charts and wall art demonstrate that a teacher cares about the performance of students. Arrangement of the chairs also motivates students to understand social expectations of a teacher and makes students ready to participate in the classroom activities. Effective arrangement of chairs can lead towards a disciplined classroom. The sitting arrangement provides space for interaction between students, and performing activities in groups. Some students, who feel neglected or unsuccessful to gain individual attention from their teacher due to traditional arrangement of chairs, create disruption. A teacher should arrange chairs and other resources in such a way that enables the teacher and the learners for an easy interaction between them and smooth execution of classroom activities. To motivate the students for speaking activities, chairs and desks can be arranged in a circle. This practice can strengthen the listening process and enable the listeners to actively maintain eye contact with the speaker. Such type of classroom arrangement helps overcoming fear and making students feel invited to express them. An area in the classroom with comfortable chairs devoted to a small library can be inviting for students to do their work with concentration. This library provides a space to learn what a learner wants to learn instead of what is assigned to learn.

As we know that lighting arrangements, personal display, and the use of colors in the classroom have a psychological effect on the minds of learners. Visual environment has ample effect on the minds, and is necessary for the good results. Proper lighting is good to achieve good results (Schneider, 2002, as cited in Spenser & Blades; Barnitt, 2003; Earthman, 2004). Sleeman and Rockwell (1981) opine that each color has a particular effect on the moods of the children (learners) like feeling relaxed, warm or cool. In this respect the color scheme in the classroom can prove vital for the learning environment. It is also indicated that color can also change the mood, behavior and even judgments. Engelbrecht (2003) concludes that color receives a biological reaction from human mind, and can be effective for the creation of optimum learning environment in the classroom. Personal display by the teacher is good for self-esteem of the children (Maxwell and Chmielewski, 2008). Light is the most effective part of a classroom environment. A large number of schools use fluorescent light bulbs which can be disturbing because they buzz. Classrooms can utilize natural light and the softer lighting which can create warmer environment. Reading corners with lamps can stimulate love for reading.

According to Hannah (2013), classroom environment can be made stimulating by hanging the students' works on the walls. This practice enables the students to understand the expectations of their teacher towards their assignments, the students feel that their assignments are valued by the teacher and they themselves value their work. Noise has very strong effect on the cognitive ability of the students (Stansfeld and Matheson, 2003). It is proved that acoustic environment matters a lot for the learning of students (Schneider, 2002; Lercher et al, 2003; Earthman, 2004; Fisher, 2008).

Freeman and Anderson (2013) list down some classical methods of English language teaching which include Grammar Translation Method, The Direct Method, The Audio Lingual Method, The Silent Method, Communicative Language Teaching, Total Physical Response. They discuss that besides helping teachers in performing their tasks a method helps a teacher realize and evaluate his/her performance. This conscious thinking leads them to reflect on their teaching practices as an individual and as a community and urges them to do things differently and grow professionally.

It is an established fact that a well-trained teacher is the guarantee of students' better achievement. Consequently, we can say that teacher training and the achievement of the students have a relationship (Zepeda, 2006). A well-trained teacher can develop his/her methodology according to the needs and knowledge of his/her students. Adunola (2011) says that teachers must be trained to adopt as many strategies as their students need.

Effective teaching is a mixture of different variables like positive reinforcement, feedback, positive classroom environment, higher order questioning and teaching methods that include students in the decision making process for their learning (Walberg, 1986). On the question of method, most of the researchers favor cooperative teaching strategies (Wolfenberger & Canella, 2015). Cooperative teaching strategies can help the students in learning together to augment their learning with interest and inspiration (Aziz and Hossain, 2010).

In Pakistan, the situation is very alarming as only chalk and talk is used, and no attention is given to the individual differences of the students (Inamullah & Naseeruddin, 2008; Naseer, Patnam, & Raza, 2009; Topping, 2012; Jan, 2013; Sultana & Zaki, 2015). It feels that traditional method is unable to provide good results. According to Hussain (2008), students get only 8% of talking time during classroom teaching while 80% is consumed by the teacher and remaining 12% is spent silence. We cannot presume that such time distribution can provide good results. That may be due to the incompetence of the teachers (Halai, 2012) or they are lacking pedagogical abilities (Iqbal, Azam, & Rana, 2009).

Worldwide second language teaching is experiencing changes in approaches and beliefs every day. Barrot (2013) investigated the modifications in the ESL from traditional to modern methods. He found that the fundamental issue in research in ESL is the difference between teaching practice and theories. Socio-cognitive approach should be adopted where a student is not considered a plain object whose purpose is to acquire knowledge and it can actively participate in learning process.

Tran (2017) studied viewpoints of EFL teachers and students on using role plays in teaching English. The results showed that both the teachers and student agreed that role plays have positive impact on learning English as a foreign language. It makes learning interesting and students feel encouraged to participate. Almost all teachers use role plays specifically for speaking practices. The only reported disadvantage of role plays was noise and disturbances which were caused during performance. Lippincott (2017) focused on the question whether working in small groups and holding one another accountable at the same time will increase students' confidence of using English in comparison with the group where everyone is responsible for his or her own learning.

Research Methodology

For this research, experimental method was applied and the sample was equally divided into two groups: experimental group and control group. Homogeneity of the sample was ensured so that the results of both groups could be compared. For the teaching purpose, the experimental group was taught through the Access teaching method for which the teachers were properly trained and the control group was taught through traditional method used in public schools across the province of the Punjab.

The Access Program was implemented in four cities of the Punjab province i.e. Lahore, Faisalabad, Multan and Sargodha. Population of the study included all the students (N=3,469) who appeared in test to get admission in the Access Program. There were 680 students who secured admission in the Access Program after passing through written and oral tests while remaining 2,789 students could not either qualify or join the program, but continued their regular education at public school.

The data were collected from more than one location, so multiple sampling techniques were used to fulfill the needs of the study. Another reason for selecting multiple sampling designs was the difference in the target groups (the Access Program and public schools) of the population which could be catered only through this design. For the Access Program, the researcher used random cluster sampling technique. A male and a female class were randomly selected from each location i.e. Multan, Lahore, Faisalabad and Sargodha. Thus, it included eight classes with 25 students in each class that makes 200 students in total.

On the other hand, for public schools, purposive sampling technique was used. Only those students, who took the Access entry test (pre-test) and were offered admission, were included in study. These students either could not join the Access Program or quit it within first quarter (three months) for any reason after joining it. From them, 50 students (gender balanced) from each location i.e. Multan, Lahore, Faisalabad and Sargodha (200 students in total) were selected. This inclusion criterion for public school students was set specifically so that comparison of the Access Program and public school could be justified in terms of greater similarity of sample.

To know about the linguistic achievement of the students, a diagnostic test was adapted. After its adaptation, the test was conducted as an admission test for the Access Program. For reading and writing skills, the test was an adapted version of the Compass Publishing (Malarcher & Janzen, 2010). This test also served the purpose for this research as a pre-test and post-test while making comparison of Access and non-Access students. For listening and speaking skills, an oral test was conducted from the students. The questions of oral test were constructed with simple structures and the main focus was on inclusion of single domain.

The test was conducted as a pre-test as per the requirement of the study. More than 3,469 students took this pre-test, and the test was on different days at different locations (Multan, Lahore, Faisalabad and Sargodha). Students, who secured 33% or above in the written test, were called for oral test to assess listening and speaking skills. The oral test was consisted of five questions. The questions were developed using very simple syntactic structures so that the students could understand them easily. Even if a student was unable to understand any question in English, it was asked in Urdu so that information can be collected, which was helpful for enrolling him/her in the Access Program (though gathering information has nothing to do with this research). A post test was conducted to see the effects of ELT practices on students' linguistic achievement. This was the same test used as pre-test. There was a huge gap of one complete year between administering the test as pre-test and post-test, so there was no familiarity or affinity was created among students regarding the test items. This test was conducted by the researcher after one year at the Access centers and public schools which were included in the sample. Schedule for the post test was set by the researcher himself to avoid any kind of contradiction with the days allocated to the Access centers and public schools. There were separate days for Access students and public school students. The oral test, consisted of the same five questions which were asked in the pre-test, was conducted.

Data Analysis

Table 1

Frequency of Pre-Test Responses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	7.50	1	.3	.3	.3
	10.50	2	.5	.5	.8
	11.00	9	2.3	2.3	3.0
	11.50	12	3.0	3.0	6.0
	12.00	7	1.8	1.8	7.8
	12.50	13	3.3	3.3	11.0
	13.00	12	3.0	3.0	14.0
	13.50	10	2.5	2.5	16.5
	14.00	13	3.3	3.3	19.8
	14.50	17	4.3	4.3	24.0
	15.00	14	3.5	3.5	27.5
	15.50	11	2.8	2.8	30.3
	16.00	24	6.0	6.0	36.3
	16.50	13	3.3	3.3	39.5
	17.00	24	6.0	6.0	45.5
	17.50	18	4.5	4.5	50.0
	18.00	34	8.5	8.5	58.5
	18.50	18	4.5	4.5	63.0
	19.00	7	1.8	1.8	64.8
	19.50	9	2.3	2.3	67.0
	20.00	21	5.3	5.3	72.3
	20.50	6	1.5	1.5	73.8
	21.00	32	8.0	8.0	81.8
	21.50	20	5.0	5.0	86.8
	22.00	22	5.5	5.5	92.3
	22.50	2	.5	.5	92.8
	23.00	6	1.5	1.5	94.3
	23.50	1	.3	.3	94.5
	24.00	5	1.3	1.3	95.8
	25.00	3	.8	.8	96.5
	25.50	2	.5	.5	97.0
	26.00	3	.8	.8	97.8
	26.50	1	.3	.3	98.0
	27.00	4	1.0	1.0	99.0
	27.50	1	.3	.3	99.3
	28.00	2	.5	.5	99.8
	29.00	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	400	100.0	100.0	

When frequency measure was applied on the data gathered in pre-test, above table was generated which shows that out of 400 students only 1 (.3%) student got highest marks that is 29 out of 50. The students who got 20 or higher than 20 marks are only 132 out of 400, and on the lower side the students who got marks lower than 20 are 268 which shows that most of the students achieved low score that is between 7.50 to 19.50. The lower ebb was 7.50 achieved by only one student. There was a lot of variation in the score of students from 7.50 to 29. The highest number of students (34) achieved 18 score that is 8.5 % the highest percentage.

Table 2
Frequency of Post-Test Responses

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	11.00	1	.3	.3	.3
	12.00	1	.3	.3	.5
	15.00	2	.5	.5	1.0
	16.00	1	.3	.3	1.3
	17.00	1	.3	.3	1.5
	17.50	3	.8	.8	2.3
	18.00	7	1.8	1.8	4.0
	18.50	1	.3	.3	4.3
	19.00	1	.3	.3	4.5
	19.50	3	.8	.8	5.3
	20.00	4	1.0	1.0	6.3
	20.50	2	.5	.5	6.8
	21.00	5	1.3	1.3	8.0
	21.50	8	2.0	2.0	10.0
	22.00	6	1.5	1.5	11.5
	22.50	4	1.0	1.0	12.5
	23.00	5	1.3	1.3	13.8
	23.50	5	1.3	1.3	15.0
	24.00	9	2.3	2.3	17.3
	24.50	6	1.5	1.5	18.8
	25.00	7	1.8	1.8	20.5
	25.50	2	.5	.5	21.0
	26.00	6	1.5	1.5	22.5
	26.50	4	1.0	1.0	23.5
	27.00	14	3.5	3.5	27.0
	27.50	6	1.5	1.5	28.5
	28.00	19	4.8	4.8	33.3
	28.50	1	.3	.3	33.5
	29.00	10	2.5	2.5	36.0
	29.50	7	1.8	1.8	37.8

30.00	11	2.8	2.8	40.5
30.50	1	.3	.3	40.8
31.00	5	1.3	1.3	42.0
31.50	7	1.8	1.8	43.8
32.00	13	3.3	3.3	47.0
32.50	4	1.0	1.0	48.0
33.00	2	.5	.5	48.5
33.50	1	.3	.3	48.8
34.00	4	1.0	1.0	49.8
35.00	2	.5	.5	50.3
35.50	1	.3	.3	50.5
36.00	3	.8	.8	51.3
37.00	3	.8	.8	52.0
37.50	4	1.0	1.0	53.0
38.00	10	2.5	2.5	55.5
38.50	4	1.0	1.0	56.5
39.00	4	1.0	1.0	57.5
39.50	1	.3	.3	57.8
40.00	20	5.0	5.0	62.8
40.30	1	.3	.3	63.0
40.50	13	3.3	3.3	66.3
41.00	8	2.0	2.0	68.3
41.50	2	.5	.5	68.8
42.00	21	5.3	5.3	74.0
42.50	6	1.5	1.5	75.5
43.00	9	2.3	2.3	77.8
43.50	5	1.3	1.3	79.0
44.00	27	6.8	6.8	85.8
44.50	1	.3	.3	86.0
45.00	11	2.8	2.8	88.8
45.50	4	1.0	1.0	89.8
46.00	7	1.8	1.8	91.5
46.50	9	2.3	2.3	93.8
47.00	8	2.0	2.0	95.8
47.50	6	1.5	1.5	97.3
48.00	8	2.0	2.0	99.3
48.50	3	.8	.8	100.0
Total	400	100.0	100.0	

When frequency measure was applied on the data gathered in post-test, above table was generated which shows that out of 400 students only 3 (.8%) students got highest marks that is 48.50 out of 50. On the other hand the lowest marks were 11 obtained by only 1 (.3%) student. Other students were between 11 and 48.50, and there is a lot of variation as is mentioned in the table. 27 students out of 400 got 44 marks that is the highest number of students getting same marks in the post test.

Table 3
Overall Paired Samples Statistics for complete test participants

		Mean	N	Correlation	Correlation Sig.	Mean	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Prtr	17.7338	400	.160	.001	-16.6295	-35.422	399	.000
	Pstr	34.3633	400						

A two sample t test was applied on pre and post-tests of complete sample of 400 participants to check whether there was any difference of development in the four skills of English language. Data was collected from samples two times with a difference of treatment. In both pairs, results show (in the table above) that yes there is statistically significant difference in the result of pre and post-tests (M=17.74vs M=34.36 with t_{399} =-35.422 and sig. (2-tailed) = .001 that is less than p value of .05). The result of tests shows in correlative terms is .160 with a correlation sig. of .001 which is again less than the cut value that shows there was the same group used for the data collection and the correlation is positive but weak (r = 0.160, p > .001). The result also shows that the result of post-test was 16 point higher than the scores of pre-test (95% CI [-17.55, -15.71]). Results specifically show that when suitable milieus and methods were used to teach four skills of English language, they could produce a lot of difference which can be noted in the above table.

Table 4
Access Students Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Correlation	Correlation Sig.	Mean	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Prtr	18.1875	200	.227	.001	24.4290	72.962	199	.000
	Pstr	42.6165	200						

A two sample t test was applied on pre and post-tests of 200 participants from the Access Program to check whether there was any difference of development in the four skills of English language. Data was collected from samples two times: at time of admission and after one year. In both pairs, results show in the table above that yes there is statistically significant difference in the result of pre and post-tests (M=18.19vs M=42.62 with t_{199} = 72.962 and sig. (2-tailed) = .001 that is less than p value of .05). The

result of test shown in correlative terms is .227 with a correlation sig. of .001 which is again less than the cut value that shows there was the same group used for the data collection and the correlation was positive and strong (r = 0.227, p > .001). The result also shows that the result of post-test was 24 point higher than the scores of pre-test (95% CI [23.77, 25.09]). Results specifically show that when the required milieus and methods were used to teach four skills of English language in the Access classrooms they could produce a lot of difference which can be noted in the above table.

Table 5
Public Schools Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Correlation	Correlation Sig.	Mean	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Prtr	17.2800	200	.037	.598	8.8300	22.051	199	.000
	Pstr	26.1100	200						

A paired sample t test was applied on pre and post-tests of 200 participants from public schools to check whether there was any difference of development in the four skills of English language. Data was twice collected from the same samples: once when they appeared for Access entry test and second after one year. In both pairs, as per the results shown above in the table that yes there is statistically significant difference in the result of pre and post-tests (M=17.28vs M=26.11 with t_{199} = 22.051 and sig. (2-tailed) = .001 that is less than p value of .05). The result of test shown in correlative terms is .598 with a correlation sig. of .001 which is again less than the cut value that shows there was the same group used for the data collection and the correlation is positive but very weak (r = 0.037, p > .001). The result also shows that the result of post-test was only 8points higher than the scores of pre-test (95% CI [8.04, 9.62]). Results specifically show when the suitable milieus and methods were not used to teach four skills of English language in non-Access classrooms, the notable difference cannot be created in the learning of the students (though a little difference could be produced yet it was less than expected). The result is described in the table which can be noted.

Table 6
Independent Sample Statistics between Groups (Complete Pre-test)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T Value	Sig. (2-tailed)
Prtr	Access	200	18.1875	4.25430	.451	.652
	Non-Access	200	18.0175	3.21483		

The table is showing the result of independent sample t test between Access and non-Access groups. As shown in the above table, there is no significant difference between the scores of Access and non-Access groups as the Sig. (2-tailed) value is .652 that is greater than the cut value of p > .05. The mean score of both groups shows that overall performance of both Access and non-Access groups was almost the same as the mean score of Access was 18.1875 and the means score of non-Access group was 18.0175 which is almost equal. Their t value is .451 which is positive 2-tailed value, which is square of one tailed data and it shows that the difference between Access and non-Access groups' performance is almost equal.

Table 7
Independent Sample Statistics between Groups (Complete Post-test)

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T Value	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pstr	Access	200	42.6165	3.25999	40.359	.000
	Non-Access	200	26.1100	4.77776		

The post-test was conducted and the result was recorded in above table after applying independent sample t test. As per the data given in the table, there is a significant difference between the scores of Access students and non-Access students, as the sig. (2-tailed) value is .001 which is less than the cut value of p<.05. Their mean scores show better result of Access students over non-Access students as the mean score of Access students is 42.6165 while the mean score for non-Access students is 26.1100 and the 2-tailed t value is 40.359 which is positive. The result shows that the overall performance of Access students is much better than that of non-Access students as the difference of mean scores is almost 16.49 which shows a large difference in the scores of both genders.

The results of the research proved that students of Access Program achieved much higher score that the students of public school. As calculated and presented in tables above that both the groups showed improvement within a span of one year but the learning of the students of Access Program was significantly better (from average score of 18.18 to 42.61) from the students of Public Schools (from average score of 18.01 to 26.11).

Discussion

The results proved that ELT practices in the Access Program affected the students positively. This result also proves the claims of the researchers like Hannah (2013), Schneider (2002), Maxwell and Chmielewski (2008) and others who established the strong relationship of classroom environment with better learning achievement. Access Program promises better learning environment as claimed in 'Handbook for Provider' of English Access Microscholarship Program (2015). The handbook also establishes that Access teachers will get customized training and will teach using teaching methodologies

and techniques that are useful and beneficial for their learners. The details of which can be found in 'Introduction' section. It also proves that claims of Zepeda (2006), Adunola (2011) and others who established positive relationship between effective teacher training and better learning achievement of the learners. The better results of the students of the Access program can be referred to the findings of Wolfenberger and Canella (2015), Aziz and Hossain (2010), Tran (2017), Lippincott (2017) and others who established in their researches that better teaching methodologies and techniques can significantly improve the learning outcome. Thus it is proven that the ELT practices of Access Program are better than the ELT practices of Public School because the effect is significantly different.

Conclusion and Recommendations

In the light of the above 'findings' and 'discussion' it is concluded that ELT practices of Access Program are significantly better than the ELT practices of public schools as proven by their effect on learning outcomes of both the groups. Now the ELT practices used in Access Program should be researched thoroughly to take them as a model for all English Language Programs in Pakistan and for suggesting further improvement in the Access Program itself.

References

Adunola, O. (2011). *The impact of teachers' teaching methods on the academic performance of primary school pupils in Ijebu-ode Local cut Area of Ogun State.* Ego Booster Books, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Ali, A., Tariq, H. R., & Topping, K. J. (2012). Perspectives of academic activities in universities in Pakistan. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *37*(3), 321-348.

Aziz, Z., & Hossain, M. A. (2010). A comparison of cooperative learning and conventional teaching on students' achievement in secondary mathematics. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*.

Barnitt, H. (2003). Lighting for the future building service. *The Magazine for the CIBSE, 25*(1), 38-39

Barrot, J. S. (2014). A macro perspective on key issues in English as second language (ESL) pedagogy in the post method era: Confronting challenges through socio cognitive-transformative approach. *The Asia - Pacific Education Researcher, 23*(3), 435-449. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0119-4

Earthman, G. I. (2004). *Prioritization of 31 criteria for school building adequacy*. American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Maryland.

Engelbrecht, K. (2003). *The impact of colour on learning*, Retrieved from, http://web.archive.org/ web/20040218065036

Faiz, F. A. (2011). *Problems and prospects of science education at secondary level in Pakistan*. Islamabad: (Unpublished Dissertation). Retrieved from prr.hec.gov.pk/: http://prr.hec.gov.pk/

Fisher, E. S. (2008). *The effect of the physical classroom environment on literacy outcomes: How 3rd class teachers use the physical classroom to implement a balanced literacy curriculum*. A Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School University of Missouri.

Freeman, L. D., & Anderson, Marti. (2013). *Techniques and principles in language teaching (3rd ed.) Oxford Handbooks for Language Teachers*. Kindle Edition. Oxford University Press

Halai, N. (2012). Developing understanding of innovative strategies of teaching science through action research: A qualitative meta-synthesis from Pakistan. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 387-415.

Hannah, R. (2013). *The effect of classroom environment on student learning*. Western Michigan University, Unpublished thesis of Honors

Hussain, I., Inamullah, H. M., & Naseer-Ud-Din, M. (2008). Teacher-students verbal interaction at the secondary level. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, *5*(9), 41-43.

Iqbal, H. M., Azam, S., & Rana, R. A. (2009). Secondary school science teachers' Views about the 'nature of science'. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, *31*(2), 29-44.

Jan, K. (2013). Perceptions of private school teachers in Pakistan regarding the effects of student-centered approach on the abilities of their students. *International Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research*, *4*(2).

Lercher, P., Evans, G. W., & Meis, M. (2003). *Ambient noise and cognitive processes among primary school children. Environment and Behavior, 35*(6), 725-735.

Lippincott, D. (2017). *Accountability groups to enhance language learning in a university intensive English program* (Order No. 10274597). Available from Pro Quest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1898480288). Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1898480288?accountid=172684

Malarcher, C., & Janzen, A. (2010). *Reading challenge 1* (2nd ed.). Compass Publishing.

Maxwell, L., & Chmielewski, E. (2008). Environmental personalization and elementary school children's self-esteem. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 28*(2), 143-153.

Naseer, F., Patnam, M., & Raza, R. (2009). *Are child-centered classrooms effective? Impact of the CRI program on student learning outcomes in Pakistan*. Economics of Education Review, 669-683.

Pallant, J. (2011). SPSS Survival manual (4th ed.). *A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press.

Pandey, P., & Pandey, M. M. (2015). *Research methodology: Tools and techniques*. Romania: Bridge Centre.

Schneider, M. (2002). Do school facilities affect academic outcomes? National clearing house for educational facilities. *Environmental Education*, *1*(3), 167-173.

Sleeman, P., & Rockwell, D. (1981). *Designing learning environments*. New York: Abe books.

Stansfeld, S. A., & Matheson, M. (2003). Noise pollution: Non-auditory effects on health. *British Medical Bulletin*, *68*, 243-257.

Sultana, M., & Zaki, S. (2015). Proposing project based learning as an alternative to traditional ELT pedagogy at public colleges in Pakistan. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies, 4*(2), 155-173. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1666993364?accountid=172684

Tran, N. H. (2017). *EFL students' and teachers' perspectives on the use of role-play in teaching english in the Vietnamese Context*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (10251565).

U.S. Department of State. (2015). *English access microscholarship program 2015-2016 program handbook for providers*. U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Education and Culture Affairs, Office of English Language Programs.

Walberg, H. J. (1986). *Synthesis of research on teaching* (In M. C. Witt rock (Ed), Handbook of research on teaching. ed. New York: Paragon

Wolfensberger, B., & Canella, C. (2015). Cooperative learning about nature of science with a case from the history of science. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, *10*(6), 865-889.

Zepeda, S. J. (2006). Classroom-based assessments of teaching and learning. *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice*, 101-124.