

Impact Factor: 3.4546 (UIF) DRJI Value: 5.9 (B+)

# A study on barriers in learning the English subject faced by students of public sector secondary schools of Quetta city

SOBIA AFRIDI¹ ALIYA AYUB SAFIA MASOOD SADIQA SAUD

Education Department
Sardar Bahadur Khan Women University, Quetta, Pakistan
SHAZLEEN AFRIDI
English Department
Sardar Bahadur Khan Women University, Quetta, Pakistan
NAHEEDA JALAL
Institute of Biochemistry
University of Balochistan, Quetta, Pakistan

#### **Abstract**

The present study was designed to investigate the barriers in learning the English subject by students of public sector secondary schools of Quetta city. The study was limited to secondary level. This study was carried out in Quetta city Baluchistan, Pakistan. It was observed that the secondary school students have been facing several barriers in learning English subject. It was also observed that in recent times the government tries to equip teachers with the best possible training, but the situation is still not up to the mark. The participants of the study were 140 students, including 70 girls and 70 boys and 60 English teachers (n=30) were male and (n=30) were females, Students and teachers were administered through two different questionnaire, the collected data were analyzed through SPSS by applying ANOVA and T-test; it was revealed that students still felt difficulties in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Corresponding author: sobiaafridi17@gmail.com

speaking, listening, reading and writing English because teachers are not applying appropriate methods for teaching English subject.

**Key words:** Barrier, secondary school students, second language.

#### INTRODUCTION

Ministry of Education (2006) introduced the English as a compulsory subject from grade one to tenth grade in all government schools in Pakistan. As this step opens up the new avenues to the Pakistani students to go for a higher studies with its, but it brings new challenges for the teachers to teach English and students faced barriers to comprehend this subject in a proper way because of the insufficient prior knowledge of this subject.

As the secondary level is an important level for the secondary school students, which prepares students to enter into a higher institution for better learning or to be a member of the family through joining the different jobs. As Jimenez and Rose (2010) affirms, "without a sustained and systematic effort students in the process of learning English have almost no hope of acquiring the kinds and amounts of cultural, social and academic capital that they need to move into higher education or meaningful work" (p.411). English is not only a subject to teach in the classroom, but also the medium for social practical use (Foley, 2005). "English is not a subject which can be taught; it is a subject which must be learnt." (Michel West). For most of the academicians and practitioners teaching English is the integral concerns because through right teaching teachers facilitate the acquisition easy for the students. (Patil, 2008). Amongst the many barriers faced by the Pakistani students, the most prominent factor in research are Grammar Translation method and old methods of teaching(Akram &Mahmood,2007)other factors include the transfer English language skills through obsolete book, endorsement of rote learning, untrained English language teachers, short period of class in the week, overcrowded classrooms, deficiency of language aids. Thus it becomes compulsory to distinguish among the barrier of English faced by students and ascertain the pedagogical factors which have been practicing in the public sector secondary schools of Quetta city. English is using as a second language is a problem both for students and teachers. In this study, we will identify the barriers which affect

learning in English subject, as English is occupied its place in every circle of life, business, commerce, technology, science, trade or education.

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

English language has been introduced as a compulsory subject in our school system by our government from primary to higher secondary level, as acquisition of second language is a difficult task for most of the secondary school students they face barriers in learning English subject particularly when they enter into higher secondary school because they bear the same barriers in the other science subjects which are in English if this problem is address in a reasonable way it will facilitates learning in a more understandable and productive way. This research study attempts to elucidate the barriers faced by students in learning English at the secondary level in Quetta city.

#### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

- 1. To identify the barriers in learning English subject at secondary level.
- 2. To find out the pedagogical factors affecting learning English subject at secondary level.
- 3. To suggest the strategies to overcome the barriers affecting the effective learning of English subject.

#### RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- 1. What are the problems faced by students in learning English at secondary level?
- 2. What are the main factors responsible for creating problems in learning English at Secondary level?
- 3. What could be the possible strategies to overcome the barriers in learning English?

#### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this study, a survey was conducted to identify and analyzed the factors creating barriers in learning the English subject by students of secondary school of Quetta city. This study will be quantitative in nature and statistical methods have been applied to analyze data. A survey questionnaire will be constructed on a five point Likert scale.

The collected data are based upon the questionnaire responses of 140 students of the secondary schools and 60 secondary school English teachers.

#### **Population**

The sample size for this research study will be two hundred. (N#200). The researcher collected data from different twenty secondary schools of Quetta district, ten government Girls and ten Government Boys secondary schools of Quetta district were included in this research study.

#### Sample size

The sample size consists of total 140 students of secondary level. Sample was further divided into (n=70) girls students and (n=70) boys students and 60 English teachers (n=30) male and (n=30) female.

Stratified sampling technique was used in the present study. The sample was directly collected.

#### Data Collection and Instrumentation

The data were collected by conducting a survey method, the tool for conducting this survey was five point Likert scale questionnaire, one for secondary school students and one for secondary school teachers. The five point Likert scale were formulated after extensive study of the literature review and the present classroom practices for teaching English subject. After formulating the questionnaire, the questionnaire used for pilot testing after some minor changes the validity and reliability of the questionnaire were calculated and further disseminated for collecting data.

#### **Data Analysis**

Data obtained from the students and teacher's questionnaire will be analyzed through SPSS while applying ANOVA and Independent sample t -test. The data of 160 students were analyzed and then the data of 60 teachers were analyzed simultaneously.

#### **Demographic Characteristics of Respondents**

The demographic characters of the students has been shown in the table 1 (N=140)70% were boys students and 70% were girls students

were randomly selected from 7 boys and 7 girls secondary schools. 80% students from 9th class and 60% students from 10th class. Majority numbers of students were from Pashtu language (n=85). The secondary school students were mostly from the sub urban primary school, 83.6%were from chiltan town and 61.4% were from zarghoon town.

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic Of	Frequency N=140	Percentage%
Students(n=140)		
Gender wise		
Girls	70	70
Boys	70	70
Class wise		
9 <sup>th</sup> -class	80	57.1
10 <sup>th</sup> -class	60	42.9
Mother Tongue		
Urdu	20	20.7
Pushtu	85	60.7
Bharavi	17	12.1
Sindhi	5	3.6
Punjabi	4	2.9
Schools		
7 girls Schools	7	5.0
7 Boys Schools	7	5.0
Location of primary		
school		
Chiltan town	54	83.6
Zarghoon town	86	61.4

# Reponses of Students regarding speaking, listening, reading and writing barriers

Through ANOVA test following results came forward as for gender (male and female) has a significant relationship with listening barrier (p<.039) and with speaking barrier (p<.031) while for reading and writing barrier it shows insignificant value. While secondary classes have and mother shown insignificant relationship with each barriers. For institution, listening barrier (p=.047), speaking barrier (p=.035) and reading barrier (p=.000) shows significant value. While for primary location of schools shows significant relationship with listening barrier (p=.001) and speaking barrier (p=.001).

Table 2 Student's Responses Regarding Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing Barriers.

Gender(Male and Female)	Significance level(p<0.05)
Listening Barrier	.039
Speaking Barrier	.031
Reading Barrier	.681
Writing Barrier	.515
9th & 10th Class	Significance level(p<0.05)
Listening Barrier	.430
Speaking Barrier	.403
Reading Barrier	.976
Writing Barrier	.301
Mother Tongue	Significance level(p<0.05)
Listening Barrier	.566
Speaking Barrier	.677
Reading Barrier	.007
Writing Barrier	.619
Institutions	Significance level(p<0.05)
Listening Barrier	.047
Speaking Barrier	.035
Reading Barrier	.000
Writing Barrier	.180
Primary School	Significance level(p<0.05)
Listening Barrier	.001
Speaking Barrier	.001
Reading Barrier	.099
Writing Barrier	.193

#### **Independent Sample t-test**

## Respondent's responses regarding listening, speaking, Reading and Writing Barriers in terms of gender

The table 3 below has shown that after applying Independent sample t test with the variables of gender the 2-tailed significance difference has been shown in listening (p=0.039)and speaking barrier(p=0.031>0.05) as it has shown the lower value than(p< 0.05) while reading and writing barrier has shown insignificant difference.

Table 3 Independent Sample T test on gender basis

Levene's Test for Equality							
	of Variences					t-test for Equality of Mean	
		F	Sig.	Т	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference
L-B	Equal Variences assumed	12.580	.001	-2.085	138	.039	17143
S-B	Equal Variences assumed	4.936	.028	-2.178	138	.031	24286
R-B	Equal Variences assumed	2.326	.130	.412	138	.681	.05714
W-B	Equal Variences assumed	2.055	.154	.653	138	.515	.20000

### Table 4 Demographic Characteristics of Teachers (N=60)

In the present study 30 male and 30 female teachers taken part from the institutions (N=7) majority of the teachers having 1 to 10 years (N=34) majority of the teachers were 30 years age. General qualification having 91.7% and mostly around 81.7% did their professional degree and around 88.3% were having no training in how the teacher English to secondary school students.

Gender	Frequency(N=60)	Percentage%
Male	30	50.0
Female	30	50.0
Institution	7	5.0
Designation		
SST(Science)	36	60.0
SST(General)	24	40.0
Experience		
1-10 years	34	56.7
10-20 years	18	30.0
20-30 years	8	13.3
Age of teachers		
28-38 years	30	50.0
38-48 years	22	36.7
48-58 years	8	13.3
General Qualification		
M.A	55	91.7
M.Sc.	5	8.3
Professional Qualification		
B.Ed.	11	18.3
M.Ed.	49	81.7
Training in English teaching		
No training	53	88.3
Training	7	11.7

Table5. Results of ANOVA test regarding gender, institutions, designation, and experience of the teachers, age of teachers, genera and professional qualification, English teaching training. Through analysis of second questionnaire which was filled by 60 secondary English school teachers. ANOVA test shows the following significant difference at the 5%level of significance. Gender shows the significant relationship with listening pedagogy (p=.032) speaking pedagogy (p=.000) reading pedagogy (p=.000). While institution shows significant relationship with listening pedagogy(p=.001) Speaking pedagogy(p=.000) reading pedagogy(p=.000)Designation shows listening pedagogy(p=.005)speaking pedagogy(.000)reading pedagogy(p=.003)Experience of the teachers shows significant relationship with listening pedagogy(p=.023),General qualification shows significance with writing pedagogy(p=.043)While age of teacher, professional qualification and English teaching training shows insignificant difference.

Listening Pedagogy	Gender	Significance Level(p<0.05)
Speaking Pedagogy         .000           Reading Pedagogy         .000           Writing Pedagogy         .101           Listening Pedagogy         .001           Speaking Pedagogy         .000           Reading Pedagogy         .000           Writing Pedagogy         .000           Writing Pedagogy         .005           Speaking Pedagogy         .000           Reading Pedagogy         .003           Speaking Pedagogy         .003           Reading Pedagogy         .021           Experience of the teachers            Listening Pedagogy         .464           Reading Pedagogy         .464           Reading Pedagogy         .338           Age of teachers            Listening Pedagogy         .385           Reading Pedagogy         .385           Reading Pedagogy         .385           Reading Pedagogy         .616           General Qualification            Listening Pedagogy            Speaking Pedagogy            Speaking Pedagogy            Speaking Pedagogy            Speaking Pedagogy <td>Listening Pedagogy</td> <td>.032</td>	Listening Pedagogy	.032
Writing Pedagogy   .001	Speaking Pedagogy	.000
Institutions	Reading Pedagogy	.000
Listening Pedagogy	Writing Pedagogy	.101
Speaking Pedagogy	Institutions	
Reading Pedagogy   .000	Listening Pedagogy	.001
Writing Pedagogy   .388     Designation   .005     Speaking Pedagogy   .000     Reading Pedagogy   .003     Writing Pedagogy   .021     Experience of the teachers   .023     Isitening Pedagogy   .023     Speaking Pedagogy   .464     Reading Pedagogy   .173     Writing Pedagogy   .173     Writing Pedagogy   .385     Age of teachers   .385     Listening Pedagogy   .385     Reading Pedagogy   .385     Reading Pedagogy   .746     Writing Pedagogy   .616     General Qualification   .385     Listening Pedagogy   .416     Reading Pedagogy   .416     Reading Pedagogy   .416     Reading Pedagogy   .416     Writing Pedagogy   .416     Writing Pedagogy   .416     Writing Pedagogy   .416     Writing Pedagogy   .416     Reading Pedagogy   .416     Writing Pedagogy   .466     Writing Pedagogy   .465     Reading Pedagogy   .505     Professional Qualification   .385     Listening Pedagogy   .505     English Teaching Training   .385     Listening Pedagogy   .272     Reading Pedagogy   .522     Reading Pedagogy   .522     Reading Pedagogy   .522     Reading Pedagogy   .522     Reading Pedagogy   .758	Speaking Pedagogy	.000
Designation	Reading Pedagogy	.000
Listening Pedagogy	Writing Pedagogy	.388
Speaking Pedagogy         .000           Reading Pedagogy         .003           Writing Pedagogy         .021           Experience of the teachers	Designation	
Reading Pedagogy         .003           Writing Pedagogy         .021           Experience of the teachers	Listening Pedagogy	.005
Writing Pedagogy         .021           Experience of the teachers         .023           Listening Pedagogy         .464           Reading Pedagogy         .173           Writing Pedagogy         .538           Age of teachers	Speaking Pedagogy	.000
Experience of the teachers	Reading Pedagogy	.003
Listening Pedagogy	Writing Pedagogy	.021
Speaking Pedagogy	Experience of the teachers	
Reading Pedagogy       .173         Writing Pedagogy       .538         Age of teachers	Listening Pedagogy	.023
Writing Pedagogy         .538           Age of teachers	Speaking Pedagogy	.464
Age of teachers         .121           Listening Pedagogy         .385           Reading Pedagogy         .746           Writing Pedagogy         .616           General Qualification         .525           Listening Pedagogy         .416           Reading Pedagogy         .181           Writing Pedagogy         .043           Professional Qualification            Listening Pedagogy         .209           Speaking Pedagogy         .850           Writing Pedagogy         .505           English Teaching Training            Listening Pedagogy         .522           Speaking Pedagogy         .522           Reading Pedagogy         .758	Reading Pedagogy	.173
Listening Pedagogy   .121     Speaking Pedagogy   .385     Reading Pedagogy   .746     Writing Pedagogy   .616     General Qualification     Listening Pedagogy   .525     Speaking Pedagogy   .416     Reading Pedagogy   .181     Writing Pedagogy   .043     Professional Qualification     Listening Pedagogy   .209     Speaking Pedagogy   .465     Reading Pedagogy   .850     Writing Pedagogy   .850     Writing Pedagogy   .505     English Teaching Training     Listening Pedagogy   .272     Speaking Pedagogy   .522     Reading Pedagogy   .758	Writing Pedagogy	.538
Speaking Pedagogy         .385           Reading Pedagogy         .746           Writing Pedagogy         .616           General Qualification           Listening Pedagogy         .525           Speaking Pedagogy         .416           Reading Pedagogy         .043           Professional Qualification           Listening Pedagogy         .209           Speaking Pedagogy         .465           Reading Pedagogy         .850           Writing Pedagogy         .505           English Teaching Training         .272           Speaking Pedagogy         .522           Reading Pedagogy         .758	Age of teachers	
Reading Pedagogy       .746         Writing Pedagogy       .616         General Qualification         Listening Pedagogy       .416         Reading Pedagogy       .181         Writing Pedagogy       .043         Professional Qualification         Listening Pedagogy       .209         Speaking Pedagogy       .465         Reading Pedagogy       .850         Writing Pedagogy       .505         English Teaching Training       .272         Listening Pedagogy       .522         Reading Pedagogy       .758	Listening Pedagogy	.121
Writing Pedagogy         .616           General Qualification         .525           Speaking Pedagogy         .416           Reading Pedagogy         .181           Writing Pedagogy         .043           Professional Qualification         .209           Speaking Pedagogy         .465           Reading Pedagogy         .850           Writing Pedagogy         .505           English Teaching Training         .272           Speaking Pedagogy         .522           Reading Pedagogy         .758	Speaking Pedagogy	.385
General Qualification         .525           Listening Pedagogy         .525           Speaking Pedagogy         .416           Reading Pedagogy         .181           Writing Pedagogy         .043           Professional Qualification           Listening Pedagogy         .209           Speaking Pedagogy         .850           Writing Pedagogy         .505           English Teaching Training         .272           Listening Pedagogy         .522           Reading Pedagogy         .758	Reading Pedagogy	.746
Listening Pedagogy       .525         Speaking Pedagogy       .416         Reading Pedagogy       .181         Writing Pedagogy       .043         Professional Qualification         Listening Pedagogy       .209         Speaking Pedagogy       .465         Reading Pedagogy       .850         Writing Pedagogy       .505         English Teaching Training       .272         Listening Pedagogy       .522         Reading Pedagogy       .758	Writing Pedagogy	.616
Speaking Pedagogy         .416           Reading Pedagogy         .181           Writing Pedagogy         .043           Professional Qualification           Listening Pedagogy         .209           Speaking Pedagogy         .465           Reading Pedagogy         .850           Writing Pedagogy         .505           English Teaching Training         .272           Listening Pedagogy         .522           Reading Pedagogy         .758	General Qualification	
Reading Pedagogy       .181         Writing Pedagogy       .043         Professional Qualification         Listening Pedagogy       .209         Speaking Pedagogy       .465         Reading Pedagogy       .850         Writing Pedagogy       .505         English Teaching Training       .272         Speaking Pedagogy       .522         Reading Pedagogy       .758	Listening Pedagogy	.525
Writing Pedagogy .043  Professional Qualification  Listening Pedagogy .209 Speaking Pedagogy .465 Reading Pedagogy .850 Writing Pedagogy .505  English Teaching Training  Listening Pedagogy .272 Speaking Pedagogy .522 Reading Pedagogy .758	Speaking Pedagogy	.416
Professional Qualification  Listening Pedagogy .209 Speaking Pedagogy .465 Reading Pedagogy .850 Writing Pedagogy .505 English Teaching Training Listening Pedagogy .272 Speaking Pedagogy .522 Reading Pedagogy .758	Reading Pedagogy	.181
Listening Pedagogy       .209         Speaking Pedagogy       .465         Reading Pedagogy       .850         Writing Pedagogy       .505         English Teaching Training       .272         Listening Pedagogy       .522         Reading Pedagogy       .758		.043
Speaking Pedagogy .465 Reading Pedagogy .850 Writing Pedagogy .505 English Teaching Training .272 Speaking Pedagogy .522 Reading Pedagogy .758	Professional Qualification	
Reading Pedagogy .850 Writing Pedagogy .505  English Teaching Training Listening Pedagogy .272 Speaking Pedagogy .522 Reading Pedagogy .758	0 00	
Writing Pedagogy .505  English Teaching Training Listening Pedagogy .272 Speaking Pedagogy .522 Reading Pedagogy .758		
English Teaching Training  Listening Pedagogy .272 Speaking Pedagogy .522 Reading Pedagogy .758		
Listening Pedagogy .272 Speaking Pedagogy .522 Reading Pedagogy .758		.505
Speaking Pedagogy .522 Reading Pedagogy .758		
Reading Pedagogy .758	0 00	
		.522
Writing Pedagogy .617	0 00	.758
	Writing Pedagogy	.617

**Table 6** has shown that listening pedagogy having a strong association with gender (p=.032) at 5% level of significance. While speaking and reading pedagogies have shown the highest relationship with (p=.000) significance. Whereas writing pedagogy has shown the insignificant value (p=.101) in relation to the gender.

	Levene's Tes	st for Equali					
	of Variences					t-test for Equality of Mean	
		F	Sig.	Т	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference
L-P	Equal Variences assumed	6.126	.016	2.201	58	.032	.53333
S-P	Equal Variences assumed	2.968	.090	-6.240	58	.000	-1.66667
R-P	Equal Variences	**********					
	assumed	11.54	.001	-4.160	58	.000	-1.26667
W-P	Equal Variences assumed	.779	.381	1.665	58	.101	.50000

#### DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study is to identify the different barriers faced by the secondary school students in learning English subject in government schools of Quetta city. The barriers in listening, speaking, reading and writing were all identified collectively. The survey method was used to obtain the results. The analysis conducted through one way ANOVA test reveals that the listening barrier has shown the significant difference for gender and primary school location while insignificant difference for classes, mother tongue and institutions. Despite of gender, school location, and mother tongue all the students facing similar problems in learning English subject because the way they taught English by their teachers is not appropriate.

The analysis for speaking barrier through ANOVA test has shown that for gender, institutions and primary school location it has significant difference while for classes and mother tongue it has shown the insignificant difference.

The analysis for reading barrier through ANOVA test has shown the insignificant difference in gender, classes and primary school location while for institutions and mother tongue shown the significant difference.

The analysis of writing barrier through ANOVA test has shown the insignificant difference for gender, classes, mother tongue institutions and primary school location.

The analysis of independent t test in terms of gender has shown the significant difference in listening and speaking barrier while insignificant differences in reading and writing barrier. One of the most important thing which the curriculum board is ignoring is this to minimize the number of units while including other relevant activities so that the teacher should not have a particular pressure of finish the course rather take plenty of time to make students understand and practice this foreign language for better understanding.

The analysis of second questionnaire revealed that all selected secondary school teachers whether male or female do not teacher English in a way in which it has to be taught because they teacher it as other teachers teach Urdu Without using appropriate teaching strategies in the class .they are of the views that Speaking, listening and reading are not a part of the examination so they are not important to teacher, the teachers of all selected secondary school just follow the English Urdu translation and emphasized on cramming without teaching grammar ,sentence structure and vocabulary to the students. The pedagogies for speaking, listening, and reading are totally neglected in all the selected secondary government schools. Teachers are not taking English classes as they are of the view that it's hard for them to teach English because they do not have proper training in teaching this foreign language and on the teacher's part they themselves fail to understand certain things.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The findings revealed that the listening barrier in learning English has a significance difference with gender and primary school location while insignificant difference for classes, mother tongue and institutions. In case of speaking barrier in learning English, gender, institutions and primary school location have a significant difference while for classes and mother tongue it has an insignificant difference. After analysis, it has been found that for reading barrier, in learning English has an insignificant difference in gender, classes and primary

school location while in institutions and mother tongue it has shown the significant difference. As far as the writing barrier is concerned in learning English it has an insignificant difference in gender, classes, mother tongue institutions and primary school location.

In general, students do not pay attention and concentration that will create barriers in attaining knowledge of English. The English subject basically consists of four sub skill as listening, speaking, reading and writing while students faced barriers in comprehending pronunciation, they do not get the meaning of the text, when teacher reading for them, they are unable to understand difficult grammatical structure, while they do not get the opportunity to practice listening skill because there is no Audio visual facilities are present in the classroom. Students do not have enough confidence to speak English while they feel shy to use even a word in the class. The students like to adhere with their mother tongues during their classes while they show less interest in learning English because teachers fail to motivate their students to use English in their class because the teachers themselves using Urdu or other local languages with the students. Most of the students have a view that they do not get the opportunity to use English in their daily lives. In case of reading students do not recognize words and do not like to do reading in front of the whole class, because reading English is a difficult task for them and they start stammering during their reading due to nervousness the students do not comprehend what they read until their teachers explain them in Urdu.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Teachers should encourage students to communicate in English not only in the classroom, but with their peers and at home so that they do practice to speak English and it will build their confidence. Student centered activities should be used by the teachers in the classroom.

Teachers should try to promote all four skills (speaking, listening, reading and writing) in the class.

Activity based learning will help students to improve their learning in English subject. Teachers should encourage students to read English newspaper and school should provide interesting reading materials to the students.

For teaching English, teachers should prepare lesson plans and according to the planned lesson deliver their lessons in a more effective way with the help of audio visual aids which will create realistic environments for students to learn in a better way.

The government should provide the in training service to train the teachers to use English in the classroom. With the cooperation policy makers the teachers must try to bring the reforms in the pattern of examination, for test the spoken language of the students, they must allot separate marks for them.

The government should facilitate or train local teachers to establish a language laboratory.

Managements should insist teachers to assess student's proficiency in English at regular interval of time. The teachers should encourage students to read English material which students find interesting. The management must insist English teachers to speak English within the classroom, in school campus or even outside the school.

English teachers must encourage students to speak English and they should also allot the separate period for spoken English once/twice in a week.

Group discussion should be conducted by the teachers in the classrooms right from the beginning, so the students learn how to speak and listen purposefully to each other in the classroom.

To enhance the basic knowledge of composition and grammar, adequate written practice is required.

Co-curricular activities should be organized in the class through word games such as quizzes and puzzles, to improve their word-power and vocabulary.

Students must be involved in English language activities such as role play, extempore, storytelling, essay-writing, debate through interesting way. (Like using power point)

Listening and speaking are the two neglected skills which should be practiced and improved with correct pronunciation and accent under the supervision of the teacher.

Through Audio-visual Aids, the practice of predicting and summarizing should be taught preferably in the classroom.

The teacher's community must arrange seminars in which they can discuss challenges of teaching English subject so they must

be address in a proper ways, in which they suggest the teaching strategies to overcome the barriers of the students through right pedagogical techniques.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Alvarez, Denise Jean. "A Concert of Voices: Helping Collegelevel ESL Students Learn to Write Research Papers." PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Charlotte, 2006.
- 2. Aziz, Asma Abdul, Muhammad Umar, Farida Dilshad, and Mariam Mustafa. "Learning Difficulties and Strategies of Students at Higher Secondary Schools in Punjab." *Journal of Policy Research (JPR)* 1, no. 2 (2015): 55-61.
- 3. Akram, Muhammad, and Abrar Hussain Qureshi. "Problems in learning and teaching English pronunciation in Pakistan." *Int'l Journal of Research in linguistics & Lexicography* 4, no. 1 (2012): 43-48.
- 4. Adas, Dana, and Ayda Bakir. "Writing difficulties and new solutions: Blended learning as an approach to improve writing abilities." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 3, no. 9 (2013): 254-266.
- Alrashidi, Oqab, and Huy Phan. "Education Context and English Teaching and Learning in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: An Overview." *English Language Teaching* 8, no. 5 (2015): 33-44.
- 6. Asif, Muhammad. "Using the literature to address a problem/issue in writing." *International journal of academic research and reflection* 1, no. 2 (2013).
- 7. Ali, Sher, Naseem Ahmad, Noreen Manzoor, and Sofia Naseer. "Students' Perceptions about Teaching English as Compulsory Subject at Secondary Level in Punjab, Pakistan." Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE) 3, no. 1 (2014): 21-33.
- 8. Akram, Muhammad, and Mamuna Ghani. "Motivation in Learning English at I-ntermediate Level in Pakistanl." *International Journal of Research in Linguistics and Lexicography* 1, no. 3 (2012): 7-19.

- 9. Akbari, Zahra. "The role of grammar in second language reading comprehension: Iranian ESP context." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 98 (2014): 122-126.
- 10. Ahmad, Nasir, S. Ahmad, Maqsud Alam Bukhari, and Tayyab Alam Bukhari. "The nature of difficulties in learning english by the students at secondary school level in pakistan." *Journal of Education and Practice* 10, no. 2 (2011): 18-24.
- 11. Aziz, Asma Abdul, Muhammad Umar, Farida Dilshad, and Mariam Mustafa. "Learning Difficulties and Strategies of Students at Higher Secondary Schools in Punjab." *Journal of Policy Research (JPR)* 1, no. 2 (2015): 55-61.
- 12. Awan, Abdul Ghafoor, and Mehvish Shafi. "ANALYSIS OF TEACHING METHODS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AT GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL IN DG KHAN CITY-PAKISTAN." Global Journal of Management and Social Sciences ISSN 2519 (2016): 0091.
- 13. Alrashidi, Oqab, and Huy Phan. "Education Context and English Teaching and Learning in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia: An Overview." *English Language Teaching* 8, no. 5 (2015): 33-44.
- 14. Berns, Michael W., Hong Liang, Gregory J. Sonek, and Yagang Liu. "Micromanipulation of chromosomes using laser microsurgery (optical scissors) and laser-induced optical forces (optical tweezers)." In Cell Biology: A Laboratory Handbook. Academic Press New York, 1994.
- 15. Boonpattanaporn, Pornpan. "A Comparative Study of English Essay Writing Strategies and Difficulties as Perceived by English Major Students: A Case Study of School of Humanities, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce." (2007).
- 16. Bashiruddin, Ayesha, and Rabail Qayyum. "Teachers of English in Pakistan: Profile and recommendations." *NUML Journal of Critical Inquiry* 12, no. 1 (2014): 1.
- 17. BABAIBA, Wahiba. "Reading Comprehension Difficulties among EFL Learners: The Case of Third-Year Learners at Nehali Mohamed Secondary School." PhD diss., 2015.

- 18. Bolinger, Dwight. "1975. Aspects of Language." England: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich (1968).
- 19. McLaren, Neil, and Daniel Madrid, eds. *TEFL in secondary education: Workbook*. Universidad de Granada, 2006.
- 20. Chakravarthy, Ranganath VNallan. "Problems Encountered By Rural Students in Writing English—Role of English Teacher-Some Solutions."
- 21. Crystal, David. The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language. Ernst Klett Sprachen, 2004.
- 22. Duke, Nell K., and P. David Pearson. "Effective practices for developing reading comprehension." *Journal of education* 189, no. 1-2 (2009): 107-122.
- 23. Dietz, Carolyn Lindgren. "The uniqueness of the English language learner: Research based strategies for English language learners." (2013).
- 24. Devine, Joanne. "The role of metacognition in second language reading and writing." *Reading in the composition classroom:* Second language perspectives (1993): 105-127.
- 25. Ellis, Rod. "Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective." *TESOL quarterly* 40, no. 1 (2006): 83-107.
- 26. Florez, Mary Ann Cunningham. "Improving Adult English Language Learners' SpeakingSkills." (1999).
- 27. Ferdous, Sukriti Sohini. "Effectiveness of Communicative Language Teaching Approach at HSC Level." PhD diss., East West University, 2011.
- 28. Goodman, Kenneth S., ed. *The psycholinguistic nature of the reading process*. Wayne State University Press, 1973.
- 29. Goh, Christine. "Second language listening expertise." In *Expertise in second language learning and teaching*, pp. 64-84. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2005.
- 30. Gammill, Deidra M. "Learning the write way." *The Reading Teacher* 59, no. 8 (2006): 754-762.
- 31. Goh, Christine CM. "A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems." *System* 28, no. 1 (2000): 55-75.
- 32. Guanghui, Ma, and Wen Qiufang. "The relationship of L2 learners' linguistic variables to L2 writing ability,[J]." Foreign Language Teaching and Research 4 (1999).