

Received: 05 February 2024, Accepted: 05 April 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33282/rr.vx9i2.162>

Investigate The Role of Sociolinguistic Variables in The Improvement of L2 Learners' English Proficiency Among Students

Wahid Mehmood¹, Shumaila Shoukat², Rabia Mamoon³, Abida Parveen⁴, Sabir Hussain^{5*},
Fakhar-Ul-Zaman⁶, Abdul Qahar⁷, Raj Kumari⁸

1. Ph.D. Scholar (Education), Northern University Nowshera, KPK, Pakistan. Email: captainwahid@gmail.com
2. Lecture of English, Lahore Leads University, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: shumaila.eng@leads.edu.pk
3. Ph.D. Scholar, Education Department, Superior University Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: rabia.mamoon4@gmail.com
4. Ph.D. Scholar (Education) The University of Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: abidakhadim1@gmail.com
5. Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Educational Training, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7515-1917> Email: sabirjanmarri@gmail.com
6. Visiting Lecturer, Department of Education, University of Narowal, Punjab, Pakistan. Email: malikfakhar717@gmail.com
7. Ph.D. Scholar, Secondary Teacher Education, Allama Iqbal Open University Islamabad, Pakistan. Email: abdulqahar045@gmail.com
8. MS. Scholar, Department of Education, University of Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan, Email: 20203021-016@uskt.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: Sabir Hussain^{5} <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7515-1917>

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the role of sociolinguistic variables in improving L2 learners' English proficiency among students in government and private secondary schools in Dera Ghazi Khan. The current study aimed to investigate the factors that impact children's second language acquisition in their families and how parents may assist their children in learning and improving a second language. The study was generalized to the population of 75440 government and private secondary school students. The sample was two hundred (100 government secondary schools and 100 private) secondary school learners. An achievement test was used for the collection of data. The research instrument (achievement test) consisted of 26 statements. The acquired data was organized and tabulated using SPSS, determining the mean, standard deviation, t-value, and p-value (significant) levels. The t-test was used to assess the significance

of the difference between the means of the two types of educational systems compared to one another. As a criterion, the value was determined at the 01 level. The study's main findings were that students from private secondary schools had more significant difficulties learning verb forms, narration, self-perceived level of English, exposure to English, WTC with Friends, sentence arrangements, and WTC with strangers than students from public secondary schools. Students in both types of educational systems experienced the same difficulty when it came to acquiring voices. The instructors at private secondary schools lacked the qualifications and expertise of practical teaching approaches for English. All of the courses in both types of educational systems were overcrowded. Using audio-visual aids in teaching English is lacking in public and private secondary schools.

Keywords: Sociolinguistic factor, English Proficiency, L2, English improvement.

Introduction

Language instruction educates students on communicating successfully in social situations (Alrefae & Al-ghamdi, 2019). Although the government plans to improve the delivery of the English language within educational organizations and the increasing need for English communicative skills is essential for occupation in the rapidly developing Pakistan, traditional grammar-translation teaching methods have been unsteady and ineffective. The rise of the industry in Pakistan, the migration of foreign laborers, and the government's aim to integrate the country into the global economy where English was needed all contributed to the demand for English and, consequently, its teaching and usage. As a result, Pakistan underwent a significant transformation toward ELT in the 1970s, bringing about all the intended reforms. For instance, "tens of thousands of Americans and Chinese were employed in Pakistan," and "English language teaching became part of training and curriculum at almost all the institutes of higher education" in 1973 (Zuhur, 2011). The Ministry of Education also planned a unique program for English language teachers in 1973. Since then, ELT has expanded dramatically in Pakistan. However, Khalid Al-Seghayer (2011) noted that Pakistan falls into the low ability (rather than the internal/great ability) circle country, to use B. Kachru's terminology denotes the level of English in various countries, and this researcher and many other researchers have noted this. As the abstract states, English is taught as a foreign language in Pakistan. Since English is the language of the library and the medium of teaching for all general and professional university courses, all university graduates must study the language and possess an academic understanding of English. However, it frequently happens that students who enroll in institutions do not have the necessary English language skills. Even the English language training courses offered to them in the Preparatory Year to close the gap anticipate some basic level of competence from them so that they understand the course instructions. They are expected to pursue university courses in English. They enter the university after the crucial age for language learning in a native or nearly native context, unknowingly internalizing the target language's hidden grammar, complicating the issue. In Pakistan, English instruction starts at the elementary level and progresses through higher levels. However, according to Al-Seghayer, language learners' comprehension (in reading, writing, speaking, and listening) is frequently still relatively low (2011). Having "meaningful engagement in the target language, natural communication in which

speakers are concerned not with the form of their utterances but with the message they are sending and comprehending" is the primary objective of language learning (Krashen, 2007). A crucial area of language teaching and learning moving forward is the development of English language learners' communicative competence, which is essential for the learners' long-term development. In a sense, sociolinguistic competence is the capacity of a person to produce and comprehend suitable utterances in a particular context. Speech acts, which are predetermined utterances employed under certain circumstances to achieve activities like recognizing, extending greetings, demanding, responding, etc., are practiced as part of the dominion. It also includes a person's perception of what is appropriate in various socioeconomic contexts.

Literature Review

Pakistan's English-speaking community has grown significantly, and this connection to the outside world is mainly due to it. Pakistani English is a well-known language since it satisfies 185 of the requirements set forth by Platt, Weber, and Lian (1984) for being designated a new English. They contend that new English should be taught in educational institutions as a preferred topic and style of instruction. They also contend that new English should be created as a non-native variety, employed as a lingua franca, and localized in terms of expression and form. Research initiatives throughout the world used a variety of methods. Cruz (2018), for instance, analyses the purpose of code-switching using a descriptive method. Using a corpus-based approach, Pantaleon (2018) determined how "for example" and "for instance" were used. Additionally, utilizing computerized concordance software, Reyes, De Vera, and Medrano (2018), Bursztejn et al. (2011), N. Tran, T. Tran, and Bien (2010) prepared the course materials for students. Many academics have studied Pakistani English impressionistically. Baumgardner (1993) carefully investigated the linguistic effects of the Urdu language on the English language in his method. Additionally, Talaat (2002) thoroughly examined the influence of the Urdu language on Pakistani English in her study using text analysis. Rahman (1990) also notes that Pakistani English frequently employs the progressive aspect with habitual and complete actions. Additionally, some researchers conducted corpus-based studies to look into Pakistani English's unique variety. Using an empirical approach, R. Mahmood and A. Mahmood (2009) identified unusual features of Pakistani English as an independent variable. Corpus linguistics gave the study of the language(s) a new boost. However, the main focus of most of the studies remained the peculiarities that led Pakistani English spoken and written to be recognized as a distinct variety. In his study of spoken and written language, Biber (1988) developed a more thorough corpus-based multidimensional/multivariate approach that carefully examines the co-occurrence of linguistic features. He argues that it is improper to study linguistic variation by concentrating on distinct linguistic features while ignoring related linguistic features. The researchers, however, used a multi-dimensional model to study English used in Pakistani at a very late stage. Aleem's (2013) research was the first to assess Pakistani news media from a multi-dimensional standpoint. Using Biber's (1988) Multi-dimensional Modal, he looked at linguistic variance in the Pakistani advertisement register. Using Biber's (1988, 2006) multi-dimensional modal, researchers (such as Ali, 2018; Alvi et al., 2016; Asghar et al., 2018; Shakir & Deuber, 2018, 2019) researched Pakistani English. The investigation of diachronic differences among languages is a well-established field of study.

Statement of the Problem

The research aimed to investigate the sociolinguistic factors in improving L2 learners' English students at government secondary schools and private secondary school students in the district of Dera Ghazi Khan. The present research examined the family environmental factors that influence children's second language learning to investigate how the family environment affects children's motivation to learn and improve a second language.

Significance of the Study

This study is essential because a brief investigation explored sociolinguistic factors that help improve children's second language pronunciation and a lot of vocabulary used in daily life. This study is also essential for teachers to teach the second language better as a sociolinguistic background factor.

Researchers have examined numerous parts of dialect learning, such as guardians' perspectives on whether their kids should learn strange dialects, their financial status, and their instructive foundation. Furthermore, the investigation depicts the social impact of various families. Notwithstanding, the writing on the most proficient method to best address the effects of guardians on this theme is restricted.

The objective of This Study

The objectives for the present study were given as follows:

- 1- To explore the family environmental factors that influence children's second language learning.
- 2- To investigate how parents and schools help children learn a second language well.
- 3- To find the differences between government secondary schools and private secondary schools, students' level of willingness to communicate in English in the following background variables.
 - a) Provenance
 - b) Types of education
 - c) Self-perceived level of English
 - d) Exposure to English
- 4- To find the differences in the willingness of public and private secondary school students to communicate in English as a foreign language with the following interlocutors,
 - a. Friends
 - b. Acquaintances
 - c. Strangers
- 5- Measure the level of English performance in L2 of government secondary schools and private secondary school students of district Dera Ghazi Khan.

Research Questions

1. What family environmental factors influence children's second language learning?
2. How can parents and schools help children learn a second language well?
3. Are there any significant differences between government secondary schools and private secondary schools' students' level of willingness to communicate in English in the following background variables?
 - a. Provenance
 - b. Types of education
 - c. Self-perceived level of English
 - d. Exposure to English
4. Are there any significant differences between government secondary schools and private secondary schools' students' level of willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language with the following interlocutors?
 - a. Friends
 - b. Acquaintances
 - c. Strangers
5. Are there any significant differences between the performances in learning English as L2 of government secondary schools and private secondary school students of Dera Ghazi Khan?

Population and Sampling

This research comprised all 121 (77 government and 44 private) secondary schools, all 75440 (42153 government and 33287 private secondary school) students from District Dera Ghazi Khan. (Source: School Education Department).

The sample was selected as random sampling for better pasteurization and data collection from the targeted population, according to the research advisory table indicated by L. R. Gay in 2003. So, only two hundred (100 government and 100 private) secondary school learners were selected from 10 (5 government and five private secondary schools) secondary schools of district Dera Ghazi Khan.

Design

This research work was exploratory by nature; achievement tests and rubrics were used to explore sociolinguistic factors in improving L2 learners' English in district Dera Ghazi Khan. For data collection, an achievement test was used in each sample school. The achievement test was the same for every student. The data were evaluated using the program SPSS V 20. Several tests, such as the t-test, the mean score, the standard deviation, and the percentage, were utilized to determine accurate results.

Instrumentation

An achievement test was used with rubrics to check the student's language performance and the sociolinguistic factor in improving L2 learners.

Data Collection

The researcher will conduct the same achievement test in each sample school at different times and collect the data. Scholars conduct various rubric tests to assess student's performance and record other errors for further research findings.

Data Analysis

Collected data were organized, and statistical techniques were used with the help of Social Sciences Package Software (SPSS) respectively. Furthermore, mean value, Standard Deviation, t, and p were applied to clarify the picture regarding investigating the Role of sociolinguistics factors in improving L2 learners' English in Dera Ghazi Khan, especially secondary level students learning at district Dera Ghazi Khan.

Data Interpretations

Table No. 1: Sample size

District	GSS	PSS	Total
Schools	5	5	10
Students	100	100	200

Table no 1 shows the sample size of this research study. The participants were selected as Two hundred (100 GSS and 100 PSS) secondary school' learners from 10 (5 GSS and 5 PSS) secondary schools of D. G. Khan.

Table No. 2: Result of Government secondary schools and private secondary schools student achievement test (no of errors)

School	No of Errors	(%)
GSS School	7982	42.95
PSS School	12538	57.05
Total	20520	100

Table No 2 highlights the results of performance and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 42.95% (7982) of the GSS secondary school students made no mistakes. On the other hand, 57.05% (12538) of errors were made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students in the family environment.

Table No. 3: Results regarding the overall test of both secondary schools

Study variable	GSS		PSS		df	p	t
	Mean	S. D	Mean	S. D			
Family Environment	33.80	10.09	25.71	9.19	198	0.000*	8.12

N=200, Significance Level=0.05

In Table 3, the GSS secondary school students show a 33.80 mean value and 10.09 S. D; however, PSS students have 25.71 in mean weight and 9.19 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 8.12. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams.

Table No. 4: Result of GSS and PSS student’s achievement test (tense-measurement)

School	No of Errors	(%)
GSS School	3621	44.82
PSS School	4878	55.18
Total	8499	100

Table No 4 highlights the results of tense measurement and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 44.82% (3621) of the GSS secondary schools’ students made no mistakes; on the other hand, 55.18% (4878) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students.

Table No. 5: Results regarding the overall tense measurement of both secondary schools

Study variable	GSS		PSS		Df	p	t
	Mean	S. D	Mean	S. D			
Parents and schools help children.	19.38	9.11	24.11	10.11	198	0.000*	5.81

N=200, Significance Level=0.05

In Table 5, the GSS secondary school students show 19.38 mean values and 9.11 S. D; however, PSS students have 24.11 mean weight and 10.11 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 5.81. This result shows the highly significant mean difference between these two educational streams, so hypothesis two is rejected based on this result.

Table No. 6: Result of GSS and PSS students (active voice and passive voice)

School	No of Errors	(%)
GSS School	2313	39.69
PSS School	3917	60.31
Total	6230	100

Table No 6 highlights the results of active voice and passive voice and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 39.69% (2313) made no mistakes made by the GSS secondary schools' students, on the other hand, 60.31% (3917) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary schools.

Table No. 7: Results regarding overall active voice and passive voice of both SS

Study variable	GSS		PSS		Df	p	t
	Mean	S. D	Mean	S. D			
Provenance	21.01	10.21	17.99	9.78	198	0.000*	4.28

N=200, Significance Level=0.05

In Table 7, the GSS secondary school students show 21.01 mean values and 10.21 S. D; however, PSS students have 17.99 in mean weight and 9.78 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 4.28. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams.

Table No. 8: Result of GSS and PSS students (direct narration and indirect narration)

School	No of Errors	(%)
GSS School	3003	41.44
PSS School	4187	58.56
Total	7190	100

Table No. 8 highlights the results of direct narration and indirect narration and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 41.44% (3003) no mistakes were made by the GSS secondary schools' students on the other hand, 58.56% (4187) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students.

Table No. 9: Results regarding direct narration and indirect narration of both SS

Study variable	GSS		PSS		Df	p	t
	Mean	S. D	Mean	S. D			
Types of Education	29.88	11.11	19.13	9.11	198	0.000*	5.04

N=200, Significance Level=0.05

In Table No 9, the GSS secondary schools' students show 29.88 mean values and 11.11 S. D; however, PSS students have 19.13 in mean weight and 9.11 SD. Hence, their p-value was observed as 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found to be 5.04. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams.

Table No. 10: Result of GSS and PSS student's (Self-perceived level of English)

School	No of Errors	(%)
GSS School	2213	43.44
PSS School	3189	56.56
Total	5402	100

Table No 10 highlights the results of Self-perceived level of English and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 43.44% (2213) of the GSS secondary schools' students made no mistakes; on the other hand, 56.56% (3189) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students.

Table No. 11: Results regarding Self-perceived level of English of both secondary schools

Study variable	GSS		PSS		Df	p	t
	Mean	S. D	Mean	S. D			
Self-perceived level of English	21.88	10.06	12.32	8.14	198	0.000*	5.37

N=200, Significance Level=0.05

Table No. 11 shows the GSS secondary school students have 21.88 mean values and 10.06 S. D. On the other hand, PSS students have 12.32 in mean weight and 8.14 S.D. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which was significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found to be 5.37. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams.

Table No. 12: Result of GSS and PSS students (exposure to English)

School	No of Errors	(%)
GSS School	2109	41.11
PSS School	3316	58.89
Total	5425	100

Table No 12 highlights the results of exposure to English and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 41.11% (2109) made no mistakes by the GSS secondary schools' students, on the other hand, 58.89% (3316) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students.

Table No. 13: Results regarding exposure to English in both secondary schools

Study variable	GSS		PSS		Df	p	t
	Mean	S. D	Mean	S. D			
Exposure to English	14.72	9.01	9.47	8.11	198	0.000*	4.01

N=200, Significance Level=0.05

In Table No. 13, the GSS secondary schools' students show 14.72 mean values and 9.01 S. D; on the other hand, PSS students have 9.47 in mean weight and 8.11 S.D. Hence, their p-value was observed as 0.000*, which is significant with 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 4.01. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams.

Table No. 14: Result of GSS and PSS students (WTC with Friends)

School	No of Errors	(%)
GSS School	3292	42.46
PSS School	4127	57.54
Total	7419	100

Table No 14 highlights the results of WTC with Friends and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 42.46% (3292) made no mistakes made by the GSS secondary schools' students, on the other hand, 57.54% (4127) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students.

Table No. 15: Results regarding WTC with Friends of both secondary schools

Study variable	GSS		PSS		Df	p	t
	Mean	S. D	Mean	S. D			
WTC with Friends	22.12	11.22	17.12	10.04	198	0.000*	5.52

N=200, Significance Level=0.05

In Table No. 15, the GSS secondary schools’ students show 22.12 mean values and 11.22 S. D; however, PSS students have 17.12 mean weight and 10.04 SD. Hence, their p-value was observed as 0.000*, which is significant with 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found to be 5.52. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams.

Table No. 16: Result of GSS and PSS students (WTC with Acquaintances)

School	No of Errors	(%)
GSS School	3081	43.45
PSS School	4190	56.55
Total	7271	100

Table No 16 highlights the results of WTC with Acquaintances and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 43.45% (3081) made no mistakes made by the GSS secondary schools’ students, on the other hand, 56.55% (4190) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students.

Table No. 17: Results regarding WTC with Acquaintances of both secondary schools

Study variable	GSS		PSS		Df	p	t
	Mean	S. D	Mean	S. D			
WTC with Acquaintances	33.98	12.45	24.76	10.78	198	0.000*	5.49

N=200, Significance Level=0.05

In Table No 17, the GSS secondary school students show 33.98 mean values and 12.76 S. D; however, PSS students have 24.76 in mean weight and 10.78 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 5.49. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams.

Table No. 18: Result of GSS and PSS students (WTC with strangers)

School	No of Errors	(%)
GSS School	2472	40.02
PSS School	3198	59.98
Total	7271	100

Table No 18 highlights the results of WTC with strangers and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 40.02% (2472) made no mistakes made by the GSS secondary schools' students, on the other hand, 59.98% (3198) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students.

Table No. 19: Results regarding WTC with strangers from both secondary schools

Study variable	GSS		PSS		Df	p	t
	Mean	S. D	Mean	S. D			
WTC with strangers	29.53	11.67	21.09	10.11	198	0.000*	4.12

N=200, Significance Level=0.05

In Table No. 19, the GSS secondary schools' students show 29.53 mean values and 11.67 S. D; however, PSS students have 21.09 mean weight and 10.11 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 4.12. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams.

Findings of Research

Table 1 shows the sample size of this research study. The participants were selected as Two hundred (100 GSS and 100 PSS) secondary school' learners from District Dera Ghazi Khan's 10 (5 GSS and 5 PSS) secondary schools. Table no 2 highlights the performance results and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 42.95% (7982) of the mistakes were made by the GSS secondary schools' students. On the other hand, 57.05% (12538) of errors were made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students. In Table 3, the GSS secondary school students show a 33.80 mean value and 10.09 S. D; however, PSS students have 25.71 in mean weight and 9.19 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 8.12. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams. Table 4 highlights the tense measurement results and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 44.82% (3621) made no mistakes with the GSS secondary school students. On the other hand, 55.18% (4878) of errors were made by PSS

students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students. In Table 5, the GSS secondary school students show 19.38 mean values and 9.11 S. D; however, PSS students have 24.11 mean weight and 10.11 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 5.81. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams. Table no 6 highlights the results of active voice and passive voice and no errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 39.69% (2313) made no mistakes made by the GSS secondary schools' students, on the other hand, 60.31% (3917) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students.

In Table 7, the GSS secondary school students show 21.01 mean values and 10.21 S. D; however, PSS students have 17.99 in mean weight and 9.78 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 4.28. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams. Table no 8 highlights the results of direct narration and indirect narration and no of errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 41.44% (3003) no mistakes made by the GSS secondary schools' students on the other hand, 58.56% (4187) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students. In Table 9, the GSS secondary school students show 29.88 mean values and 11.11 S. D; however, PSS students have 19.13 in mean weight and 9.11 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found to be 5.04. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams. Table no 10 highlights the results of Self-perceived level of English and no of errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 43.44% (2213) no mistakes made by the GSS secondary schools' students on the other hand, 56.56% (3189) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students. In Table no 11, the GSS secondary school students show 21.88 mean values and 10.06 S. D; however, PSS students have 12.32 in mean weight and 8.14 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found to be 5.37. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams. Table 12 highlights the results of exposure to English and no of errors between GSS and PSSs; according to this table, 41.11% (2109) no mistakes made by the GSS secondary schools' students; on the other hand, 58.89% (3316) no of errors made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students. In Table 13, the GSS secondary school students show 14.72 mean values and 9.01 S. D; however, PSS students have 9.47 in mean weight and 8.11 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 4.01. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams. Table 14 highlights the results of WTC with Friends and no errors between GSS and PSSs; this table shows that 42.46% (3292) of the GSS secondary school students made no mistakes. On the other hand, 57.54% (4127) of errors were made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students.

In Table 15, the GSS secondary schools' students show 22.12 mean values and 11.22 S. D; however, PSS students have 17.12 mean weight and 10.04 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found to be 5.52. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams. Table no 16 highlights the results of WTC with Acquaintances and no errors between GSS and PSSs; this table shows 43.45% (3081) made no mistakes by the GSS secondary schools' students. On the other hand, 56.55% (4190) of errors were made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students. In Table 17, the GSS secondary school students show 33.98 mean values and 12.76 S. D; however, PSS students have 24.76 in mean weight and 10.78 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 5.49. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams. Table 18 highlights the results of WTC with strangers and no errors between GSS and PSSs; this table shows 40.02% (2472) of no mistakes were made by the GSS secondary schools' students. On the other hand, 59.98% (3198) of errors were made by PSS students at this level. This result shows that GSS secondary school students perform more significantly than PSS secondary students. In Table 19, the GSS secondary schools' students show 29.53 mean values and 11.67 S. D; however, PSS students have 21.09 mean weight and 10.11 SD. Hence, their p-value was 0.000*, which is significant at 0.05. Meanwhile, the value of the t-test was also found at 4.12. From this result, the high significance means the difference between these two educational streams.

Recommendations

1. The English language as a second language should be taught in PSS and GSS secondary schools with the help of socio-linguistic methods in classrooms. The teachers should motivate the learners to learn English positively as a future tool and teach systematically.
2. family environmental factors play an essential role in speaking and learning English, so parents and teachers should try to talk and create an English language environment at home and school.
3. Teachers of these two streams should prepare for the modern need. PSS teachers should especially have in-service training to learn about novel technologies and teaching methodologies.
4. The PSS should be positive and responsible when selecting teachers at the secondary level, especially English teachers. Their academic and professional teaching degrees must be observed before assigning them classrooms.
5. The human resources must be exchanged among both secondary levels. Due to this technique, society and students become more courageous and motivated to seek L2 in their cultural background.
6. The government of Pakistan, Educational policymakers, and other stakeholders must take responsibility for raising and improving the English language at the secondary level.

References

- Al-Haq, Al-Abed, & Smadi. (1996). Spread of English and Westernization in Saudi Arabia. *World Englishes*, 15(3): 307-317.
- Alrefaee, Y. Alghamdi, N. (2019). Refusals among Yemeni EFL Learners: A Study of Negative Pragmatic Transfer and Its Relation to Proficiency. *Asian EFL Journal*. 25, 5-1, 191-214.
- Al-Seghayer, K. (2011). *English teaching in Saudi Arabia: Status, issues, and challenges*. Riyadh, Saudi Arabia: Hala Publications.
- Bachman, L. (2000). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. (3rd ed) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L.F., & Palmer, A.S. (1996). *Language Testing in Practice: Designing and Developing Useful Language Tests*. Oxford etc.: OUP.
- Batang, B.L. (2010) *A Prospective Teacher's Level of Communicative Competence: A Basis for the Development of a Communicative Language Training Program*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation University of Santo Tomas, Manila.
- Brown, D.H. (1994) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Prentice-Hall Regents, Prentice Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Brown, D.H. (2000) *Principles of language learning & teaching*. (4th ed). New York: Longman.
- Bjekic, D. (2006) *Effects of Professional Activities on Teachers Communication Competence Development*. *The Internet Journal*.
- Canale, M. & M. Swain. 1980. Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
- Canale, M. & Swain. (1990). *Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing*. *Applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.
- Chomsky, N. A. (2006). *Language and mind*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R., (1983). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harmer, J. (1991) *The practice of English language teaching*. London; New York: Longman; New York.

- Hoang, Van Van (2016) The Current Situation and Issues of Teaching English in Vietnam.
- Hymes, D. H. (1971). On communicative competence. In C. J. Brumfit & K. Johnson (Ed.), *The communicative approach to language teaching*. London: Oxford University.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In Pride. J.B. & Janet Holmes, (Eds). (1972). Great Britain: Penguin
- Hymes, D. (2003). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In C. B. Nguyen, Thi Mai Hoa (2008) *Developing EFL learners' intercultural communicative competence: A gap to be filled?*. Asian EFL Journal, 21 July: 122-139.
- Nunan, D. (1988) *Language Teaching Methodology*. Great Britain: Prentice-Hall International.
- Nunan, D. (1998) *The Learner-centered curriculum*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
- Krashen, S. (2007, July 2). Stephen Krashen's theory of second language acquisition. Retrieved From <http://www.sk.com.br/sk-krash.html>.
- Richards, J.C (2007) *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge University Press
- San Diego II, A. R. (2008) *Communicative Competence and the Role of English in the Philippine University of Makati*.
- Savignon, S. J. (1983). *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. USA: Addison - Wesley.
- Sauvignon, S. J. (Ed.). (2002). *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Context and concerns in teacher education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Simbulan, V.S. (2008) *An English Language Enhancement Program for Isabela State University System: A Prototype Model* GS Research Journal University of La Salette, Santiago City Vol. 3, No.1.
- Torres, R.D. (2009) *Effects of Communicative Language Approach &The Use of Multi-Media on the Students Grammatical Competence*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation at Notre Dame University, Cotabato City.