

## **A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF GRAMMAR TRANSLATION METHOD AND DIRECT METHOD IN TEACHING OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL IN THE DISTRICT OF VEHARI-PAKISTAN**

**Muhammad Usman<sup>1</sup>, Muhammad Tariq Ayoub<sup>2</sup>, Dr.Abdul Ghafoor Awan<sup>3</sup>**

**ABSTRACT**-The objective of this study was to conduct a contrastive study of Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Direct Method (DM) at secondary level to assess how far each method is effective in teaching a foreign language. Data was collected through a questionnaire The research findings indicated that the ratio of usage of GTM method was fairly higher ranging from 90% to 100% and the usage of DM method is fairly lower ranging from 0.0% to 10% only which shows that old and traditional methods were being used in the classroom at secondary level even today. Teachers did not take interest in using the DM. In the context of Pakistani classroom, an eclectic approach should be adopted by using both the methods appropriately keeping in view the learners need.

**Key words:** Grammar Translation Method, Teaching Methods, Direct Method.

Type of paper: **Original research paper**

Paper received: 15.06.2018

Paper accepted: 18.08.2018

Online published: 01.10.2018

---

1.M. Phil Scholar, Department of English, Institute of Southern Punjab, Multan.

2. Assistant Professor, Government College of Sciences, Multan.

[tariqayub2017@gmail.com](mailto:tariqayub2017@gmail.com). Cell # +923027533645.

3. Dean, Faculty of Management and Social Sciences, Institute of Southern Punjab.

[ghafoor70@yahoo.com](mailto:ghafoor70@yahoo.com). Cell #+923136015051.

## **1.INTRODUCTION**

Since last six decades, it has been the discussion among different linguists about the scope of teaching of English through grammar translation methods and direct method. In the context of foreign language teaching, many methods were designed and applied in the classroom of different countries but with the passage of time many linguists gave opinion either in favour of one and other opposed it. The same is the situation with the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Direct Method (DM). In the Pakistani context, GTM prevailed firstly but with the passage of time and development in DM earned it the first rank rather than the GTM in elite class schools. According to Pinnock (2009), majority of the population (91.62%) of Pakistan use L1 (mother tongue) which is not used in the education. According to him, in classroom the medium of instruction is the L1 while on the other hand only small population uses foreign language in the classroom.

### **1.1 Background of the study**

After studying the history of teaching method it becomes clear to us that the origin of GTM is from the practices of teaching Latin. In 5<sup>th</sup> century, Latin was widely used language at that time it got its prominence in every field in 1500s when the decline of the Latin occurred then people left this language. Then English, French and Italian took its place (Sayed.S, 2013). According to Abdullah (2013) due to the need of communication in the middle ages, a new method was developed into audio-lingual from GTM because it could not fulfill the demand of the learner. So GTM was replaced by direct method. There were many draw backs of GTM at that time. According to Sarawathi (2001) different methods are helpful. According to the situation and context, she says that we cannot bind us to one method and we

fail in that situation. According to Haycraft (1993) the people of south Asia have to face difficulty in the process of learning and teaching of English because they have lack of consistent knowledge lack of speaking skills and lack of assessment. They have no audio-visual aids. The classroom teaching management is also ineffective. According to Nunan (1991) grammar helps the learner in the Target language (TL) better.

### **1.2 Objectives of the study**

The main objectives of the study are given below:

1. To investigate which type of language teaching method is being used in the classroom of District Vehari at secondary level.
2. To gather responses of student and teachers with reference to teaching of English through a certain method.
3. To draw a contrast of these language teaching methods in the classroom at secondary level.

### **1.3 Significance of the study**

English is the Lingua Franca. It is the language of business communication, trade and diplomacy. All over the world it is spoken. But the problem is that there is no proper aware to the students and teachers about the GTM and DM. Teachers and learners at secondary level cannot utilized and differentiate these two methods. In the schools, some where the GTM is used by the teacher. While on the other hand DM is utilized. Some people are in favour of GTM and some are against GTM and are in favour of DM. Henceforth, this study is much important in the field of teaching and English at secondary level. It will be twilight in the darkness. Many researchers in the future will take advantage from the current findings and

suggestions. The teachers of English language in the district Vehari will be able to use the right method of ELT. The teachers of English will be able to teach the students in better and the students learning will be enhanced through this study. The education department of govt. of Punjab will aware of the right method among these two techniques of teaching.

#### **1.4 Research Questions**

To investigate the contrastive study of GTM and DM, the following questions have been framed:

1. Which method is being used in the class room at secondary level in the schools of district Vehari?
2. Which method is problematic for the students of the classroom at the secondary level?
3. Which method is more successful in the classroom?
4. Which is the perception of teachers and students about these methods?

### **2.LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Grammar Translation Method**

According to Oxford Advanced Learners “it is the study or science of, rules for, the words into sentences (Syntax), and the forms of words (morphology).”

##### **2.1.1 Historical perspectives of GTM**

According to Brown (1994) the old languages like Latin and Greek were taught in the classical way or methods. The parameters of the method were to teach the vocabulary, translation of the text and the same types of written drills and nothing was beyond this, it means creative etc. In the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century that classical technique of teaching was devised as the main technique and a method for

the foreign or English language etc. There was no attention on the spoken aspect of teaching. Henceforth these languages could not prevail orally. The classical technique of teaching later was named as Grammar Translation Method in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It was started in Germany. The main purpose of this method was to teach the language through grammar and the other purpose was to translate the target language.

## **2.2 Principles of GTM**

The two worthy linguists Hedge and Thornbury (2001) investigated and overviewed about the teaching of grammar. According to them, GTM provides the input facility to the language learners and besides this it also facilitates the elements of grammar which are very helpful for EFL learners in the learning of foreign language. It facilitates and gives information which is utilized for the communication of language. According to Thornbury (2001) there are definite rules for the teaching of GTM which are given as:

### **2.2.1 Context and GTM**

In this rule the grammar is taught in the perspectives of context. The text is learned and the contextual meanings are taught with the easy vocabulary so that the language learner could easily understand the contextual meaning of the text.

### **2.2.2 Usage and GTM**

GTM is taught to the second language learner so that he could be able to use it at the sentence level and beside this he could produce the language.

### **2.2.3 Practice Time**

These rules of GTM provide the facility to the language learners for the practicing of rules of GTM so that they could be facilitates for the language learning.

### **2.2.4 Relevance**

These rules provide the facilities to the language learners so that they could relate it with the structure of mother tongue with the second language. Its main aim objective was to make the target language easier for the EFL learners.

## **2.3 Objectives of GTM**

According to Richards and Rogers (1986) there are many objectives of GTM which are given below:

1. This method is for the written languages so that the communicative proficiency could be achieved by learning it.
2. It helps in the up gradation of grammar syllabus so that it could be helpful for the development of EFL learners in language learning.
3. It provides the grammatical framework which is very helpful in vocabulary building exercises.
4. After the memorization of rules, the language can be learnt
5. It is utilized so that the language learners may write correct sentences.
6. The traditional teacher tries to teach the GTM rules so that they could be able to do translation of the text, correct the errors and mistakes which is very painful for the teacher and the learners also.
7. Its fundamental objective is to translate the target language word for word or in the perspectives of contextualization.

8. During the learning of GTM, the stress is laid on the accuracy of language learning.

## **2.4 Main Features of GTM**

Prator and Celce-Murica (1973) highlighted the fundamental peculiarities of GTM in such ways:

1. There is no action and attention for the target language because the usage of mother language has impacts on the target language.
2. The teaching of vocabulary is done through the traditional method.
3. There is elaborative discussion about the grammar intricacies.
4. This method framed the rules for the construction of joining the word together so that the language could be arranged.
5. There are rigorous exercises for the reading of the text.
6. The contextual perspectives of the text have been unattended in this pattern of language learning.
7. There is an involvement of drill for the translation of target language to the mother language or the target language.
8. There is no serious attention to the learning of pronunciation.

## **2.5 Typical Techniques of GTM**

According to Free-man (1986) there are typical techniques of GTM which are given as follows:

1. In this technique, the target language is translated into the local language.
2. The passages are given in the exercises and at the end of these passages the questions are given to assess the reading of the text.
3. Antonym and synonyms are taught without any involvement of the context.

4. Rules are deduced from the text sometimes so that learners could comprehend the rules of grammar easily which is called the deductive application in GTM.
5. In cloze test, a passage is given with the blank spaces, at the end of the passage or in the beginning of the passage list of words is given and the learners have to fill in these spaces. The purpose of this is to enhance the capability of the learner at vocabulary level.
6. Rules of GTM are taught to the students and besides this some examples of these rules are also introduced to the students so that they could understand the rules then students are asked to memorize these rules.
7. Some words are given to the students and then it is asked from them how make sentences from these given words. The situation in Pakistan is that students memorize these already made sentences of those given words because guides are available on the market.

## **2.6 Opinions of renowned linguists about GTM**

The two noteworthy linguists like Chellapan (1982) and Stern (1991) highlighted the positive points of view about the GTM method. According to Duff (1999) the role of mother tongue in learning the EFL learner is very important because it paved the way of learning of second language.

Chellapan (1982) coined the word “Translanguage” which is the combination of acquisition of second language and translation. According to Stern (1991) translation plays an important role in learning of language because the learner get advantage in L2 with the assistance of L1 which is Supportive for the L2 learning.

According to Stern (1992) for the learning of Second language, the contrastive or comparative analysis is very important. The role of translation in the whole scenario is central which means the learner gets help in learning the second language. According to Brown (1992) the role of GTM in developing or improving the communicative ability of language learner is relatively negligible. According Awan and Kamran (2018) the function of translation in the second language learning classroom is very advantageous in contrast to that we can see its negative impacts but its positive contribution in acquiring the target or second language learning. According to Austin (2003) GTM helps in developing the grammar and vocabulary. In contrast to that his view about the other method for the communicative learning is that in those methods the teacher uses only selected phrases for the communication in the classroom which is a negative aspect of the method.

## **2.8 Direct Method**

According Anthony as cited in Richards and Rogers (2001) a strategy is a general arrangement for the efficient introduction of language material, no piece of which repudiates, and all of which depends on, they chose approach. An approach is aphoristic; a strategy is procedural. One of the techniques called Direct Method. The immediate technique is a radical change from Grammar-Translation Method by the utilization of the objective language as methods for guideline and correspondence in the language classroom, and by the evasion of the utilization of the primary language and of interpretation as a system.

It is a move from abstract language to the ordinary language as the question of early direction. In this strategy, the learning of language was seen as comparable to the

main language obtaining, and the learning procedure included were frequently translated regarding an affiliation's brain research.

Brown as cited in Richards and Rodgers (2001) expressed the standards of Direct Method as follows:

- Classroom was directed solely in the objective language
- Only sentences and ordinary vocabulary were targeted
- Oral relational abilities were in a painstakingly evaluated movement sorted out around question and answer trades amongst instructors and students in little, serious class
- Grammar was instructed inductively
- New showing focuses were presented orally
- Concrete vocabulary was educated through exhibition, questions, and pictures, while dynamic vocabulary was instructed by relationship of thoughts
- Both discourse and listening perception were focused
- Correct elocution and language structure were underlined

Larsen-Freeman (2000) states that language is essentially discourse. Classroom guideline and classroom exercises are done in the target language; accordingly, students are effectively required in utilizing the target language. Conversational exercises hold a pivotal place in this strategy. Through utilizing language in genuine settings, students stand a superior shot of considering, and talking in the target language.

Stern (1991) however believes that the Direct Method is described by the utilization of the objective language as methods for guideline and correspondence in

the language classroom, and by the shirking of the utilization of the primary language and of interpretation as a strategy. These standards are found in the accompanying rules for showing oral language, which are finished up as tasks after:

- Never interpret: illustrate
- Never clarify: act
- Never make a discourse: make inquiries
- Never mirror botches: amend
- Never talk with single words: utilize sentences
- Never talk excessively: make students talk much
- Never utilize the book: utilize your lesson arrange
- Never hop around: take after your arrangement
- Never go too quick: keep the pace of the understudy
- Never talk too gradually: talk ordinarily
- Never talk too rapidly: talk actually
- Never talk too boisterously: talk normally
- Never be eager: relax

Norland and Terry (2006) describe how to apply Direct Method in educating as take after:

- I. The educator demonstrates an arrangement of pictures that frequently depict life in the nation of the objective language.
- II. The educator portrays the photo in the objective language.
- III. The educator makes inquiries in the objective language about the photo.
- IV. Students answer the inquiries as well as can be expected to utilize the objective language.

- V. Elocution is revised, yet syntactic structure is most certainly not.
- VI. Students may likewise read a section in the target language.
- VII. The instructor makes inquiries in the target language about the perusing.
- VIII. Students answer inquiries admirably well utilizing the target language.

From the clarifications above, there are a few advantages in utilizing Direct Method in educating at language course, for illustrations:

- a) Students dependably give consideration
- b) Students know a lot of words
- c) Students can have proficiency like native speakers
- d) Learners frequently attempt on the discussion, particularly points which have been instructed in the classroom
- e) This strategy has standards which can be utilized by tuition based schools which have relatively few lessons and students

### **3. RESEACH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Research Design**

According to Halliday (2002) "the social world is not flawed, its genuine nature can be set up with adequate with of description. Descriptive study is the review where we can get the significant data (Gay, 2004). As indicated by Gray (2004) in this review the cross-area sort of research was utilized that is the reason it is called descriptive approach. We also have followed this approach in our study. .

#### **3.2 Sampling**

Sampling of this type of study comprised of 60 students and 60 instructors of public schools in the rural areas of the district Vehari.. The example of the investigation of the students and educators are the male. The zone of study is far

from main land country zones of govt. sector schools of District Vehari. For exploring the study, the questionnaire has been distributed among the respondents and collected personally. The response rate was 100 percent.

### **3.3 Research Instrument**

For the study of teaching of English through GTM and DM the questionnaire has been devised as a tool of investigation. Diverse scales were utilized for gathering the information. The assessment of the respondents was inquired. Different types of scales have been adopted as instrument or the tool of questionnaire.

### **3.4 Questionnaire for students**

In this section two questionnaires were developed keeping in view the objectives of the study- one is about data of instructors the second some portion of the survey is about the perusing and composing aptitudes exercises of the learners. There are inquiries concerning the conceptualizing exercises.

### **3.5 Questionnaire for teacher**

In this area the question will be asked from the female instructors at government. schools about their showing strategies and the execution of students. In this questionnaire it has been examined from the instructors that which kind of exercises. They used amid the classroom. There are two segments in this questionnaire.

### **3.6 Procedure**

The data was collected from the sampling population of District Vehari through a structured questionnaire and field survey method was used for this purpose.

### **3.7 Analytical Techniques**

After having gathered the information through data it was organized in the table frame then it was ascertained on the premise of rate then the demographical portrayal has been given in the section of information examination. These diagrams were produced using the Microsoft excel expectations sheet 2007. At the end, the results were shown in Tables and graphs.

## **4. DATA ANALYSIS**

In this part, there are three types of sets concerning the research of teaching English through GTM and DM. Tables have been constituted so that the data may be arranged systematically. The first set of questionnaire is about the GTM method and the contents of the questionnaire are, no response, never, seldom, sometime, frequently and always. The second set of questionnaire concerns the investigation of DM and the contents of this part are no response, strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree. The third part of questionnaire is concerning to teachers of schools and the parts of questionnaire are, no response, never, seldom, sometime, frequently and always. Sixty students and sixty teachers have been taken as participants of the research.

### **4.1 Questionnaire for Students about GTM**

The results drawn through questionnaire are shown in Table 1 on next page.

**Table 1 Response of sampling students about GTM**

Q. NO.	No Response	Never	Seldom	Some Times	Frequently	Always
<b>Q.NO.1</b>	0	1	2	13	31	14
%	0.0	1.66%	3.33	21.66	51.66	23.33
<b>Q.NO.2</b>	0	1	1	11	35	12
%	0.0	1.66	1.66	18.33	58.33	20
<b>Q.NO.3</b>	0	0	1	2	39	18
%	0.0	0.0	1.66	3.33	65	30
<b>Q.NO.4</b>	0	0	1	4	36	19
%	0.0	0.0	1.66	6.66	60	31.66
<b>Q.NO.5</b>	0	0	1	3	38	18
%	0.0	0.0	1.66	5	63.33	30
<b>Q.NO.6</b>	0	0	0	3	40	17
%	0.0	0.0	0.0	5	66.66	28.33
<b>Q.NO.7</b>	0	1	1	2	37	19
%	0.0	1.66	1.66	2.33	61.66	31.66
<b>Q.NO.8</b>	0	1	1	3	38	17
%	0.0	1.66	1.66	5	63.33	28.33
<b>Q.NO.9</b>	0	1	2	4	37	16
%	0.0	1.66	3.33	6.66	61.66	26.66
<b>Q.NO.10</b>	0	0	1	2	38	19
%	0.0	0.0	1.66	2.33	63.33	31.66

## **4.2 Statement of the questions**

1. Does your teacher teach you the rules of grammar?
2. Does your teacher translate the text book word for word?
3. Does your teacher ask you to cram the answers to the questions given in the exercise?
4. Does your teacher ask you to cram the summary of the lesson?
5. Does your teacher ask you to cram the letter, story and application?
6. Does your teacher ask you to translate from Urdu to English?
7. Does your teacher ask you to cram the vocabulary?
8. Does your teacher use mother tongue in the class?
9. Do you feel any difficulty in translating the text?
10. Do you feel any difficulty while making the sentences?

Since these questions are very much relevant to the teaching situation prevalent in the country, responses provided invaluable insights not only into the situation relevant to the teaching of English as a foreign language but also about the overall scenario. The responses were gathered and subsequently analyzed through statistical tools to frame a concise view of the existing state relevant to ELT.

### **4.2.1 Discussion (Question No. 1)**

It comes to light that 1.66% respondents told that their teacher never taught them rules of grammar. While 3.33% of the respondents reported that it happened seldom about the teaching of grammar rules by the teacher. In contrast to that 21.66% of the respondents disclosed that their teacher sometime taught them rules of grammar and 51.66% of the students said that their teacher frequently taught

them grammar rules. The remaining 23.33% of the respondents expressed that their teacher always teach them grammatical rules. The concluded response of the participants shows that 95% of the students gave positive response in comparison to that 5% of the participants showed negative response.

#### **4.2.2 Discussion (Question No. 2)**

From the graph of question No.2, that 18.33% of the respondents disclosed that their teacher sometime translated the text book word for word and 58.33% of the students responded that their teacher frequently translated the text book word for word. The remaining 20% of the respondents expressed that their teacher always translated the text book word for word. The concluded response of the participants shows that 97 % of the students gave positive response in comparison to that 3% of the participants showing a negative response.

#### **4.2.3 Discussion (Question No. 3)**

From the graph of question no.3, it comes to light that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants all held that their teacher never asked them to cram the questions and answers of the exercise. While 1.66% of the respondents reported seldom about the teacher ask you to cram the questions and answers of the exercise. In contrast to that 3.33% of the respondents disclosed that their teacher sometime asked them to cram the questions and answers of the exercise and 65% of the students said that their teacher frequently asked them to cram the questions and answer of the exercise. The remaining 30% of the respondents expressed that their teacher always asked them to cram the questions and answer the exercise. The concluded response of the participants showed that

99 % of the students gave positive response in comparison to that 1 % of the participants showed negative response.

#### **4.2.4 Discussions (Question No. 4)**

From the graph of question No.4, it comes to light that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants all held that their teacher never taught them rules of grammar. While 1.66% of the respondents reported seldom about the teaching of grammar rules by the teacher. In contrast to that 6.66% of the respondents disclosed that their teacher sometime taught them these rules and 60% of the students said that their teacher frequently taught them rules of grammar. The remaining 31.66% of the respondents expressed that their teacher always taught them these rules. The concluded response of the participants showed that 100% of the students gave positive response in comparison to that 0.0% of the participants showing a negative response.

#### **4.2.5 Discussions (Question No. 5)**

From the graph of question No.5, it was shown that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants all held that their teacher never asked them to cram the letter, story and application. While 1.66% of the respondents reported seldom about the teacher asking them to cram the letter, story and application of grammar rules by the teacher. In contrast to that 5% of the respondents disclosed that their teacher sometime asked them to cram the letter, story and application and 63.33% of the students said that their teacher frequently asked them to cram the letter, story and application. The remaining 30% of the respondents expressed that their teacher always asked them to cram the letter, story and application. The concluded response of the participants showed that 100 % of

the students gave positive response in comparison to that 0.0% of the participants providing a negative response.

#### **4.2.5 Discussions (Question No. 6)**

From the graph of question No.6, it comes to light that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants all held that their teacher never asked them to translate from Urdu to English. While 0.0% of the respondents reported seldom about the teacher ask you to translate from Urdu to English using grammar rules. In contrast to that 5% of the respondents disclosed that their teacher sometime asked them to translate from Urdu to English and 66.66% of the students said that their teacher frequently asked them to translate from Urdu to English. The remaining 28.33% of the respondents expressed that their teacher always asked them to translate from Urdu to English. The concluded response of the participants showed that 95% of the students gave positive response in comparison to that 5% of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2.7 Discussions (Question No. 7)**

From the graph of question No.7, it comes to light that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 1.66% held that their teacher never asked them to cram the vocabulary. While 1.66% of the respondents reported seldom about the teacher asking them to cram the vocabulary. In contrast to that 2.33% of the respondents disclosed that their teacher sometime asked them to cram the vocabulary and 61.66% of the students said that their teacher frequently asked them to cram the vocabulary. The remaining 31.66% of the respondents expressed that their teacher always asked them to cram the vocabulary. The concluded response of the participants showed that 93% of the

students gave a positive response in comparison to that 7% of the participants providing a negative response.

#### **4.2.8 Discussions (Question No. 8)**

From the graph of question No.8, it appeared that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 1.66% held that their teacher never used mother tongue in the class. While 1.66% of the respondents reported seldom that their teacher used mother tongue in the class. In contrast to that 5% of the respondents disclosed that their teacher sometime used mother tongue in the class and 63.33% of the students said that their teacher frequently used mother tongue in the class. The remaining 28.33% of the respondents expressed that their teacher always used mother tongue in the class. The end results showed that 92% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 8% of the participants showing a negative response

#### **4.2.9 Discussions (Question No. 9)**

From the graph of question No.9, it comes to be known that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 1.66% held that they never felt difficulty in translating the text. While 3.33% of the respondents reported that they seldom felt difficulty in translating the text. In contrast to that 6.66% of the respondents disclosed that they sometime felt difficulty in translating the text and 61.66% of the students said that they frequently felt difficulty in translating the text. The remaining 26.66% of the respondents expressed that they always felt difficulty in translating the text. So we concluded that 90 % of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 10% of the participants provided a negative response.

#### 4.2.10 Discussions (Question No. 10)

From the graph of question No.10, it is revealed that 2.33% of the respondents disclosed that they felt difficulty in making the sentences and 63.33% of the students said that they felt difficulty frequently while making the sentences. The remaining 31.66% of the respondents expressed that they always felt difficulty while making the sentences after lectures of grammatical rules. Total results show that 96% of the students gave positive response in comparison to that 4% of the participants who showed negative response.

**Table 2 Results of Direct Method**

Q. NO.	No Response	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q.NO.11	0	1	2	1	12	15
%	0.0	1.66	3.33	1.66	20	25
Q.NO.12	0	1	1	2	39	17
%	0.0	1.66	1.66	3.33	65	28.33
Q.NO.13	0	0	0	2	40	18
%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.33	66.66	30
Q.NO.14	0	0	1	4	36	19
%	0.0	0.0	1.66	6.66	60	31.3
Q.NO.15	0	0	1	3	38	18
%	0.0	0.0	1.66	5	63.33	30
Q.NO.16	0	0	1	2	40	17
%	0.0	0.0	1.66	3.33	66.66	28.33
Q.NO.17	0	1	2	1	37	19

%	0.0	1.66	3.33	1.66	61.66	31.66
<b>Q.NO.18</b>	0	1	1	2	39	17
%	0.0	1.66	1.66	3.33	65	28.33
<b>Q.NO.19</b>	0	1	2	3	40	16
%	0.0	1.66	3.33	5	66.66	26.66
<b>Q.NO.20</b>	0	0	1	2	37	20
%	0.0	0.0	1.66	3.33	61.66	33.33

11. Do you feel that you should learn the grammatical rules with the context of text, by conceptual and direct method?
12. Do you feel that you should lean paraphrasing from English to English without the use of mother tongue?
13. Do you feel that you should learn the comprehension without the help of mother tongue?
14. Do you feel that you should lean the summary through concept?
15. Do you feel that the teacher should teach the letter writing, story writing and essay writing in direct method?
16. Do you feel that you should speak English in the presentation of lessons?
17. Do you feel that your teacher should speak English language while delivering the lesson?
18. Do you feel that your teacher should teach you the reading skills?
19. Do you feel that your teacher should teach you the listening skills?
20. Do you feel that your teacher should teach you writing skills?

These questions were developed to take the viewpoint of the respondents in respect of the direct method which, reportedly, seems to be less exploited in the

Pakistani context especially in rural areas. The obvious cause behind this may be associated with various factors like i) examination system checking only written proficiency and ignoring verbal aspect of communication, ii) cramming or rote-learning among the learners, iii) over-emphasis on translation mainly word for word, and iv) few occasions to communicate in public dealings.

#### **4.2.11 Discussion (Question No. 11)**

From the graph pertaining to question No.11, it is evident that 1.66% participants strongly disagreed with the statement that of the question, while 3.33% of the respondents expressed disagreement. In contrast to that 1.66% of the respondents disclosed that they were neutral about feeling that they should learn the grammatical rules with the context of text, by conceptual and direct method teach them grammar rules and 20% of the students said that they agreed to feel about it. The remaining 25% of the respondents strongly agree that they should learn the grammatical rules through direct method. Thus. 95% of the students gave positive response in comparison to that 5% of the participants showed negative response.

#### **4.2.12 Discussion (Question No. 12)**

From the graph of question No.12, it comes to be known that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 1.66% held that they strongly disagreed with the statement that of the question, while 1.66% of the respondents reported disagreement with the above mentioned statement. In contrast to that 3.33% of the respondents disclosed that they were neutral to feel that they should learn the paraphrasing from English to English without the use of mother tongue and 65% of the students said that they are agree to feel about it. The remaining 28.33% of the respondents expressed that they strongly agreed to feel

that they should learn paraphrasing from English to English without the use of mother tongue. Thus 94 % students gave positive response in comparison to that 6% of the participants showed negative response.

#### **4.2.13 Discussion (Question No. 13)**

From the graph of question No.13, it comes to be known that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 0.0% held that they strongly disagreed with the statement of the question, while 0.0% of the respondents reported disagreement about the above mentioned statement. In contrast to that 3.33% of the respondents disclosed that they were neutral to feel that they should learn the paraphrasing from English to English without the use of mother tongue and 66.66% of the students said that they agreed to feel about it. The remaining 30% of the respondents expressed that they strongly agreed to feel that they should learn paraphrasing from English to English without the use of mother tongue. In sum,3.33% students gave positive response in comparison to that 96% of the participants showed negative response.

#### **4.2.14 Discussion (Question No. 14)**

From the graph of question No.13, it comes to light that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 0.0% held that they strongly disagreed with the statement that of the question, while 1.66% of the respondents reported disagreement over the above mentioned statement. In contrast to that 6.66% of the respondents disclosed that they were neutral to feel that they should learn the summary through concept and 60% of the students said that they agreed to feel about it. The remaining 31.33% of the respondents expressed that they strongly agreed to feel that they should learn summary through concept.

Thus, we conclude that 8% of students gave positive response in comparison to 92% of the participants showing negative response.

#### **4.2.15 Discussion (Question No. 15)**

From the graph of question No.15, we know that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 0.0% held that they strongly disagreed with the statement that of the question, while 1.66% of the respondents reported disagreement about the above mentioned statement. In contrast to that 5% of the respondents disclosed that they were neutral to feel that they should learn the letter writing, story writing and essay writing in direct method and 63.33% of the students said that they agreed to feel about it. The remaining 30% of the respondents expressed that they strongly agree to feel that they should learn the letter writing, story writing and essay writing in direct method. The concluded response of the participants shows that 93% of the students gave positive response in comparison to that 7% of the participants showed negative response.

#### **4.2.16. Discussion (Question No. 16)**

From the graph of question, No 15., it comes to know that all of the participants gave answer of this question and among those participants % hold that they strongly disagreed with the statement that of the question. While % of the respondents reported seldom about the above mentioned statement. In contrast to that % of the respondents disclosed that they sometime felt that they should learn the paraphrasing from English to English without the use of mother tongue and % of the students said that they frequently felt about it. The remaining % of the respondents expressed that they always felt that they should learn paraphrasing from English to English without the use of mother tongue. Thus, total results show that

95% of the students gave positive response as compared to 5% of the participants showed negative response.

#### **4.2.17 Discussion (Question No. 17)**

From the graph of question No.17, we know that 1.66% participants strongly disagreed with the statement, while 3.33% expressed disagreement. In contrast to that 1.66% of the respondents disclosed that they were neutral to feel that their teacher should speak the English language while delivering the lecture and 61.66% of the students said that they agreed to feel about it. The remaining 31.66% of the respondents expressed that they strongly agreed to feel that the teacher should speak the English language while delivering the lecture. The concluded response of the participants shows that 5% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 95 % of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2.18 Discussion (Question No. 18)**

From the graph of question No.18, it is known that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 1.66% held that they strongly disagreed with the statement that of the question, while 1.66% of the respondents reported disagreement about the above mentioned statement. In contrast to that 3.33% of the respondents disclosed that they were neutral to feel that their teacher should teach them the reading skills and 65% of the students said that they agreed to feel about it. The remaining 28.33% of the respondents expressed that they strongly agreed to feel that their teacher should teach them the reading skills. The collective result shows that 93% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 7% of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2. 19 Discussion (Question No. 19)**

From the graph of question No. 19, it is highlighted that all 1.66% respondents were strongly disagreed with the statement that of the question, while 3.33% of the respondents reported disagree about the above mentioned statement. In contrast to that 5% of the respondents disclosed that they were neutral to feel that their teacher should teach them the listening skills and 66.66% of the students said that they agreed to feel about it. The remaining 26.66% of the respondents expressed that they strongly agreed to feel that the teacher should teach them the listening skills. The concluded response of the participants shows that 90% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 10% of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2.20 Discussion (Question No. 20)**

From the question No.20 in graph, it is evident that 3.33% of the respondents disclosed that they were neutral to feel that their teacher should teach them writing skills and 61.66% of the students said that they agreed to feel about it. The remaining 33.33% of the respondents expressed that they strongly agree to feel that their teacher should teach them writing skills. The concluded response of the participants shows that 95% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 5% of the participants showed a negative response.

The next section pertains to the analysis of the responses collected from English teachers.

**Table 3 Views of Teachers.**

Q. No.	No Response	Never	Seldom	Some Times	Frequently	Always
<b>Q.NO.21</b>	0	1	2	1	31	25
%	0.0	1.66	2.33	1.66	51.66	41.66
<b>Q.NO.22</b>	0	23	25	7	3	2
%	0.0	38.33	41.66	11.66	5	2.33
<b>Q.NO.23</b>	0	0	1	2	39	18
%	0.0	0.0	1.66	3	65	30
<b>Q.NO.24</b>	0	24	26	4	3	3
%	0.0	40%	43.33	6.66	5	5
<b>Q.NO.25</b>	0	0	1	3	34	22
%	0.0	0.0	1.66	5	56.66	36.66
<b>Q.NO.26</b>	0	1	2	3	31	23
%	0.0	1.66	2.33	5	51.66	38.33
<b>Q.NO.27</b>	0	24	22	9	4	1
%	0.0	40%	36.66	15	6.66	1.66
<b>Q.NO.28</b>	0	25	26	2	3	4
%	0.0	41.66	43.33	2.33	5	6.66
<b>Q.NO.29</b>	0	28	25	4	2	1
%	0.0	46.66	41.66	6.66	2.33	1.66
<b>Q.NO.30</b>	0	26	21	8	3	2
	0.0	43.33	35%	13.33	5	2.33

21. Do you use mother tongue while delivering the lecture?
22. Do you use the Direct Method in the classroom?
23. Do you ask your students to translate the text word by word?
24. Do you use direct method while translating the text?
25. Do you ask your students to cram the answers to the questions?
26. Do you ask your students to cram the grammar rules?
27. Do you to use GTM method in this context?
28. Do you use writing skills activities for letter, essay and story writing?
29. Do you use reading skills activities in the class?
30. Do you use listening skills activities in the classroom?

These questions were framed to get the viewpoint of the teachers engaged in teaching of the English language in the District of Vehari. Their responses were deemed highly beneficial in validating the statements or responses gathered from the language learners. By contrasting and co-indexing the responses of the learners and their teachers, we may be able to draw a coherent picture related to the better method of language teaching.

#### **4.2.21. Discussion (Question No. 21)**

From the graph of question No.21, it is revealed that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 1.66% held that they never used mother tongue while delivering the lecture. While 2.33% of the respondents reported seldom about the use mother tongue while delivering the lecture. In contrast to that 1.66% of the respondents disclosed that they sometime use mother tongue and 51.66% of the students said that they frequently use mother tongue while delivering the lecture. The remaining 41.66% of the respondents

expressed that they always used mother tongue during lecture. Thus, 95% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 5% of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2.22 Discussion (Question No. 22)**

From the graph of question No.22, the results show that 38.33% participants hold that they never used the Direct Method in the classroom while delivering the lecture. While 41.66% of the respondents reported seldom about the use the Direct Method in the classroom. In contrast to that 11.66% of the respondents disclosed that they sometime used the Direct Method in the classroom while delivering the lecture and 5% of the students said that they frequently use the Direct Method in the classroom. The remaining 2.33% of the respondents expressed that they always used the Direct Method in the classroom while delivering the lecture. The results showed that 18% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that of 82% of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2.23 Discussion (Question No. 23)**

From the graph of question No.23, it comes to be known that all of the participants gave answer of this question and among those participants 0.0% held that they never asked their students to translate the text word by word in the classroom while delivering the lecture. While 1.66% of the respondents reported seldom to ask their students to translate the text word for word in the classroom while delivering the lecture. In contrast to that 3% of the respondents disclosed that they sometime asked their students to translate the text word for word in the classroom while delivering the lecture and 65% of the students said that they frequently asked their students to translate the text word for word in the classroom

while delivering the lecture. The remaining 30% of the respondents expressed that they always asked their students to translate the text word for word in the classroom while delivering the lecture. The concluded response of the participants showed that 95% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 5% of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2.24 Discussion (Question No. 24)**

From the graph of question No.24, it is revealed that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 40% held that they never used direct method while translating the text, while 43.33% of the respondents reported seldom used direct method while translating the text in the classroom while delivering the lecture. In contrast to that 6.66% of the respondents disclosed that they sometime used direct method while translating the text in the classroom delivering the lecture and 5% of the students said that they frequently used direct method while translating the text in the classroom delivering the lecture. The remaining 5% of the respondents expressed that they always used direct method while translating the text in the classroom while delivering the lecture. The concluding results show that 17% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 83% of the participants who showed negative response.

#### **4.2.25. Discussion (Question No. 25)**

From the graph of question No.25, it comes to be known that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 0.0% held that they never asked their students to cram the answers to the questions. While 1.66% of the respondents reported seldom ask the students to cram the answers to the questions in the classroom while delivering the lecture. In contrast to that 5% of

the respondents disclosed that they sometime asked the students to cram the answers to the questions in the classroom delivering the lecture and 56.66% of the students said that they frequently asked your students to cram the answers to the questions. The remaining 36.6% of the respondents expressed that they always asked the students to cram the answers to the questions. The concluded response of the participants shows that 93% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 7% of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2.26 Discussion (Question No. 26)**

From the graph of question No.26, it comes to be known that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 1.66% held that they never asked the students to cram the rules of grammar, while 2.33% of the respondents reported seldom asked the students to cram the grammar rules in the classroom while delivering the lecture. In contrast to that 5% of the respondents disclosed that they sometime asked the students to cram the grammar rules in the classroom delivering the lecture and 51.66% of the students said that they frequently asked your students to cram the grammar rules. The remaining 38.33% of the respondents expressed that they always asked the students to cram the grammar rules. The concluded response of the participants showed that 5% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 95% of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2.27 Discussion (Question No. 27)**

From the graph of question No.27, it comes to light that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 1.66% held that they never asked your students to cram the grammar rules, while 2.33% of the

respondents reported seldom asked your students to cram the grammar rules in the classroom while delivering the lecture. In contrast to that 5% of the respondents disclosed that they sometime asked the students to cram the grammar rules in the classroom delivering the lecture and 51.66% of the students said that they frequently asked your students to cram the grammar rules. The remaining 38.33% of the respondents expressed that they always asked the students to cram the grammar rules. The concluded response of the participants shows that 22% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 88% of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2.28 Discussion (Question No. 28)**

From the graph of question No.28, it comes to be known that all of the participants gave answer to this question and among those participants 41.66% held that they never used writing skills activities for letter, essay and story writing. While 43.33% of the respondents reported they seldom used writing skills activities for letter, essay and story writing in the classroom while delivering the lecture. In contrast to that 2.33% of the respondents disclosed that they sometime used writing skills activities for letter, essay and story writing and 5% of the students said that they frequently used writing skills activities for letter, essay and story writing. The remaining 6.66% of the respondents expressed that they always used writing skills activities for letter, essay and story writing. The concluded response of the participants shows that 14% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 86% of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2.29 Discussion (Question No. 29)**

From the graph of question No.29, it comes to know that all of the participants gave answer of this question and among those participants 46.66% held that they never used reading skills activities in the class, while 41.66% of the respondents reported seldom used reading skills activities in the class in the classroom while delivering the lecture. In contrast to that 6.66% of the respondents disclosed that they sometime used reading skills activities in the class and 2.33% of the students said that they frequently used reading skills activities in the class. The remaining 1.66% of the respondents expressed that they always used reading skills activities in the class. The concluded response of the participants shows that 10% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 90% of the participants showed a negative response.

#### **4.2.30 Discussion (Question No. 30)**

From the graph of question No.30, it comes to be known that all of the participants gave answer of this question and among those participants 43.33% hold that they never use listening skills activities in the class. While 35% of the respondents reported seldom use listening skills activities in the class in the classroom while delivering the lecture. In contrast to that 13.33% of the respondents disclosed that they sometime use listening skills activities in the class and 5% of the students said that they frequently use listening skills activities in the class. The remaining 2.33% of the respondents expressed that they always use listening skills activities in the class. The concluded response of the participants shows that 20% of the students gave a positive response in comparison to that 80% of the participants showed negative response.

## 5. CONCLUSION

From the above results, we come to the conclusion that teachers are using Grammar Translation Method (GTM) widely in the classrooms to teach English. This method is old and seems easy. Teachers are avoiding to use direct method during teaching. The policy makers of Education Department should pay attention on this issue and get introduced latest teaching methods to improve the quality of learning and teaching in Pakistan.

## REFERENCE

- Abdullah, S. (2013) "A contrastive study of Grammar Translation and the Direct Methods of Teaching" (article),3rd International Conference on Business, Economics, Management and Behavioral Sciences (ICBEMBS'2013) January 26-27, 2013 Hong Kong (China)
- Allen, J.P.B. (1974) "Pedagogic Grammar". In J.P.B Allen & S.P. Corder (eds.), The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics. Techniques in Applied Linguistics, Vol.3, 59-92. London: *Oxford University Press*.
- Anthony, E.M. (1963) "Approach, Method and Technique". *English Language Teaching*, 17, 63-67.
- Austin J. D. (2003). "The Grammar Translation Method of Language Teaching": London: *Longman*.
- Awan, Abdul Ghafoor; Asma Zia (2015). "Comparative Analysis of Public And Private Educational Institutions: A Case study of District Vehari" *Journal of Education and Practices*. Vol.6 (16):122-130
- Awan, Abdul Ghafoor (1987) "Comparative study of English and Urdu Medium of Educational Institutions in Islamabad-Pakistan" , *National*

*Language Authority* Vol1 (1):150

Awan, A.G. (2012) "Human Capital: Driving Force of Economic Growth in selected Emerging Economies" *Global Disclosure of Economics and Business, Vol.1No.1.*

Awan, A.G. (2012) "Diverging Trends of Human Capital in BRIC countries" *International Journal of Asian Social Science, Vol.2 (12):2195-2219.*

Awan, A.G. and Kashif Saeed (2014) "Intellectual Capital and Research Performance of Universities in Southern Punjab-Pakistan" *European Journal of Business and Innovation Research, Vol.2 No.6:21-39.*

Awan, Abdul Ghafoor; Ayesha Kamran (2018). "Testing and assessment of large classes in English Language, *Global Journal of Management, Social Sciences and Humanities, Vol 4 (3): 622-650.*

Awan, Abdul Ghafoor, Yasmin Khalida (2015). "New Trends in Modern Poetry" *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics, Vol 13:63-72.*

Awa, Abdul Ghafoor, Shahida Perveen (2015). "Comparison of Sylvia Path and Parveen Shaker with special references to their selected poems in Feminist perspective" *Journal of Culture, Society and Development, Vol.13:11-19.*

Awan, Abdul Ghafoor, Syed Ahmad Raza (2016). "The Effects of

Totalitarianism & Marxism towards dystopian society in George Orwell's selected Fictions" *Global Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, Vol. 2 (4):21-37.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Bollerud, R. (2002) *Teaching English as a Foreign Language: To what Extent is Norwegian Used in our English Teaching Today – and why?* Hovedfag thesis. Oslo: University of Oslo, Department of British and American Studies.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: *Prentice Hall Regents*.

Brumfit, C. J. & Johnson, K. (2000). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Burnby, B. & Sun, Y. (1989). Chinese teachers' views of Western language teaching: Context informs paradigm. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 219-238.

Burner, T. (2005) "Influential Approaches, Methods, and Ideas in English Language Teaching (circa 1840-1970) with Specific Reference to the Teaching and Learning of Grammar". Term paper for EDID4010 – Fundamental Concepts of Teaching English as a Foreign Language. University of Oslo, *Department of Teacher Education and School Development*.

Canale, M & Swain, M. (1980) "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing". *Applied Linguistics*, 1: 1, 1-47.

Celce-Murcia. (1997). Direct approaches in L2 instruction: A turning point in communicative language teaching? *TESOL Quarterly*, 31: 141-152.

- Chalker, S. (1994) "Pedagogical Grammar: Principles and Problems". In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn & E. Williams (eds.), *Grammar and the Language Teacher*, 31-44. Hartfordshire: *Prentice Hall*. Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chellapan, K. (1982). *Translanguage, Translation and Second Language Acquisition*. In F Eppert (Ed.), *Papers on translation: Aspects, Concepts, Implications* (pp. 57-63) Singapore: *SEMEO Regional Language Center*.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA.
- Cook, V. (1994) "Universal Grammar and the Learning and Teaching of Second Languages". In T. Odlin (ed.), *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*, 25-49. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press*.
- Cunningham, C. (2000). *Translation in the classroom-: A useful tool for second language Acquisition*.  
<http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essay/cindyc2.pdf>.
- Ellis, R. (2006). "Current issues in the teaching of grammar: an SLA perspective". *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 (1): 83-107.
- Gay, L.R. & Airasian, P. (2003) "Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application" (7th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: *Pearson education*.
- Harmer Jeremy. (2003). "How to teach English. Beijing: Foreign Language" *Teaching and Research Press*.
- Hedge, T. (2000). "Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom". *Oxford: Oxford University Press*.

Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). "A History of English Language Teaching". *Oxford: Oxford University Press.*

Keith Johnson. (1999). "Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics: A handbook for language teaching". Oxford: *Wiley-Blackwell Press.*

Larson-Freeman, Diana. (1986). "Techniques and principles in Language teaching". *Oxford: OUP.*

Ma Yinchu & Huang Jinyan. (1992). "A Practical Guide to English Teaching Methodology". *Changsha: Hunan Normal University Press.*

Musumeci, D. (1997). "Breaking the tradition: An exploration of the historical relationship between theory and practice in second language teaching". N.Y.: *McGraw-Hill.*

Nunan, D. (1991). "Language teaching methodology". Hemel Hempstead: *Prentice Hall International.*

Penny, R. (2000). "Variation and change in Spanish". Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press.*

Prator, C.H. and M. Celce-Murcia, (1979). "An outline of language teaching approaches". In Celce-Murcia, M. and McIntosh, L. (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language.* New York: *Newbury House.*

Raymond Murphy. (2000). "Grammar in use: self-study reference and practice for students of English". Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press.*

Richards, J. et al. (2004). "Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching". Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press.*

Rivers, W. M. and Temperly, M. S. (1978). "A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English as a Second Language". Oxford: *Oxford University Press.*

- Sano, M., M. Takahashi and A. Yoneyama. (1984). "Communicative language teaching and local needs". *ELT Journal* 38(3): 170-177.
- Smith, M. (1980) "Consciousness raising and the second language learner". In: *Applied Linguistics* 2, 159-168.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (1999). "Instruction, first language influence, and developmental readiness in second language acquisition". *The Modern Language Journal*, 83: 1–22.
- Stern, H. H. (1991) "Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching". *Oxford: Oxford University Press.*
- Thornbury, S. (2003). "How to Teach Grammar". *Beijing: World Affairs Press.*
- Tomlin, R.S. (1997). "Functional grammars, pedagogical grammars, and communicative language teaching". [in:] T. Odlin (ed.) *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. Cambridge: *Cambridge University Press.*
- Va Ek, J., Alexander L. (1980). "Threshold level English". Oxford: *Pergamum.*
- Widdowson, H. (1999). "Aspects of Language Teaching". Shanghai: *Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.*
- Xiaohui, (2004). 'Grammar Translation and Teaching Research'. Shanghai: *Fudan university press.*

---

### **CONTRIBUTION OF AUTHORS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

---

This research work was carried out in collaboration among three authors.

**Author 1. Muhammad Usman**, is M.Phil Scholar at Department of English,, Institute of Southern Punjab. He designed the study, collected and analyzed data and prepared first draft of manuscript.

**Author 2: Muhammad Tariq Ayub**, is serving as Assistant Professor at Government College of Science Multan He guide Author 1 about the format and analytical techniques.

**Author 3: Dr.Abdul Ghafoor Awan**, has two Ph.Ds, one is in Economics from Islamia University of Bahawalpur-Pakistan and other is in Business Administration from University of Sunderland, U.K. He contributed in this research by way of formatting, editing and giving final shape to the manuscript.

All three authors read the manuscript carefully and declared no conflict of interest with any person or institution.

---