

Exploring Pedagogical Inadequacies in Current Teaching Practices in ESL Classroom at College Level: The Students' perspective

Amir Hafeez Malik¹, Fozia Ramzan², Shahida Parveen², Abdul Rashid^{3*}

¹Ph.D. Scholar, Department of English Linguistics, the Islamia University of Bahawalpur, ORCID-ID:<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5769-5782>

²Lecturer, Department of English Linguistics, the Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Rahim Yar Khan Campus

³Lecturer in English, The University of Layyah

*Corresponding author email: abdulrashid@bzu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

English language teaching and learning remain the focus of the academic system as English is a compulsory subject for all learners at college level. The success and smoothness of English language pedagogy depends largely on the active role of ELT teachers simply because of their dominant role inside classrooms. This paper presents a comprehensive view of pedagogical inadequacies in ESL classrooms at the college level in Punjab, Pakistan. This study is quantitative and the data has been collected through a survey questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed to 250 students of public and private colleges of district Multan. Out of 250 students, 220 students responded questionnaire. The findings of the study proved that we are practicing inadequate pedagogical methods which are the root cause of learners' dissatisfaction and poor quality of education. Quality teaching always remains a dream without enriching the teaching skills of the teachers that is only possible by removing the inadequacies in pedagogy. A revision of our pedagogical practices is suggested in the light of the analyzed data and drawn conclusion of the present study.

KEYWORDS

Academic, Dominant, Inadequacies, Pedagogy, Quantitative Study

JOURNAL INFO

HISTORY: Received: February 02, 2023

Accepted: March 24, 2023

Published: March 31, 2023

INTRODUCTION

Effective teaching and learning depends upon pedagogical methods and styles. English language teaching classrooms are bound to be interactive. Myles(2014), stated that in all educational methods of teaching a second language, the teaching and learning process has a central significance. The role of teachers increases manifolds in this regard. The students, on the other hand, do have a role in setting the routines and even changes in classroom interactions as per their needs. The observations of ELT classroom practices in Pakistan reflect that the current pedagogical practices in ESL classrooms are to some extent inadequate. The inadequacies need to be replaced with the adequacies. There are multiple aspects of these observations that highlight some prominent inadequacies. The monotonous teaching-learning routines and practices are inadequate and do not suit both the teachers and the students. Similarly, the negative impacts of such practices affect the curiosity for learning and the desire of seeking new knowledge in novel ways. Classrooms are currently functioning as the boredom house for many excited and ambitious students at the college level.

According to Bughio (2013), the discrepancy in the level of participation in the class was the main problem that students encountered. Practically, this aspect makes a huge difference in classroom interaction. The major reasons are the use of unattractive and old methodologies and the lack of implementation of modern teaching trends in true spirits. The current Pakistani ESL academic sets up follow the model where classes are more dominantly based on marks race and cramming-oriented pedagogy rather than the skills required for the 21st Century demands. The learners are fed with fixed viewpoints about curriculums and grades without effective involvement and without focus on academic growth.

The present research attempts to fill the gap by supporting the claims that ESL classrooms need more dynamic dimensions and the replacement of beaten tracks. Pakistani ESL learners may not remain an exception in this case. College classrooms demand students to be submissive, disciplined, and soft in behavior. The learners are merely passive receivers. Any participation or questioning by learners in most cases is thought to be a sign of immaturity and objectionable. The culture of crushing creativity and innovation and learner independence is often implied as a divine right by the teacher adopting older methodologies and being fixed to pass-fail action plans. Warsi (2004) reflects that educators in Pakistan are very much concerned and dissatisfied with the situations under which the English language is being taught in Pakistan. This study traces the inadequacies in current ELT pedagogical trends.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/).

1.1 The Rationale of the Study

The study focuses on questioning the role of pedagogy with the rationale that pedagogical practices can be inadequate as well as adequate. This notion raises a research gap in pedagogy. Certain inadequacies have been observed in current ELT academic settings in Pakistan. Therefore, it becomes imperative to trace these inadequacies and recommend possible adequate replacements. In academic systems like Pakistan, teacher's have the most dominant role. Teachers being the authority in class individually and independently select and adopt teaching approaches and methods that are sometimes inadequate. This study is an attempt to suggest adequate pedagogical methods.

1.2 Significance of the Study

The study is significant from the point that teaching is always teacher dependent in Pakistan. Teachers play a variety of significant roles such as teacher, facilitator, mentor, motivator, manager, administrator and supporter, and so on. Enhancing teaching skills is possible by viewing and reviewing classroom pedagogical practices and bringing necessary modifications as and when needed. Selecting and adopting adequate practice may get better results and improve the quality of education.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The present study has the following objective:

1. To present a comprehensive view of current ELT teaching pedagogy
2. To analyze the major reasons for the inadequacies of poor teaching practices
3. To suggest remedies for improvement in current pedagogical inadequacies

1.4 Research Questions

1. What are common ELT pedagogical practices adopted by ESL teachers in Pakistan?
2. What are the major reasons for poor ELT teaching practices?
3. What are the possible remedies for improving current inadequate pedagogical practices?

2. Literature Review

Teaching is an evolutionary process and activity. Simasiku (2016) is of the opinion that teaching English as a second language has been and continues to be still a challenging task among ESL teachers globally. Teaching demands teachers to be dynamic and avoid any possible inadequacies that might become a part of academic activity. The researcher has traced the following most common inadequacies found in current pedagogical practices in ELT classrooms: (a) monotonous teaching practices, (b) boredom for learners, (c) one-way teaching which means no involvement of learners, (d) less teaching more cramming or memorization, (e) result-centered teaching, (f) no creativity or innovation practiced and allowed, (g) lack of teacher's interest, (h) teacher dominance culture, (i) lack of motivation (j) lack of lesson plans and (k) lack of independent learning. It has been observed that most English teaching-learning classrooms undergo monotonous teaching practices. Teaching is never a static activity as done by a large number of teachers and this can be labeled as teaching inadequacy. Brigs (2014) aptly asserts, "Teacher speaks in a monotone voice and reads aloud from the textbook". This statement sums up the current ELT pedagogical scenario as this is the most common teaching approach adopted by a large number of English language teachers. According to Raymond (2008), effective teaching achieves excellent, successful, outstanding learning outcomes. Teaching based on an adequate learning environment is a requisite for effective learning experiences.

For an example in modern times, mobile has a significant impact on learning of language. Kamasak, et al (2021) is of the view that MALL is extensively used to increase the effectiveness of different language teaching methods i.e. English as a Medium Instruction (EMI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) which combine content and linguistic skills in parallel

The problems faced by learners in the learning environment affect the performance of the learners and fail to achieve teaching and learning outcomes. Boredom in an ELT classroom is another inadequate element frequently practiced in our English language classrooms. As a one-way traffic approach, the teachers go on doing everything by themselves resulting in the boredom of learners. Tariq, et al. (2013) is of the view that learning is only efficient when the environment is suitable and helpful. Boring and static teaching practices are inadequate and need replacement. The researcher has pointed out a common inadequate element of ELT practices. Coleman (2010) concluded his study that English language teaching is frequently unsuccessful, that it does not help children in their educational careers, and that it may be counterproductive. Inadequacies in teaching practices are one of the main reasons of learners lose interest in the learning process. Several common inadequacies can be found in ELT classrooms. A classroom cannot exist without teachers. Their roles are multi-dimensional and multi-purposes based. According to Richards (2011), the teacher plays an important role in the classroom, especially in English as a foreign language. The teacher's role is as a mediator, facilitator, and monitor. The more active and agile the teachers are the more learning opportunities emerge. Teachers lead the way in learning or losing interest. Boredom-oriented classrooms are one of the reasons for the inadequacies of pedagogical practices. Zawodniak et al. (2017) ascertained boredom-evoking factors including language activities, teacher behavior, and lesson preparation. Idris (2019), states that the teacher is the center of learning with all learning activities revolving around him which are later on to be crammed and reproduced to pass an examination. The points raised by Idris clearly reflect the pivotal role of teachers in academic settings covering all academic activities. It has been observed that in many ELT classrooms, the teachers practice strict learning environments with nominal

and often even no participation of the learners. Ahmed, Abbas, Jalil, Ahmed (2019) believe that the English language formal classroom environment adds to the anxiety of learners. The teachers being the central figures in the classrooms need to pay attention to this inadequacy in teaching practice. Chohan and Rana (2016), clearly point out that there are different reasons for the low nature of the English language skills of learners this point takes attention to the inadequacies of the teaching practices. Ceka and Murati (2016) emphasize that the teachers' experience is important while teaching ESL worldwide. Viewed in this perspective is assumed that some pedagogical inadequacies can be eliminated with experience. Addressing the pedagogical issue is highly significant as Nassaji (2012) points out that in evaluating pedagogical findings, assessors should be familiar with the practice of classroom teaching. Ushioda (2013) stated that in the globalization era, English and its related issues are associated with education, curriculum, language teaching, and student motivation. This proves the point that pedagogy moves around these aspects and any inadequacies in teaching are not ignorable as the foundation of education.

Cheng (2021) considers that the written feedback of the teachers can enhance the learning ability of the student dramatically. But when such is deficient in the classroom, the students get bored and their learning becomes reductive. So the teacher is supposed to get feedback of his teaching method through different and alternative resources.

Grami, et al. (2021) investigated in his study and concluded that deploying alternative sources of feedback in ESL writing classes, including peer feedback, with the aim of improving writing. Similarly, Razgatlioglu, M., & Ulusoy, M. (2022) is of the view that activity based teaching enhances the reading fluency and creative writing skills of the students. Fathi (2023) has also concluded that Teachers' attitude toward the use of learning management systems (LMS) in English classes has a significant impact on the performance of the students like getting training.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study is quantitative in nature.

3.1 Data Collection

The data was collected by designing a survey questionnaire covering all the possible aspects to view and review the current teaching practices and have a detailed idea about the major reasons for inappropriate ELT pedagogy.

3.2 Participants

The questionnaire was distributed to 250 students of public and private colleges of district Multan. Out of 250 students, 220 students responded questionnaire which was processed for the analysis.

3.3 Data Analysis

The data were analyzed by using SPSS software.

Table.1. Old Method of Teaching

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	35	15.9	15.9	15.9
	2	33	15.0	15.0	30.9
	3	35	15.9	15.9	46.8
	4	95	43.2	43.2	90.0
	5	22	10.0	10.0	100.0
Total		220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement "My teacher uses old methods of teaching." 22 respondents (10%) responded with option 1 always, 95 respondents (43.2%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 35 respondents (15.9%) responded with option 3 often, 33 respondents (15.0%) responded with option 4 rarely, 35 respondents (15.9%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirms that 66/220 (30.9%) responses show that old methods of teachings are not used while 154/220 (69.1%) responses show that old methods of teachings are used.

Table.2. Preparedness of Teacher

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	2	15	6.8	6.8	6.8
	3	31	14.1	14.1	20.9
	4	25	11.4	11.4	32.3
	5	149	67.7	67.7	100.0
Total		220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher comes prepared to class for teaching.” 149 respondents (67.7%) responded with option 1 always, 25 respondents (11.4%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 31 respondents (14.1%) responded with option 3 often, 15 respondents (6.8%) responded with option 4 rarely, 0 respondents (0%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 15/220 (6.8%) responses show that the teacher does not come prepared to class for teachings while 205/220 (93.2%) responses show that come prepared to class for teachings.

Table.3. Use of activities for teaching

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	20	9.1	9.1	9.1
	2	36	16.4	16.4	25.5
	3	24	10.9	10.9	36.4
	4	73	33.2	33.2	69.5
	5	67	30.5	30.5	100.0
Total		220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher uses activities for teaching.” 67 respondents (30.5%) responded with option 1 always, 73 respondents (33.2%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 24 respondents (10.9%) responded with option 3 often, 36 respondents (16.4%) responded with option 4 rarely, 20 respondents (9.1%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 56/220 (25.4%) responses show that the teacher does not use activities for teaching while 164/220 (74.6%) responses show that the teacher uses activities for teaching.

Table.4. Involvement of students in activities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	13	5.9	5.9	5.9
	2	31	14.1	14.1	20.0
	3	44	20.0	20.0	40.0
	4	54	24.5	24.5	64.5
	5	78	35.5	35.5	100.0
Total		220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher involves students in class activities.” 78 respondents (35.5%) responded with option 1 always, 54 respondents (24.5%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 44 respondents (20.0%) responded with option 3 often, 31 respondents (14.1%) responded with option 4 rarely, 13 respondents (5.9%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 54/220 (20.0%) responses show that the teacher does not involve students in class activities while 176/220 (80.0%) responses show that the teacher involves students in class activities.

Table.5. Involvement of student in problem solving in class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	8	3.6	3.6	3.6
	2	29	13.2	13.2	16.8
	3	24	10.9	10.9	27.7
	4	38	17.3	17.3	45.0
	5	121	55.0	55.0	100.0
	Total		220	100.0	100.0

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher solves students’ problems in class.” 121 respondents (55.0%) responded with option 1 always, 38 respondents (17.3%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 24 respondents (10.9%) responded with option 3 often, 29 respondents (13.2%) responded with option 4 rarely,

08 respondents (3.6%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 37/220 (16.8%) responses show that the teacher does not solve students' problems in class while 183/220 (83.2%) responses show that the teacher solves students' problems in class.

Table.6. Positive Attitude of Teacher in Class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	1	.5	.5	.5
	2	8	3.6	3.6	4.1
	3	28	12.7	12.7	16.8
	4	17	7.7	7.7	24.5
	5	166	75.5	75.5	100.0
	Total	220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement "My teacher shows a positive attitude in class." 166 respondents (75.5%) responded with option 1 always, 17 respondents (7.7%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 28 respondents (12.7%) responded with option 3 often, 08 respondents (3.6%) responded with option 4 rarely, 01 respondents (0.5%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 09/220 (4.0%) responses show that the teacher does not show a positive attitude in class while 211/220 (96.0%) responses show that the teacher shows a positive attitude in class.

Table.7. Teaching complete syllabus in class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	5	2.3	2.3	2.3
	2	10	4.5	4.5	6.8
	3	24	10.9	10.9	17.7
	4	34	15.5	15.5	33.2
	5	147	66.8	66.8	100.0
	Total	220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement "My teacher teaches complete syllabus in class." 147 respondents (68.8%) responded with option 1 always, 34 respondents (15.5%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 24 respondents (10.9%) responded with option 3 often, 10 respondents (4.5%) responded with option 4 rarely, 05 respondents (2.3%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 15/220 (6.8%) responses show that the teacher does not teach a complete syllabus in class while 205/220 (93.2%) responses show that the teacher teaches a complete syllabus in class.

Table.8. Teacher Corrects Errors in Class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	7	3.2	3.2	3.2
	2	11	5.0	5.0	8.2
	3	35	15.9	15.9	24.1
	4	36	16.4	16.4	40.5
	5	131	59.5	59.5	100.0
	Total	220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement "My teacher corrects errors in class." 131 respondents (59.5%) responded with option 1 always, 36 respondents (16.4%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 35 respondents (15.9%) responded with option 3 often, 11 respondents (5.0%) responded with option 4 rarely, 07 respondents (3.2%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 18/220 (8.2%) responses show that the teacher does not correct errors in class while 202/220 (91.8%) responses show that the teacher corrects errors in class.

Table.9. Teacher enjoys class Teaching

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	4	1.8	1.8	1.8
	2	17	7.7	7.7	9.5
	3	33	15.0	15.0	24.5
	4	58	26.4	26.4	50.9
	5	108	49.1	49.1	100.0
	Total	220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher teaches enjoys teaching class.” 108 respondents (49.1%) responded with option 1 always, 58 respondents (26.4%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 33 respondents (15.0%) responded with option 3 often, 17 respondents (7.7%) responded with option 4 rarely, 04 respondents (1.8%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 21/220 (9.5%) responses show that the teacher does not enjoy teaching class while 199/220 (90.5%) responses show that the teacher enjoys teaching class.

Table.10. Use of different teaching styles for different topics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	13	5.9	5.9	5.9
	2	24	10.9	10.9	16.8
	3	39	17.7	17.7	34.5
	4	64	29.1	29.1	63.6
	5	80	36.4	36.4	100.0
	Total	220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher teaches uses new/different teaching styles for different topics.” 80 respondents (36.4%) responded with option 1 always, 64 respondents (29.1%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 39 respondents (17.7%) responded with option 3 often, 22 respondents (10.0%) responded with option 4 rarely, 02 respondents (0.9%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 15/220 (6.8%) responses show that the teacher does not use new/different teaching styles for different topics while 205/220 (93.2%) responses show that the teacher uses new/different teaching styles for different topics.

Table.11. Teacher’s feedback in class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	11	5.0	5.0	5.0
	2	24	10.9	10.9	15.9
	3	24	10.9	10.9	26.8
	4	68	30.9	30.9	57.7
	5	93	42.3	42.3	100.0
	Total	220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher gives feedback in class.” 93 respondents (42.3%) responded with option 1 always, 68 respondents (30.9%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 24 respondents (10.9%) responded with option 3 often, 24 respondents (10.9%) responded with option 4 rarely, 11 respondents (5.0%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 35/220 (15.9%) responses show that the teacher does not give feedback in class while 185/220 (84.1%) responses show that the teacher gives feedback in class.

Table.12. Teacher’s Motivation in Class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	.9	.9	.9
	2	18	8.2	8.2	9.1
	3	18	8.2	8.2	17.3
	4	49	22.3	22.3	39.5
	5	133	60.5	60.5	100.0
	Total	220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher motivates students in class.” 133 respondents (60.5%) responded with option 1 always, 49 respondents (22.3%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 18 respondents (8.2%) responded with option 3 often, 18 respondents (8.2%) responded with option 4 rarely, 02 respondents (0.9%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 20/220 (9.1%) responses show that the teacher does not motivate students in class while 200/220 (90.9%) responses show that the teacher motivates students in class.

Table.13. Boring Environment of the Class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	90	40.9	40.9	40.9
	2	33	15.0	15.0	55.9
	3	16	7.3	7.3	63.2
	4	65	29.5	29.5	92.7
	5	16	7.3	7.3	100.0
	Total	220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher’s class is boring.” 16 respondents (7.3%) responded with option 1 always, 65 respondents (29.5%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 16 respondents (7.3%) responded with option 3 often, 33 respondents (15.0%) responded with option 4 rarely, 90 respondents (40.9%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 32/220 (14.6%) responses show that the teacher’s class is boring while 188/220 (85.4%) responses show that the teacher’s class is not boring.

Table.14. Satisfaction level from Teacher

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	5	2.3	2.3	2.3
	2	6	2.7	2.7	5.0
	3	29	13.2	13.2	18.2
	4	46	20.9	20.9	39.1
	5	134	60.9	60.9	100.0
	Total	220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “I am satisfied with my teacher.” 134 respondents (60.9%) responded with option 1 always, 46 respondents (20.9%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 29 respondents (13.2%) responded with option 3 often, 6 respondents (2.7%) responded with option 4 rarely, 05 respondents (2.3%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirms that 11/220 (5.0%) respondents are not satisfied with the teacher while 209/220 (95.0%) respondents are satisfied with the teacher.

Table.15. Positive learning environment in class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	5	2.3	2.3	2.3
	2	11	5.0	5.0	7.3
	3	25	11.4	11.4	18.6
	4	22	10.0	10.0	28.6
	5	157	71.4	71.4	100.0
	Total	220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher creates a positive learning environment in class.” 157 respondents (71.4%) responded with option 1 always, 22 respondents (10.0%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 25 respondents (11.4%) responded with option 3 often, 11 respondents (5.0%) responded with option 4 rarely, 05 respondents (2.3%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 16/220 (7.3%) responses show that the teacher does not create a positive learning environment in class while 204/220 (92.7%) responses show that the teacher creates a positive learning environment in class.

Table.16. Achievement of Teaching Targets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	4	1.8	1.8	1.8
	2	15	6.8	6.8	8.6
	3	31	14.1	14.1	22.7
	4	45	20.5	20.5	43.2
	5	125	56.8	56.8	100.0
Total		220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher sets and achieves teaching targets.” 125 respondents (56.8%) responded with option 1 always, 45 respondents (20.5%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 31 respondents (14.1%) responded with option 3 often, 15 respondents (6.8%) responded with option 4 rarely, 04 respondents (1.8%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirms that 19/220 (8.2%) responses show that the teacher does not set and achieve teaching targets while 201/220 (91.8%) responses show that the teacher sets and achieves teaching targets.

Table.17. Homogeneity of the Teaching Method

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	60	27.3	27.3	27.3
	2	19	8.6	8.6	35.9
	3	42	19.1	19.1	55.0
	4	41	18.6	18.6	73.6
	5	58	26.4	26.4	100.0
Total		220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher has only one/same teaching style.” 58 respondents (26.4%) responded with option 1 always, 41 respondents (18.6%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 42 respondents (19.1%) responded with option 3 often, 19 respondents (8.6%) responded with option 4 rarely, 60 respondents (27.3%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 79/220 (35.1%) responses show that the teacher does not have only one/same teaching style while 141/220 (64.9%) responses show that the teacher has only one/same teaching style.

Table.18 .Teacher allow student’s Participation in class

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	7	3.2	3.2	3.2
	2	17	7.7	7.7	10.9
	3	14	6.4	6.4	17.3
	4	39	17.7	17.7	35.0
	5	143	65.0	65.0	100.0
Total		220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher allows students to participate in class activities.” 143 respondents (65.0%) responded with option 1 always, 39 respondents (17.7%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 14 respondents (6.4%) responded with option 3 often, 17 respondents (7.7%) responded with option 4 rarely, 07 respondents (3.2%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 24/220 (10.9%) responses show

that the teacher does not allow students to participate in class activities while 196/220 (89.1%) responses show that the teacher allows the students to participate in class activities.

Table.19. Praise of Students by teachers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	15	6.8	6.8	6.8
	2	12	5.5	5.5	12.3
	3	32	14.5	14.5	26.8
	4	67	30.5	30.5	57.3
	5	94	42.7	42.7	100.0
Total		220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher praises students in class.” 94 respondents (42.7%) responded with option 1 always, 67 respondents (30.5%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 32 respondents (14.5%) responded with option 3 often, 12 respondents (5.5%) responded with option 4 rarely, 15 respondents (6.8%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 27/220 (12.3%) responses show that the teacher does not the teacher praise students in class while 193/220 (87.7%) responses show that the teacher praises students in class.

Table.20 .Sharing experiences with Students

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	2	.9	.9	.9
	2	10	4.5	4.5	5.5
	3	21	9.5	9.5	15.0
	4	56	25.5	25.5	40.5
	5	131	59.5	59.5	100.0
Total		220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher shares experiences in class.” 131 respondents (59.5%) responded with option 1 always, 56 respondents (25.5%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 21 respondents (9.5%) responded with option 3 often, 10 respondents (4.5%) responded with option 4 rarely, 02 respondents (0.9%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 12/220 (5.5%) responses show that the teacher does not share experiences in class while 208/220 (94.5%) responses show that the teacher shares experiences in class.

Table.21. Interest of the teachers in Training

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	16	7.3	7.3	7.3
	2	22	10.0	10.0	17.3
	3	36	16.4	16.4	33.6
	4	60	27.3	27.3	60.9
	5	86	39.1	39.1	100.0
Total		220	100.0	100.0	

The above table illustrates the responses of 220 respondents to the survey statement “My teacher shares shows interest in training and attends training.” 86 respondents (39.1%) responded with option 1 always, 60 respondents (27.3%) responded with option 2 sometimes, 36 respondents (16.4%) responded with option 3 often, 22 respondents (10.0%) responded with option 4 rarely, 16 respondents (7.3%) responded with option 5 never. The above data confirm that 38/220 (17.3%) responses show that the teacher does not share experiences in class while 208/220 (82.7%) responses show that the teacher shows interest in training and attends training.

DISCUSSION

The result analysis of the data confirms that some teachers use old methods o but majority of teachers use old methods. Maximum teachers come prepared to the class and use activities for teaching and do remedial work in the classroom. A number of teachers use new or different pedagogical styles for teaching different topics. On the other hand, a large number of teachers go with single teaching approach. A huge number of students agree that mostly the classes are boring. The sharing of

experiences with students is also satisfactory along with achieving targets. Theoretically speaking, the students feel that the teachers are making efforts to make teaching learning practices effective yet the practical review says that even all efforts applied teaching inadequacies remain and need to be replaced.

Findings

In view of the observations and research questions asked in this study, the following findings are being submitted:

1. The current ELT Pedagogical practices are inadequate and faulty.
2. The current ELT Pedagogical practices are teacher-centered.
3. The current ELT Pedagogical practices need improvements.
4. The current ELT Pedagogical practices can be improved by pointing out problems and suggesting appropriate solutions.
5. It is not affordable to have poor ELT Pedagogical practices.
6. Effective ELT Pedagogical practices are needed for quality education.

CONCLUSION

Teachers are demanded to deliver the lectures creatively and interactively to give the learners motivation and a sense of achievement. Sharing of knowledge on the part of the teachers must be an interesting learning experience for the learners. Quality education is based on removing inadequacies and the teachers can do that successfully and effectively. Inadequate teaching practices are drastic for the teachers, the learners, and the quality of education. The target of effective and quality education can only be achieved by replacing pedagogical inadequacies with the creative, innovative, and inspirational pedagogical approach by the teachers as they are the perfect change agents. In the light of analyzed data and the conclusion drawn this study recommends.

1. Keep the focus on ELT Pedagogical practices.
2. View and review ELT Pedagogical practices from time to time
3. ELT teachers need to improve personally and professionally.
4. Only quality teaching results in quality education

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S., Abbas, F., Jalil, M. K., & Ahmed, M. (2019). *Language anxiety as a detrimental factor in English language learning: A survey of religious Madaris. Al-Qalam*, 24(2), 346-363.
- Brigs, S. (2014). *20 Things Educators Need to Know about Digital Literacy Skills. Informed, Open Colleges, Australia*. Retrieved from <http://www.opencolleges.edu.au/informed/features/digital-literacy-skills/>
- Bughio, F. A. (2013). *Improving English language teaching in large classes at university level in Pakistan*. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Sussex. Retrieved from <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/45170/>
- Cheng, X., Zhang, L. J., & Yan, Q. (2021). *Exploring teacher written feedback in EFL writing classrooms: Beliefs and practices in interaction. Language Teaching Research*, 13621688211057665.
- Ceka, A., & Murati, R. (2016). *The Role of Parents in the Education of Children. Journal of Education and Practice*, 7, 61-64.
- Chohan, M. N., & Rana, M. S. (2016). *A comparative study of Rural and Urban EFL Secondary school students towards usefulness and liking of English in Punjab, Pakistan. IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 21(9), 22-28.
- Coleman, H. (2010). *Teaching and learning in Pakistan: The role of language in Education*. Islamabad: The British Council, 1-56.
- Fathi, J., Mohammaddokht, F., & Afzali, M. (2023). *Exploring Iranian efl teachers' attitudes toward the use of learning management systems in English classes. Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura*, 28(1), 30-48.
- Grami, G. M. A., Alhomidan, H. A., Aljohani, R., Bustanji, A., Hawari, H. A., & Janbi, A. H. (2021). *Teaching ESL Writing in Saudi Arabia: A Case for the Integration of Peer Feedback. European Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(6), 87-93.
- Idris, M. (2019). *Developing the Reading Comprehension by Using Grammar Translation Method*. <https://doi.org/10.31237/osf.io/qsh4z>.
- Kamasak, R., Özbilgin, M., Atay, D., & Kar, A. (2021). *The effectiveness of mobile-assisted language learning (MALL): A review of the extant literature*. In *Handbook of research on determining the reliability of online assessment and distance learning* (pp. 194-212).
- Myles, F. (2014). *Second language acquisition (SLA) research: its significance for learning and teaching issues. Subject Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies Guide to Good Practice*.
- Nassaji, H. (2012). *The relationship between SLA research and language pedagogy: Teachers' perspective. Language Teaching Research*, 16(3), 337-365. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168812436903>
- Raymond, S. M. (2008). *Effective and Ineffective University Teaching from the Students' and Faculty's Perspectives: Matched or Mismatched Expectations?* Thesis submitted to the University of Exeter in part requirement for the Doctor of

- Education (EdD). Retrieved from <http://eric.exeter.ac.uk/exeter/bitstream/10036/40767/6/RaymondS.pdf> (April 7, 2017)
- Razgatlioglu, M., & Ulusoy, M. (2022). *The Effect of Activity-Based Poetry Studies on Reading Fluency and Creative Writing Skills*. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 18(3), 226-243.
- Richards, J.C. (2011). *Competence and Performance in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simasiku, E. (2016). *Communicative Language Teaching: Learning Language through Meaningful Interaction*. In A. Ferreira (Ed.), *Teaching Language* (pp. 86-101). Macmillan.
- Tariq, A. R., Bilal, H. A., Sandhu, M. A., Iqbal, A., & Hayat, U. (2013). *Difficulties in Learning English as Second Language in Rural Areas of Pakistan*. *Academic Research International*, Vol. 4 No. 6.
- Ushioda, E. (2013). *Motivation and ELT: Global issues and local concerns*. In *International perspectives on motivation*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137000873_1.
- Warsi, J. (2004). *Conditions under which English is taught in Pakistan: An applied linguistic perspective*. *Sarid Journal*, 1(1), 1-9.
- Zawodniak, J., Kruk, M., & Chumas, J. (2017). *Towards conceptualizing boredom as an emotion in the EFL academic context*. *Konin Language Studies*, 5(4), 425-441.