-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

# Methodic Analysis of Language Teaching in Access Microscholarship Program: A New Perspectiv

## * Azhar Munir Bhatti

English Department, Higher Education, Punjab, Pakistan

## Muhammad Iqbal

Applied Linguistics, University of Management and Technology Lahore, Pakistan

## Furrakh Abbas

Department of Linguistics, University of Okara

*__Email of the corresponding author__: Azharmunir18@hotmail.com

## ABSTRACT

*The current study aims to find the distinguishing traits of the teaching method used in the Access Microscholarship Program funded by the US State Department. The teaching method is analyzed based upon the model given by Richards & Rodgers in 1986 and further refined in 2001 and 2014. The study is experimental and used a small survey besides experimentation. There were two groups, the control and experiment group and homogeneity was applied by using the same age bracket and background. The researcher completed the experiment, proving that the students taught by Access teachers improved significantly compared to the traditional teaching method used in ESL/EFL classes in Pakistan. Post-test comparison of both Access and ESL classes showed a significant difference in the results of both classes that showed the efficacy of the teaching method used in Access classes. After the experiment, the method is compared with the model of Richard and Rodgers to know its distinguishing factors. That comparison shows that the model gives students better learning and makes them good citizens by adding a weekly module on social work. The study accepted H1 as a proven hypothesis, and H0 was rejected, which ultimately proved the efficacy of the teaching method used in Access classes.*

*Keywords*__:__ Access teaching method, ESL/EFL classes, Method, Good Citizen, Social Work

## INTRODUCTION

English has achieved official status in Pakistan since its inception. However, since then, it has been taught as a compulsory subject from nursery to graduation because the Pakistani language teachers use the traditional method for language teaching (Naseer, Patnam & Raza, 2013), which is unable to provide good results.

In Pakistan, there are mainly two kinds of institutions; state-run and privately owned. In state-run educational institutions, there are efficient and qualified teachers. But they either

have no pedagogical knowledge (Faiz, 2011) or are incompetent (Halai & Khan, 2011), or the prevalent environment may not be conducive enough to support the use of new methodologies (Sultana & Zaki, 2015). Moreover, it resulted in no participation of students in the teaching-learning process (Najamonnisa & Haroon, 2014).

In our country, the primary focus is on grades, which is why there is no focus on using methods used to teach languages by other countries. Even in Pakistan, CLT can be used with a slight modification to match the needs for good grades (Abbas, Aslam, & Yasmeen, 2011). Even writing and speaking skills can be integrated to have good grades (Bhatti, Parveen, & Ali, 2017), but the problem is that no one is serious about implementing such changes, and students are suffering. They are passing through a so-called language teaching process where they are not getting expertise in language nor adopting the culture (local or international). Language is a cultural capital (Abbas, Nazir, & Rana, 2017), but we are still indecisive about adopting the culture. Neither our textbooks present any iota of culture nor are the teachers adding any kind of cultural reality before the students, resulting in their inability to decide about their future. Hence they are wayward.

Keeping in view the importance of the English language, the current situation of our students' inability to learn this language, and the low economic status of most of our population, the state department of the United States of America has started a micro-scholarship program for the non-native countries to teach English to their teens. It was and is a good initiative since its inception in 2004. English Access Micro-Scholarship Program is run in 85 countries, and almost 95000 students have participated since its start in 2004 (US Department of State).

It's a rigorous 2-year English language training program administered by US Embassies in its officiated countries. The teaching staff is recruited from the host country, and teenage students are selected through a baseline test to be admitted to the class. This program is administered to boost the aplomb of the youth working in their motherland; after knowing an international lingua franca, they can best serve their countries. The primary purpose of this program is to enhance positive feelings in the masses of the countries where the access program is being offered as the graduated students portray the US sense of camaraderie in their relations. Moreover, it also deals with enlightening the teens of underprivileged areas of the world; so they would be able to solve their countries' problems in a leadership role (US Department of State). The current study analyzes the teaching method used in the Access Microscholarship Program. The study hypothesized that the method used is a new method that might be named "Democratic Teaching Method" or "Access Teaching Method.

**Objectives of Study**

The current article is working under the following objectives:

- To analyze the teaching methodology which is being used in the Access Microsholarship English Language Teaching Program run by US State Department
- To compare the Access teaching method with the traditional method used for teaching ESL/EFL classes in Pakistan

**Hypothesis**

**H1:** The teaching method, which is being used in the Access Microsholarship English Language Teaching Program run by US State Department, is different and good for the

learning and transforming the students into a good citizens than the teaching methods being used in ESL/EFL classrooms across the globe and it is a democratic teaching method based upon the democratic tradition of United States of America.

**H0:** The teaching method used in the Access Microsholarship English Language Teaching Program run by US State Department is the same as teaching methods used in ESL/EFL class classrooms Paan, which does not transform the students into good citizens.

## Scope of the Study

The current study is an analytical overview of the teaching method in the English Language Teaching Classroom of Access Microscholarship program. The process is essential for the success of a teaching program because it has multiple elements which are vital to not only the program but also the learners of that program. Through this analysis, the researchers are interested in highlighting this method's difference from the other ways applied in language teaching elsewhere in Pakistan. The researchers believe this method is new in the already used language teaching method. The success of this method is already established as the learner, after learning through this method, succeeded in different social setups, whose data is available on the State Department of USA website. The main focus of this study is to use this method for language teaching so that the progress of ESL/EFL students can be ensured in Pakistan. This analysis is also beneficial for the language teachers and curriculum setters because, by this analysis, the language teachers can increase their abilities, and the curriculum setters can add the pool of activities and tasks in the future curriculum for ESL students.

## Literature Review:

Access Programs funded by US Embassies provide a unique opportunity to the students of economically underdeveloped areas the exposure to learn the English language to up the following steps on the ladder of success as this language is a source of success (Salkowitz, 2010) being a language of science, technology, business, and arts (Crystal, 2003). but, mainly, is the language of the powerful economy (Salkowitz, 2010). It is a Lingua Franca language of contact among different world communities (Jenkins, 2003) because it is one of the most comprehensible languages in the world (Crystal, 2012). The world has turned into a global village, and people are now called digital natives, digital immigrants (Prensky, 2001), netizens (Hauben, 1995) or digital citizens Berger, Tolbert & McNeal, 2007). Language learning is a complex process (Sun, SteinSteinkraus der Steen, Cox, & de Bot, 2016; Stevick, 1982; Kane & Sheingold, 1980) and needs attention from two different perspectives: teaching and learning (Moeller & Catalano,,, 2015). As far as the teaching of a language in an effective way is concerned, it has different elements, including teaching methods, teaching environment, teaching material, teachers' knowledge and inclination, feedback, classroom environment, and higher-order-thinking boost (Walberg, 1986; Harris & Duibhir, 2011; Killion & Hirsh, 2011; Dincer, Goksu, Takkac & Yazici, 2013; Meksophawannagul, 2015). From the learning side, students' ability, involvement, motivation, and interest are essential factors (Kaplan, Lavadenz & Armas, 2011; Meksophawannagul, 2015).

For good learning, the most important thing is teaching strategy, which some favor Cooperative teaching (Wolfenberger & Canella, 2015), or the method which cares for the learners (Long & Holy, 2006) or how they actively participate in the process (Najamonnisa

& Haroon, 2014). It is a fact that a teaching program cannot be succeeded without the effectiveness of teaching methodology (Keroeker, 2004). Concerning selecting the method, one has to focus on certain variables like knowledge of content, pedagogy and teaching skills (Jacobsen, Eggen & Kauchak, 2009). Dreikurs & Soltz (1968) argued that only the subject knowledge is not enough except it is multiplied with pedagogical and teaching skills knowledge; this is the only way for effective teaching.

In Pakistan, English is considered a means of success and prestige and a language which is needed for the successful developmental process (Shamim, 2008); that is why there is enough research available on the teaching of English language, methodology, teacher-student talk time, traditional style of teaching, the competence of the teachers, and teachers' lacking pedagogical skills, (Sultana & Zaki, 2015; Jamil, Topping, & Tariq, 2012; Halai, & Khan, 2011; Faiz, 2011; Sajjad, 2010; Iqbal, Azam & Rana, 2009; Naseer, Patnam & Raza, 2009; Inamullah, Naseeruddin, Hussain & Iftikhar, 2008). However, the language teachers in Pakistan are not ready to learn new methods; they are not getting the international scenario of adopting new techniques for language teaching. ESL teaching has shifted from traditional to modern methods (Barrot, 2014). Modern is the world of digital natives, and they are well versed in technology, so they could learn best by using a method that should incorporate technology in their regular classrooms.

When we talk about method, there are three essential elements a method can be described with: approach, design and procedure (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). In his renowned study (1996), Dr. Grasha broadly categorized teaching methods into content-focused and student-focused. Based upon the issues above with the teaching methods being adopted in Pakistani language classrooms, it is hypothesized by this research that Access micro-scholarship program is using a new method which might be called the Democratic Teaching method or Access Teaching method. However, as no study is available to check its distinguishing characteristics, the current research is conducted to differentiate the teaching method used in the Access program.

## Research Methodology

The current study is expository in its nature as the teaching method is going to be analyzed. The study is experimental too because the analysis is based upon the experiment, in which the researcher takes two classes: one from the Access program and another from another private institute where English is taught as an L2. The students of both classes belong to the same age bracket and social background. Sampling was random and convenient as the researcher is already attached to both institutes. After the experimentation, the researcher used Richards & Rodgers method model to assess the qualities and drawbacks of the teaching method used in Access classes.

## Experimentation

The researcher used a pre and post-test 2-groups experimental design where one group received treatment, and the other was taught with traditional teaching methods, which are used to teach ESL students in Pakistan. The treatment was used for three months, in which three days a week was specified for class teaching. The researcher used alternative days to teach both classes. The schedule was set before starting teaching classes. A pre-test of both the groups was conducted before the start of class, and after the treatment, a post-test was conducted to ensure the results. Twenty-five students in each class were selected after the

pre-test. The test was 100 marks, in which 25 25 marks were assigned to each of the four skills.

**Method Assessment**

For the analysis purpose, the method model presented by Richards & Rodgers in 1986, revised in 2001 and further refined in 2014 was used to analyze the teaching method used in Access classes. All the model components were compared with the teaching style of the Access program to have a component-to-component comparison of the technique.

**Data Analysis**

Table 1

*Paired Samples Statistics (ESL Class)*

|  |  | Mean | N | Correlation | Correlation Sig. | Mean | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESL Class | Pre | 23.6800 | 25 | -.276 | .182 | -34.040 | -24.838 | 24 | .001 |
|  | Post | 57.7200 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

A paired sample t-test was used to measure the difference between pre-and post-tests of ESL classes to check whether there was any progress after three months of treatment. Data were collected twice from ESL Classes with a difference in treatment. In both pairs, the table above shows a statistically significant difference in the pre and post-test results (M=23.68 vs. M=57.72 with $t_{24}$=-24.838, p>.001). The effect size was calculated as -4.95, which is the medium effect. The test result shows correlation terms is -.276 and correlation sig. Value is .182, which shows that both the results are taken from the same group and negatively correlated as post-test results are higher than pre-test results. It also means that ESL class learns through the traditional teaching method used in Pakistan for ESL classes.

Table 2

*Paired Samples Statistics (Access Class)*

|  |  | Mean | N | Correlation | Correlation Sig. | Mean | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Access Class | Pre | 23.0000 | 25 | -.323 | .115 | -47.720 | -34.695 | 24 | .001 |
|  | Post | 70.7200 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

A two-sample t-test was applied to pre and post-test results of the Access class to analyze the difference in their progress after three months of treatment. Data were collected both before the start of the classes and after three months to check whether they had progressed or not. The results show that they improved significantly as the mean difference is 47.72 with $t_{24}$=-34.695, p>.001. The effect size was calculated with the Cochran formula, offering a large effect size of 6.94. Correlation -.323 with sig. A score of .115 shows a weak

correlation between the results. The test means that the teaching method used for the Access class returned with significant effect and good results.

Table 3: *Paired Samples Statistics (Pre-test)*

|  |  | Mean | N | Correlation | Correlation Sig. | Mean | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-Test | Access | 23.0000 | 25 | -.103 | .626 | -.68000 | -1.135 | 24 | .268 |
|  | ESL | 23.6800 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

A paired sample t-test was applied to the pre-test results of ESL and Access class that shows there was no significant difference in the results of both classes as p-value is more vital than cut value p<.268; whereas, mean difference is also very low, i.e., only .68 in which pre-test mean score of Access class is 23.00 and the same for ESL class was 23.68 having $t_{24}=1.135$. Therefore, the correlation is weak and associated with an ESL class. That means the students chosen for the experiment have the same academic ability before applying treatment, as the results are shown in the above table.

Table 4

*Paired Samples Statistics (Post-test)*

|  |  | Mean | N | Correlation | Correlation Sig. | Mean | T | Df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| post-Test | Access | 70.7200 | 25 | -.195 | .350 | 13.000 | 7.023 | 24 | .001 |
|  | ESL | 57.7200 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The result of the post-test using paired sample t-test is shown in the above table. The results show a significant difference between the results of Access and ESL classes after giving treatment. The results are M=70.72 for Access class vs. M=57.72 for ESL class, t(24)=7.023, which is positive and shows the mean difference towards Access class and the p score shows the significant difference because its score is less than the cut value of .005. Correlation scores show a negative and weak correlation between the results. The results show that students in Access class learned a lot by using the Access teaching method.

**Analysis of the Method**

We can analyze this method based on the criterion/model/framework offered by Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rodgers (2014) in their book "approaches and methods in language teaching." He described that a method should have the three essential components of Approach, Design and Procedure. By the approach, he meant to say that this part of the method deals with the philosophy of language and philosophy of learning; by design, they want to focus on the syllabus, material selection, roles of teachers, learners and material and in the last portion of the procedure, they are dealing with the practical side of method,

when the process is applied in the actual classroom. Finally, the procedure includes techniques and interactional patterns between teachers and learners.

In contrast to traditional language teaching, the method has included a critical addition to making the access students reflexive, essential, and socially engaged language learners. It is through the notion of Critical pedagogy, given by Freire in 1970, which can enhance students' language learning by creating a conducive environment for them to grow in a culturally and socially relevant milieu through the engagement of the students in critical and creative discussions. The inclusion of CALL also adds new students who are tech-oriented.

**Theory of Language**

It is a theoretical base for any method. The theory of language behind the technique is a mixed breed. As no particular document is available to say directly, it can be given as a hint. We can say that it is a mixture of interactional, sociocultural and Genre models. This inclination is based upon the way of teaching and the use of activities being performed in the classroom

The language combines specific structures used to interact (Schramm, 1997) or transact in a society (Barnlund, 1970). Language has multi-purposes to fulfill, and one of these purposes is to make good interpersonal relations (Richards & Rodger, 2014). Rivers (1987) said interaction hones the students' language skills because it facilitates them through focusing on receiving and sending authentic messages. Chowdhury (2005) argued that teachers and learners contribute to interaction in the classroom, which also means that learners and teachers are equal participants in the creation of interactive sessions. That is why Rivers (1987) accepted interaction as the vital process of teaching communication to the students because its main focus is on the negotiation of meaning.

In the access classroom, teachers are always focused on the cultural beliefs, customs and rituals of the learners' culture; hence, it shows another theory of language is also in focus: sociocultural theory. This theory imparts language through contextual clues, which means context is essential because after learning a language, the learner has to use it in their social context (Vygotsky, 1978). He was of the view that social interaction is necessary for the development of human cognition, that is, language development, because the follower of this theory has this staunch belief that community has a primary role in the linguistic development of a child as social, psychological, and cultural context is used for the teaching, because of integrative nature of social and environmental settings is essential (Briner, 1999; Mitchell & Miles, 2004; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). The heart of the sociocultural theory is two basic concepts: mediation and meaning (Kozulin, 1990). Vygotsky was interested in interacting with social activities that transform children's minds. Those meaningful activities work like an impulsive mediation process between a child's mind and society (Minick, 1987).

It means that interaction alone is not enough, but sociocultural interaction is the focus of the study. That another point of view that is implemented in access teaching is genre theory. The genre theory concept focuses on the individual and independent language style for a particular kind of writing and speaking (Chandler, 1998). Kress (1988) defined Genre as 'a kind of text that derives its form from the structure of a (frequently repeated) social

occasion, with its characteristic participants and purposes'. Fees (1998) briefly summarized its focal points as:

- Language is used as a meaning-making source
- Language is a system, and it has multi interrelated systems
- Users of language use this resource while using it
- The users create the text for the creation of meaning
- Texts are bound to be shaped by the social context of their use
- The users of language ultimately shape the social context

(Fees, 1998: 5)

**Theory of Learning:**

Kramina (2000) defines language learning as a conscious process that is the product of either a formal learning situation or a self-study program' (p. 27). It means that language learning plays an integral role in uniting all parts of a language (Robbins, 2007). Here we are talking about the learning theory behind language teaching in access programs. Again by looking at the teaching, it can be inferred that it is also a mixture of interaction theory, constructivism, sociocultural learning theory and individual factors.

As we have discussed in the interactional theory of language, interactional learning is almost based upon the same principles. It focused on mutual understanding through collective working in a group or peer setting so that the meaning could be negotiated (Well, 1987). It works like modification and multiplicity of input from different levels of learners and has a beneficial effect on language learning (Lazaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martinez, 2015; Oliver, 1998, 2002, 2009; Ellis, 1985; Gass & Varonis, 1986). In the unique facility access, learners have to talk with native speakers, sometimes live and some other times online. They receive feedback on this speaking from more advanced speakers. This type of interaction is perfect for a student of low ability as an advanced learner. While interacting with the beginners, try to accommodate them by using simple vocabulary, reducing speed, differently saying the concept, adjusting topics, sometimes avoiding idiomatic expressions, stressing on main words, reiterating some elements, using simple structures, and sometimes paraphrasing or explaining (De la Colina & Mayo, 2009; Ellis, 1985; Gass, Mackay & Ross-Feldman, 2005; Long & Porter, 1985; Mackay, 2007; Oliver, 2002). This modification facilitates the students' learning and understanding of the contents. This is only the teacher who supports this interactive process and leads the learning of students.

The second thing focused on students' learning in the access classroom is making learners responsible for their knowledge. Learners are made part of activities' construction, choice of topics and selection of contents. The theory of concern is constructivism, which compels the learners to internally construct the meaning to process the personal learning environment (Williams & Burden, 1997). Constructivism resulted from the child development theory of Piaget (1980), Dewey (1929) and Bruner (1961), including the work of Vygotsky (1962). This theory considers learning an active rather than passive process, internalizing outer knowledge. Von Glasersfeld (1995) explained that knowledge is not the name of stimulus-response; instead, it requires the self-regulated development of concepts by creating abstraction and reflection. It does not mean meaning is passively constructed

through the learners' experiences. It needs an active involvement to make the learning happen.

Nonetheless, the learner creates the knowledge as an organizer, who organizes, de-organize and then reorganizes new understanding based upon existing knowledge in their cognitive domain (Breuer & Kummer, 1990). Focusing on the social dimension, the learner interacts with their environment and other learners, providing a context (Perin, 2011) and ultimately helping the learner solve their problems by creating a dialogue (Bell, 2010). This approach is student-centered and emphasizes project-based learning in which the learner asks questions to find answers and faces multiple interpretations. Teachers act as a guide and facilitators (Bell, 2010). Access classrooms use a student-centered approach and project-based approach. It is believed that learners can construct knowledge if given a learning environment and enough time to question the Content and interact with one's peers.

In the classroom, learners are grouped to interact with each other to learn in a conducive environment they select. In each group, the mixed ability students are included so that the interaction between lower capacity and higher ability students can be done. This furthers the concept of constructing knowledge by the learner himself and then transfers that knowledge with some more knowledgeable person in the shape of his fellow or some native speaker by creating a dialogue. The same is done in the program. This sociocultural domain of learning emphasizes the learning in a social setting (in this case, it will be the classroom); it also focuses on the interaction between and among people (i.e., teachers and learners), objects (like books, texts, and images), and the activities that are graded according to the culture of the learners, and events (acts of instruction and their sequence). In sociocultural theory, learning is considered participation duly guided and directed by some knowledgeable entity. Therefore, it exerts that a novice can gradually construct new skills and knowledge through participation in various activities joined by mixed ability others (Rogoff, 1990). Vygotsky, the pioneer of this theory, said that scaffolding is essential in creating new knowledge in this learning theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991). While focusing on the sociocultural interaction to construct internal knowledge, the access program also focuses on individual factors. This program believes that each individual is different, so needs personal attention; for this, the teachers are trained to design activities through learners' collaboration. Teachers plan a pool of activities, out of which the learners or the group of learners have to select the action they feel comfortable with. Individual factors may include the preference of learning styles, the effect of the affective filter, learning strategies and motivation.

**Objectives**

Objectives are the heart of a method; it is the result that, after the completion of the program, what kind of knowledge the learners will have and what kind of skills they will be able to do. According to the Richards & Rodgers model (1986), a method should have general and specific objectives. The same is true for the access teaching program. Therefore, the access teaching method has the following general and specific objectives behind the teaching-learning process.

Generally speaking, the method is used to make the learners learn the English language at a level to efficiently use it in any environment, from simple to complex. Specifically, it compasses to use the English language in the society to move upward on the ladder of

success by being aware of different language domains, e.g., in the office, in the community, in a different situation, like writing a CV, job application, an article, or creating a presentation or to deliver a speech. It is also designed to enable learners to listen to and understand the language from simple to mixed tones in a slow to the fast mode of speaking. Another specific objective of an access teaching program is to make the learners be able to read almost every Genre where language is used.

**Syllabus Model**

Hutchinson & Waters (1987) defined a syllabus as a statement of the contents learned, and the linguistic performance can be shown. Yalden (1987) also described a syllabus as 'a summary of contents to which learner will be exposed (p. 87). Robinson (2011) talked about the importance of syllabus design, which is the set of decisions for the units of contents and in which sequence those units will be presented to the learners to better their performance (p. 294). Nunan (1988) contended that syllabus designing is concerned with selecting and sequencing the Content to cater to the needs of the learners. He defined need analysis as a kind of information attaining system, referring to need analysis as "techniques and procedures for collecting information to be used in syllabus design" (p. 13). But Richards & Platt (1992) defined need analysis as "the process of determining the needs for which a learner or group of learners require a language and arranging the needs according to priorities" (p. 242).

Another point of view came from Hutchinson & Waters (1997), who divided need analysis into two components: target needs and wants, in which target needs are the actual action required to learn something and wants is the views of learner about their needs. Needs analysis is required keeping in mind the objectives of teaching, whether general or specific. Dublin and Olshtain (1986) pointed out that goals focus on the social, institutional and cultural needs of the ESL/EFL learners.

Nunan (1988) divided the syllabus into two significant parts: product-based and process-based. The product-based syllabus is what is to be learned. It is a kind of formal Content and leaves the learning of skills, but the process-based syllabus encompasses open-view learning and informs the learner to learn fundamental life skills (White, 1988). There is much criticism on product-based syllabi (Widdowson, 1979, 1987; Murphy, Skehan, 1996; Ellis, 1997; Lightbrown & Spada, 2006; Tagg & Woodward, 2011) and process-based syllabi like procedural (Prabhu, 1983), task-based (Long, 1985) or Content-based (Mohan, 1986) is suitable for the non-native students because it gradually focuses on the development of the learner's ability of language learning (Widdowson, 1987). It is established that language production, which is the main focus of designing or selecting a syllabus, is mediated through the learners' attention and their good memory in which the teacher plays their role as a guide, a monitor or a facilitator (Cunningsworth, 1998). It is also a fact that if the task at hand is complex for the learners, their language production ability might be affected. Skehan (1998) and Robinson (2003) gave the model of task complexity in which it is argued that the cognitive demands imposed by the task on the learners' minds change their production level. Therefore, the task is the basic syllabus design and sequencing unit.

In this respect, the syllabus used in the access teaching classroom is process-based, and as we know that there is no fixed syllabus, but in the choice of material/contents, an Access

teacher works as a guide and facilitator with the students to select, design or use the material that could cater the cultural, social and individual needs of the students. So the material used in the Access classroom is chosen with the consent of the students. They (the learners) are given their democratic right in the classroom to participate in each learning process so that the interaction between learners and the Content must be meaningful.

**Types of Activities**

Activities are designed by the teachers with the consent of the learners. After creating and developing the activities, the learners are again given a choice to work on their favored activity. Activities are designed according to the sociocultural and individual needs of the learners, which could help learners interact with society in real life. Activities are also designed while keeping in mind the interactional pattern of the culture and the societal requirements of the learners. Some of the activities used in the Access classroom are based on noticing techniques and information transfer. Teachers always try to design problem-solving activities so that the students can be aware of the issues of their societies and how to handle those issues.

Volunteer social services are frequently given to drive their attention towards their society, so the learners must be mobilized to further good deeds in their respective communities. Activities are focused on boosting learners' motivation through raising critical thinking abilities so that they can decide about taking sides or being neutral in case of a conflict. Games are a source of learning, and in language classrooms, games are abundantly used to refine the students' behavior, as is the case with access programs. The Access program's primary focus is to refine the youth of under-developed countries. Games are also used as an activity to give a better learning environment for language learners. Emersion is considered the best tool to learn a language speedily, so for the creation of emersion, the Access students are encouraged to interact with native speakers and are asked to play the role of native speakers.

Activities are assigned to the groups or pairs to increase the concept of community in the learners. They are also asked to interact with authentic material and interpret the information so that higher-order thinking must be encouraged in the learners' minds. Yet numerous activities could be used in this classroom, provided that the activities should meet the criterion of making the learners able to communicate in a natural environment with ease and flexibility based on their social, cultural and individual needs.

**Roles**

Learners work in the classroom based on semi to fully autonomous roles depending on the activity's demands. Learning-centered classrooms are believed to provide the best teaching environment where students learn through questioning and interaction with everything. Therefore, it has been named 'learner-centered assessment' (Huba & Freed, 2000), a learning paradigm (Barr & Tagg, 1995). In a report (1999), the national research council contended that there are four types of focus used in a learning environment: knowledge-centered, learner-centered, assessment-centered, and community-centered. In which learner-centered are considered the best foci for learning.

McCombs and Whistler (1997) contended that in a learner-centered classroom, learners play the role of co-creator in the learning process, who knows the issues and considerations

of knowledge. That is why access to classrooms is highly learner-focused. Going further in the Access classroom, based upon the democratic tradition of the USA, the learners are almost fully autonomous in which teachers facilitate their learning. Content is working under their jurisdiction. It is a democratic classroom where everyone has a voice, and their voice is given much more important than in any other classroom. As in a democracy, it is said that it is a government of the people, for the people, by the people; the same happens here in Access classroom, where learning of the learners is for the learners and the learners. That is the motto of the access classroom to promote democratic values. To achieve this goal, teachers and instructional material subdue before the learners, who have ultimate significance. The classroom is set as per the demands of the learners and the needs of the activities for which the teacher works as a need analyst so that the actual needs of the students are catered to in the classroom.

Classrooms are duly prepared to meet the dynamic needs of language learning. In case of needs, the teachers also play the role of counselors to solve the issues and lead the students towards success. Moreover, he sometimes plays the role of need analyst, and process manager as the students are energetic, and the teacher must manage their interactional process. In this respect, instructional material is selected which is understandable and provides a sufficient challenge to the learners so that they could have a positive interaction with the authentic material that boosts their impulse toward knowledge.

We know that assessment and evaluation are two significant elements of a teaching program. These two things are always a sense of apprehension for the students/learners and the teachers. Learners are tensed that they have to go through a rigorous evaluation process and to get good grades, they work hard; sometimes, they try to learn by heart and the learning process is hindered because the desire to have good marks drives them. Almost the same is the case with the teachers, who are also pressured to write tests, arrange formal exams, and allow their learners to have good grades to be promoted. In the Access classroom, there is no such type of pressure for the learners or teachers as there is no formal examination kind of things happened. Students are assessed through their daily portfolio, which is updated daily. The portfolio is designed to record daily activities and tasks, and students' performance is marked in each portfolio. In this way, neither teachers nor learners have any pressure of evaluation and having to be promoted because this program is conducted on pass/fail grounds. The main aim is to impart the language skills for which a certificate is given to the Access student. Students are given a free mind to learn only without any hassle and external pressure. They enjoy the sessions being part of the teaching process, from the selection of material and classroom setting to the choice of activity. This type of teaching makes them fully autonomous learners.

**Procedure**

The practical portion of the method is how the activities would accomplish the task of teaching what is to be. As we mentioned, this teaching method's objectives are to make fully autonomous language users use the newly learned language in a simple to complex environment. The freer activities used in this method focus on the sociocultural domain of learning to make the learners comprehend the input and produce the comprehensible output in an environment where they are mentally free to discover and activate skills to explore their true potential of learning a new language. In the classroom, the teacher focuses on enhancing learner talk time. The target is to reduce teacher talk time which is usually high

in a traditional language classroom, but in the Access classroom, teacher talk time is replaced with learner talk time. Yet, it does not mean that teacher is a mum, but the talk time is utilized for the learners to make them efficient users of the language. Vygotsky (1962) pointed out his theory of 'zone of proximal development as Krashan (1980) has given his input model. Both of these theories have fostered that the input given to the students should be a little higher than their ability which is shown with Z+1 by Vygotsky and i+1 by Krashen. But Vygotsky added another point he named 'scaffolding,' which is a kind of support from the teachers to the learners so that they can smoothly move along the learning path. In the Access classroom, the activities are used as per the level of students, and the input is given in the form z+1 with scaffolding from the teacher. This procedure improves the learning, and smooth classroom practice continues.

**Summary of Methodological Features:**

This method has the following features based upon Richards & Rodgers Model (1986).

| Approach | Theory of Language | A mixture of Interactional, sociocultural and Genre models | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Theory of Learning | A mixture of interaction theory, constructivism, Sociocultural learning theory and individual factors in language learning | |
| Design | Objectives | General | To learn the language at a level to efficiently use in any environment, simple to complex |
| | | Specific | -To use language in society to move upward on the ladder of success by being aware of different language domains, e.g., in the office, create cv, writing an application for the job, writing an article, creating a presentation, and delivering a speech.<br>-To make learners listen and understand the language from simple tone to mixed tone and from slow to fast mode<br>-To be able to read almost every Genre where language is used |
| | Syllabus Model | Process-based model of the syllabus will be used, and Content will be selected democratically opinionated by the learners and discussion with the teacher | |
| | Types of Activities | Noticing<br>Information gap and information transfer<br>Problem-solving and problem-based learning activities<br>Social services activities<br>Critical thinking activities<br>Motivation booster<br>Anxiety reducer<br>Interactive games<br>Role plays<br>Simulations<br>Question/answer<br>Question balls<br>Picture interpretation | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Peer/pair and group work<br>Humanistic domain |
| | Learner's role | Semi to fully autonomous, performer, problem solver, project builder, equity-based, active processor |
| | Teacher's role | Gradually shift the burden of learning from teacher to learner, democracy in which everyone has a voice, facilitator, confidence builder, and counselor |
| | Role of Instructional Material | Focused on understandable, relevant and exciting exchanges of information, help the learners to learn at their pace with their style of learning, provide facility to self-evaluate and independent learning and real task to help in real world |
| Procedure | Classroom Techniques | Scaffolded learning, no burden of assessment, portfolio assessment, equitable space, av aids, teacher-student, student-student, and student-teacher interactional patterns |

**Conclusion**

The State Department of USA funding is running an access micro scholarship program. The main aim of this program is to equip the young generation of under-developed countries with the language which is used almost by the world for the progress of any kind. This program is offered without any fee structure; even a stipend is provided. A baseline test selected the students and enrolled them to get world-class language education. Though the teachers are chosen from the concerned country, the US language experts fully train them, and after training, the teachers teach the students. Each facility is given in the classroom for the smooth learning process. It tries to provide the best environment for language learning, as shown by the student's success in society. They are serving their country with a better understanding of the issues, and this knowledge has made them better citizens. Based on their age-old democratic tradition, the classrooms are also set into a form where each learner could have their voice. Their motto is language learning of the learners is for the learners, and by the learners. Emersion is an agreed-upon phenomenon in which language learning is smooth, speedy, and without any problem. In the Access classroom, a kind of emersion is offered to the students by indulging in the activities, meeting with the natives sometimes online and some other time, face to face meeting. The students are asked to volunteer the social activities to serve their community. They find the chance to look at different social action processes. No assessment is another positive booster for their learning. It is the best method that is used to teach a language. It can be named the 'Democratic teaching method' or the Access teaching method.

The good results of this method are also shown through experimentation, as the students of the Access program got a lot of progress compared to the students taught traditionally. Though the ESL students were also taught using some elements of CLT but the focus is only on learning the English language, but the focus of the Access teaching method is to make them better citizens, which is why social activities are part of Access teaching. They have been given a chance to speak with native speakers and got help from wonderfully designed websites for their enhancement activities. These components make the teaching method used in Access classes the only process which not only works for students' better language learning but also focuses on their social well-being and, in this way, transforms

them into perspective and prospering citizens of their country. In the end, it can be easily said that H1 is proven and accepted that the teaching method used in Access classes is different from the technique used in ESL/EFL classes in Pakistan, and it transforms the students into good citizens by adding social services to their teaching modules. The social service element added in this method distinguishes it from other forms because it is because of this element that the students being taught in Access classes assured themselves that after the learning, they would work to better their country.

The study recommends that the method be implemented in public sector schools to get their students to learn English. The new research can be conducted to check its distinguishing factors, which are helpful for good learning and good change in their social behavior.

## REFERENCES:

Abbas, F., Nazir, S., & Rana, A. M. K. (2017). Language as cultural capital: exploring the language used by Pakistani multilingual speakers in four domains. *Hamdard Islamicus*, *40*(3&4), 1-16.

Abbas, F., Aslam, S., & Yasmeen, R. (2011). Communicative language teaching: a modified version. Language in India, 11, 331-341

Barnlund, D. C. (1970). A Transactional Model of Communication in Sereno and Mortensen eds. Foundations of Communication Theory. *Harper and Row*, *18*, 50.

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning—A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, *27*(6), 12-26.

Barrot, J. S. (2014). A macro perspective on critical issues in English as the second language (ESL) pedagogy in the post method era: Confronting challenges through the sociocognitive-transformative approach. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *23*(3), 435-449.

Bell, S. (2010). Project-based learning for the 21st century: Skills for the future. *The Clearing House*, *83*(2), 39-43.

Bhatti, A. M., Parveen, S., & Ali, R. (2017). Integration of speaking and writing skills for better grades: perception of graduate students in Pakistani public sector colleges. *International Journal of Research and Social Development in Social Science (IJRDS)*, 3(2)

Breuer, K., & Kummer, R. (1990). Cognitive effects from process learning with computer-based simulations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *6*(1), 69-81.

Briner, M. (1999). *Lev Vygotsky*. Retrieved March 3, 2018, from http://curriculum.calstatela.edu/faculty/psparks/theorists/501vygot.htm

Bruner, J. S. (1961). The act of discovery. *Harvard educational review*, 31, 21-32

Cadiero-Kaplan, K., Lavadenz, M., & Armas, E.G. (2011). Essential Elements of Effective Practices for English Learners. *The policy brief*, 1, 1-5

Chandler, D. (1998). Personal home pages and the construction of identities on the web. http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/short/webident.html

Chowdhury, S. (2005). Interaction in second language classrooms. *BRAC University Journal*, II (1), 77-82

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge university press

Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a global language*. Cambridge university press

Cunningsworth, A. (1998). Choosing your course book. Oxford: Oxford University Press

de la Colina, A. A., & Mayo, M. D. P. G. (2009). Oral interaction in task-based EFL learning: The use of the L1 as a cognitive tool. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *47*(3-4), 325-345.

Dewey, J. (1929). *My pedagogic creed*. Progressive Education Association.

Dincer, A., Goksu, A., Takkac, A., & Yazici, M. (2013). Common Characteristics of an Effective English Language Teacher. *Online Submission*, *4*(3), 1-8.

Dreikurs, R., & Soltz, V. (1968). *Children: the challenge*. Meredith Press.

Dublin, F., & Olshtain, E. (1986). Course design: Developing programs and materials for language learning.

Ellis, R. (1985). Teacher-pupil interaction in second language development. In S. M. Gass, & C. G. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition (pp. 69–85). Rowley, MA: Newbury House

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. OUP

Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford University Press

Faiz, N. S. M. (2011). From theory to practice: The learning challenges for international students to succeed in a Malaysian technical and vocational (TVE) higher education institution. In *Third Asian Conference on Education*.

Gass, S. M., Mackey, A. & Ross-Feldman, L. (2005). Task-based interaction in classroom and laboratory settings. *Language Learning*, 55, 575–611

Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1986). Sex differences in NNS/NNS interactions. *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*, 327-351.

Glasersfeld, E. V. (1995). Sensory experience, abstraction, and teaching. *Constructivism in education*, 369-383.

Grasha, A. F. (1996). Teaching with style. Pittsberg: PA, Alliance

Halai, N., & Khan, M. A. (2011). Developing pedagogical content knowledge of science teachers through action research: A case study from Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Forum on Science Teaching and Learning*, 12(1).

Harris, J., & Duibhir, P. Ó. (2011). Effective language teaching: A synthesis of research. *School of Linguistic, Speech*.

Hauben, M. (1995). The net and netizens: the net's impact on people's lives.

Huba, M. E., & Freed, J. E. (2000). *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning*. Allyn & Bacon, 160 Gould St., Needham Heights, MA 02494.

Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes*. Cambridge University Press.

Hutchinson, & Waters. (1997). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centered approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Inamullah, H.M; Naseeruddin, M; Hussain, I & Iftikhar, S. (2009). The Development of Technical Education in Pakistan. *International Business & Economics Research Journal*, 8(1): 87-90

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

Jacobsen, D. A., Eggen, P., & Kauchak, D. (2009). Methods for teaching. Metode-metode Pengajaran Meningkatkan belajar siswa TK-SMA. *Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar*.

Jamil, M., Topping, K. J., & Tariq, R. H. (2012). Perceptions of university students regarding computer-assisted assessment. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, *11*(3).

Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes*. London: Routledge

Kane, J. H., & Sheingold, K. (1980). Language development: A complex, systematic, and natural process. *Day Care and Early Education*, *8*(2), 39-54.

Kane, J. H., & Sheingold, K. (1980). Language development: A complex, systematic, and natural process. *Day Care and Early Education*, *8*(2), 39-54.

Killion, J., & Hirsh, S. (2011). The elements of effective teaching. *Journal of staff development*, *32*(6), 10-16.

Kozulin, A. (1990). The concept of regression and Vygotskian developmental theory. *Developmental Review*, *10*(2), 218-238.

Kramiņa, I. (2006). Applied linguistics in Latvia: problems and perspectives. *Humanities and Social Sciences*, *1*(47), 56-66.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Kress, G., & Threadgold, T. (1988). Towards a social-theory of genre+ a category of literary theory. *Southern Review-Adelaide*, *21*(3), 215-243.

Lantolf, J. P., Thorne, S.L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. OUP

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Acquisition. In. B. van Patten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Explaining Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press.

Lazaro & Azpilicueta, (2015). Investigating negotiation of meaning in EFL children with deficient levels of proficiency, *International Journal of English Studies,* 15 (1), pp. 1-21

Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press

Long, M. H. (1985). A role for instruction in second language acquisition: Task-based language teaching. *Modeling and assessing second language acquisition*, *18*, 77-99. Mohan, B. A. (1986). *Language and Content* (Vol. 5288). Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Mohan, B. A. (1986). *Language and Content* (Vol. 5288). Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Mackey, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Conversational Interaction in Second Language Acquisition: A Collection of Empirical Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McCombs, B. L., & Whisler, J. S. (1997). *The Learner-Centered Classroom and School: Strategies for Increasing Student Motivation and Achievement. The Jossey-Bass Education Series*. Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, San Francisco, CA 94104.

Meksophawannagul, M. (2015). Teacher and learner views on effective English teaching in the Thai context: The case of Engineering students. *English Language Teaching*, *8*(11), 99.

Minick, N. (1987). The development of Vygotsky's thought: An introduction. In *The collected works of LS Vygotsky* (pp. 17-36). Springer, Boston, MA.

Moeller, A. K., & Catalano, T. (2015). Foreign language teaching and learning. In J. D. Wright (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences* (2nd Ed.), Vol-9. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 327-332. Doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.92082-8

Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. J., & McNeal, R. S. (2007). *Digital citizenship: The Internet, society, and participation*. MIT Press.

Najamonnisa, & Haroon, Z. M. (2014). Primary School Teachers' Perspectives Regarding Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning: A Descriptive Study. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences,* 2 (1), 95-108

Naseer, M. F., Patnam, M., & Raza, R. R. (2010). Transforming public schools: Impact of the CRI program on child learning in Pakistan. *Economics of Education Review*, *29*(4), 669-683.

Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design*. Oxford University Press.

Oliver, R. (2002). The patterns of negotiation for meaning in child interactions. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 97–111

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, & Wells, G. (1987). *The negotiation of meaning: Talking and learning at home and school*. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Perin, D. (2011). Facilitating student learning through contextualization: A review of evidence. *Community College Review*, *39*(3), 268-295.

Piaget, J. (1980). Schemes of action and language learning. *Philpapers*

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy* (Vol. 20). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants part 1. *On the horizon*, *9*(5), 1-6.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. (3ʳᵈ Ed). CUP

Richards, J.C., Platt, J., and Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. London: Longman

Rivers, W. M. (1987). *Interactive language teaching*. Cambridge University Press, 40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011

Robbins, D. (2007, June). Vygotsky's and Leontiev's Non-classical Psychology related to second Language Acquisition. In *International Nordic-Baltic Region Conference of FIPLV Innovations in Language Teaching and Learning in the Multicultural Context* (Vol. 47057).

Robinson, P. (2003). The cognitive hypothesis, task design, and adult task-based language learning. *University of Hawai'i Second Langauge Studies Paper 21 (2)*.

Robinson, P. (2011). Task-based language learning: A review of issues. *Language Learning, 61*(Suppl. 1), 1-36. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00641.x.

Robinson, P. (Ed.). (2011). *Second language task complexity: Researching the cognition hypothesis of language learning and performance* (Vol. 2). John Benjamins Publishing.

Rogoff, B. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in a social context.

Sajjad, S. (2010). Effective teaching methods at the higher education level. *Pakistan Journal of Special Education*, *11*, 29-43.

Sajjad, S. (2010). Effective teaching methods at the higher education level. *Pakistan Journal of Special Education*, *11*, 29-43.

Salkowitz, R. (2010). *Young world rising: How youth technology and entrepreneurship change the world from the bottom up* (Vol. 13). John Wiley & Sons.

Schramm, W. (1997). *The Beginnings of Communication Study in America* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997).

Shamim, F. (2008). Trends, issues and challenges in English language education in Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *28*(3), 235-249.

Skehan, P. (1996). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and Change in language teaching* (pp. 17–30). Oxford: Heinemann

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Stevick, E. W. (1982). *Teaching and Learning Languages*. Cambridge University Press, 32 East 57th Street, New York, NY 10022.

Sultana, M., & Zaki, S. (2015). Proposing Project-Based Learning as an alternative to traditional ELT pedagogy at public colleges in Pakistan. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, *4*(2), 155-173.

Sun, H., Steinkrauss, R., van der Steen, S., Cox, R., & de Bot, K. (2016). Foreign language learning as a complex dynamic process: A microgenetic case study of a Chinese child's English learning trajectory. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *49*, 287-296.

Tagg, C., & Woodward, E. (2011). *Syllabus and materials*. Birmingham: CELS, University of Birmingham

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). Language and thought. *Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, Ontario, Canada*.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Readings on the development of children*, *23*(3), 34-41.

Walberg, H. J. (1986). Synthesis of research on teaching. *Handbook of research on education*, *3*, 214-229.

White, R. (1988). *The ELT curriculum*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Widdowson, H. (1979). *Explorations in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (1987). The roles of teacher and learner. *ELT Journal*, *41*(2), 83-88.

William, M., & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A Social Constructivist Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Wolfensberger, B., & Canella, C. (2015). Cooperative Learning about Nature of Science with a Case from the History of Science. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 10*(6), 865-889.

Yalden, J. (1987). *Principles of course design for language teaching* (pp. 16-18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.