

# Annals of Human and Social Sciences www.ahss.org.pk

# **RESEARCH PAPER**

# Teaching Language Skills to Young Learners through Activities: A Case Study of Primary Schools in Gujrat

#### <sup>1</sup>Adnan Hussain\* <sup>2</sup>Perveen Akhter Farhat <sup>3</sup>Muhammad Aslam

- 1. Primary School Teacher, GHS Christian Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan
- 2. Assistant Professor, Department of English, Lahore Leads University Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
- 3. Assistant Professor, Department of ELT & Linguistics, IER,, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

\*Corresponding Author

adnanshah32777@gmail.com

# **ABSTRACT**

Interactive teaching is central to learning language skills at all grades. The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of Activity Based Teaching on leaning of the four major skills. To achieve this purpose, pre-test post-test control group design was used with a random sample of 34 male students selected from the list of primary schools located in the district Gujrat. A pre-test was conducted before the treatment of 5 weeks and a post-test was administered within a week after the treatment with the control and experiment group. To find out the significance of the difference between the scores of the tests, t-test for independent samples was run. The test indicated a significant difference in the performance of the experiment group. The study has important significance for the teachers, syllabus designers, and the materials developers. It is recommended in light of the findings that interactive teaching interspersed with activities should replace the lecture-based teaching of language skills, especially with 5th graders.

**Keywords:** 

Activity-Based, Communicative Approach, Language Skills, Teaching English Young

Learners

# Introduction

Language teachers use variety of techniques and methods to teach all language skills. One of the language teaching methods is "Traditional Method" which is considered as teacher centered method as teacher performs all things by himself/herself in the classroom. Clearly, the main objective of any second language teaching method is to enhance the second language ability of the learners. However, traditional methods of language teaching lack integration process of second language into sub- groups of separate abilities and understanding domains. Traditional method of language teaching is based on traditional opinion of education where teacher's role is to transfer all information whereas learners are inactive receivers in teaching learning process (Kuzu, 2007).

Richards (2005) highlights that in "Traditional Method" learning is under the control of the teacher. Therefore, in traditional language teaching method teaching and learning depends only on the teacher and it is supposed that while attending the lesson learners are able to attain knowledge if they are listening teacher's justifications and examples. The traditional way of teaching is conceived to work as jug and mug i.e. pouring of knowledge from one container to another which is empty. This approach is constructed on the condition that presence of the teacher and alert listening is sufficient to confirm that learning process is happening (Scrivener, 2005).

Patil (2008) opines that in the continent of Asia, learners show nervousness, uncertainty and anxiety in practice of English language. Hence, in order to bring efficiency in English language skills, it is essential to boost learners' confidence and eliminate their

nervousness. Furthermore, he explains it is essential for the teachers to provide learners opportunities, to apply English in real-world and related situations. Warm-up activities, games, rhymes, tales, animations are the activities that are supportive in language teaching. Playing and experimenting with language provides pleasure and develops self-confidence in language learners. If anxiety of the learners is eliminated, they will able be to use creative English.

As traditional Methodology has less impact on second language learning, so teachers have to adopt the ways where learners are not passive rather, they are active participants. One of them is "Activity Based Learning". Singal et al. (2018) defined "Activity Based Learning' as student centered approach with the goal to give thought provoking learning targets, engaging and flexile learning for all pupils. Activity based learning offers support to the learners and allows them to remain connected with class fellows which improves work and stimulates learners confidently (Deci & Ryan, 2000). According to Quin (2012) activity based learning which is also called cooperative learning, combined learning, task-based learning can be defined as teaching technique that involves learners in the learning process. It is composed of a variety of motivating activities. The learners are engaged instead of gaining knowledge inactively. Prince (2004) observed activity based teaching as a technique where learners are engaged in the learning process. Harfield et al. (2007) stated that learners actively participate in activity-based teaching instead of passive listeners. If tasks in activity-based learning are composed of real life events, it will make learners familiar with up to date knowledge and it can be useful in certain conditions for better learning.

# **Literature Review**

Zhang (2010) conducted a study to compare features of cooperative language learning and traditional language teaching method. According to him in traditional language teaching the role of the learner is none or negative, he/she is passive learner and teacher's role is to control teaching process and to provide support and feedback to the learners. On the contrary, in cooperative language learning the role of the learner is positive, he/she is active participant and role of teacher is to organize group work and facilitate communication tasks. In cooperative language learning materials are arranged according to the need of the lesson. Generally instructional activities are designed in cooperative language learning to engage learners in communication. In cooperative language learning interaction is mostly learner to learner and also teacher to learner. Learners are arranged in groups in cooperative language learning. All the participants take part in activity and play role in achieving success.

Anwer (2019) conducted research to see the impact of activity-based teaching on learners' academic achievement and its effectiveness on students' motivation. It was experimental research in which experimental and controlled groups were formed. Random assignment was used to select subjects. Pre-test and post-test were designed for the study. Keeping in mind constructivist theories, diverse activities are designed so that learners are enthusiastically engaged in learning and are able to develop their own knowledge instead of passive listeners. In this way more profound clarification of the subject and interpersonal abilities are developed.

Dissanayake, Alahakoon and Wijesinghe (2020) performed their study on two objectives i.e. to see the effectiveness of Activity Based Teaching method to teach English language to primary learners and to investigate the impact of Activity Based Teaching to develop reading, writing, listening and speaking skills of primary learners. The nature of their research was action research. Using their observations, they concluded that activity-based teaching method was more attractive method that produces environment which is more engaging and builds rapport between teacher and learners. The Activity Based Teaching method is encouraging for the learners and they are actively involved in learning activities.

Golji and Dangpe (2016) performed a study to make association of games in learning process. In their opinion monotonous teaching restrict learning process. They employed the game of snake and ladder to enhance speaking and reading skills. Digital dice and timer were also used as game constituents. They noticed that game based learning was helpful to recognize and fill the gap between theoretical concepts and actual learning. Game based learning provides cooperative learning atmosphere, enhances thinking ability of the learners and facilitate peer learning.

Nor (2014) conducted a mixed method research to see the impact of activity based teaching in improving listening skill. Findings of his research were introduction of listening activities that could be applied in language class to improve listening skill of the learners. Activities introduced by Nor (2014) were Information Transfer, Paraphrasing and Translation, Answering Questions, Summarizing and Filling in the blanks to enhance listening skill of the learners.

Singh (2016) postulates teacher should monitor the communicative activities and provide them feedback. Apart from this, teachers should try to give stress free environment, so that students can do practice without any constraint. In present scenario the role of teacher is just to facilitate learners therefore teachers should apply inventive teaching methods. Furthermore, Singh (2016) finds that for effective learning, those activities should be emphasized in which learners use language they are going to learn. He concluded that for improving learner's pronunciation and speaking skill teachers have to design communicative activities. Role plays, mock debates, group discussion and practice activities are useful in developing pronunciation. Activities like extempore, summarizing a tale/story, interviews, story completion are not only useful to enhance the speaking skill of the learners but also contribute in developing confidence of the learners to speak.

According to Richards, Richards and Renandya (2002) in order to encourage learners to write pre- writing activity is effective because it motivates learners to get start, it facilitates learners to produce concepts to collect information for writing. Group brainstorming, clustering and free writing activities are effective in enhancing learners writing skill. Moreover, multimedia sources like videos, films, printed material etc. can also be utilized to encourage learners to write efficiently. Interviews, surveys and questionnaires are also helpful in this regard.

Although, many researches had been performed on activity-based throughout the world. However, there is not enough research conducted in Pakistan especially in Punjab on Activity Based Teaching methodology. Furthermore, studies conducted on implementation of Activity Based method of teaching show that language teachers don't know variety of activities and their proper application in the classroom. Present research was conducted to fill this gap.

# **Research Hypotheses**

- Ho1: There is a significant difference between mean scores of experimental group and control group on posttest with respect to achievement in listening.
- Ho2: There is a significant difference between mean scores of experimental group and control group on posttest with respect to achievement in speaking.
- Ho3: There is a significant difference between mean scores of experimental group and control group on posttest with respect to achievement in reading.
- Ho4: There is a significant difference between mean scores of experimental group and control group on posttest with respect to achievement in writing.

#### **Theoretical Framework**

Different theories have been employed in the current research. To study children' thinking and process of development from childhood to adulthood, Jean Piaget gave the notion of "Stage Theory". According to Piaget, intelligence is the basic process of life through which organisms adjust in their environment and during this adaption process, children achieve stability among themselves and in their surrounding as well. Piaget observed that children explored their environment and were able to learn naturally. They were attentive investigators who have constructed knowledge through their own activities. While interacting with the environment, children constructed cerebral structures or strategies. Furthermore, they were continuously associated to make multifaceted plans. Piaget concluded that this association is interacted. Simultaneously, children have to change their forming plans to organize with what they are experiencing in their current situation. This series of changing plans is called adaptation (Pinter, 2011).

According to Pinter (2011) Vygotsky stresses continued development rather than in stages. It focuses on the vital role of societal atmosphere, role of skillful facilitator and the role of nature to help novice learners. Instead of direct encounters with the physical world, for Vygotsky the building of information and understanding is innately social movement. Vygotsky gave idea of the zone of proximal development (ZPD). The ZPD is the space between real development level confined by own problem resolving ability and the level of latent development confined through problem resolving ability indirection of skillful person or more proficient peers.

Mercer (2000) proposed another idea of Intermental Development Zone (IDZ) to show the significance of effective communication within the ZPD. He postulated that in teaching and learning process both teacher and learner have to establish common information and objectives. They should use conversation and combined action to make a mutual open space, and intermental development zone (IDZ). If standard of the zone is effectively sustained, learners become able to associate this practice as new skill and understanding beyond their established abilities. If the dialogue fails to adjust, the IDZ breaks down and scaffolded learning also stops.

Primarily, the main goal of English language teaching is to develop student's language skills i.e. a. Listening, b. Speaking, c. Reading and d. Writing. Zaremba (2006) proposed that reading and listening skills are called receptive skills whereas writing and speaking are called productive skills which are considered vital for effective communication in English language. He also suggests that for interaction speaking is considered more important than other language skills. The proficient oral communication can be produced by many activities like formal talking activities, skilled drill exercises etc. According to Goh (2007) speaking is an important skill for effective communication among all language skills. Particularly, speaking is very essential skill for communication for those who are not the native speakers of a particular language. As English language is being used in communication throughout the world specially in the internet world. That's why it is essential to improve speaking skill not only for non-native speakers as well as for native speakers to communicate with international community. Therefore, speaking skill should be developed by designing of syllabus, teaching methodology, selecting various tasks and resources and assessment techniques.

Watkins (2007) argues that "reading" is an essential skill among all other language skills as it is a major source of obtaining new knowledge. It is said that if the learner's reading ability is not improved then he/she will not be able to understand the subject content of reading material. Learners are required to have motives for reading and it can be done by preparing effective activities. Reading in second language learning is only possible if the learner is familiar with different process and techniques of reading. Therefore, it is the duty of teachers to introduce a variety of strategies while enhancing the reading ability of the

learners. The fourth language skill is writing, which is a way to convert thoughts into language. Therefore, it is essential that the writing should be coherent, simple, perfect and comprehensible. The role of teachers in this regard is to familiar pupils with diverse writing techniques and tactics. Making a good writer is not an easy task. Teachers should motivate, guide, and facilitate learners in this regard. Making learners good writers' continuous repetition is required. Oxford (2001) proposed that the second language learning approaches play an important role in second language acquisition because these facilitate EFL/ESL learners to achieve complexity in L2 acquisition. These kinds of techniques not only provide assistance and feedback to the L2 learners but also enhance the learning capabilities of the learners.

#### **Material and Methods**

The present research is quantitative in nature. As quantitative research deals with the data which is based on numbers, so present research work is quantitative in nature because the researcher collected data which is numerical in nature. In this research work experimental research was selected to find the cause and effect relationship between dependent and independent variables.

# **Sampling**

All primary school students (1,94,326) of District Gujrat were the population for the study (School Education Department, Punjab). At the first stage, permission was taken from the principal of the institute. Secondly, the presence and availability of the students were ensured. Thirdly, enrolled Grade-V primary learners in the Govt. Christian High school were selected using convenience sampling i.e. sub type of non-Probability sampling technique. In experimental and quantitative research, the sample was selected with randomization.

For conducting the experimental work researcher's selection was the primary section of Govt. Christian High School in the city Gujrat. Researchers selected the sample of 34 Grade-V enrolled ESL learners.

# Instrumentation

Different tests have been designed for all four language skills i.e. listening, speaking, reading and writing.

The listening test was comprised of 10 items. The first 5 items were attempted by the students after listening to the recording. However, the last 5 items were attempted by the learners after listening a passage read by the teacher. Speaking test was prepared to assess students' conversations in English. Ten oral questions were included in the speaking test. The response of the students was recorded on a recording device. The reading test was developed to measure vocabulary, grammar and language structure. Ten items were included in the reading test to evaluate skimming, scanning and inference. Whereas the writing test measured four writing abilities i.e. spellings, punctuation, grammar and syntax. This part is composed of 10 items.

# **Validity**

Validity of all tests were maintained by the opinions of related experts of British Council. Language teachers and trainers Miss. AafiaQuraishi, Miss Sadia Quraishi and Miss Rabia. Further, the test items were selected from Grade-V English textbook which is published by authentic publisher i.e. Punjab Textbook Board Lahore.

# Reliability

Reliability of the test was measured by using Split-half technique. The test items were divided into two halves depending upon the content and difficulty of the test items. Both halves were marked separately. To calculate reliability Spearman- Brown formula was used which is Reliability = 2r/1+r

Where r is called actual correlation between the halves of the instrument. Correlation coefficient is 0.88 by using Spearman-Brown formula which was highly strong.

# **Pilot Testing**

Pilot testing was conducted on 10 students of Grade V of Govt. Islamia high School Gujrat i.e. other than the sample of the study. Collected data of pilot testing showed that there was no confusion related to test items.

# **Analysis of Data**

Data was analyzed by using SPSS version 21 and independent sample t-test was used for data analysis with the compatibility of window ten. The procedure of data analysis was based on the analysis and comparison of achievement test scores which were the pretests of both the groups and posttests of both the groups, experimental and control group. In the data analysis the level of significance is maintained as 0.05.

#### **Results and Discussion**

#### **Pre-test Results**

Table 1
Group statistics

|                       |    |        | ar oup stat | 151105 |  |
|-----------------------|----|--------|-------------|--------|--|
| Variable              | N  | M      | S. D        | SEM    |  |
| Control<br>Group      | 17 | 5.1765 | 1.07444     | .26059 |  |
| Experimental<br>Group | 17 | 5.4706 | 1.17886     | .28592 |  |

Table 2
Independent Samples Test

|         |                               |      | - 11       | iucpci | iuciit i | Jampic   | 3 1 636     |               |         |                                |
|---------|-------------------------------|------|------------|--------|----------|----------|-------------|---------------|---------|--------------------------------|
|         | ]                             |      | s Test for | •      |          |          |             |               |         |                                |
|         |                               | Equa | lity of    |        |          |          |             |               |         |                                |
|         |                               | Vari | ances      |        |          | t-te     | st for Equa | lity of Means | 3       |                                |
|         | -                             |      |            |        |          | Sig. (2- | Mean        | Std. Error    | Interva | nfidence<br>al of the<br>rence |
|         |                               | F    | Sig.       | T      | df       | tailed)  | Difference  | Difference    | Lower   | Upper                          |
|         | Equal<br>variances<br>assumed | .920 | .345       | 760    | 32       | .453     | 29412       | .38685        | -1.0821 | .49387                         |
| Pretest | Equal variances not assumed   |      |            | 760    | 31.73    | .453     | 29412       | .38685        | -1.0823 | .49414                         |

Table No 1 and table no 2 show the results of independent samples t-test to identify differences in mean scores of pre-test scores of control and experimental groups. Results show that there is no significant difference between mean scores of control group (M = 5.18, SD = 1.07) and experimental group (M = 5.47, SD = 1.18), t (-.760), df (31.73) and p > 0.05.

# **Post-test Results**

**Table 3 Group statistics** 

| Variable           | N  | M      | S. D    | SEM    |
|--------------------|----|--------|---------|--------|
| Control Group      | 17 | 6.2353 | 1.14725 | .27825 |
| Experimental Group | 17 | 8.1765 | .88284  | .21412 |

Table 4 Independent Samples Test

|          |                                   | Levene's Test for<br>Equality of<br>Variances |      |       |       | t-te:    | st for Equal | ity of Means |         |                                |
|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------|--------------------------------|
|          |                                   |                                               |      |       |       | Sig. (2- | Mean         | Std. Error   | Interva | nfidence<br>al of the<br>rence |
|          |                                   | F                                             | Sig. | T     | df    | tailed)  | Difference   | Difference   | Lower   | Upper                          |
|          | Equal<br>variances<br>assumed     | .875                                          | .357 | -5.53 | 32    | .000     | -1.94118     | .35110       | -2.656  | -1.226                         |
| Posttest | Equal<br>variances<br>not assumed | l                                             |      | -5.53 | 30.03 | .000     | -1.94118     | .3511        | -2.658  | -1.224                         |

Table no 3 and table no 4 show the results of independent samples t-test to identify differences in mean scores of pre-test scores of control and experimental groups. Results show that there is significant difference between mean scores of control group (M = 6.24, SD = 1.15) and experimental group (M = 8.18, SD = .88), t (-5.53), df (30.03) and p< 0.05. Hence, hypothesis is proved.

# **Data Analysis of Speaking Skill**

# **Pre-test Results**

Table 5
Group statistics

|                    | di oup statistics |      |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------|-------------------|------|-------|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Variable           | N                 | M    | S. D  | SEM  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Group      | 17                | 6.12 | 2.497 | .606 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental Group | 17                | 4.88 | 1.364 | .331 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6
Independent Samples Test

|         |                               | Levene's Test for<br>Equality of<br>Variances |      |       |       | t-tes               | st for Equa       | lity of Means              | 3                |                                |
|---------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
|         |                               | F                                             | Sig. | Т     | df    | Sig. (2-<br>tailed) | Mean<br>Differenc | Std. Error<br>e Difference | Interva<br>Diffe | nfidence<br>al of the<br>rence |
|         |                               |                                               |      |       |       |                     |                   |                            | Lower            | Upper                          |
|         | Equal<br>variances<br>assumed | 6.408                                         | .016 | 1.790 | 32    | .083                | 1.235             | .690                       | 170              | 2.641                          |
| Pretest | Equal variances not assumed   | l                                             |      | 1.790 | 24.77 | .086                | 1.235             | .690                       | 187              | 2.657                          |

Table no 5 and table no 6 show the results of independent samples t-test to identify differences in mean scores of pre-test scores of control and experimental groups. Results

show that there is no significant difference between mean scores of control group (M = 6.12, SD = 2.50) and experimental group (M = 4.88, SD = 1.37), t (1.79), df (24.77) and p > 0.05.

#### **Post-test Results**

Table 7
Group statistics

| Variable           | N  | M     | S. D  | SEM  |  |
|--------------------|----|-------|-------|------|--|
| Control Group      | 17 | 8.00  | 2.372 | .575 |  |
| Experimental Group | 17 | 13.59 | 2.599 | .630 |  |

Table 8
Independent Samples Test

|          |                                   | Levene's Test<br>for Equality of<br>Variances |      |       |       | t-tes               | st for Equa        |                            |         |                                |
|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
|          |                                   | F                                             | Sig. | Т     | df    | Sig. (2-<br>tailed) | Mean<br>Difference | Std. Error<br>e Difference | Interva | nfidence<br>al of the<br>rence |
|          |                                   |                                               |      |       |       |                     |                    |                            | Lower   | Upper                          |
|          | Equal<br>variances<br>assumed     | .053                                          | .819 | -6.55 | 32    | .000                | -5.588             | .853                       | -7.33   | -3.85                          |
| Posttest | Equal<br>variances<br>not assumed |                                               |      | -6.55 | 31.74 | .000                | 5.588              | .853                       | -7.33   | -3.85                          |

Table no 7 and table no 8 show the results of independent samples t-test to identify differences in mean scores of pre-test scores of control and experimental groups. Results show that there is significant difference between mean scores of control group (M = 8.00, SD = 2.37) and experimental group (M = 13.59, SD = 2.59), t (-6.55), df (31.74) and p < 0.05. Hence, hypothesis is accepted.

# **Data Analysis of Reading skill**

# **Pre-test Results**

Table 9
Group Statistics

| Variable           | N  | M    | S. D  | SEM  |
|--------------------|----|------|-------|------|
| Control Group      | 17 | 6.41 | 1.228 | .298 |
| Experimental Group | 17 | 6.53 | 1.281 | .311 |

Table 10 Independent Samples Test

|         |                                      | Levene's Test<br>for Equality of<br>Variances |      |     |       | t-tes               | st for Equa        | i                          |         |                                |
|---------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------|-----|-------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
|         |                                      | F                                             | Sig. | T   | df    | Sig. (2-<br>tailed) | Mean<br>Difference | Std. Error<br>e Difference | Interva | nfidence<br>al of the<br>rence |
|         |                                      |                                               |      |     |       |                     |                    |                            | Lower   | Upper                          |
|         | Equal<br>variances<br>assumed        | .203                                          | .655 | 273 | 32    | .786                | 118                | .430                       | 994     | .759                           |
| Pretest | Equal<br>variances<br>not<br>assumed |                                               |      | 273 | 31.94 | .786                | 118                | .430                       | 994     | .759                           |

#### **Post-test Results**

Table 11
Group statistics

|                    | dioup statisties |      |       |      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------|------------------|------|-------|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Variable           | N                | M    | S. D  | SEM  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Group      | 17               | 7.06 | 1.345 | .326 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Experimental Group | 17               | 8.76 | .664  | .161 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 12 Independent Samples Test

|          |                                   | Levene's Test for<br>Equality of<br>Variances |      |       |       | t-tes           | lity of Means      |                            |         |                                |
|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
|          |                                   | F                                             | Sig. | T     | df    | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean<br>Difference | Std. Error<br>e Difference | Interva | nfidence<br>al of the<br>rence |
|          |                                   |                                               |      |       |       |                 |                    |                            | Lower   | Upper                          |
|          | Equal<br>variances<br>assumed     | 9.99                                          | .003 | -4.69 | 32    | .000            | -1.706             | .364                       | -2.45   | 965                            |
| Posttest | Equal<br>variances<br>not assumed | d                                             |      | -4.69 | 23.37 | .000            | -1.706             | .364                       | -2.46   | 954                            |

Table no 11 and table no 12 show the results of independent samples t-test to identify differences in mean scores of pre-test scores of control and experimental groups. Here, results show that there is significant difference between mean scores of control group (M = 7.06, SD = 1.35) and experimental group (M = 8.76, SD = .664), t (-4.69), df (23.37) and p< 0.05. Hence, hypothesis is acknowledged.

# **Data Analysis of Writing Skill**

#### **Pre-test Results**

Table 13
Group statistics

|                    |    | ar oup starts |       |      |  |
|--------------------|----|---------------|-------|------|--|
| Variable           | N  | M             | S. D  | SEM  |  |
| Control Group      | 17 | 10.71         | 3.138 | .761 |  |
| Experimental Group | 17 | 9.59          | 2.959 | .718 |  |

Table 14
Independent Samples Test

|                               | for Eq | e's Test<br>uality of<br>iances |       | t-test for Equality of Means |                     |                    |                            |                  |                                |
|-------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|-------|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
|                               | F      | Sig.                            | Т     | df                           | Sig. (2-<br>tailed) | Mean<br>Difference | Std. Error<br>e Difference | Interva<br>Diffe | nfidence<br>al of the<br>rence |
|                               |        |                                 |       |                              |                     |                    |                            | Lower            | Upper                          |
| Equal<br>variances<br>assumed | .088   | .769                            | 1.068 | 32                           | .293                | 1.118              | 1.046                      | -1.01            | 3.248                          |

| Pretest Equal |       |       |      |       |       |       |       |
|---------------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| variances     | 1.068 | 31.89 | .293 | 1.118 | 1.046 | -1.01 | 3.249 |
| not assumed   |       |       |      |       |       |       |       |

Table no 13 and table no 14 show the results of independent samples t-test to identify differences in mean scores of pre-test scores of control and experimental groups. Results show that there is no significant difference between mean scores of control group (M = 10.71, SD = 3.14) and experimental group (M = 9.59, SD = 2.96), t (1.068), df (31.89) and p > 0.05.

#### **Post-test Results**

Table 15

|                    |    | di dup statisti | LS .  |       |  |
|--------------------|----|-----------------|-------|-------|--|
| <b>Variable</b>    | N  | M               | S. D  | SEM   |  |
| Control Group      | 17 | 11.12           | 4.299 | 1.043 |  |
| Experimental Group | 17 | 19.88           | 3.314 | .804  |  |

Table 16
Independent Samples Test

|          | macpenaent samples Test           |        |                                |       |       |                     |                    |                            |                  |                                |
|----------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
|          |                                   | for Eq | e's Test<br>uality of<br>ances |       |       | 3                   |                    |                            |                  |                                |
|          |                                   | F      | Sig.                           | Т     | df    | Sig. (2-<br>tailed) | Mean<br>Difference | Std. Error<br>e Difference | Interva<br>Diffe | nfidence<br>al of the<br>rence |
|          |                                   |        |                                |       |       |                     |                    |                            | Lower            | Upper                          |
|          | Equal<br>variances<br>assumed     | 1.316  | .260                           | -6.66 | 32    | .000                | -8.765             | 1.317                      | -11.44           | -6.08                          |
| Posttest | Equal<br>variances<br>not assumed | l      |                                | -6.66 | 30.05 | .000                | -8.765             | 1.317                      | -11.45           | -6.07                          |

Table no 15 and 16 show the results of independent samples t-test to identify differences in mean scores of pre-test scores of control and experimental groups. Results show that there is significant difference between mean scores of control group (M = 11.12, SD = 4.29) and experimental group (M = 19.88, SD = 3.31), t (-6.66), df (30.05) and p< 0.05. Hence, hypothesis is approved.

The first hypothesis that there is an impact of activity based teaching on performance of experimental group with respect to achievement in listening was approved. Similarly, the second hypothesis that there is an impact of activity-based teaching on performance of experimental group with respect to achievement in speaking was also accepted. Likewise, the third hypothesis there is an impact of activity-based teaching on performance of experimental group with respect to achievement in reading was approved. Similarly, the fourth hypothesis that there is an impact of activity-based teaching on performance of experimental group with respect to achievement in writing was also accepted.

The Activity Based Teaching method implemented in the present study played a vital role in developing language skills of the learners. This method provided an interesting and enjoyable environment to the learners. Learners were comfortable while participating in activities. During this method of teaching learners learnt language through observations, feeling, listening, speaking, reading, writing discussing, imagining, investigating and reporting. They were able to memorize different things and were able to connect new information with previous knowledge. Understanding of the learners was improved as learners were provided with the environment where they could interpret, explain and apply

knowledge. Socializing was developed through Activity Based method of teaching as it provides learners to develop happy relationships between learners to learners and teacher to learners.

During the current study, it was noticed that in ABL learners were more responsible, disciplined and showed a good attitude towards Activity Based learning. Activity Based method of teaching is effective for teachers to develop their skills like time management and lesson planning. During the implementation of activity-based teaching in language classroom it was also observed that the majority of the learners were enthusiastic. Learners showed the spirit of teamwork and sharing attitude. Activity based teaching methodology was effective in developing other skills of the learners. Leadership ability, time management, critical thinking were the skills that were developed during implementation of activity based teaching. Similarly, working with peers this methodology was also helpful in developing confidence among learners.

Besides, researchers faced many challenges during the implementation of activity-based teaching. First of all, it was not easy to create an atmosphere in the language classroom that was essential for activity-based teaching. The second challenge was the seating arrangement of the learners as they were selected from a public school and there was a shortage of furniture in the school as well. Third, to motivate the learners to participate in activities as they were not taught like this way before. Fourth, to control the pair or group activities as it was not an easy task to observe all the learners at the same time. The fifth problem was to keep all learners in the classroom as the aim was to see the impact of teaching methodology on all learners. Therefore, it was essential for all learners to attend the class regularly. The sixth challenge was time management as activity-based teaching methodology takes more time to achieve learning outcomes. The seventh challenge was to maintain discipline during implementation of activity-based teaching. Similarly, Activity Based teaching methodology increases the workload of the teachers as teachers had to design variety of activities and they had to spend more time in monitoring and controlling the classroom activities.

# Conclusion

The current study was an effort to examine the impact of activity-based teaching in developing language skills of the primary learners. In the second language learning process the development of language skills is very important. Therefore, it must be given more importance. The use of activity-based teaching methods improves language skills of the learners and gives better results as compared to traditional methods of teaching. ABL makes the language learning process easier and more enjoyable for the learners. Pakistani language learners face many problems like ineffective learning environment, influence of mother language and large number of learners. These problems can be settled using the Activity Based method of teaching. The findings of the pre-test and post-test indicated that after treatment the learners who were taught through activity-based teaching performed better than those who were taught through traditional teaching method.

#### Recommendations

It was a pioneered research in district Gujrat of Pakistan which was conducted in order to improve language skills of the primary learners through Activity Based Teaching method at primary level but this method of teaching could be used for the elementary and secondary level learners. Furthermore, apart from English language learners, it could also be conducted for other subjects specially science subjects and mathematics. Moreover, the present study was conducted on male learners but could be done for female learners or mixed learners. Further, this study was conducted using learners of the school which is located in the city but it could be done for the learners studying in schools of village areas.

#### References

- Anwer, F. (2019). Activity-Based Teaching, Student Motivation and Academic Achievement. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 6(1), 154-170.
- Ahmad, A., Abulaban, A., Al Shawwa, L., Merdad, A., Baghlaf, S., Abu-shanab, J., Algethami, A. &Balkhoyor, A. (2015). Factors potentially influencing academic performance among medical students. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 6(1), 65.
- Deci, E. & Ryan, R. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227-268.
- Dissanayake, D. M. R. S., Alahakoon, A. M. Y. S., & Wijesinghe, W. A. D. S. K. (2020). *Activity Based Teaching Method for Effective English Language Teaching in Primary Education,* SSRN
- Goh, C. C. M. (2007). *Teaching speaking in the language classroom.* Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Golji, G. G., &Dangpe, A. K. D. (2016). Activity-based learning strategies (ABLS) as best practice for secondary mathematics teaching and learning. *International Advanced Journal of Teaching and Learning*, *2*(9), 106-116.
- Harfield, T., Davies, K., Hede, J., Panko, M. and Kenley, R. (2007). Activity based teaching for Unitec New Zealand construction students. Emirates Journal for Engineering Research, 12(1), 57-63.
- Kuzu, A. (2007). Views of preservice teachers on blog use for instruction and social interaction. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 8(3), 34-51.
- Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and minds: How we use language to think together.* Psychology Press.
- Nor, H. (2014). The techniques in teaching listening skill. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 4(1), 41-51.
- Oxford, R. L. (2001). "Language learning styles and strategies". In M. Celece-Murcia (Ed.), Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (3 ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle. *Thompson International*, pp. 359-366.
- Patil, Z. N. (2008). Rethinking the objectives of teaching English in Asia. *Asian EFL spJournal.10*(4), 227-240.
- Pinter, A. (2011). Children learning second languages. Springer.
- Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of engineering education*, 93(3), 223-231.
- Quin, Y. (2012). Impact of active learning in the classroom on academic achievement and motivation. *Innovation Magazine*, 11(1), 51-53.
- Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Richards, J. C., Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press

- Scrivener, J. (2005). Learning Teaching. Palgrave
- Singh, S. (2016). Developing speaking skill in English through activity based learning. *International Education and Research Journal*, *2*(7), 107-108.
- Stößlein, M., & Changchun, P. R. (2009). Activity-based Learning Experiences in Quantitative Research Methodology for (Time-Constrained) Young Scholars-Course Design and Effectiveness. In *POMS 20th Annual Conference, Orlando, Florida. USA* (pp. 1-33).
- Singal, N., Pedder, D., Malathy, D., Shanmugam, M., Manickavasagam, S. &Govindarasan, M. (2018). Insights from within activity based learning (ABL) classrooms in Tamil Nadu, India: Teachers perspectives and practices. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 60, 165-171.
- Watkins, P. (2007). *Learning to teach English: A practical introduction for new teachers.* New Delhi: Viva Books Private Limited.
- Zaremba, A. J. (2006). Speaking professionally. Canada: Thompson South-Western
- Zhang, Y. (2010). Cooperative language learning and foreign language learning and teaching. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(1), 81-83.