Role of Siraiki in Teaching/Learning English at Graduation Level: A Case Study from the Southern Punjab, Pakistan

| Muhammad Ahsan* | Zahoor Hussain† | Noshaba Younus‡ |

Abstract

The focus of the present research was to find out the Role of Siraiki Language in Teaching/Learning English Language at graduation Level. By this study the researcher attempted to expose the intentions for which the students and instructors make use of Siraiki in their English language classroom inside and outside activities and in the same way, to show the actions and the situations in which they select for not using their L1. To explore a clear comprehension of the current subject matter, the research targeted on the 577 students and the 156 teachers. Data was collected through questionnaires. The data was examined through SPSS (statistical package for social sciences) 23 version. Data were inspected using descriptive analysis, Analysis of variance (ANOVA), T-Test and Cronbach's alpha. The findings of the present study showed that the students and the teachers indicated highly positive perceptions concerning the use of Siraiki language in EFL classroom.

Key Words: Teaching, Learning, Siraiki, Grammar, Assignments

Introduction

First language of a person may aptly be defined as the mother tongue or native language and all these phrases are used as alteration. On the other hand, this does not mean that they are always used to show the similar goal in other surroundings. In the similar way, the sphere of this term and reveals that these expressions may refer either to the language acquired first in early life or to a language which was acquired later but has come to be the dominant one, extends Stern (1983). Mother tongue is the language one reflects in, the language one dreams in and the language one computes in (Kangas, 1981). She makes four categories of the characteristics of mother tongue. Firstly, the "origin" (the language learnt first) secondly, the "competence" (the language known best) thirdly, the "function" (the language used most) and lastly, the "attitude" (the language one identifies with and is identified by others as a native speaker of). L1 is the language which someone attains in early years and which in general becomes his/her natural instrument of thought and communication (UNESCO, 1953; cited in Hamers & Blanc, 2000). For the purpose of this research, all the above discussed terms will be used to show the language attained first at home or institution in youth. English language has the status of being an international language so, according to some researchers and writers, it is no longer the carrier of a singular culture. For example, English as an international language does not belong to any single culture, so that non-native speakers do not require internalizing the cultural norms of native speakers, states Smith (1976) cited in McKay, 2000). He is of the opinion that the learning of any language is totally about learning how to practice it appropriately and acceptably according to the norms of the native speaker. On the other hand, some others view that a language cannot be taught without the prior knowledge of a target culture. A language and its cultural knowledge are highly indivisible, thinks Lademann (1992), p.13 cited in Zaid, 1999). He states that language students should have the prior knowledge of the social background and cultural and behavioural styles of the members of the L2 language culture. This pleads the question of the possible cultural divergence L2 students would experience when being taught by instructors from different cultural backgrounds, as when Muslim students in Pakistan are taught

---

*Lecturer, Department of English, Ghazi University Dera Ghazi Khan, KP, Pakistan.
Email: mahsan@gudgk.edu.pk
†Lecturer, Department of English, Bahaudin Zakariya University, Layya Campus, Punjab, Pakistan.
‡Instructor, Department of English, Riphah International University Faisalabad Campus, Punjab, Pakistan.

the teaching materials that have been designed in the Western countries without particular regard to Muslim expectations, norms, and values. One of the multifarious problems is the cultural foundation of the teaching/learning process, states McKay (2004) in her debate of western culture and the teaching of English as an international language. She clearly says that in spite of the growth in learning English as an international language, a number of countries discard the addition of western culture, its norms and values in teaching syllabus and texts, at the same time as some others give importance and promote them. Individuals who support the addition of western culture in materials in the L2 classrooms include language teachers such as Adaskou, Britten, and Fahsi (1990), cited in McKay, 2004) who offer the argument for having a cultural element in language teaching that it can support international understanding, make deeper an understanding of one's own culture and motivate students and learners by facilitating their visits to foreign countries and motivate learners.

However, McKay presents Japan as an example of a country that puts in its own cultural content into English teaching materials. Suzuki (1979) wrote" Japan, as an international power, has no need for western culture or to follow everything western in order to learn", in his bestseller: "why the Japanese people are no good at English". In his opinion, the acceptance of the values inherent in the teaching texts is a form of mental colonization. This study, however, does not explore the political and cultural implications of L2 teaching in Pakistan in detail. Yet, the reality that bilingual/multilingual non-native English-speaking teachers in Pakistan provide their learners a completely different set of cultural understandings in the way that they teach, interact and speak with learners and in their choice of materials and languages.

Learners' Mother Tongue use in the Target Language Context

Gardner and Lambert (1972) state that a learner carries higher motivation when he/she initially gets into a language classroom, whether instrumental, or integrative, or both. Things are not so straightforward to make a distinction, once learning has started. His or her initial accomplishment may raise higher motivation which, in response, will urge the student to give more preference, time and effort to his/her learning and to achieve more success, thus forming a supreme domain. A ferocious circle is also equally possible, however. When particularly adult learners, start focusing a language class, they bring motivation as well as some anxiety also. They are unfamiliar to second language and are not sure whether they will be successful or fail in learning it. For those who are beginners, the first a small number of classes are essential they should be a little challenging however, optimistically, not threatening. The main question here is how to boost and carry on the students' motivation. Claxton (l984) suggests that the teacher, to fulfill this, should offer what the student is ready to learn i.e., what he is willing to learn, not necessarily what he wants to learn. In due course the question is: are the adults capable of learning foreign language through L2 lonely? Maybe some are but many are not. In learning of English as a L2 or second language, for example, a Pakistani student in the United Kingdom, most of the learners, whether, they are proficient or not, will carry on learning since they have instant use of L2, in this case English in the U.K. In conditions where English is L2 or second language such as in Pakistan things to a certain extent are different. Many students who are not good at learning L2 may increasingly give up or plainly drop out because they, quite happily, can spend their lives in this world without learning L2. It is, moreover, highly difficult to cover the gulf between their restricted capability to converse in L2 and the ideas they desire to communicate if the class is instructed entirely in L2/second language. It is expected in this type of classroom that the teacher and the students have nothing to talk all the informal and in order to keep the learner's motivation up in a perfect sphere, proper use of mother tongue in the classroom is effective. A number of reasons for the students' propensity to use first language throughout the L2 lesson, points out (Harmer, 2009). Teacher, occasionally, calls learners to do something (e.g. to speak about a complicated subject matter) which they are not good at to manage with their less knowledge of the L2. In such a case the practice of the L1 is must. Teachers should think deeply about the actions they select in order to opt assignments corresponding with the learners` linguistic proficiency. In contrast the innumerable exercises of the uphill tasks which learners cannot undertake even with the great input can bring about a stress which can persistently cause hatred to the topic. The most natural way of expressing themselves for all the people is L1. It is widely used in each school curriculum and in the L2 lesson. Students use it without

thinking and repeatedly. It is because Harmer (2009) puts it in simple words that we try to make sense of a new linguistic (and conceptual) world through the linguistic world were previously familiar with. Similarly, mother tongue is the master key to foreign languages, the device which gives us most precise, the fastest, and most complete source of accessing a foreign language (Butzkamm, 2003). Learners use their mother tongue for explaining activities and tasks to other learners generally and frequently. The teacher can influence the students' use of their mother tongue over and over again. It is possible that students will carry out L1 as well, if teachers use L1 themselves. Harmer offers the very last reason that highlights the role of the individual learning styles and abilities as some students are capable to learn a L2 language with no use of their native language but for the others the mother tongue is a requirement. Students often keep away from using the target language for the reason that they do not want to feel uncomfortable about the mistakes they make, maintains Nation (2003). It can be positive to reassure the learners that in learning mistakes are an important part and that there is no need to feel disgraced. Harmer gives several motivating reasons but one more which he leaves unattended. Many students jump immediately to their mother language because they are slow learners. It is much easier for them to talk a bit in L1 and if there is no forfeit from the teacher, they will not see any reason why to discomfort themselves by searching proper English correspondents and will carry on in using the L1 every time they get a slot. For all compassionate teachers, this sort of situation should be a word of warning. Once teachers permit their students to do what they want they will face a huge problem with removing their mistakes. Every instructor of L2 should, consequently, prepare a list of the rules at the start and maintain time and again on its devotion during the whole course. For students who are not tremendously motivated, it may involve too much effort to try to understand, states Moon (2000).

Instructors' Drives for L1 Use in L2 Situation

If students bend to the L1 instead of speaking English, it is to a certain extent understandable. But the teacher faces the problem when he is the one who uses L1 more than it is needed. But the teachers have got a number of serious reasons even why they keep away from English. The first category belongs most probably to those teachers who are of the view that they come again to mother tongue in the classroom discussion because students do not understand them. This is true because learners really do not comprehend instantly. Every L2 teacher should understand that this is not the matter of a current situation but it is a long-term exercise which has to be increasingly developed. Atkinson (1993) acknowledges "In this situation translation could be the helpful means but it should be used only when it is essentially necessary". If students look absolutely confused, teachers cannot give up after a few unsuccessful lessons even. It is better at first to try some other techniques, like L2/target language demonstrations or definitions, and only when nothing of that works the teacher should use translation. Another usual cause refers to the fact that teachers are not sure about their linguistic capacities. They will use mother tongue/L1 rather than getting themselves into the shaming state by making errors while discussing in the target language. Such a situation when teachers do not have mastery in the language which they have to make learn can be very disagreeable.

The certainty about the pathetic L2/target language communicative proficiencies can result in the feelings of inferiority, puts Rahman (2006) in straight words. These teachers do not even partake in any further education in order to keep themselves aside from an embarrassment. But learners` knowledge of the L2 is much substandard, at the elementary school especially, so they are not competent enough to become enlightened of most of the mistakes. Atkinson (1993) states that it is further fruitful for L2 students to pay attention on faulty English rather than no English and he also proposes advice to the instructors not to think of too much care of their precision because such an extra care over and over again leads to more and more mistakes. In parallel Nation (2003) also expands the idea that good strategy could be to make a list of most frequent commands, sentences, and phrases because in this manner the role of the first language in the management of class can be reduced and the role of the target language maximized. Many instructors minimize the use of second language because it is very time-taking to explicate everything in the L2 (more specifically when the learners' level of mother tongue

is low) and the shortage of time in the lesson on one side and amount of syllabus they are assumed to teach on the other side do not let them such a waste of time. Moon (2000) has expressed the similar opinion that long explanations in the target language could consume too much time and resultantly learners of L2 could lose concentration and interest.

It is important to say, to wind up, that there are some suitable reasons and causes for using mother tongue in L2 teaching but some of them might look like lame excuses. When the use of mother tongue is justifiable and when it is not, teachers should attentively ponder over it. Through this discussion we can draw result that whenever L2 is not being used there should be a sound reason for this (Gill, 2005). Recognizing the idea that L1 in English classroom context is not just an exhibition of instructors' or learners' failure teachers could use it as an assisting instrument in the classroom interaction. It has to be determined, however, cautiously in which part of the teaching/learning process contribution of the learners' L1 language could be surely useful and in which it could work rather in a disorderly manner. Atkinson (1989) proposes that a number of classroom tasks in which it can be positive and productive to take an advantage of the mother tongue. The core aim of this study is also to extract the positive and productive ends of Siraiki language in teaching/learning English at degree level.

Research Questions

The current study contained the following research questions:

- What are the impacts of Siraiki language in learning process of English at graduation level?
- What are the effects of Siraiki language in teaching process of English at graduation level?

Methods and Materials

Since the purpose of the current research was to explore the role of Siraiki language in teaching/learning English language at graduation level. For this purpose, research methodology should include a description of participants, sampling plan, target institutions, and data collection procedures and instruments, all the above particulars are suggested by Beale (2002).

Therefore, the data collection tool used for this project were questionnaires, developed for L2 learners and their instructors. This procedure helped in collecting the huge amount of data from a large group of research participants. The selected localities of this study were government colleges and universities situated in the home division of the researcher and two other divisions like Multan and Bahawalpur, so it would be significantly effortless to develop a favorable bond with the respondents. Research participants were 577 (college and university students): 301 were male and 276 were female studying at their third- and fourth-year BS, BA/B.Sc., and B. Com in the 2015 academic year.

With the idea to determine the subjects' judgment of the use of Siraiki language in their L2 classes, the researcher developed Students' and teachers' questionnaires and it was the only data collection technique used in current research. These two questionnaires were constructed by the researcher keeping in view the studies by Elmetwally (2012), Al-jadidi, Husna S. (2009), Maniruzzaman (2003) and Rahman (2006) as models with slight modification on the basis of researcher's personal seven years of teaching experience and these few adaptations and modifications were also supported by Johnson (1992) who noted that "what makes a high-quality questionnaire is building on theory and earlier research; building on preceding work not only assists to improve the quality of tools but allows researchers to share the findings of similar studies to one another". The ended form of the questionnaires was the result of my own readings in the literature, joint with my own manifestations and understanding of the subject. In the same way, one of the most important purposes of these necessary modifications and adaptations was to appeal to the Pakistani context. The questionnaires had two parts i.e. demographic information and 75 statements which were based on the format of a typical five-level Likert item.

Demographic Data of Learner Participants

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage of Age Group of the Contributors

Age Groups	Frequency	Percentage
17-19 (years)	445	77

| 20-22 (years) | 132 | 23 |
| Total | 577 | 100.0 |

Table 1 shows data about the frequency and percentage of age group of the participants (students). The data of 577 respondents (male and female) was divided into two categories of age groups. In the first category of age group (17-19 years), there were 445 participants who were 77% of the total number. In the second category of age group (20-22 years), there were 132 respondents who were 23% of 577 respondents.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage of Gender of the Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Female	276	48
Male	301	52
Total	577	100.0

Table 2 displays data about frequency and percentage of gender of the participants. In this table the received data was divided into male and female categories and in the female gender category there were 276 respondents who were 48% of total 577 participants and in the male gender category 301 participants were included who were 52% of the total number of respondents.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage of Mother Tongue of L2 Learners

Mother Tongue	Frequency	Percentage
Urdu	168	29.1
Punjabi	65	11.3
Siraiki	322	55.8
Others (Blochi, Pushto & Rangri)	22	3.8
Total	577	100.0

The Table 3 exhibits data on the subject of frequency and percentage of mother tongue of the students. In this category the collected data was segregated into four sub-categories i.e. Urdu, Punjabi, Siraiki and other languages (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri). In the first sub-category 168 students responded their mother tongue as Urdu which was 29.1% of 577 participants. In the second sub-category 65 respondents replied their mother tongue as Punjabi and it was 11.3% of the total number. The third sub-category showed 322 participants who spoke Siraiki which was 55.8% of the total population. The fourth sub-category was the combination of Blochi, Pashto and Rangri languages and 22 students responded these languages as their mother tongue and this was 3.8% of the total selected population.

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage of Gender of the Participants (Teachers)

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	75	48.5
Female	81	51.5
Total	156	100

The Table 4 indicates the variable selected for the current study and this was the frequency and percentage of gender of the participants (teachers). In this table the received data was divided into male and female categories and in the male gender category there were 75 respondents which were 48.5% of total 156 participants and in the female gender category 81 participants were included which were 51.5% of the total number of respondents.

Table 5. Frequency and Percentage of the Participants Mother Tongue Wise (Teachers)

Mother tongue	Frequency	Percentage
Urdu	66	42.8

Punjabi	27	17.2
Siraiki	59	37.5
Others (Blochi, Pushto & Rangri)	04	2.5
Total	156	100

The Table 5 presents data on the subject of frequency and percentage of mother tongue of the teachers. In this variable the collected data was separated into four sub-categories i.e. Urdu, Punjabi, Siraiki and other languages of the region (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri). In the first sub-category 66 teachers responded their mother tongue as Urdu which was 42.8% of 156 participants. In the second sub-category 27 respondents replied their mother tongue as Punjabi and it was 17.2% of the total number. The third sub-category showed 59 participants who spoke Siraiki which was 37.5% of the total population. The fourth sub-category was the combination of Blochi, Pashto and Rangri languages and only 4 teachers responded these languages as their mother tongue and this was 2.5% of the total selected population.

Table 6. Mean Score criteria

High	**Strongly Agree**
	4.5 to 5.0
	Agree
	3.5 to 4.4
Medium	Sometime used
	2.5 to 3.4
Low	Disagree
	1.5 to 2.4
	Strongly Disagree
	1.0 to 1.4

The Table 6 leads toward the mean score; a criterion adopted from Oxford (1990) having the object of enhanced comprehension of the overall scale use and use of all categories. Such type of taxonomy has been a well-liked statistical analysis of the scale with all its categories. Hence the same criterion is adopted to enhance comprehension of the results current data analysis.

Table 7. Reliability of the Scale (Learners) = .939

Scale Category	**Reliability**
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.805
Impact of L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy	0.742
Reasoning of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.764
Situation & Atmosphere of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.825
Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.869

Table 8. Showing Frequency of Learners' reported on overall scale of L1 use in L2 pedagogy

	No. of students	**Mean**	**SD**
Overall scale L1 Use	577	3.47	0.71

In the Table 8 descriptive statistics indicated that the participants responded a High degree of L1 use in L2 learning but overall, near to the medium having the value (M=3.47, SD=0.71).

Table 9. Showing Frequency of Students' Reported on Five Categories of Scale (Students)

Scale Categories	**No. of students**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Frequency of category**
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2	577	3.44	0.51	Medium

Impact of L1 use in L2	577	3.41	0.55	High
Reasoning of L1 use in L2	577	3.39	0.54	Medium
Situation & Atmosphere of L1 use in L2	577	3.53	0.53	High
Contribution of L1 use in L2	577	3.57	0.61	High

Table 9 showing all five scale categories in the present study were used as High to medium range the most preferred category reported was Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.57, SD=0.61), Situations of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.53, SD=0.53),Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.44, SD=0.51),Impact of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy(M=3.41 SD=0.55) and the medium Reasoning of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy (M=3.39, SD=0.54).

Table 10. Reliability of the Scale (Teachers) = .935

Scale Category	Reliability
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.821
Impact of L1 Use on L2 Pedagogy	0.806
Reasoning of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.743
Situation & Atmosphere of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.778
Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	0.807

Table 11. Showing Frequency of Teachers' Reported on Overall Scale of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy

	No. of teachers	Mean	SD
Overall scale L1 Use	156	3.30	0.53

In the table 11 the descriptive statistics indicated that the participants responded a Medium degree of L1 use in L2 learning (M=3.30, SD=0.53).

Table 12. Showing Frequency of Teachers' Responses on Five Categories of Scale

Scale Categories	No. of Teachers	Mean	SD	Frequency Category
Perception & Belief of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.10	0.61	Medium
Impact of L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.32	0.45	Medium
Reasoning of L1 Use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.37	0.64	Medium
Situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.27	0.43	Medium
Contribution of L1 use in L2 Pedagogy	156	3.44	0.51	Medium

Table 12 showing all five scale categories in the present study were used as medium range the most preferred category reported was contribution of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.44, SD=0.51), reasoning of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.37, SD=0.64), impact of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.32, SD=0.45), situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2 pedagogy(M=3.27, SD=0.43) and perception & belief of L1 use in L2 pedagogy (M=3.10, SD=0.61).

Table 13. Showing Analysis of Variance ANOVA of Teachers' Mother Tongue with five Categories

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Perception	Between Groups	133.414	3	44.471	.348	.791
	Within Groups	19441.591	152	127.905		
	Total	19575.005	155			
Impact	Between Groups	879.370	3	293.123	2.226	.087
	Within Groups	20014.691	152	131.676		
	Total	20894.061	155			

Reasoning	Between Groups	562.789	3	187.596	3.758	.012
	Within Groups	7588.681	152	49.926		
	Total	8151.470	155			
Situation & Atmosphere	Between Groups	250.237	3	83.412	1.252	.293
	Within Groups	10125.417	152	66.615		
	Total	10375.654	155			
Contribution	Between Groups	344.370	3	114.790	2.755	.045
	Within Groups	6334.166	152	41.672		
	Total	6678.536	155			

Table 13 demonstrates the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of teachers' mother tongue with respect to five main scale categories. It reveals findings of the ANOVA with relation to respondents (teachers) of this study. The interaction of teachers' mother tongue with the sub-categories of the main scale category reveals statistically non-significant correlation of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 with F= .348 and P=.791, Impact of L1 use in L2 with F=2.226 and P=.087 but Reasoning of L1 use in L2 with F=3.758 and P=.012 showed statistically highly significant. The fourth sub-category, Situation and Atmosphere of L1 use in L2 with F=1.252 and P=.293 showed statistically non- significant. On the other hand, the fifth sub-category which is the Contribution of L1 use in L2 with F= 2.755 and P=.045 showed statistically significant.

Table 14. Showing ANOVA Results of Compare Mean Teachers' Mother Tongue Wise

Mother tongue		Perception	Impact	Reasoning	Situation	Contribution
Urdu	Mean	49.0704	64.3189	38.8508	41.7186	29.8697
	N	66	66	66	66	66
	Std. Deviation	11.13711	1.23854E1	6.97111	7.72964	5.99846
Punjabi	Mean	49.6776	66.3457	41.0627	42.3386	31.4259
	N	27	27	27	27	27
	Std. Deviation	13.18075	1.42846E1	8.36102	10.32754	8.09133
Siraiki	Mean	50.5613	68.6893	42.3507	43.8838	32.0508
	N	59	59	59	59	59
	Std. Deviation	10.73369	8.61213	6.52094	7.50812	6.12323
Others	Mean	45.7059	74.9167	47.2885	47.7500	37.9750
	N	4	4	4	4	4
	Std. Deviation	7.74537	1.20641E1	6.97682	8.14776	6.28510

Table 14 shows ANOVA mean results of Teachers' mother tongue wise. It illustrates that Siraiki language category has maximum mean value (M=50.561) than Punjabi language category (M=49.677), Urdu language category (M=49.070) and other languages category (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri) (M=45.705). Similarly, the impact of L1 use in L2 sub-category shows that other languages (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri) category has maximum value (M=74.916) than Siraiki language category (M=68.689), Punjabi language category (M=66.345) and Urdu language category (M= 64.318). The third sub-category which is the reasoning of L1 use in L2 reveals that other languages category (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri) has maximum value (M=47.288) than Siraiki language category (M=42.350), Punjabi language category (M=41.062) and Urdu language category (M=38.850). The situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2 category which is the fourth sub-category indicates that other languages (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri) also has the maximum value (M=47.750) than Siraiki language category (M=43.883), Punjabi language category (M=42.338) and Urdu language category (M=41.718). The fifth and last sub-category, which is the 'Contribution of L1 use in L2' category also strengthens the idea that other languages (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri) category carries the maximum value (M=37.975) than Siraiki

language category (M= 32.050), Punjabi language category (M= 31.425) and Urdu language category (M=29.869).

Table 15. Showing Analysis of Variance ANOVA learners' Mother Tongue with five Categories

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Perception	Between Groups	1538.771	3	512.924	3.681	.012
	Within Groups	79843.945	573	139.344		
	Total	81382.715	576			
Impact	Between Groups	479.906	3	159.969	2.684	.046
	Within Groups	34151.701	573	59.602		
	Total	34631.607	576			
Reasoning	Between Groups	171.801	3	57.267	1.013	.387
	Within Groups	32395.574	573	56.537		
	Total	32567.375	576			
Situation & Atmosphere	Between Groups	592.833	3	197.611	2.872	.036
	Within Groups	39432.497	573	68.818		
	Total	40025.330	576			
Contribution	Between Groups	107.730	3	35.910	.388	.762
	Within Groups	53022.248	573	92.534		
	Total	53129.978	576			

*. The Mean Difference is Significant at the 0.05 Level.

Table 15 indicates the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of students' mother tongue with respect to the main five scale categories. The interaction of students' mother tongue with the first sub-category reveals statistically most significant correlation of perception and belief of L1 use in L2 with F= 3.681and P=.012, the second sub-category also reveals statistically most significant correlation of the Impact of L1 use in L2 with F= 2.684 and P=.046 but reasoning of L1 use in L2 with F=1.013 and P=.387 showed statistically non- significant. Conversely to it, the fourth sub-category, situation and atmosphere of L1 use in L2 with F=2.872 and P=.036 showed statistically most significant correlation. But the fifth and the last sub-category which is the contribution of L1 use in L2 with F= .388 and P=.762 showed statistically non-significant correlation.

Table 16. Howing mean Comparison of Students' Mother's Tongue with five Categories

Mother's Tongue		Perception	Impact	Reasoning	Situation	Contribution	Mother's Tongue
Urdu	Mean	71.1642	43.0531	37.8457	42.2940	46.2942	
	N	168	168	168	168	168	
	Std. Deviation	11.12848	7.41740	6.94159	8.38439	9.05078	
Punjabi	Mean	68.6343	44.2055	36.4846	40.0544	45.6923	
	N	65	65	65	65	65	
	Std. Deviation	16.23856	9.21539	8.67170	8.79788	10.38233	
Siraiki	Mean	73.1111	44.9148	37.9332	43.2664	46.8321	
	N	322	322	322	322	322	
	Std. Deviation	11.25582	7.54756	7.56078	8.18538	9.63292	
Others	Mean	75.6839	46.4091	39.3561	43.3776	47.5877	
	N	22	22	22	22	22	
	Std. Deviation	8.77578	7.69250	7.51432	7.65882	11.24798	
Total	Mean	72.1380	44.3498	37.7988	42.6256	46.5759	
	N	577	577	577	577	577	

Std. Deviation	11.88652	7.75399	7.51935	8.33597	9.60414

Table 16 explains the results of mean comparison of students' mother tongue with the five sub-categories. The perception and belief of L1 use L2 sub-category indicates that other languages category (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri) has maximum mean value (M=75.683) than Siraiki language category (M=73.111), Urdu language category (M=71.164) and Punjabi language category (M=68.634). Similarly, the impact of L1 use in L2 sub-category shows that other languages (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri) category has maximum value (M=46.409) than Siraiki language category (M=44.914), Punjabi language category (M=44.205) and Urdu language category (M=43.053). The third sub-category which is the reasoning of L1 use in L2 reveals that other languages category (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri) has maximum value (M=39.356) than Siraiki language category (M=37.933), Urdu language category (M=37.845) and Punjabi language category (M=36.484). The atmosphere and situation of L1 use in L2 category which is the fourth sub-category indicates that other languages category (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri) also has the maximum value (M=43.377) than Siraiki language category (M=43.266), Urdu language category (M=42.294) and Punjabi language category (M=40.054). The fifth and last sub-category which is the 'Contribution of L1 use in L2' category also support the idea that other languages (Blochi, Pushto and Rangri) category carries the maximum value (M=47.587) than Siraiki language category (M= 46.832), Urdu language category (M= 46.294) and Punjabi language category (M=45.692).

Discussions on the Findings

The answers of the research questions and the discussion on those answers are as under:

RQ 1: What are the Impacts of Siraiki in Learning Process of English at Graduation Level?
The findings of the examined data showcased that the learners' mother tongue (Siraiki) has positive impacts on English/L2 learning. Outcomes of the research about the effects of Siraiki language use on learning process in English language classroom are from high to medium degree frequency. It describes that the learners consider highly constructive role of Siraiki language regarding L2 pedagogy. It is because they think that the involvement of Siraiki language is important as it saves time and makes English language learning process easier and faster. In the similar manner, they also think that Siraiki language gives them an efficient and accurate means for analyzing semantic features of words and their appropriate use in diverse contexts in the foreign language and it serves as a kind of cognitive support for helping me to remember what they had learned previously. Students are agreed that Siraiki language produces positive impacts on learning English grammar better when it is explained in their mother tongue and in the same way they are of the view that Siraiki language helps them to understand L2 idioms and expressions. The results of the study also resembled the research findings conducted by Schweers (1999). He is of the view that students believe that L1 offers an important role as a facilitating and supportive tool that helps and produces positive impacts on L2 learning.

RQ 2: What are the Effects of Siraiki Language in Teaching Process of English at Graduation Level?
The findings of the analyzed data reveal that the instructors' mother tongue (Siraiki language) has positive effects on L2 teaching. According to the research findings about the impacts of Siraiki language use on teaching process in L2 classroom, responses are from high to medium degree frequency. It shows that teachers consider the role of Siraiki language as highly positive regarding L2 pedagogy. It is because they think that the use of Siraiki language is important as it saves time and makes L2 teaching process easier. Similarly, they think that Siraiki language provides them an efficient and accurate means for analyzing semantic features of words and their appropriate use in diverse contexts in the foreign language and it serves as a kind of cognitive support for helping them to remember what they had taught and learned previously. Teachers and students are agreed that Siraiki language produces positive impacts on learning English grammar in a better way when it is explained in their own mother tongue and in the same line of action, they are of the view that it helps them to understand L2 idioms and expressions. The results of the study also resembled the research findings conducted by Schweers (1999). He is of the view that teachers and students believe that L1 offers an important role as a facilitating and supportive tool that helps and produces positive effects on L2 learning.

Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

The results of this study propose and suggest two promising inferences. First and the major one, it becomes visible from the findings that the teachers who partook in the current research used too much and showed highly positive perceptions toward the use of Urdu language in the foreign language classroom, which is advantageous for the L2 students and their learning to some extent. Heretofore, it was considered that the use of L1 may or may not be a facilitating tool or a language barrier. The maximum use of the foreign language should remain the main object and therefore, teachers and students should be conscious of the excessive use of Siraiki only to facilitate their teaching and learning activities. Secondly, it also comes into sight that it is so easy for teachers to use L1 not only as a useful teaching technique to solve uphill concept or situation, but as the main medium of instruction. This type of behavior in L2 classroom might be proved negative both for teachers and students. So, it can be summarized from the above discussion that the second language should remain the main focus to be used in the foreign language classroom with the limited and judicious use of Siraiki in some situations, however.

Contribution of the Study

Since this study attempted to reveal the role of Siraiki language in teaching/learning English language at Graduation level in the Southern Punjab, its implication curtailed from the following considerations:

1. The current study is contributory since it determines whether teachers and learners are ready to accept and use of Siraiki language in EFL classrooms.
2. Information from the current study concerning EFL learners' and teachers' attitudes toward using Siraiki language motivates learners and teachers in an L2 classroom.
3. This work would assist curriculum developers in designing appropriate syllabi to make EFL teaching and learning more beneficial in Pakistani context.
4. The use of Siraiki, in L2 situation contributes to learners' and teachers' potential development of meaning.

Limitations of the Study and Research Gaps

- The present study was delimited to find out the role of Siraiki language in teaching/learning English language at Graduation level. Reverse to it, in future research on this subject can be realized on school going and Postgraduate level L2 learners and their mentors at the same time for striking view point of the distinct sample.
- This study was conducted at the Government universities and colleges of the South Punjab. Contrary to this approach in future researches sub-campuses of public sector universities, Government schools, private universities, their sub-campuses, schools and colleges can also be merged for boosted understanding of the issue.

References

Adaskou, K., Britten, D., and Fahsi, B. (1990). Design decisions on the cultural content of a secondary English course for Morocco. *ELT Journal, 44*(1), 3-10.

Al-jadidi, Husna S. (2009). Teaching English as a foreign language in Oman: an exploration of English Language teaching pedagogy in tertiary education. PhD thesis, Victoria University.

Atkinson, D. (1989). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal, 41*(4), 241-247.

Atkinson, D. (1993). Teaching in the Target Language: A Problem in the Current Orthodoxy. *Language Learning Journal, 8*(93), 2-5.

Beale, J. (2002). Is communicative Language Teaching a thing of the Past? TESOL, 37(1), 12-16. Retrieved on September, 06th, 2008 on the World Wide Web: http://www.jasonbeal. essaypages/ clt _essay.html

Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. *Language Learning Journal, 28*, 29-39.

Claxton, G (1984) Live and Learn, Buckingham. *Open University Press.*

Elmetwally, E. E. (2012). Students' and teachers' attitudes toward the use of learners' mother tongue in English language classrooms in UAE public high schools. Unpublished Master's Thesis, The British University in Dubai, UAE.

Gardner, R., & Lambert, W. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. *Rowley, Mass., Newbury House.*

Gill, S. (2005). The L1 in the L2 classroom. Humanizing Language Teaching Major Articles, *76*(5). Retrieved February 24, 2006, from http://www.hltmag.co.uk/ sep05/mart03.htm

Harmer, J. (2009). The Practice of English Language Teaching. *Pearson Longman*, UK.

Johnson, K. E. (1992). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Reading Behaviour, 24*(1).

Kangas, S (1981) Bilingualism or not, Bank House, 8a Hill Road, clevedon, Avon BS21 7HH, England.

Lademann (1992) cited in Zaid, M. A. (1999). Cultural Confrontation and Cultural Acquisition in the EFL Classroom. IRAL, International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 37 2, 111-126.

Maniruzzaman, M. (2003). 'The use of mother tongue in the EFL classroom: learner's reaction.' Harvest: Jahangirnagar Studies in Literature, *18*.

McKay, S.L. (2004) Western culture and the teaching of English as an International Language (EIL). *English Language Teaching Forum 42(*2), 10–15.

Moon, J. (2000). Children Learning English. UK: Macmillan Heinemann.

Nation, P. (2003). The role of the first language in foreign language. Asian EFL Journal, 5(2), pp. 1-8.

Rahman, S. (2006). Speech Repertoires in Bangladesh: Monolingual or Multilingual, in ELT in Bangladesh: A Socio-psychological Study of Public and Private Universities in Dhaka, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Jawaharlal Nehru University. India.

Schweers, W. Jr. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 Classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 37*(2), 6 - 9.

Smith, L. (1976). English as an International Auxiliary Language. *RELC Journal, 7*(2), 38 − 42.

Stern, H. H. (1983). Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching. Oxford: *Oxford University Press*.

Suzuki, B.H. (1979) Multicultural education: What's it all about. *Integrateducation 17(*1-2):43-50.

UNESCO (1953). The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education, Paris, UNESCO.