

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF L2 SPEAKING PROFICIENCY AMONG PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN LAHORE, PAKISTAN

Sabah Aslam

MPhil scholar, University of education

Sidra Bukhari

Lecturer, University of Education Bank Road Campus

sidra.bukhari@ue.edu.pk

Tayabba Yasmin

Associate Professor, University of Education Bank Road Campus

tayyaba.yasmin@ue.edu.pk

Syeda Ayesha Siddiq

Forman Christian College (A Chartered University)

syedaayeshasiddiq91@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the factors that influence L2 speaking proficiency in 9th and 10th grade students at public and private secondary schools in Lahore, Pakistan. The study focuses on the effect of schooling type and the role of teaching methodologies and the medium of instruction in developing students' English-speaking proficiency. A quantitative cross-sectional descriptive research design was employed. The sample comprised 80 students, including 40 students from public schools and 40 students from private schools. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire and analyzed through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data, while an Independent Samples t-test and Simple Linear Regression Analysis were employed to examine the research objectives. The findings revealed that private school students demonstrated comparatively higher L2 speaking proficiency than public school students. The results further indicated that teaching methodologies and the medium of instruction significantly influenced students' speaking proficiency. Greater exposure to communicative teaching practices and English-medium classroom interaction contributed positively to oral language development, whereas traditional teaching methods and frequent use of Urdu limited opportunities for effective English communication. The study concludes that improving communicative teaching practices, strengthening English language exposure, and providing continuous teacher professional development can enhance students' L2 speaking proficiency at the secondary school level.

Keywords: *L2 Speaking Proficiency, Public Schools, Private Schools, Teaching Methodologies, Medium of Instruction, English Language Learning.*

Introduction

English has become the dominant language of international communication, education, business, science, and technology. In countries where English is taught as a second language, the ability to communicate effectively in English has become an essential academic and professional requirement. Among the four language skills, speaking is regarded as one of the most challenging because it requires learners to use vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and confidence simultaneously.

Therefore, improving L2 speaking proficiency has become one of the major goals of English language education in many developing countries, including Pakistan.

In business, science, technology, education, and international communication, English has emerged as the primary language. In nations where English is taught as a second language, proficiency in the language has become a prerequisite for employment and education. Speaking is thought to be one of the most difficult of the four language skills since it necessitates the simultaneous use of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and confidence. As a result, increasing L2 speaking ability has emerged as one of the main objectives of English language instruction in many developing nations, including Pakistan.

Teaching methodology is another important factor that influences second language learning. Modern communicative approaches encourage learners to participate actively in classroom interaction, whereas traditional teacher-centered approaches often emphasize grammar translation, memorization, and examination preparation. Similarly, the medium of instruction adopted in schools determines the amount of exposure students receive to English during classroom learning. Greater exposure to English may enhance learners' confidence and improve speaking proficiency.

Although numerous studies have examined factors affecting English language learning, comparatively fewer studies have investigated how school type and teaching methodologies jointly influence L2 speaking proficiency among secondary school students in Punjab. Understanding these relationships can provide valuable evidence for educators, curriculum developers, school administrators, and policymakers to improve English language teaching practices.

Therefore, the present study focuses specifically on examining the influence of schooling type (public versus private) and teaching methodologies together with the medium of instruction on the L2 speaking proficiency of secondary school students in Punjab.

Statement of the Problem

English speaking proficiency remains one of the weakest language skills among secondary school students in Punjab despite many years of formal English instruction. Pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary usage, grammatical accuracy, and oral communication are all areas where students frequently struggle. The differences in instructional strategies used in various classrooms and school systems could be one explanation.

Public and private schools differ in instructional environments, availability of learning resources, classroom interaction, and language exposure. Likewise, differences in teaching methodologies and the medium of instruction may influence opportunities for students to practice spoken English. However, limited empirical evidence is available regarding how these factors affect L2 speaking proficiency among secondary school students in Punjab.

Objectives of the Study

The study aims to achieve the following objectives:

- To look into how Punjab's L2 speaking proficiency is affected by public versus private education.
- To investigate how instructional strategies and the medium of instruction affect students' ability to speak in a second language.

Research Questions

The study addresses the following research questions:

- What is the effect of different schooling types (public versus private) on L2 speaking proficiency in Punjab?
- How do teaching methodologies and the medium of instruction shape students' L2 speaking proficiency?

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study are expected to contribute to English language education by providing empirical evidence regarding the influence of schooling type and teaching methodologies on students' speaking proficiency. The study will help educators choose better teaching strategies that encourage oral English communication. The results can be used by school administrators to enhance teacher professional development initiatives and classroom language practices. The results may also be useful to curriculum designers when creating communicative English language programs. The findings can also be used by educational policymakers to develop plans for improving English language teaching in Punjab's secondary schools.

Delimitations of the Study

The study is delimited to secondary school students studying in public and private schools in Punjab. It focuses exclusively on two independent variables: schooling type and teaching methodologies together with the medium of instruction. The dependent variable of the study is L2 speaking proficiency. Other potential factors influencing speaking proficiency are beyond the scope of the present investigation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Role of Schooling Types in L2 Speaking Proficiency

The degree of language proficiency among students in Grades 9 and 10, particularly in speaking, is greatly influenced by the type of schooling. In Pakistan, as in many other nations, there is a significant disparity between the public and private education systems, with the latter being thought to have better resources and learning environments (Bashir, 2020). On the other hand, public schools in Pakistan are frequently underfunded, overcrowded, and occasionally lack the facilities necessary to promote language development (Bajwa and Ahmed, 2019).

The speaking proficiency of Grades 9 and 10 students is also improved when English is used as the language of instruction in majority of private schools giving them a greater language immersion (Zahid and Raza, 2017). Also, multimedia resources such as interactive whiteboards and language labs, are usually more available in private schools to teach language effectively (Raza and Akhtar, 2016). Conversely, the Pakistani education system places a heavy emphasis on traditional system of teaching in schools, including rote memorization and grammar-centered classes, which do not necessarily help students to train their speaking skills (Bashir, 2020).

The quality of teachers and teaching methods is another distinction between public and private schools. Teachers in private schools might have received more training in English language instruction techniques like task-based learning and communicative language teaching (CLT). These methods emphasize interaction, fluency, and everyday communication as crucial components of learning to speak. In contrast, public school teachers are more likely to employ traditional teaching methods, such as grammar-translation approaches, which prioritize reading and writing over speaking. Students' oral skills will be significantly impacted by this methodological gap.

According to research, students' speaking proficiency will increase if language instruction is delivered in an interactive manner; conversely, if it is delivered in a traditional manner, students' speaking proficiency will be limited because they are unable to use language communicatively (Bukhari and Shakir, 2021; Ahmed et al. is.

Impact of Teaching Methodologies on L2 Speaking Skills

The teaching practices used in L2 classrooms have an extensive influence on students' speaking proficiency. Among the many language teaching approaches, communicative language teaching (CLT) is well known for emphasizing the development of speaking abilities. CLT emphasizes the use of language in everyday communication, which fosters engagement and motivates students to make meaningful use of the language. According to Richards (2017), CLT is focused on learning through tasks, where students are involved in a variety of tasks, including role-plays, discussions, and problem-solving exercises. Through these exercises, students can improve their fluency and practice speaking in authentic

TBLT has worked especially well in the context of Pakistan, particularly, in case of private schools, where teachers have the means and expertise to make the application successful (Bajwa and Ahmed, 2019). On contrary, education at Pakistani elementary schools can be characterized by use of traditional and grammar-focused teaching that can deprive students of chances to practice speaking (Raza and Akhtar, 2016).

Although the Direct Method has its benefits, it is not always appropriate for students who are inexperienced in using English, particularly when the context in which students use the method is not rich in English. Where English is the sole language of instruction in classrooms, many learners face difficulties in comprehending instructions. This may create anxiety and confusion and lower participation. Hence, some researchers have advocated a balanced or eclectic approach which involves the use of both the Direct Method and L1 support, if needed. This flexibility helps students to understand and at the same time provides opportunities for speaking practice (Harmer, 2015; Littlewood, 2014; Alqahtani, 2018).

Teaching Methodologies and Medium of Instruction in L2 Speaking Development

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has become a pedagogical approach that prioritizes interaction with learners, meaning making, and communication in real life. CLT is not only about grammatical correctness, but about communicative competence. It includes role play, group discussion, information gap and problem-solving tasks to require students to practice their language in contexts that are real. Research studies in Pakistan have shown that students who are exposed to CLT have shown marked improvements in fluency, confidence and speaking skills when compared with the traditional approach. For instance, significant improvements in communicative competence and oral proficiency were observed in the university students after being taught with the CLT approach (Memon et al., 2025; Bashir et al., 2025; Kinnaird et al., 2021).

The persistence of GTM in Pakistan can be attributed to a number of factors, including its compatibility with the examination system and its perceived ease of implementation. Teachers prefer GTM because it allows them to teach large classes and complete the curriculum quickly. Additionally, this method emphasizes memorization and test preparation, which appeals to parents and students. However, this emphasis on accuracy limits the amount of fluency development that is acceptable and required for communication in the real world. The idea of GTM should be

abandoned in favor of more interactive teaching strategies because studies have shown that an excessive reliance on GTM causes a gap between language knowledge and communicative competence (Nasreen et al. 2024; Bukhari & Shakir, 2021; Siddique and Zahid, 2025).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

In this study, which employed a cross-sectional research design, the researcher examined the impact of public and private schooling on L2 speaking proficiency in students in Lahore's ninth and tenth grades. An observational research technique called cross-sectional design compares the variations and correlations between variables that are present in the population at a specific point in time without altering the research environment. Because it enables researchers to compare different groups in their natural environments and obtain a realistic picture of the situation as it appears in the field, the design is frequently used in educational research.

The researcher was able to collect the data at a single time, so that the data collection process is efficient, and at the same time the researcher is able to get meaningful and comparable results from the responses of learners in each group. Nonetheless, comparing multiple groups under comparable circumstances is one benefit of the cross-sectional design. This study's objective was to compare the L2 speaking abilities of students attending public and private schools. By evaluating both groups during the same academic period, time-related variables like curriculum changes and academic differences are minimized. This made it possible to compare the speaking abilities of the different educational programs more validly without relying on time-related variables.

Research Method

The type of research applied in this study is quantitative research which is appropriate in gathering measurable data that can be subjected to statistical analysis. Quantitative studies are especially advantageous when there are some relationships between variables, including type of schooling (public or private) and speaking proficiency in L2 (Creswell, 2014).

The study was also in a position to find data on speaking proficiency of students, teaching methodologies as well as motivational and institutional factors through structured questionnaires and surveys. These tools were designed so that all of the participants' data was comparable and easily comparable. In quantitative research, statistical tools can be used to systematically analyze data, allowing for the generalization of findings to a larger population.

Bryman (2016) states that quantitative research techniques are the best to determine correlations and test hypotheses, so that they could be used to evaluate the impact of certain variables (such as teaching style or institutional support) on speaking skills. Moreover, approach offers the objectivity required to examine the factors without the researcher bias, which guarantees the reliability and validity of findings.

Setting of Research

The study was carried out in Lahore, which is capital city of Punjab in Pakistan and education is a miniature of national system. The city of Lahore was chosen due to its variety of educational options, both state and privately made, and provided a unique chance to understand difference in L2 speaking proficiency in different educational environments (Zahid and Raza, 2017). The research has taken three privates and three

government schools and this was given a representative sample of educational diversity of Lahore.

Lahore is also an eclectic socio-economic neighborhood, where the students of different backgrounds study in public schools and private ones. This setting made it possible to look into how socioeconomic factors affect second language proficiency, which is crucial in countries like Pakistan where socioeconomic status is one of the factors that determines access to and the quality of education (Ali and Khan, 2018). Due to research conducted in the Lahore region, the study was able to compare the various school types and their individual effects on language learning, specifically in the case of second language acquisition.

Participants

The research was conducted among 9th and 10th graders, since at this age the students are at the decisive age in secondary school and are supposed to be well versed with English and in English speaking at least. The number of students chosen to take part in study was 80 with 40 students from government schools and 40 students from private schools. Random sampling was used to select the participants so as to represent a balanced sample of students in two types of schools.

The emphasis on public and private school students is critical as it would analyse the variation in L2 speaking proficiency because of teaching methods, resources and institutional considerations. In addition to eliminating gender bias, the inclusion of both male and female students ensures that the results are inclusive and relevant to all students in the area. In the research, Cohen et al. (2018) make the assumption that random sampling will increase the sample's representativeness and allow the results to be extrapolated to a larger group of secondary school students.

Research Instruments

The research instruments were to obtain various fragments of data related to the factors which influenced the L2 speaking proficiency. The instruments were a demographic survey, self-reported L2 speaking proficiency and questionnaires which addressed the areas of teaching methods, motivation, and institutional support. The self-rating test on speaking proficiency was informed by Nageen et al. (2025) who evaluated the levels of L2 speaking proficiency through a 6-point scale, where A1 (beginning) is the lowest score, and C2 (proficient) is the highest score. This scale provided the students with the chance to rate their personal speaking ability in a clear and standardized way.

A structured questionnaire, based on that of Awan and Shafi (2016), was applied to measure teaching methodologies and factors of school environment. The questionnaire contained the statements connected with the teaching practice, anxiety with the use of language and contentment with the existing instructional approach. In same way, to measure the motivational factors, questionnaire was based on statements reworded by Berges-Puyo (2018) differentiating extrinsic and intrinsic motivations. These measures were selected because they were proven to be reliable in related studies (Awan and Shafi, 2016; Berges-Puyo, 2018) and can easily collect the necessary data.

Data Collection

The process of data collection was conducted within four weeks where the questionnaires were administered to participants in a school environment. The process was designed in a way that all the students were given explicit information on how to fill out the instruments. Prior to commencement of data collection process, students

and their parents were informed about the study and were given consent to participate in it, therefore, ethical considerations were met. In order to reduce the possibility of biasing, data collection was put in a standard format when collecting data, all participants were included without considering whether they are in public or the private schools.

The standardization involved the use of same instructions, administration of surveys in a similar setting, and taking all questionnaires within same time. According to Cohen *et al.* (2018), such a method also introduces uniformity in data gathering, a factor that is essential in sustaining the validity and reliability of findings.

Reliability Analysis

Reliability analysis was conducted to examine the internal consistency of the research instrument used in the present study. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was employed to determine the reliability of each scale included in the questionnaire. According to Hair *et al.* (2010), a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.70 or above indicates acceptable reliability, whereas values exceeding 0.80 demonstrate good internal consistency.

The Teaching Methodologies and Medium of Instruction scale consisted of 12 items and yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.825, indicating a high level of internal consistency. This suggests that the questionnaire items designed to measure classroom teaching practices and the medium of instruction consistently assessed the intended construct. The reliability coefficient confirms that the scale was appropriate for evaluating instructional practices influencing students' L2 speaking proficiency.

The Oral Proficiency scale comprised 12 items and produced a Cronbach's alpha of 0.866, demonstrating excellent internal consistency. The items measuring fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, and interactive speaking skills were highly consistent in assessing students' L2 speaking proficiency. Therefore, the scale was considered a reliable measure of oral proficiency.

Overall, the reliability coefficients of both scales exceeded the recommended threshold of 0.70, indicating that the research instrument possessed satisfactory internal consistency and was suitable for subsequent statistical analyses.

Table 3.1
Reliability Analysis

Scale	Total Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
Teaching Methodologies and Medium of Instruction	12	0.825
Oral Proficiency (L2 Speaking Proficiency)	12	0.866

RESULTS

Demographic Information

Table 4.1 presents the demographic characteristics of study sample, which consists of 80 participants. The gender distribution in sample shows that 30 boys (37.5%) and 50 girls (62.5%) participated in study. The mean gender value is 1.62 with a SD = 0.48. This indicates that a larger proportion of sample was female, which reflects the general enrollment trends in schools in Lahore, where girls tend to outnumber boys in secondary education (Zahid & Raza, 2017). The mean value suggests that the gender categories were relatively well-balanced, though there is a higher representation of girls.

The participants were grouped into three age categories: 13-14 years (32 students, 40.0%), 14-15 years (33 students, 41.3%), and 15-16 years (15 students, 18.8%). The mean age category is 1.78, with a SD = 0.74. This distribution indicates that the sample was largely composed of students in the age range of 13-15 years which is typical with 9th and 10th-grade students. This proportion of students in 1415 years of age is higher and depicts the age of the students in the middle years of secondary education in Pakistan.

The sample of the study was balanced (50-50) between the 9th grade students (40 students) and 10th grade students (40 students). The average of this variable is 1.55, SD = 0.50. The balance will ensure that the data gathered is reflective of the two grades and meaningful comparisons can be made between the two levels of secondary education.

The sample was also equal (40 students, 50%) in government and the private schools (40 students, 50%). The average of this variable is equal to 1.51 and SD = 0.50. Such a balanced sample will provide an opportunity to directly compare L2 speaking proficiency of students in Lahore who study in both public and private school systems and it is important to comprehend how the type of schooling affects language learning outcomes.

The second language speaking proficiency level of participants varied, with a range of levels from A1 (beginning) to C2 (proficient). The mean proficiency level is 3.25, corresponding to B1 (Pre-intermediate) level, with a SD = 1.73. The highest percentage of participants (21.2%) scored at the A1 and C1 levels, indicating a bimodal distribution where students are split between beginners and more advanced students. The A2 (elementary) level had 16 students (20%), while the B2 (upper-intermediate) and C2 (proficient) levels had 9 students each (11.3%). This distribution suggests that while there is a significant number of students who are at the beginning or intermediate stages of L2 speaking proficiency, there are also students who have reached advanced levels of proficiency.

Table 4.1: Demographic Information (N=80)

Variables		f	%	Mean	SD
Gender	Boys	30	37.5%	1.62	0.48
	Girls	50	62.5%		
Age	13-14 Year	32	40.0%	1.78	0.74
	14-15 Year	33	41.3%		
	15-16 Year	15	18.8%		
Class	9 th	40	50.0%	1.55	0.50
	10 th	40	50.0%		
School	Government	40	50.0%	1.51	0.50
	Private	40	50.0%		
L2 Speaking Proficiency Level (L2SPL)	A1: Beginning	17	21.2%	3.25	1.73
	A2: Elementary	16	20.0%		
	B1: Pre-intermediate	12	15.0%		
	B2: Upper-intermediate	9	11.3%		
	C1: Advanced	17	21.2%		
	C2: Proficient	9	11.3%		

Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.2 presents the descriptive statistics of Teaching Methodologies and Medium of Instruction (TMMI), based on responses of participants. The statement "You

translate the text of lesson from English to Urdu" has a $M = 3.27$ with a $SD = 1.413$. This indicates that, on average, students somewhat agree with the practice of translating lessons from English to Urdu. The relatively high standard deviation suggests that there is variability in students' experiences or preferences regarding translation. Similarly, statement "You learn English grammar tense rules in Urdu and then convert the sentences into English" has a $M = 2.55$ and a $SD = 1.157$. This lower mean indicates a moderate tendency to rely on Urdu for learning grammar rules, though the relatively smaller standard deviation suggests more consistency in this practice.

The statement, you understand lesson when your teacher teaches you in Urdu, had the greatest $M = 3.90$ and $SD = 1.074$ meaning that students strongly agree with the notion that they understand lessons better when they are taught in Urdu. This is indicative of the general trend in most Pakistani classrooms where Urdu is the main language of instruction especially in state schools.

The same tendency can be observed in statement You speak in English language with your teacher and friends where the value of $M = 3.90$ and $SD = 1.074$ was obtained. This implies that though students can speak English when communicating with teachers and classmates, still there is still a trend of teaching in Urdu in other areas of learning process.

The helping book statement You learn the essays or stories which your teacher told you to learn has a $M = 2.81$ $SD = 1.526$. This shows a moderate propensity to memorize essays and stories but there is quite a range of variation in the way students approach such tasks. In the same way, statement "You like creative writing activities in writing skills rather than memorizing essays or stories" had a $M = 2.73$ and a $SD = 1.393$. This indicates that, not extremely high, students tend more towards creative writing assignments than rote memorization.

In terms of classroom involvement, statement "You ask questions during the period" received a $M = 3.28$ and $SD = 1.485$. This indicates that the students tend to be comfortable about asking questions, although there is a variation in the degree of their active participation in the learning process. The other interesting activity, you like to act on dialogues during communication skills got a $M = 3.41$ and $SD = 1.446$ indicating that there was moderate interest in performing dialogues during language learning activities.

The statement, "Are you satisfied with the present teaching style of your teacher of English subject?" had a $M = 3.37$ and a $SD = 1.296$. This indicates that students are generally satisfied with the current teaching style, though the standard deviation suggests some level of dissatisfaction or differences in opinion.

Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics of Teaching Methodologies and Medium of Instruction (TMMI)

Statements	Mean	SD
You translate the text of lesson from English to Urdu.	3.27	1.413
You learn English grammar tense rules in Urdu and then convert the sentences in to English.	2.55	1.157
You understand lesson when your teacher teaches you in Urdu.	3.90	1.074
You learn the essays or stories which your teacher told you to learn from helping book.	2.81	1.526
You like to fill in blanks which are taken from the text.	2.58	1.472
You ask question during period.	3.28	1.485

You take lesson in English language instead of Urdu.	2.27	1.232
You speak in English language with your teacher and friends.	3.90	1.074
You can better understand lesson when your teacher teaches you in English language instead of Urdu.	2.86	1.481
You like to act on dialogues during communication skills.	3.41	1.446
You prefer to creative writing tasks in writing skills instead of memorizing essays or stories.	2.73	1.393
Are you satisfied with the present teaching style of your teacher of English subject?	3.37	1.296

Independent Samples T-test

Table 4.3 presents the results of t-test for equality of means conducted to compare the second language Speaking Proficiency Level (L2SPL) between students from public and private schools. The Levene's Test checks if the variances of two groups (public and private schools) are equal, which is an assumption of independent t-test. In this case, F value for Levene's Test is 0.000, and Sig. value is 1.000. A significant value (typically less than 0.05) would indicate unequal variances, but here, p-value is 1.000, meaning there is no significant difference in variances between the two groups. Therefore, we can assume equal variances and proceed with the t-test for equality of means under the assumption of equal variances.

The t-test compares the means of L2 speaking proficiency levels between the public and private school students. The t-value is 0.257, and df (degrees of freedom) is 78, which refers to number of participants in both groups. The p-value (Sig.) associated with the t-test is 0.798, which is much higher than the common alpha level of 0.05. This indicates that there is no significant difference between speaking proficiency of public and private school students. The 95% confidence interval (CI) for the difference in means is provided as -0.675 to 0.875, meaning we are 95% confident that the true mean difference in L2 speaking proficiency between public and private school students lies between -0.675 and 0.875. Since this confidence interval includes 0, it further suggests that there is no significant difference in speaking proficiency between the two groups.

Table 4.9: Effect Of Schooling Types (Public Vs. Private) on L2 Speaking Proficiency

		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig.	95% CI	
							Lower	Upper
L2SPL	Assumed	0.000	1.000	0.257	78	0.798	-0.675	0.875
	Not Assumed			0.257	77.9	0.798	-0.675	0.875

Regression

Table 4.4 presents the regression analysis results for the role of Teaching Methodologies and Medium of Instruction (TMMI) on L2 Speaking Proficiency Level (L2SPL). The unstandardized coefficient (B) for TMMI is -0.621, with a standard error of 0.322. This indicates that for every unit increase in TMMI, L2 Speaking Proficiency Level decreases by 0.621 units on average. However, this negative relationship suggests that teaching methodologies and medium of instruction may not be significantly impacting speaking proficiency, as seen in following results.

The standardized coefficient (Beta) for TMMI is -0.213, indicating a moderate, negative relationship between TMMI and L2 speaking proficiency. The standardized

beta coefficient allows for comparison of effect size of TMMI relative to other predictors in model. A negative beta suggests that better teaching methodologies and medium of instruction (measured by TMMI) might slightly reduce speaking proficiency, though the effect is weak.

The t-statistic for TMMI is -1.929, and p-value (Sig.) is 0.057, which is slightly above the commonly used significance level of 0.05. This means that the relationship between TMMI and L2 speaking proficiency is not statistically significant at the 5% level. Therefore, based on these results, we fail to reject the null hypothesis that TMMI has no significant effect on L2 speaking proficiency. Although the negative sign of coefficient suggests a possible relationship, lack of statistical significance indicates that this result may not hold true in broader population.

Table 4.10: Role of Teaching Methodologies and Medium of Instruction

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	5.164	1.010		5.112	0.000
TMMI	-0.621	0.322	-0.213	-1.929	0.057

Dependent Variable: L2 Speaking Proficiency Level

DISCUSSION

The demographic makeup of the study offers valuable information as to how the learners' characteristics might be connected to their development of L2 speaking skills. There was relatively equal distribution among age groups, grade levels and school types in the sample, enhancing the generalizability of the results. The higher female enrolment rate, however, is indicative of the wider educational trends in urban and semi-urban areas of Pakistan where the enrolment of females in secondary level is seen to be more than males. In previous studies, it has been suggested that in terms of language learning outcomes, the female learners tend to perform better in speaking than the male learners, because the female learners are likely to be more willing to engage in communicative activities and exhibit greater language learning motivation (Oxford, 2017; Ehrman & Oxford, 1995).

The results indicate that the traditional teaching methods are still prevalent in the English language classrooms, regarding the medium of instruction in the classes. In the classroom, the results showed that the traditional teaching methods are still the main teaching methods in the English language classroom, which concerns the medium of instruction in the classroom. The use of translation, Urdu explanation and grammatical reading suggests that Grammar Translation Method (GTM) is widely used in the educational system in South Asia, and historically prevalent method there. Despite places given to reading and writing accuracy, GTM offers little opportunity for students to engage in spontaneous speaking, limiting the development of their fluency (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011).

The results of oral proficiency show that students have a good level of speaking, but there is variation in each skill, including fluency, words used and grammatical correctness. Students speak with relative confidence in basic conversation and are somewhat less skillful in expressing themselves in more complex ways with more precise vocabulary and grammatical control in spontaneous discourse. One of the biggest challenges that come up with speaking fluently is vocabulary restrictions. Nation (2013) argues that vocabulary knowledge is one of the most important factors that influences speaking proficiency because learners need to have enough lexical

resources to be able to present their ideas clearly and accurately. Not having the words, he or she needs usually causes hesitation, pauses and ease in communication. Also, it is noted that with the difficulty in shifting between the formal and informal registers, the learners lack the pragmatic competence. Pragmatic competence is the ability to comprehend the language use in relation to social context which is very important for effective communication (Taguchi, 2015). This means that a learner might be grammatical but may not be communicative.

The result shows the students' own problems in acquiring the skill of speaking are pronunciation problems, grammatical errors, hesitations, and lack of fluency in speaking. Pronunciation problems are especially important, consistent with the cross-linguistic influence theory that posits that the phonological systems differences between the native language and the target language make problems persist (Derwing & Munro, 2005). Learners also find it difficult in organizing their sentences and linking their ideas while speaking, showing that they lack the discourse competence.

CONCLUSION

This study examines the factors influencing L2 speaking proficiency among 9th and 10th grade students in public and private schools in Lahore, Pakistan. It focuses on teaching methodologies, student motivation, institutional support, and the challenges teachers and students face in developing English speaking skills. The findings indicate that L2 speaking proficiency is shaped by multiple interconnected factors, and clear differences exist between public and private school contexts. Teaching methodologies show a positive relationship with students' oral proficiency. However, their overall impact remains limited in producing strong gains in speaking performance.

The results also show that students' L2 speaking proficiency is influenced by the type of schooling. Due to increased exposure to the English language, smaller class sizes, and more interactive teaching methods, private schools offer comparatively better opportunities for speaking skill development. On the other hand, there are few opportunities for meaningful English speaking practice because many public schools still use traditional teaching methods and Urdu as the primary language of classroom communication. The results also show that improving students' oral English proficiency at the secondary school level can be greatly aided by closing the instructional practice gap between public and private schools.

Recommendation

1. Teachers require continuous professional development to effectively adopt Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) approaches. These methods should focus on interactive speaking activities and real-life communication tasks. Both public and private schools need to promote student-centered teaching strategies that actively engage learners in spoken English use.
2. Communicative and task-based speaking activities should be adopted in English language classrooms to give learners frequent chances to engage in real life oral interaction in educational institutions. Practice pair work, group discussion, role plays, presentations and problem-solving activities to enhance fluency, confidence and communicative competence.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, T., & Aslam, M. (2019). *Exploring students' attitudes towards English language learning: A case study from Pakistan*. *Journal of Educational Research*, 8(2), 112-124.

- Abbasi, M. H., & Farshad, M. (2023). Testing speaking skills in an undergraduate ESL classroom in Pakistan. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 4(4), 345–352.
- Adamson, L. (2024). Fear and shame: Students' experiences in English-medium secondary classrooms in Tanzania. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(8), 3275–3290.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Multilingual Matters.
- Bashir, M., Azeem, M., & Dogar, A. H. (2025). Effectiveness of communicative language teaching approach in developing speaking skills at secondary level in Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 16(2), 45–56.
- Bashir, R. (2020). The influence of schooling type on language proficiency: A comparative study of public and private schools in Pakistan. *Pakistani Journal of Education*, 37(1), 42-58.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D., & Goodwin, J. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Clément, R. (1980). Ethnicity, contact and communicative competence in a second language. In H. Giles, W. P. Robinson, & P. M. Smith (Eds.), *Language: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 147–154). Pergamon Press.
- Coleman, H. (2011). *Teaching and learning in Pakistan: The role of English*. British Council Report.
- Ellis, R. (2018). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold.
- Gardner, R. C. (2010). *Motivation and second language acquisition*. Peter Lang.
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning*. Newbury House.
- Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Haryati, S. (2019). An analysis of students' problems in learning English at SMKN 1 SimpangEmpat. *University of Muhammadiyah Malang*.
- Heng, D., Pang, S., & Em, S. (2023). Challenges of teaching mixed-ability EFL classes: A study of two private schools. *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)*, 6(3), 591–604.
- Heywood, J. (2000). *Assessment in higher education: Student learning, teaching, programmes, and institutions* (Vol. 56). Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

- Kazim, S., Raza, M., & Iqbal, Z. (2025). Impact of traditional grammar translation method on English speaking skills at secondary school level. *Journal of Development and Social Sciences*, 6(1), 210–223.
- Laufer, B., & Nation, I. S. P. (1999). Vocabulary size and use. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(2), 223–246.
- Lemos, R. D. S., & Hartati, E. (2021). Revealing pre-service teachers' reading skills by utilizing CEFR in their self-assessment. *JET (Journal of English Teaching) Adi Buana*, 6(01), 87–97.
- Liaqat, F., Islam, M., Azim, M. U., & Lodhi, A. S. (2025). Investigating academic resilience in learning English: An ecological context of undergraduate students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1467544.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2015). *The role of teacher education in improving English language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2017). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Yasmeen, A., Khan, A. N., & Gul, M. (2024). The influence of parents and institutions on English language proficiency. *Research Journal of Social Sciences and Economics Review*.