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ABSTRACT

The Punjab government decision for changing mode of teaching from Urdu to English created disturbance among the teachers. Because Urdu was being used as medium of instruction even prior to creation of Pakistan, so, it was difficult for teachers to modify their minds, for English as language of instruction. They showed less confidence in their capabilities and faced problems in adjusting themselves in new environment and while delivering education to the students efficiently. They should hesitate to absorb the change. Keeping in mind the situation, the present study was conducted to measure and compare the willingness, confidence level and self-efficacy beliefs among the teachers of Urdu and English, while teaching at secondary schools. The study to explore the self-efficacy beliefs of school teachers and make a comparison on the basis of medium of instruction. For the purpose, the sample of teachers who were teaching Urdu or English to any of the classes from 1-10 was taken. Use Survey method and for sampling Multistage stratified random sampling technique was used. Sample size was 864 with 432 male teachers and 432 female teachers form 216 randomly selected, form them these were 429 Urban and 435 rural teachers, 452 were teaching English and 412 Urdu selected primary, elementary and secondary schools of the nine districts selected from three administrative divisions of the Punjab province randomly. Data were collected using Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) developed by Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk (2001) For data collection the scale having 24 items on the three different sub scales were used the bilingual version of the questionnaire was used for the convenience of respondents and analyzed this data using independent samples t-test, two way and multivariate analysis of variance. The study revealed that teachers of Urdu had a higher level of self-efficacy as compared to teachers of English on the overall TSES scores as well as on the three sub-scales of the instrument.
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INTRODUCTION

In societies, where several languages are spoken, discussion on mode of education is common. Generally public is in favor of mother language as mode of education, while globalization is demanding a common language like English, among the nations for better coordination. Moreover, English is a widely used language in the field of science and technology, international business matters and communication (Nunan, 2003). In the
multifaceted nations such as Pakistan where Urdu is considered to be the national language the School Education Department declared 588 schools in phase I and 1764 in phase II as English medium, under the Education Sector Reforms of the Government of the Punjab. It was decided that from 1st April 2009, mathematics and science subjects from class 6th in the selected public sector high schools of the Punjab will be taught in English language (Directorate for staff Development 2010).

This system was also to be introduced in kindergarten classes of the other schools of primary education wing. Similarly, social studies were to be taught in English language, in the schools having facility of English teachers. Progressively, these schools were to be shifted from Urdu medium to English medium by ensuring that subjects like Urdu, Islamic studies, Arabic and other optional subjects are taught in national language. It was also decided that all public sector schools of highly populated cities having high literacy level like Lahore, Sialkot, Faisalabad, Sargodha and Multan will use English medium of instruction. Moreover, School Education Department of the Punjab planned to shift all the government institutions in the Punjab province from Urdu medium to English medium by the next year (Directorate of Staff Development 2010).

This instant shift of teaching language from Urdu to English have several problems like teacher’s abilities, motivation, incentives, knowledge about subjects and school environment itself, similarly, student’s behavior toward English as medium of study. Moreover, when medium of study is in foreign language, the quality of education depends upon the teacher’s expertise and proficiency over that foreign language (Jones 2001), because, teachers act as demonstrators both academically and socially as linguistic practitioners for the learners. Franklin (2000), argued that foreign language as a medium of instruction usually creates problem. On the other hand, if teacher’s language is the same as subject’s language, then teacher can effectively and easily teach the students and manage the class efficiently.

These hitches become more complicated for the teachers of public schools, which have students from diverse background, like socio-demographic and varying abilities in using English in different subjects (Ovando & Collier 2005). This situation demands for teachers to work in contrast to their proficient language and exhibit educational performance. Such difficult job generate unease among the teachers, which lead to disruptive personality, mental tension and stop teacher’s capabilities, and in turn hampers student’s academic achievement. So anxiety creating factors should be dealt with for better performance of the teachers. According to The Ohio State University, (2002). A number of teachers which are pathetic in English may suffer more than those teachers, who have command on this language, so this can affect the efficiency of weak teachers. Great sense of efficacy is one of the best recognized effective teacher’s attributes (Henson, Kogan, & Vacha-Haase, 2001).

The self-viability convictions among the educators make motivation, enthusiasm, achievements, and interest (Bandura 2007). People with high motivational power exhibit anticipated outcomes with higher performance and have grater courage to persist difficulties. In contrast, weak motivation among people creates hardship and hopelessness. Berman et al. (2007) argued that self-efficacy beliefs among teachers play a dynamic role in determining the projects effectiveness.
The Present study objective is to determine that, by settling these anxieties whether or not modification in mode of teaching is fruitful. The researcher envisioned to compare the self-efficacy beliefs among the teachers of class 1-10, by means of medium of teaching and to examine, whether the English teachers feel more proficient than the Urdu teacher.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Self-Efficacy

Bandura (2007), demarcated Self-efficacy as views in one’s abilities to inaugurate and attain the actions needed for attaining and managing the potential conditions. It means that people choose how to act according to their beliefs to achieve the targets and know about their abilities and knowledge pertaining to specific tasks (Pajares, 2002). Moreover, in many respects self-efficacy has a great importance; it aids people in making selections in their lives It provides courage and motivation to solve the problems and persist during catastrophes in life (Bandura, 2004).

Professed self-efficacy provides a sound base of social cognitive theory, as self-efficacy of the people affects alteration and variation for their own deeds and have vital role in their determinations (Bandura 2007, Maddux 2005). These beliefs decide whether individual is hoper or worrier and whether the behavior of the people is self-supporting or self-declining. Numerous studies found the positive relationship between Self-efficacy convictions and mankind’s establishment (Holden et al. 2000, Multy et al. 2005, Stajkovic & Luthans 2008).

Efficacy beliefs provide an automated motivation in achieving the aims, dealing with difficulties and anticipated outcomes. The self-efficacy beliefs develop the thought to act and react under worries and despair with courage, determination and braveness. It happens because these factors develop positive capabilities, welfares and ethics among the human beings, even in absence of previous experience (Bandura, 2001). Similarly, self-efficacy comprises of concepts having several magnitudes, powers and erratic stages. These efficacy beliefs are not static characteristics but vary according to an individual’s finding, enactments and accomplishments in a sure area and in a specific time. The association between individual’s previous knowledge, logic of self-efficacy, and upcoming recitals is resolute of the analysis of individual’s recital and not by the real enactment it.

Beliefs about Learning a Language

Researches have attempted to categorize beliefs and many other factors that influence language learning beliefs. Kalaja (2005) unveiled that learner’ convictions as capricious and depicted its fluctuation from individual to individual and starting with one setting then onto the next. Its base was originated from the perception of that learners’ prior knowledge which plays an important role in learning language. For instance, if one considers that knowledge of any language can be achieved by any person easily, then he has positive behavior toward learning the language as compared to others. Horwitz (2007), revealed that local circumstances act as participatory features toward the learning beliefs of the learners of the language. Wenden (2000), stated learners’ beliefs as knowledge which is deliberately acquired from teachers, parents or colleagues or
insensible attainment of it by perceiving or mocking. Outcome on language learning accomplishment is also acknowledged by the scholars.

Students capability of learning in the classroom is based on the student’s beliefs (Horwitz, 2000), thus the threatening necessities to deal with student’s beliefs has been propagated by the scholars (Rubin 2007). As per findings of Benson and Lor (2000), investigations regarding the small concepts of learner’s second language are termed metacognition for measuring the effects, progress and working attitude of the student’s beliefs.

Learner’s beliefs also depend upon their teacher’s beliefs. Kern (2005), matched learners and teacher’s beliefs and found that teacher’s beliefs influenced the learner’s beliefs to some degree and she established that learner’s beliefs changed to some extent with passage of time. Peacock (2008), sustained that new practices do not affect the learner’s beliefs. He examined the results by comparing the 158 English as Foreign Language (EFL) learners in a Hong Kong University and 30 EFL teacher’s beliefs by face to face meeting and direct contacts.

Several scholars are in agreement with Kalaja (2005) who described beliefs as unchanging and usually right. On the other hand, considered these as unstable because these are altered with the passage of time. Though, Mori (2000), stated that it should be kept in mind that beliefs do not change easily, it may take long time to alter. But, good teaching practices can modify them. Horwitz (2000) recommended that misapprehension should be avoided in student’s beliefs as these may affect the willpower of learning second language. Additionally, he recognized that learner’s willpower must be taken into consideration by the teachers. It provides continued aid to the learners for foreign language learning process. Educators have to recognize that the learner’s beliefs also affect the teaching methodology which in turn increases the learner’s beliefs (Peacock 2008, Mori 2000, Benson and Lor 2000).

The literature cited above, provides the base for the researchers to recognize the importance of the learner’s beliefs. Whether, these were changeable, constant or affected by the learner’s local environmental conditions, these beliefs act as vital role in the learning procedure of new things.

**Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Use of Strategy**

It is Peoples personal thinking about the particular things which help them in decision making. LaRose & Eastin (2000), considered it as self-assessment, effecting one’s activities, tries to do something and achieving desires. Moreover, how a learner sees his abilities in performing the works and educational targets and his self-efficacy was his thinking about his abilities to attain the task (Bandura, 2004).

As per studies (Multon, et al. 2005, Bandura & Pajares 2007, Stajkovic & Luthanus, 2008), the learner’s decision affects his enthusiasm, achievement and self-assessment. As internal inspiration and accomplishment are stimulated, then it affects the selection of learning techniques. Individuals try to refrain from those activities, which they thought out of control and try to act those, which they think is manageable by them easily (Yang, 2000).
Investigations revealed that learners with high level of self-efficacy frequently use different techniques. Pajares and Schunk (2001), stated extensive determination, higher perceptive and metacognitive approaches used by the learners with greater self-efficacy beliefs. Several researches have validated the strong effects of self-efficacy beliefs and educational accomplishments. it will be critical that self- viability is not a conclusion from claiming self-happening event. It grows progressively and several features like culture, family, education and society pay to achieve it.

Few researches find the relationship among self-efficacy beliefs and techniques applied. Wong and Chiu (2010), examined relationship between ESL (English Spoken and Listening) pre-service educators’ self-efficacy views and techniques exercised. The discoveries of this study disclosed the strong correlation among teachers’ higher self-efficacy beliefs and techniques used by them. Similar, results were found by the study conducted by Magogwe and Oliver (2007). Yang (2000), who found a close relationship between the learner’s self-efficacy beliefs and application of different techniques particularly efficient practical techniques exercised on 505 EFL Taiwanese university students.

Abedini et al. (2011), investigated the join amid beliefs, systems exercised and dialect ability of 203 Iranian undergraduates using Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) and The Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI), what’s more found dialect taking in convictions as interceding component in learners.’ classroom knowledge. Zare-ee (2011), explored culture as an explicit reflection in provoking beliefs and techniques exercised. Learners’ self-efficacy beliefs had link with all types of techniques besides metacognitive techniques.

**Influencing factors**

Influencing factors are classified in to two groups, first demographic and second contextual. The self-efficacy of the teachers in the context explicit perception is reliant on an explicit situation (Dellinger et al., 2008; Kass and Friedman, 2002). It may be effected by several elements such as management and school environment, associate’s observation and help, student’s physiognomies, corporal atmosphere, school level and so on (Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, 2007). These contextual factors possibly shed influences on the teacher’s self-efficacy. Demographic factors were comprised of age, gender, designation, educational degree, service length, married position, etc.

Several researches on the correlation of teacher’s self-efficacy to behavior of teachers and learning results has been conducted (Henson 2001; Khurshid, Qasmi & Ashraf 2012; Conger & Kanungo 2000; Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Lee, Dedrick & Smith, 2004; Smylie 2000; Pajares 2004; Wolters & Daugherty 2007).

Depending upon the researches on the teacher self-efficacy under those far reaching arrangement of circumstances, demographic features, emphasis on the outcomes of the teacher’s self-efficacy and its connection for location, gender, school level, designation, and service length trailed by the appraisal works carried to explore teacher’s self-efficacy during changeover period in the mode of teaching from the mother language to foreign language.
METHODOLOGY

Design of Research
This study was descriptive survey type. Quantitative approach was used to conduct this study. A quantitative approach provides valuable information if the researcher wants to apply the results of the study to the target population (Pallant 2011). Descriptive survey research inquiries about the incidence and style or scattering of variants; it is not influencing variants but includes describing (Tschannen-Moran, 2007).

Objective of the present research was to measure the self-efficacy of Urdu and English Teacher, so Teacher’s Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) was used for the collection of data.

Population
All the teachers of Urdu and English, from class I-X of all the public sector schools, irrespective of their designation teaching at primary, elementary and secondary level within the jurisdiction of Punjab province was the target population of the study. Only two teachers who were teaching Urdu or English teaching from class I-X in nine randomly selected districts from three administrative divisions of the Punjab, comprised the accessible population of the study.

Sampling
According to Holden et al. (2001), a sample in a study is the group from whom information is obtained, whereas according to Hoy (2007) sampling is a process of selecting subjects for a study in such a way that the subjects represent all the characteristics of the population from which they are being selected.

Sample was drawn by Multistage stratified random sampling technique from the accessible population. The procedure for constituting sample for this study consisted of the following steps.

- Only three divisions were randomly selected (Lahore, Gujranwala, Faisalabad)
- Three districts from each division were randomly selected.
- The districts selected thus were Lahore, Kasur, Sheikhpura, Gujranwala, Sailkot, Gujrat, Faisalabad, Chiniot and Jhang.
- All the government sector schools from each district were sub-divided into strata of primary, elementary, and secondary schools’ level.
- Each of these stratum was further sub-divided in to two sub-strata of urban schools and rural school on locale basis
- Then these sub-stratums were further split into boys’ and girls’ schools.
- Out of these schools, two English teachers and two Urdu teachers were selected randomly from both boys’ and girls’ schools.
Table 1
Randomly Selected Three Districts from Nine Administrative Divisions of the Punjab

| Sr.No. | Division   | Districts                          |
|--------|------------|------------------------------------|
| 1      | Lahore     | Lahore, Kasur and Sheikhupura      |
| 2      | Gujranwala | Gujranwala, Sialkot and Gujrat     |
| 3      | Faisalabad | Faisalabad, Chiniot and Jhang      |

From sample of males and female schools, researcher selected two Urdu teachers and two English teachers form each gender. All the teachers of the nominated 216 schools, who were teaching English or Urdu to class i to x, were selected as sample of the study.

Instrument of the Study
To measure the level of self-efficacy beliefs, among the target population, Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), established by Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk (2001), was adopted.

Collection of Data
The data was collected through personal visits to schools and help of some of friends and colleagues. Prearrangement for meeting with school teachers was made through telephonic calls to ensure their availability so that teachers may fill the questionnaire during their free periods. The telephonic calls were also made a reminder when questionnaires were left to be filled in later. This way data from 864 teachers were collected.

Data of Analysis
Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 21 was used for data processing and analysis. Following procedures was used for interpreting the data.

- T-test was applied to measure the mean value of self-efficacy score of Urdu and English school teachers.
- Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to assess the change in mean values on the three sub scales of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES).
- Two Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to measure the dissimilarity the mean self-efficacy values of Urdu and English teachers of secondary schools on the basis of gender, area, school level, teacher designation, and tenure of service.

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Table 2
Medium of Instruction Basis Distribution of Sample

| Distribution     | Respondents | N   | Percentage (%) |
|------------------|-------------|-----|----------------|
| Medium of instruction | English    | 452 | 52             |
|                   | Urdu        | 412 | 47             |
According to subject wise analysis 52% (452) teachers were English teacher, whereas, 48% (412) were teaching Urdu language.

T-value (11.618) was important at α=0.05 because p=0.000<α=0.05. Self-efficacy scores of Urdu and English teachers indicate noteworthy alteration amid their mean (Table 2).

| Mode of instruction | N   | M     | S.d  | M.d  | t-value | p-value |
|---------------------|-----|-------|------|------|---------|---------|
| Urdu Teacher        | 412 | 142.73 | 28.955 | 15.87 | 11.618  | 0.000*  |
| English Teacher     | 452 | 126.86 | 28.250 |       |         |         |

*p<0.05

Moreover, mean score, standard deviation and mean contrast score were expressed in Table 3. Vital mean change score indicated higher value of self-efficacy among the Urdu teachers as compared to English teachers.

| Scales                          | Mode of instruction | N   | Mean Score | St. Deviation | Mean Difference (UT-ET) | F-Value | Significance |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----|------------|---------------|------------------------|---------|--------------|
| Efficacy in Student Engagement  | Urdu Teacher        | 412 | 46.67      | 9.81          | 5.02                   | 122.09  | 0.000*       |
|                                 | English Teacher     | 452 | 41.54      | 9.66          |                        |         |              |
| Efficacy in Instructional Strategies | Urdu Teacher        | 412 | 48.27      | 10            | 5.42                   | 118.56  | 0.000*       |
|                                 | English Teacher     | 452 | 42.85      | 10.83         |                        |         |              |
| Efficacy in classroom management | Urdu Teacher        | 412 | 47.79      | 10.31         | 5.41                   | 127.08  | 0.000*       |
|                                 | English Teacher     | 452 | 42.48      | 9.46          |                        |         |              |

*p<0.05

That F-value over each sub-scale from claiming TSES in regards mode about educating help variances were stated to Table 4. These values identifying with mode for educating help shown that each sub-scales about TSES viz. Viability to pupil inclusion (F=122.09, p=0.000<0.01), viability clinched alongside showing arranging (F=118.56, p=0.000<0.01), Furthermore viability over schoolroom association (F=127.08, p=0.000<0.01) varies meaningfully On Urdu Furthermore English teachers’ self-viability convictions. Urdu teachers’ viability in pupil association (M=46.67, s.D. =9.81), viability over educating arranging (M=48.27, encountered with urban decay because of deindustrialization, engineering concocted, government lodge. D. =10.00),
Also viability on schoolroom association (M=47.79, s.D. =10.31) may be more terrific similarly as contrasted with English educators.

**FINDINGS**

As per outcomes of the data analysis by using the aforementioned analytical tests, the key results of this study were:

1. Apparent variance was observed between the mean scores of Urdu and English teachers. Substantial difference of the mean self-efficacy score indicated that Urdu were more Self-Efficacious as compared to English.
2. MANOVA outcomes indicated that that Urdu and English teachers vary considerably on (TSES) Scale. The measures of mean variance for the mode of teaching exposed that all the three sub-scales Efficacy in Student involvement, Efficacy in teaching and Efficacy in classroom organization. Additionally, Urdu teachers’ secured upper stage of self-Efficacy than English teachers regarding students involvement and classroom organization.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Conclusions were made after reviewing the outcomes of the study and detailed discussion of the findings of the research work as follows:

1. Urdu teacher had High level of self-efficacy in comparison to the English teachers. Which indicated that Urdu teachers recognize themselves more proficient and comfortable in execution of their responsibilities of teaching as compared to the English teachers?
2. Urdu teachers and English teachers both dissimilar level on the three sub-scales. The Urdu teachers showed greater value of self-efficacy in measurement of three sub-scales i.e. pupil’s involvement, teaching tactics, and classroom organization. Hence, Urdu teachers felt High level of contented and comfort in involving their students in class activities, planning better approaches to increase students’ interest in education, and handle complex situations in the school during teaching as compared to their colleagues i.e. English teachers.
3. No change was observed among the male teachers and female teachers, indicating similar level of self-efficacy among them. But, mode of teaching disclosed different results. Urdu teacher exhibit High level of self-efficacy regardless of gender in comparison to English teachers.

**DISCUSSION**

The current research work is a comparison between the self-efficacy beliefs of Urdu and English. The main objective of the current research was measure the effectiveness of teachers and to assess whether, the English teachers were proficient and feel comfort in teaching student in English as mode of teaching and achieve the desired results. The outcomes of the research questions formulated in the current study were discussed as below:
Urdu teachers showed greater value of self-efficacy in comparison to English teachers, which means, that Urdu teachers perceive themselves more proficient in teaching and attaining the desired results as compared to English teachers. The study in mother language promote enthusiasm among the students which encourage them to complete their education up to the high level and also increase the quality of education. However, Tung, Lam, and Tsang (2007), in their study conducted in Hong Kong, displayed the diverse outcomes. The teachers were fragmented according to their beliefs regarding mode of teaching. Some of the teachers thought mode of teaching in native language was more appropriate and they preferred local language as mode of study particularly during early stage education while others recommend that they more efficient while using both languages as medium of instruction.

The probable reason for this disagreement may be the differences among the societies. Pakistani society is a bilingual society, where local languages are widely spoken in parallel to Urdu as a national language. English and Arabic being the global language and religious language respectively have their significance. In this context, use of local language is common among the teachers in Pakistan. So, it seems natural that Urdu teachers thought themselves more capable and efficient in teaching as compared to English teachers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As per findings of the present study on the research topic, following recommendations were formulated.

1. The outcomes of present research along with earlier studies, revealed that medium of instruction in the local and national language exhibit more confidence level and enhance the proficiencies of the teachers in delivering the knowledge to the students as compared to the teachers of the English as foreign language. Thus policy of implementing English from the early classes may be revised to achieve the desired outcomes. It is further suggested that mode of teaching from class 1-10 may retained as Urdu.

2. English teachers may be trained further in lingual matter, teaching tracts, student involvement and organizational skills to enhance the self-efficacy level. However, the refresher courses should be for longer period to achieve the positive outcomes of the training.
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