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ABSTRACT

Communication skills include speaking, writing, reading and listening skills. These skills are equally important for the teachers to conduct teaching activities within the classrooms. The effective delivery of information among teachers could help students in improving their academic performance. This study was conducted to explore the communication skills of the teachers working on regular and contract basis in English medium schools in Lahore District. Total 84 teachers (42 regular and 42 contract teachers) participated in this study. Data were collected through questionnaire and analysed through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). T-test was applied to compare the communication skills of regular and contract teachers. Findings conclude that regular and contract teachers were statistically different regarding structured sentencing, non-verbal behaviors and speaking skills (P<0.05). Low professional qualification, job insecurity, lack of pre-service and in-service trainings, interest and increased curriculum responsibilities were the significant factors (P<0.05) impeding the development of communications skills among regular and contract-based teachers. This study urges that a concrete pre-service and in-service training programs should be arranged across the educational institutions for the development of teachers. This study has strong implications for the all-educational institutions carrying teaching activities.
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INTRODUCTION
Communication skills was described as the dissemination of message that contains the mutual understanding between the frameworks in which communication process occurs (Saunders and Mills, 1999). Without any doubt, communication skills are inevitable in professional discourse. For the teachers, the communication skills and abilities are viewed more important because the effective communication skills enable teacher to handle the teaching process very effectively (Hinkel and Fotos, 2001). Speaking, writing, listening and reading are the key skills under communication skills and teachers are supposed to master all these skills in order to conduct teaching sessions in best interest of students. The effective communication skills help teachers to undertake education well in order, manage classroom activities, interact with the students in a classroom and motivate students towards learning process (Bee, 2012).

Teacher is the one who determines the academic performance of the students. The qualities, abilities and attributes are integral in teaching and learning process. Thus, it is indispensable for the teachers to develop key skills such as communication skills in order to expedite the teaching process. Teachers communication skills had significant impact on academic performance and
achievements of the students (Khan et al., 2017). Of the many important attributes like knowledge and attitude, communication skills remain prominent (Okoli, 2017). Zlatić et al. (2014) explored that communication competence is the widely discussed and an important attribute. The communication process involves non-verbal, verbal and para-verbal components and it is designed to mediate students and teacher’s behavior. The effectiveness of the process increases with the depth of interaction that comes through the skills development (Muste, 2016). Zlatić et al. (2014) concluded that through interaction the communication competence increased.

The educational methods comprise teaching, training, discussion, storytelling and directed research. All these educational activities require some sort of expertise in communication of your messages. Learners may also educate themselves, but education often takes place under the supervision of educators (Watson et al., 2016). By and large, schooling is any contribution or act that has formative effect on character, mind and physical limit of an individual whereas the teachers matter colossal (Rogoff et al., 2016).

Considering the present situation in Govt. and Private Institutions (where permanent and contract-based teachers are assigning the same duties) it was necessary to check the competencies of teachers working on regular basis. The intensity of the study is also inclined toward identification and prioritization of factors that are creating hindrance in the development of efficient need-based framework for the training and capacity building of both contract based and permanent educational personals. According to nature of contract based and regular appointed teachers the authoritative worker/teachers full uncertain viewing their employment when contrasted with general educators. It looked out, that what kind of execution is being given by the standard and in addition contract based educational personals. It investigated that what is the effect on the teaching methodologies, it is possible that they are increasing admirably from authoritative or customary teachers.

METHODOLOGY
This study was quantitative in nature. The population of the study comprise of all the schools in District Lahore where medium of instruction in English. List of all teachers (contract based and permanent) was obtained from all the schools who meet the criteria of having English as medium of instruction and where some teachers are permanent and some teachers are on contact. Purposive sampling method was used for the selection of sample. Non-Proportionate stratified sampling technique was used for selection of respondents from the available total population of teachers from the selected schools. A sample size of 84 respondents was obtained (42 regular and 42 contracts based appointed teachers) at 95% confidence level and by maintaining the confidence interval 8 by using online available software www.suveysystem.com.

Interview schedule was considered as suitable method for the collection of relevant data from the selected respondents. The interview schedule was prepared in English, open ended as well as close ended questions were incorporated. An interview schedule measured the process of communication as an element of social interaction; in particular, the individual’s ability to listen, to empathize, to understand, to manage angry feelings, to express oneself, and to communicate skilfully were explored. A number of research articles were reviewed regarding the related topics. The interview schedule that was developed in the present study has used before by Prozesky (2014) and Okoli (2017). The variables and standard communicational competency assessment method was adopted to ensure the accuracy of the analysis. Before collection of final data, the developed interview schedule was pre-tested on 20 respondents (other than the sampled respondents). Content validity and face validity was assured by consultation with experts. Reliability was tested by calculating Cronbach’s alpha value that was 0.87. For processing and analyzing data, the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) program was used. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, mean, and standard deviation were calculated for conclusions and results. T-test was applied for the comparative analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Table 1 indicates that of the total respondents 54.8% were male and 45.2% were female. Among total respondents, 40.5% of respondents were aged under 40 years followed by 59.5% aged more than 40 years. In context of educational level, more than half (56.0%) of respondent had academic qualification of Masters or equivalent and 44.0% of respondents’ academic qualification was M.Phil. This indicates that the
respondents were well qualified indeed and supposed to have good communication skills. Apart from the academic education, the respondents had professional education as well. Of the total respondents, 34.5% had B. Ed and one fifth (20.2%) of respondents had M. Ed. These teachers would be having more expertise and well learned with the modern day needs of the teaching. Though, the major chunk didn’t have additional professional education. The results regarding professional experience indicated that 14.3% of respondents were considerably new in the field as they had experience of 1 to 5 years. One fifth (20.2%) of respondents had 6-10 years of professional experience. Half of the respondents were experienced of 11-20 years and 15.5% of respondents were most experienced as they were involved in teaching from 21-25 years. Perhaps these most experienced teachers would be more skilled and effective in communication while using English as medium. In the meantime, these seniors might be sources of learning for the new ones. Of the total respondents, 16.7% of the respondents belonged to rural and 83.3% had urban background. The background had a significant association with the development of teachers. The urban environment often renders adequate facilities and opportunities to the individuals to learn and improved. Conversely, the rural areas had lesser opportunities and inadequate facilities obligatory for the individual to grow.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of respondents.

| Demographic Characters       | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender                      |           |            |
| Male                        | 46        | 54.8       |
| Female                      | 38        | 45.2       |
| Age Group                   |           |            |
| Below 40                    | 34        | 40.5       |
| 40 years and above          | 50        | 59.5       |
| Educational qualification   |           |            |
| Masters or equivalent       | 47        | 56.0       |
| M. Phil                     | 37        | 44.0       |
| Professional qualification  |           |            |
| B. Ed                       | 29        | 34.5       |
| M. Ed                       | 17        | 20.2       |
| No M.Ed or B.Ed             | 38        | 45.2       |
| Professional Experience     |           |            |
| 1 to 5 years                | 12        | 14.3       |
| 6 to 10 years               | 17        | 20.2       |
| 11 to 20 years              | 42        | 50.0       |
| 21 to 25 years              | 13        | 15.5       |
| Background                  |           |            |
| Rural Area                  | 14        | 16.7       |
| Urban Area                  | 70        | 83.3       |

**Level of communicational competency**

Communication competence refers to the knowledge of effective and appropriate communication patterns and the ability to use and adapt that knowledge in various contexts. The present study was focused on communicational competencies of English language; therefore, the respondents were explored regarding communicational competencies while considering the standard communicational competencies strands (Table 2).

Table 2 shows that four variables including linguistics, strategic communicational competencies, socio linguistic and discourse were considered as important in communication competency. There was a statistical difference regarding sentence structure between the regular and contractual teachers (P<0.05). The mean difference indicate that contractual teachers had more
skills of sentence structuring as compared to regular teachers. There was non-significant difference regarding vocabulary, language conviction and grammar command between the regular and contractual teachers. The mean difference indicate that contractual teachers were more skillful. Gartmeier et al. (2016) endorsed that it is imperative for the teachers to get language conviction ability as disseminating knowledge in simple and clear form is onus to teachers.

Table 2. Communication competencies of Regular and Contract based teachers.

| Communicational competency variables                  | Regular Teachers       | Contract based teachers | T-Statistics |
|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
|                                                      | Mean ± SD              | Mean ± SD               |              |
| **Linguistics**                                      |                        |                         |              |
| Vocabulary                                           | 3.18±1.31              | 4.05±1.25               | -1.300       |
| Language conviction                                  | 3.30±1.37              | 3.50±1.43               | 1.017        |
| Sentence structuring                                 | 3.01±1.26              | 3.25±1.35               | -2.682*      |
| Grammar command                                      | 3.10±1.21              | 3.86±1.37               | -0.794       |
| **Strategic communicational competencies**           |                        |                         |              |
| Overcoming language gaps                             | 3.18±1.31              | 3.12±1.47               | -0.914       |
| Plan for communication                               | 2.30±1.37              | 3.96±1.04               | 0.302        |
| Self-evaluation during communication                 | 2.11±1.58              | 3.10±1.98               | -0.825       |
| Achieve conventional fluency                         | 3.05±1.03              | 2.45±1.53               | 1.000        |
| Modify text for audiences’ purpose                   | 3.51±0.95              | 3.63±1.23               | -1.031       |
| **Socio linguistic**                                 |                        |                         |              |
| Having awareness of cultural norms                   | 3.18±1.31              | 2.98±1.75               | 0.237        |
| Social language rules                                | 3.30±1.37              | 2.36±1.96               | 2.034        |
| Non-verbal behavior                                  | 3.01±1.26              | 3.45±1.28               | 1.035*       |
| Cultural reference                                   | 3.10±1.21              | 2.56±1.13               | -0.525       |
| **Discourse**                                        |                        |                         |              |
| Speaking                                             | 3.56±1.42              | 3.32±1.56               | 1.868*       |
| Writing                                              | 3.10±1.78              | 3.75±1.28               | 0.090        |

In context of strategic communicational competencies, there was a non-significant difference (P>0.05) between the regular and contractual teachers regarding overcoming language gaps, plan for communication, self-evaluation during communication, achieve conventional fluency and modify text for audiences’ purpose. The t-values were just marginal and indicated a meager difference of skills. Thus, regular and contractual teachers were more or less equal in strategic communicational competencies. Findings are contrary to those of Rider and Keefer (2006) as he found that the permanent teachers had more strategic communicational competencies as compared to contractual teachers. In context of socio-linguistic approach, there was a significant difference between regular and contractual teachers regarding non-verbal behavior (P<0.05). The t-value of 1.035 indicates that the difference was adequate and contractual teachers had more skills of non-verbal communication skills. Perhaps, the contractual teachers were more inclined towards development of their communication skills because the good communication skills would help them to achieve job security and excel their professional career. Findings are consonant with those of Siegal (1996) as he maintained that social factors have significant influence on the linguistic competencies. For those countries where English is not their native language, the professionals learn it for many reasons. With the passage of time the socio-linguistic competencies improved for the professionals. Whereas the beginners often lack in these skills. Celce-Murcia (1995) had reported that less experiences and newly inducted teaching faculty had inadequate socio linguistic abilities. There was a non-significant difference between
the regular and contractual teachers regarding awareness of cultural norms, social language rules and cultural difference (P > 0.05). There was a significant mean difference regarding speaking (P < 0.05) skills of regular and contractual teachers. The regular teachers had more ability to speak well in English language as compared to contractual teachers. Perhaps, the regular teachers remain the regular part of teaching and different educational activities such as seminars and workshops. These kinds of educational activities usually involve audiences of different genre which allowed the regular teachers to get more grip on speaking as compared to the contract-based teachers.

Table 3. Factors hindering the communication competencies development among regular and contract-based teachers.

| Hindrance factors                        | Regular teachers | Contract based teachers | T-statistics |
|------------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Low professional qualification           | 3.67±1.04        | 4.25±1.65               | -2.061*      |
| Formal trainings on English language     | 3.11±0.96        | 4.02±0.98               | 1.289        |
| Job insecurity                          | 2.12±1.89        | 4.89±0.56               | -3.873*      |
| Financial instability                   | 2.52±1.58        | 3.76±1.13               | -0.928       |
| Infrastructure and environment           | 3.14±1.06        | 3.21±1.08               | -1.074       |
| Lack of parental support                 | 2.05±1.92        | 3.58±1.05               | 0.432        |
| Home Environment                         | 3.16±1.52        | 3.32±1.07               | -0.822       |
| Division of responsibility              | 2.12±1.82        | 3.34±1.40               | -1.653       |
| Less command on subject                 | 2.08±1.58        | 3.23±1.18               | -1.359       |
| Lack of pre service and in-service training | 2.62±1.63     | 3.53±0.96               | -2.926*      |
| Less interest                           | 2.14±1.95        | 3.66±0.93               | 1.589*       |
| Lack of facilities (A.V. Aids)           | 2.85±1.65        | 3.46±1.09               | -0.620       |
| Increased curriculum responsibility      | 2.54±1.82        | 3.22±1.17               | 2.562*       |
| Student teacher interaction             | 1.83±1.78        | 3.17±1.32               | 0.133        |

Table 3 shows the different factors hindering the development of communicational competencies among regular and contract teachers. There were different factors as perceived by the teachers whereas the perceived effect was different as well for the regular and contractual teachers. There was a significant difference (P < 0.05) regarding low professional qualification as a limiting factor. This indicate that both group of teachers had different perceptions. For the contractual teachers, having low professional qualification was one of the key factors limiting their ability of communication. This further accentuate that with the increasing level of professional education there will be more development of communication abilities. Job insecurity was another factor showing a significant difference (P < 0.05). The t-value of -3.873 indicate a significant and increasing difference in the perception of two groups of teachers. Contractual teachers had more job insecurity and they perceived it impacting their abilities significantly. There was a significant mean difference regarding infrastructure and environment (P < 0.05). The infrastructure and environment, if conducive, persuades the teachers to grow and learn. Contrary, the inverse environment can develop the discouragement among teachers. Lack of pre-service and in-service training had the significant mean difference (P < 0.05). The teachers perceived that organizing pre-service and in-service training can guide the teachers to acquire the modern-day competencies. The pre-service training could help the aspirants to mold their skills whereas in-service programs could enlarge the skills of regular teachers in best interest of students and the institution. Increased curriculum responsibility was significant (P < 0.05). This implies that if the teachers are kept involved only in curriculum and teaching activities the other skills may get affect. In order to generate the communication competencies, it is imperative to stay part of extracurricular activities, seminars and different type of trainings. The contractual teachers had more reservations as compared to regular teachers as mean values explained.
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS
This study accentuates that communications skills are obligatory to achieve for the teachers for teaching and learning process. There was a significant mean difference between the skills of regular and contract-based teachers such as structured sentencing, non-verbal behaviors and speaking skills (P<0.05). Most of the attributes of communication skills were non-significant. This implies that regular and contract-based teachers were more or less similar in skills. Low professional qualification, job insecurity, lack of pre-service and in-service trainings, interest and increased curriculum responsibilities were the significant factors (P<0.05) were the leading factors impeding the development of communications skills among regular and contract-based teachers. It is suggested that there should be same accountability standard for both regular and contract-based staff. Capacity building of teachers will be also helpful tool regarding enhancement of competency of teachers.
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