The Criterion Cj

The Criterion
An International Journal in English

Quarterly Refereed & Indexed Open Access Journal

Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Vishwanath Bite

Managing Editor

Madhuri Bite

Diagnosing Oral Efficiency of L2 Learners of Engineering Students

L. Amutha
Part Time Scholar
Department of Linguistics
Bharathiyar University
Coimbatore 641046
&
Dr. P. Selvakumar
Associate Professor
Department of Linguistics
Bharathiyar university
Coimbatore 641046

Abstract

The case study is experimented to diagnose how the use of L2, as the medium of instruction in engineering colleges, has affected the learners' oral proficiency. The study is to find the factors which hamper learners' participation in speaking skill. The dearth of learners' oral proficiency in L2 lands them unemployment as L2 has become global and link language. The strategy and pedagogy style used in this experimental study will help the language teachers to adopt innovative methods to improve the learners' oral proficiency. This research will explain how students can be prepared for oral communication in the class. This describes teaching and practicing the linguistic factors; vocabulary, grammar, fluency, accuracy and body language that the learners will need for the speaking activity. This paper includes methodology, results analysis, findings, limitations and conclusions.

Statement and purpose of the study

Most schools and many language institutions aim to help their L2 learners pass local, national, and international examinations. Many of these examinations are written, with little or no speaking element in them. School teachers and students feel that speaking skills can not be observed and unimportant because it is much more important to get better writing skill for the examination. It is also easier to correct mistakes in written work, and teachers and students can more easily see their progress, or lack of it, in writing whereas speaking can be more difficult to mark as correct or not. However, speaking practice can assist students in learning linguistic components vocabulary, grammar, and fluency. Improving these components will help students advance their written communication also. Though many oral testing exist, they are out of reach for the rural based and first generation graduates and for economically poor status learners. Henceforth, the methodology carried out by the researcher is more accessible to all kinds of learners. The activity based testing strategy does not require more sophisticated and hi-tech based instruments or place. Therefore, it is not difficult for the language teachers of poor equipped rural background schools and colleges. The methodology tried out in this experimental study has more scope for the above mentioned second language learners.

Objectives of the Study

- To distinguish and compare the oral proficiency of participants in pre tests and post tests

- To involve slow learners with exemplary, eager enthusiastic students as role models and learn to grab the opportunities and encourage them to use the language freely in order to enhance their proficiency and accuracy in the language with confidence

Hypothesis

The researcher supports the task-based learning for the mixed ability learning classroom and also opposes the conventional chalk and talk methodology. Therefore, to find the efficiency, the pre and post tests paradigm is adopted.

Research Methodology

A language teacher should understand the importance of enhancing the students' delivery skills, increasing their confidence, and developing their methods of organization and out of box thinking skills. On the other hand, teachers as language testers, it is necessary to establish a careful research design. "Language teachers and language testers need a method which takes subjective qualitative observations and then transform them into objective quantitative measures" (Nakamura& Velans 2001).

An orientation program is conducted on the objectives and methodology for this experiment for Mechanical Engineering, Information Technology, Computer Science Engineering, Civil Engineering and Electrical and Electronics Engineering which are abbreviated in this study as follows (MECH, IT, CSE, CIVIL, and EEE) for this experiment. Then the target participants are granted permission to clarify the doubts in this regard and which are answered on the same day. It also explained the purpose of the researcher as well as the benefits of the target participants. The group of participants who respond to the questionnaire is only 60. Their ages range from 17 to 20 years.

In the design of the study, it is planned to utilize a meaningful sampling strategy that is to select twenty students for the class in order to maximize variation of social and economic background, field of study, location of schools, gender and age. It is explained that their participation in this study is voluntary and they have the right to depart voluntarily from the study at any time. And it is also ensured, that their participation would not affect their regular classes. The researcher highlights the benefits of taking part in the study, which includes reflection and awareness of their experience in learning English as a second language focusing on fluency, practice, and the opportunity to participate and promote their oral efficiency in this experimental study.

The data gathering method for this research composes of three parts. The first section of the questionnaire is the socio- economic information that requests personal and background information including the target participants' age, gender, residing place, place of birth, schools located, and their course discipline which is useful for the progress of the learner's English profile**(see appendix I).** The second part of the questionnaire focuses on learner's attitude towards English as a second language, expectations from the facilitators, or from the institution and their first preference among four skills namely LSRW **(see appendix II).** The third part consists of sample oral tests that are composed of two principal tasks such as: oral presentation and impromptu speech. Protocols and rating scales for the purpose of assessing learner's skills are also created.

Rating Scale and diagnostic tool for testing

According to Brown (2004), a well constructed test must have four basic characteristics. *The first* and most fundamental aspect is that "a test constitutes a method or instrument with a set of techniques, procedures, or items that requires a performance from the test taker" (p. 3). *Second,* a test has to measure either a general ability or a specific competency. For example, "a multi-skill proficiency test determines a general ability," such as speaking or listening, while a test on recognizing the correct use of verbs "measures specific knowledge" (p. 3). *Third,* a test measures a person's "ability, knowledge or performance" (p. 3). Brown indicates that it is important for the test administrators to understand their audience. Their backgrounds and experiences are relevant information to know if the test is developed according to their abilities. *Finally,* "a test measures performance, but its results imply the test takers' ability, or in other words, competence." (p.3). Underhill (1987) defines an oral test as a "repeatable procedure in which a learner speaks and is assessed on the basis of what he/she says (p. 7)".

In this experiment the marking scores could be awarded on the basis of speaking grading criteria as per American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL 1999). The range could be from 1,2,3,4, where Grade 4 is advanced- the speaker has exceptional communication skills, Grade 3 is intermediate- the evidence of very good language proficiency, Grade 2 is elementary- the speaker makes a number of lexical or grammatical errors and the speaker may depend too much on rehearsed phrase, Grade 1 is novice- the speaker has difficulty in expressing himself in anything other than short sentences. The selected components for the activities oral presentation and impromptu speech are vocabulary, fluency, delivery skills, oraganization of ideas, spontaneity, composing ability, body language and grammar.

The Sample Oral Test (SOT)
General Speaking proficiency structure for SOT

In the process of testing a language, there are fundamental step which particularly relate to how the researcher defines the test structure. Lado defines (as cited in Fulcher, 2003), speaking as construct, it must be associated with observable performance or features. In other words, a construct definition has to be operational, most importantly; the test purpose guides and helps build the definition. In this study, SOT has the purpose of assessing general speaking proficiency. Therefore, the construct has to be clearly defined in an operational way that constitutes general speaking proficiency. It must identify the specific types of features that contribute to the operational definition of speaking proficiency. For the purpose of simplifying the SOT, the study focused on different language competence: grammar, pronunciation, fluency, vocabulary, accuracy, clarity, and body language.

The act of speaking entails the "verbal use of language to communicate with others (Fulcher 2003, p.23). One's *pronunciation* needs to be good enough to deliver the message so that it is understood by the receiver. There are many acceptable varieties of English sounds. It varies from person to person and region to region. It does not matter what important is mutual intelligibility; the senders message must be understood by the receiver and vice-versa.

Fluency is the most important characteristic of effective oral communication. It is the natural flow of words without any unnecessary pauses and repetition. This natural flow of words or expression can come from the ability to compose and speak meaningful utterances by using appropriate vocabulary and grammar skills.

A good *vocabulary* is another important factor for good and effective oral communication. In order to understand what one speaks, one needs to recognize the meaning of word as well as

guess the meaning from word structure and infer meaning from the contents. It is needed to learn and practice vocabulary skills.

    Body language is an integral part of oral communication. It includes facial expression, gestures and body movement, eye contact, distance, space, and mannerisms. As non-verbal communication expresses individual's emotions, social attitudes and feeling, it can convey more meaning than spoken words.

Pre Test Result Analysis

Empirical study I

Oral Presentation

    It is important for the presenters to make the audience listen to them. The audience will be spell bound if their delivery skills are good. Though the topic is well planned in advance, they found the situation stressful and a few requested for postponement. This task is preferred first among the seven activities to comfort the target participants and investigate the use of appropriate oral presentation skills.

Results of the Oral Presentation- Table 1

Levels	Delivery skills	Organization of Ideas	Vocabulary	Fluency
Advanced	1(1.7 %)	0	0	0
Intermediate	15 (25%)	10 (16.7%)	22(36.7%)	12 (20%)
Elementary	28 (46.7%)	33(55%)	38 (63.3%)	32 (53.3%)
Novice	16 (26.7%)	17 (28.3%)	0	16 (26.7%)

    Table 1 is designed for the following skills: delivery skills, organization of ideas, vocabulary and fluency. The first descriptor titled as delivery skills attempted to analyze the use of voice, eye contact, gestures, body posture, body movements, and facial expression as they are capable to arrest the audiences alive till the end of a session. Only a hand full of the target participants is aware of these techniques but they also failed in performance. It is viewed that many are unaware of delivery skills and felt shy or nervous to apply them in the practical presentation. Therefore the result is thus, there is only 1(1.7%) target participant at the advanced level, 15(25%) of them had been at the intermediate level, 28(46.7%) target participants prove their delivery skills to the elementary level, and 16(26.7%) of them are able to get only novice level.

    Organization of ideas is a central part of any presentation which focuses on three major things such as (i) introduction which describes greeting the audience, short note on title and the presenters, it helps to get the audiences' interests, launches the credibility among the audience and foretaste the most important ideas, (ii) body of the content portrays the central themes, sub themes, sequential, general to particular, and vice–versa, the most important to the least and vice-versa, problems and solutions, comparison and contrast. And (iii) conclusion restates or summarizes the presentation topic, reemphasizes the central themes, focuses on aim, encourages

the spectators to respond and then provides the closure. The poor planning makes their presentation less impressive. Thus, the result for this activity is as follows, it is pathetic to note that nobody's idea is organized to the advanced level. There are 10(16.7%) target participant whose organization is to be at the intermediate level, 33(55%) of them are at the elementary level, and 17(28.3%) of them are capable of being at the novice level.

As it is a prepared presentation, it is identified that they have an adequate word stock to deliver but a few make mistakes in sentence formation due to their intimidation. None is able to get to the advanced grade. There are 22(36.7%) target participants whose vocabulary is at the intermediate level, 38(63.3%) of them prove their word power to the elementary level, and it is happy to observe that none of the target participants' word power is at the novice level.

The following are the results for the fourth parameter titled fluency. As participants are inexperienced presenters often try to control their nervousness and stage fright by speaking fast. It quickly exposes their nervousness. And the audience find it difficult to understand what they speak. Their memorized vocabulary for this task is strong enough to be fluent but it is neither understood nor clear. So the obstructions for fluency are the psychological problems such as nervousness, fear of peers and stage etc. As for the other two parameters organization of ideas and vocabulary concerned, none of them prove their fluency to the advanced level. 12 (20%) participants fluency level is at the intermediate level, 32(53.3%) of them are able to get to the elementary level and 16(26.7%) target participants' fluency level is at the novice level.

Empirical study II

Impromptu Speech

Having impromptu speech activities in school or colleges is a common phenomenon now-a-days. Any speech that is spoken on the spot without prior planning and preparation come under the category of impromptu or extempore speech. It must also have all the components of good speech requirements like clarity, articulation and other linguistic ability; besides, it should sound interesting to the audience. It outlines the flexibility, adaptability, it stimulates mental activity of the presenter during the presentation, and it enables the speaker to maintain personal and visual communication with their listeners.

Results of the Impromptu Speech - Table 2

Level	Spontaneity	Composing ability	Body language	Grammar
Advanced	1(1.7)	0	0	0
Intermediate	9(15%)	14(23.3%)	10 (16.7%)	6 (10%)
Elementary	29(48.3%)	33(55%)	29(48.3%)	29(48.3%)
Novice	21(35%)	13(21.7%)	21 (35%)	25(41.7%)

Table 2 contains the ratings and scores for the impromptu task, and it is pristine. It consists of four linguistic parameters namely: spontaneity, composing ability, body language and grammar. 1(1.7%) target participant's spontaneous expression is at an advanced level. The spontaneous expression is discerned to be at the intermediate level for the given 9(15%) target participants. There are 29(48.3%) participants whose spontaneity is at the elementary level and 21(35%) of them are at the novice level. The result for composing ability is analyzed as follows; nobody's composing ability is discerned to be at the advanced level. A group of 14(23.3%) participants are able to obtain

the intermediate grade, 33(55%) of them prove their competency to the level of elementary and 13(21.7%) participants' composing ability is only at the novice level.

For the component of body language, none of their ability prove to be at an advanced level, 10(16.7%) of them are at the intermediate level. The given 29(48.3%) target participants are capable to obtain the grade of elementary level and 21(35%) of them get novice level only.

Finally, the result for grammar is that there is none with an advanced level, 6(10%) target participants' grammar proficiency is observed to be at the intermediate level, 29(48.3%) of them are able to obtain elementary grade and 25(41.7%) target participants exhibit their competency to the novice level.

They are incapable of using the vocabulary and think of the appropriate words which automatically make them inarticulate. Many a participants stand silent with unnecessary gap between words and phrases. Spontaneous expression is mostly limited and which is also characterized by hesitations and long pauses with the use of one or two word utterances. They lack behind even in basic grammar which limits their speaking and communication on the topic. Content and composing ability need to be improved as it is fragmentary with no flow. A few are able to manage with the content and others. Their performance confirmed that even though they use isolated words and fragmentary sentence, they are able to create language by collecting basic learned elements such as phrases and words in order to communicate. They appear to be free from any kind of internal and external problems with the audience and other factors. But their linguistic competence needs to be fine-tuned to reach the next level.

All these problems restrict their freedom for using non-verbal language and sometimes there is contradiction between the utterances and gestures. The results show us clearly that they have to be given more focus to the language and its usage. On analyzing the performance of all the sixty target participants, it is important to observe the difference in the proficiency of oral communication. The influence of medium of instruction, and the location of schools bring more impact in the performance level.

Brief Review of Opinions of the Target Participants on Activities Based Learning

The target participants describe their informal conversation and interaction with the participants from other branches of the study. As they describe their experiences, the obstacles identified are feeling nervous around others, poor exposure to others due to limited practice. For example MEU41fears and speaks English poorly when he speaks to the superiors because he is very conscious that the listener judges his English, especially worries about pronunciation and appropriateness of words. In contrast, he feels less nervous when talking with someone who has same school background, because he is clear that in these interactions they can practice their language skills and negotiate meaning in a non-threatening forum.

Gardner (1998) says that joint effort of self-efficiency and goals on performance is affected not only by what one is trying to do it but the participants realized that activity will improve the spoken proficiency with time and practice.

All the participants are requested to share their informal task based classroom experience. They are silent for sometime, and the researcher breaks the ice. Majority of them reply that it gives different kinds of experience, but feel as if they are much under pressure and stress. They also accept that they take much effort for each activity for not to be insulted by the other course participants.

This is the state of mind for each of the target participants. The students from rural and Tamil medium background scared of the urban and English medium background students. It is to be noted that nobody's profile is discussed with others except the introduction of name and branch of the study by the researcher. The researcher is in need of the answer to the question whether they are interested to hone the oral communication. The response of the target participants is positive. The researcher helps them to get rid of their peers' apprehension and other kinds of misgivings. Based on the researcher's experience as a lecturer, it is identified that in most language class room situations, the students have to speak with two different linguistic ability personalities. Firstly, they speak with their faculty members of various subject teachers whose language proficiency is usually superior. Secondly, they speak with other students may be the classmates or some times friends from other branches, whose social background is probably not equal to them in some degrees. In such a situation students engage in communication often face barriers in communication such as not understanding, or misunderstanding. The students in the class often struggle with many possible barriers with both the teachers and the peers so that they are unable to encode or decode the message. It is planned to conduct informal learning ambience by mingling all the different branches of course. The class is highly free from all the obstructions. The researcher plays the role of monitor not as an instructor. It is particularly student centered learning, but it is strictly observed whether they speak in mother tongue or in second language. Then it is planned to test their proficiency in oral skills. The activities planned for pretest is again used for the post test to find out the qualitative results.

Comparative Result Analysis of Pre and Post tests

This section attempts to describe comparative result analysis of pre and post tests activities that made significant progress in the oral competency of target participants.

Comparative Results of the Oral Presentation - Table 3

Level	Delivery skills		Organization of ideas		Vocabulary		fluency	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
Advanced	1 (1.7%)	2 (3.3%)	0	1 (1.7%)	0	7 (11.7%)	0	6 (10%)
Intermediate	15 (25%)	34 (56.7%)	10 (16.7%)	30 (50%)	22 (36.7%)	34 (56.7%)	12 (20%)	18 (30%)
Elementary	28 (46.7%)	22 (36.7%)	33 (55%)	24 (40%)	30 (50%)	18 (30%)	32 (53.3%)	25 (41.7%)
Novice	16	2	17	5	8	1	16	11

	(26.7%)	(3.3%)	(28.3%)	(8.3%)	(13..3)	(1.7%)	(26.7%)	(18.3%)

Based on the data analysis, table 3 reveals that there is only 1(1.7%) participant who secures an advanced level for the delivery skills during the pretest but it increases to 2(3.3%) participants in the post test period. There are 15(25%) participants whose delivery skills is discerned to be the level of intermediate in the period of pre test whereas it increases to 34 (56.77%) in the post test. The delivery proficiency of 28 (46.7%) participants is at the elementary level and it decreases to 22 (36.7%) participants in the post test, 16(26.7%) participants' efficiency is at the novice level in pre test whereas there are 2(3.3%) participants during the post test.

Result analysis for the organization of ideas follows as: none of the participants' proficiency is at the advanced level in pre test but there is 1(1.7%) participant who gets an advanced level in the post test. The organization of ideas is observed to be at the intermediate level for the given 10(16.7%) participants' at the time of pre testing and 30(50%) the participants prove their proficiency to the same level during post testing. When the result for elementary is observed, there are 32 (53.3 %) participants and it decreases to 25 (41.7 %). And for the novice level, there are 17 (28.3 %) participants in the pretest and 5(8.3%) participants prove to be at the same level in the post test.

Results for vocabulary are identified as; no one tries their vocabulary efficiency to an advanced level in the pre test but a number of 7(11.7%) participants' proficiency is observed to be an advanced level during the post test. It is found that 22(36.7%) participants exhibit their word power to the intermediate level in the pre test whereas the number of participants for the same maximizes to 30 (50%) during the post test, 30(50%) participants is discerned to be at the elementary level in the pre test in contrast there is decrease of 18(30%) participants in the post test for the same level. Finally, for the novice level, there are 8(13.3%) participants pre test but it reduces to 1(1.7%) in the post test.

Lastly, the results for fluency are interpreted as follows, similar to the above results of the parameters, none of the target participants' proficiency is observed to be at an advanced level. When the results for the intermediate level are compared, it is notified that there are number of 12(20%) target participants in the pre testing period whereas the number of target participants has increased to 18(30%), thirdly, there are 32(53.3%) target participants whose fluency is able to get to the elementary level, but the post test result shows that there are 25(41.7%) target participants. Lastly, novice level is examined for which there are 16(26.7%) target participants but it lowers to 11(18.3%) in the post test.

The results can probably be further explained by considering the following aspects. Firstly, the results in above table 3 indicates clearly that after the training, the target participants make significant increase in linguistic based strategies such as vocabulary and fluency and also general skills for oral presentation such as delivery skills and organization of ideas. This is to say that task based learning ambience certainly helps the target participants in strengthening the target linguistic resources to convey the message to any types of spectators and they are also more confident to perform their communication tasks. Based on the result given in table 3, it can also be ascertained that there is significant improvement in all the four designed components such as delivery skills, organization ideas, fluency and vocabulary. As oral presentation activity is prepared well in advance, their vocabulary stock is adequate, and do not take much effort for

the usage of appropriate words at the time of presentation. Delivery skills and organization of ideas become familiar to them and tries to overcome the psychological problems which avert their fluency during the pre testing period.

Comparative Results of the Impromptu Speech - Table 4

Levels	Spontaneity		Composing ability		Body language		Grammar	
	Pretest	**Posttest**	**Pretest**	**Posttest**	**Pretest**	**Posttest**	**Pretest**	**Post Test**
Advanced	1 (1.7%)	2 (3.3%)	0	3 (5%)	0	4 (6.7%)	0	0
Intermediate	9 (15%)	20 (33%)	14 (23.3%)	26 (43.3%)	10 (16.7%)	21 (36%)	6 (10%)	12 (20%)
Elementary	29 (48.3%)	25 (41.7%)	33 (55%)	27 (45%)	29 (48.3%)	28 (46.7%)	29 (48.3%)	28 (46.7%)
Novice	21 (35%)	13 (21.7%)	13 (21.7%)	4 (6.7%)	21 (35%)	7 (11.7%)	25 (41.7%)	20 (33.3%)

Table 4 interprets the results for the components such as spontaneity, composing ability, body language, and grammar for the extempore talk. For the first component spontaneity, during the pre testing time, the oral competency is observed to be at an advanced level for the given 1(1.7%) participant in the pre test whereas it is observed to be 2(3.3%) in the post test. The target participants of 9(15%) exhibit their spontaneity competency at the intermediate level in the PT but it is 20(33.3%) in the post test, 29(48.3%) participants' efficiency is discerned to be at the elementary level in the pre test and it reduces to 25(41.7%) in the post test. There are a number of 21(35%) participants whose competency is at the novice level in the pre test and it lowers to 13 (21.7%) in the post test.

Interpretation for the composing ability follows as: none of the target participants' competency reaches to the level of an advanced level during pre test whereas 3(5%) participants exhibit their proficiency to the same level in the post test. There are 14(23.3%) participants who secure the intermediate level in the pre test and 26(43.3%) participants showcase their proficiency to the same level in the post test, there are 33(55%) target participants at the elementary level in the pre test, when the same level is observed during the post test, there are 27(45%) participants with an evidence of decrease in number. And for the novice level, there are 13(21.7%) participants in the pre test and it minimizes to 4(6.7%) in the pre test and post test respectively.

Results for body language is interpreted as follows: it is notified that during pre test nobody's competency is at an advanced grade but 4(6.7%) participants' are able to obtain the same level in the period of post testing. The performance of 10(16.7%) participants is at

intermediate level in the pre test in contrast to that there are 21(36%) participants in the post test. There are 29(48.3%) participants whose ability is discerned to be at the elementary in the pre test and 28 (46.7%) participants are at the same level in the post test, 21(35%) participants' competency is at the novice level in the and it lowers to 7(11.7%) in the post test.

The result analysis for grammar is inferred as follows: none of them is at an advanced level during both pre and post tests. Among target participants of 60, only 6(10%) prove their proficiency to the intermediate level in the pretest whereas there are 12(20%) target participants in the post test, 29(48.3%) participants' grammar proficiency is at the elementary level in the pre test but 28(46.7%) of them are at the same level in the post test, 25(41.7) participants' performance is at the novice level in the pre test, but it decreases to 20(33.3%) in the post test.

Analyzing all the results it is notified that though the improvement exists, it is bit less comparison to the other post testing results. This task is appears to be difficult even for the more experienced person. But it is assured that if the participants are given continuous and deliberate practice, they will be used to it. Though it is a task to learn the language, the importance of this task in the work place is magnificent. The improvement in body language and composing ability are good. In general, it is to be mentioned that the below proficient or efficient target participants also learned the communicative language and used during the post testing period. It is good a sign of improvement.

Pre and Post tests' performance difference with Mean Value Table 5

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Mean-diff	t-value	df	Sig. Value
Pre-test	55.3833	14.6439	1.8905	-16.0333	-23.7898	59	0.0000
Post-test	71.4167	13.6882	1.7671				

By comparing the results of the pre and post tests, the exploration of this experiment reveals that, surprisingly, all the target participants make significant upgrading in the oral efficiency from pre test to post test. The participants' average of the oral proficiency in the pre test is 55.3833 on the contrary in the post test, it is 71.4167, and the augment seem to suggest the target participants make the inclination progress by 16.0333. The addition of the oral efficiency gives the impression that the target participants are more flourished in finding ways of language adjustment such as being more attentive and using more vocabularies and make use of less complex sentence. Besides, the target participants' focused is on how to get better oral efficiency that seems as if they focus on how to make the message delivered. The qualitative analysis relating to the hypothesis points out that their oral proficiency enlarge after they had participated in the informal task based learning ambience. Verdict can probably explain that their participation in task based learning enables them to practice and produce the language output more effectively. The mean value results presented in the above table 5 shows that the participants' proficiency level differed significantly between the pre and post test. On the basis of findings, alternative hypothesis could be accepted that the difference exists between the pre and posts, and null hypothesis is rejected. The mean value tests give the researcher confidence to conclude that the result is real on these data.

Limitations

- This study is a task-based approach. The target participants are confined about 60 of different sections at undergraduate level
- The tasks chosen for this experiment such as oral presentation, video clipping, impromptu, group discussion, role play, telephonic conversation, personal interview and focused more on employability. This experiment is carried out to diagnose the oral proficiency only
- Another limitation of the study is its purposeful sampling strategy and a small number of target participants (60). Nevertheless, as Penny Ur (1996) states "the purpose of a small random sample is credibility, not representative ness". Penny further adds that this sampling strategy tries to allay suspicions about certain cases were chosen for the study

Findings

- In the pre test of the experiment it is discerned that students are confined and bound by shyness, nervousness, intimidation of peers, worried about peers' remarks etc. Most of the target participants have lack of assurance in expressing their ideas and views, then it automatically results in poor performance

- The pre test findings are also made clear that all the target participants are more stressed, and tensed though they are interested in speaking English

- It is noticed that in the post test, there is an improvement in the performance of the participants and get rid of many of the problems, if not in all the above said factors. And most of the them improve the body language, and fluency as these are offset due to the fear and other psychological problems

- Post test findings are manifested clear enough that if they map out the ways to utilize the opportunity for enabling their proficiency, they are capable to get rid of shyness, intimidation of peers etc

Pedagogical Implications

- The findings of the study suggested that many target participants are still having problems with the language; therefore a few are able to acquire proficiency only at the novice level. Thus, it is recommended that the low level proficient learners may be identified and isolated and helped for basic language learning. And for others, activities to improve all the skills are to be planned

- Lack of vocabulary is considered as a major hurdle to master the sentence structure. Thus, the tasks to improve their word power to be planned, apart from focusing the learners' oral communicative skills

- To fine tune the body language the teacher should be an example, they should not be confined to use the body language freely. If possible and affordable reputed software known for non-verbal may be shown to the learners for the effective communication.

Conclusion

The aim of this experimental study was to analyze the differences in learners' oral communication. Based on deficiency found; i.e. inadequate vocabulary, lack of motivation, situational factors, large classroom, atmosphere and non-verbal language, the teachers are advised to help them out of these problems. The study revealed that the way a teacher conducted

the class would affect learners' involvement in oral communication. English linguistic abilities determine their oral communication performance level. There were at least two problematic areas identified: lack of vocabulary and inability to master sentence structure. Having the linguistic knowledge may not guarantee to communicate effectively. The study revealed that knowing what to say is just as important as to knowing how to say. If these are implemented in language classroom, certainly there will be positive impact.

Works Cited:

ACTFL (1999). *The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines - Speaking (Revised 1999). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.*

Arter, J. A. (1989). *Assessing communicative competence in speaking and listening: A consumer's guide*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1982). *The construct validation of some components of communicative proficiency*

Bachman, L. F., & Savignon, S. J. (1986). The evaluation of communicative language proficiency: A critique of the ACTFL Oral Interview. *Modern Language Journal*, *70*(4), 380-390.

Brown, H.D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice*. White Plains, N.Y.: Pearson Education, Inc.

Courtney, M. (1996). Talking to learn: Selecting and using peer group oral tasks. *ELT Journal, 50*(4), 318-326.

Davies, A. (1985). Communicative language testing. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 22-33.

De Saint Leger, D. (2009). Self-assessment of speaking skills and participation in a foreign   language class. *Foreign Language Annals*, 42(1), 158-178.

Foster, P., Tonkyn, A., & Wigglesworth, G. (2000). Measuring spoken language: A unit or all reasons. *Applied Linguistics*, *21*(3), 354-375.

Fulcher, Glenn. (2003). *Testing Second Language Speaking.* Great Britain: Pearson Education Limited

Nakamura, Y., & Valens, M. (2001). Teaching & Testing Oral Communication Skills.*Journal of Humanities and Natural Sciences*; 111, 43-53.

Underhill, Nic. (1987). *Testing Spoken Language: A Handbook of Oral Testing Techniques.* United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix I

1**. N**ame of the participant   :

2. Gender   : Male / Female

3. Parents' highest qualification   :

4. Participants' medium of instruction   :

5. How do you consider your current level of English in?

a) Spoken   : 1.Excellent   2.Good   3.Average   4. Poor

b) Reading   : 1.Excellent   2.Good   3.Average   4. Poor

Appendix II

The following is the problems in each language classroom which usually prevent you from taking part in oral communication. So read them carefully and use the scale of strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (D), to what extent do you agree with each of the following statements.

13. Activity- enabled learning ambience for English is more useful	SA	A	D	SD
a. improving speaking skills	[　]	[　]	[　]	[　]
b. perfecting non- verbal language	[　]	[　]	[　]	[　]
c. giving an opportunity to exhibit individual's talent	[　]	[　]	[　]	[　]
d. enhance persuasion skills	[　]	[　]	[　]	[　]
e. promotes interaction between students and teacher	[　]	[　]	[　]	[　]
f. very good time passing	[　]	[　]	[　]	[　]
g. helped to put an end to our shyness	[　]	[　]	[　]	[　]
h. develops leadership skills	[　]	[　]	[　]	[　]

Appendix III

Scoring Sheets for the Pre test Activities

1. Oral Presentation

S.No	TPIN	Delivery skills	Organization of ideas	Vocabulary	Fluency
1	MTR01	2	2	3	2
2	FEU02	3	2	3	3
3	FEU03	3	3	3	3
4	FEU04	3	2	2	3
5	MTU05	2	2	2	2
6	MTR06	2	2	2	2
7	MTSU07	1	2	2	2
8	MTR08	2	2	2	2
9	MEU09	3	2	3	2
10	MTU10	1	1	2	2
11	MTR11	1	1	2	2

S.No	TPIN	Delivery skills	Organization of ideas	Vocabulary	Fluency
12	FESU12	2	2	2	2
13	FESU13	2	2	2	2
14	FESU14	3	3	3	3
15	MESU15	2	2	3	3
16	MEU16	3	2	3	3
17	MEU17	3	3	3	3
18	FTSU18	2	1	2	1
19	FER19	2	2	2	2
20	FTR20	1	1	2	1
21	FEU21	2	3	2	2
22	FEU22	4	3	3	3
23	FTU23	2	1	2	1
24	FEU24	2	3	3	2
25	FER25	2	2	2	2
26	FTU26	1	1	2	1
27	FEU27	2	3	3	2
28	MEU28	2	2	2	2
29	MEU29	3	2	2	2
S.No	TPIN	Delivery skills	Organization of ideas	Vocabulary	Fluency
30	MTU30	1	1	2	1
31	FTR31	1	1	2	1
32	FEU32	3	2	3	2
33	FTU33	2	2	2	2
34	FEU34	2	2	3	2
35	FEU35	3	2	3	2
36	FTR36	1	1	2	1
37	FESU37	2	2	2	2
38	FTR38	2	1	2	1
39	FEU39	3	3	3	3
40	MTU40	1	1	2	1
41	MEU41	2	2	2	2
42	MEU42	2	2	2	2
43	MTR43	1	1	2	1
44	MTU44	2	1	2	2

45	MEU45	2	2	2	2
46	MTR46	1	1	2	1
47	MER47	1	2	2	1
48	MEU48	2	2	3	2
49	MEU49	3	3	3	3
50	MTSU50	1	2	2	1
51	FTU51	2	2	3	2
52	MEU52	2	2	2	2
53	FEU53	3	2	3	2
54	FTR54	1	1	2	1
55	FEU55	2	2	3	2
56	MTU56	1	1	2	1
57	FEU57	3	3	3	3
58	FEU58	3	2	3	3
59	MTU59	1	1	2	1
60	FTU60	2	2	2	2

2. Extempore Speech

S.No	TPIN	Spontaneity	Composing ability	Body language	Grammar
1	MTR01	1	1	1	1
2	FEU02	1	2	2	2
3	FEU03	2	2	2	2
4	FEU04	2	2	2	2
5	MTU05	1	2	1	1
6	MTR06	1	1	1	1
7	MTSU07	1	1	1	1
8	MTR08	1	1	1	1
9	MEU09	2	2	2	2
10	MTU10	2	2	2	1
11	MTR11	1	1	1	1
12	FESU12	2	2	2	2
13	FESU13	2	2	2	2
14	FESU14	1	1	1	1

S.No	TPIN	Spontaneity	Composing ability	Body language	Grammar
15	MESU15	2	2	2	2
16	MEU16	3	3	2	2
17	MEU17	2	2	2	2
18	FTSU18	1	1	1	1
19	FER19	2	3	2	2
20	FTR20	2	2	1	1
21	FEU21	3	3	3	3
22	FEU22	2	3	3	2
23	FTU23	2	2	2	2
24	FEU24	4	3	3	3
25	FER25	3	3	3	3
26	FTU26	2	2	3	2
27	FEU27	3	2	2	2
28	MEU28	2	2	2	2
29	MEU29	2	2	2	2
30	MTU30	1	1	1	1
31	FTR31	1	1	1	1
32	FEU32	2	2	2	2
S.No	TPIN	Spontaneity	Composing ability	Body language	Grammar
33	FTU33	2	2	2	2
34	FEU34	3	3	3	3
35	FEU35	2	2	2	2
36	FTR36	1	1	1	1
37	FESU37	2	2	2	1
38	FTR38	1	2	1	1
39	FEU39	2	2	2	2
40	MTU40	1	2	2	1
41	MEU41	2	3	2	2
42	MEU42	3	3	2	2
43	MTR43	1	2	1	1
44	MTU44	1	2	2	1
45	MEU45	2	2	2	2
46	MTR46	1	1	1	1
47	MER47	2	2	2	2

48	MEU48	3	3	3	3
49	MEU49	3	3	3	2
50	MTSU50	2	2	1	1
51	FTU51	2	1	1	1
52	MEU52	2	2	2	2
53	FEU53	2	3	2	2
54	FTR54	1	2	1	1
55	FEU55	2	2	2	2
56	MTU56	1	2	1	1
57	FEU57	3	3	3	3
58	FEU58	2	3	3	2
59	MTU59	1	2	1	1
60	FTU60	1	1	1	1

Appendix IV
Scoring Sheet for the post Test

1. Oral Presentation

S.No	TPIN	Delivery skills	Organization of ideas	Vocabulary	Fluency
1	MTR01	3	3	3	2
2	FEU02	3	4	4	3
3	FEU03	3	3	3	3
4	FEU04	3	3	3	3
5	MTU05	3	2	3	2
6	MTR06	2	3	2	2
7	MTSU07	2	2	1	2
8	MTR08	3	2	3	2
9	MEU09	3	3	4	4
10	MTU10	2	2	3	2
11	MTR11	2	2	2	2
12	FESU12	3	2	2	2
13	FESU13	2	2	3	2
14	FESU14	3	3	3	4

S.No	TPIN	Delivery skills	Organization of ideas	Vocabulary	Fluency
15	MESU15	3	3	3	2
16	MEU16	3	2	3	3
17	MEU17	3	3	2	3
18	FTSU18	2	1	2	2
19	FER19	3	2	3	3
20	FTR20	2	2	2	1
21	FEU21	3	3	3	2
22	FEU22	4	3	3	4
23	FTU23	2	2	3	1
24	FEU24	3	3	4	3
25	FER25	2	3	3	2
26	FTU26	2	2	2	1
27	FEU27	3	3	3	3
28	MEU28	3	2	3	2
29	MEU29	3	3	2	2
30	MTU30	2	2	2	1
S.No	**TPIN**	**Delivery skills**	**Organization of ideas**	**Vocabulary**	**Fluency**
31	FEU32	3	3	3	3
32	FTR31	2	2	2	2
33	FTU33	3	3	3	4
34	FEU34	3	3	3	3
35	FEU35	3	3	4	3
36	FTR36	2	1	2	2
37	FESU37	2	3	2	2
38	FTR38	2	2	2	1
39	FEU39	4	3	3	3
40	MTU40	2	1	3	1
41	MEU41	3	2	3	2
42	MEU42	3	2	3	2
43	MTR43	1	2	3	1
44	MTU44	3	2	2	2
45	MEU45	3	3	3	3
46	MTR46	1	2	2	1
47	MER47	2	2	2	2

48	MEU48	3	3	3	2
49	MEU49	3	3	3	3
50	MTSU50	2	2	2	1
51	FTU51	3	3	4	3
52	MEU52	2	3	3	2
53	FEU53	3	3	3	3
54	FTR54	2	1	3	1
55	FEU55	3	3	3	3
56	MTU56	2	1	3	2
57	FEU57	3	3	4	4
58	FEU58	3	3	4	3
59	MTU59	2	2	2	1
60	FTU60	3	3	3	4

2.Extempore Speech

S.No	TPIN	Spontaneity	Composing ability	Body language	Grammar
1	MTR01	2	1	2	1
2	FEU02	2	3	2	2
3	FEU03	3	3	2	2
4	FEU04	3	3	3	2
5	MTU05	2	2	1	1
6	MTR06	1	1	1	2
7	MTSU07	2	1	1	1
8	MTR08	1	2	2	1
9	MEU09	3	3	2	2
10	MTU10	2	2	3	2
11	MTR11	2	1	2	1
12	FESU12	3	2	2	2
13	FESU13	3	2	2	2
14	FESU14	2	2	2	2
15	MESU15	2	3	2	2
16	MEU16	3	3	3	2
17	MEU17	2	2	2	2

18	FTSU18	1	2	1	1
19	FER19	3	3	3	3
20	FTR20	2	2	2	1
21	FEU21	3	3	3	3
22	FEU22	3	3	3	3
23	FTU23	2	2	2	2
24	FEU24	4	3	4	3
25	FER25	3	3	3	3
26	FTU26	2	3	3	2
27	FEU27	3	3	4	3
28	MEU28	2	3	3	2
29	MEU29	3	3	2	2
30	MTU30	1	2	2	1
31	FTR31	2	2	2	1
32	FEU32	2	3	3	2
S.No	**TPIN**	**Spontaneity**	**Composing ability**	**Body language**	**Grammar**
33	FTU33	2	2	2	2
34	FEU34	4	3	4	3
35	FEU35	3	3	3	2
36	FTR36	1	2	2	1
37	FESU37	2	2	3	1
38	FTR38	1	2	2	1
39	FEU39	3	3	3	3
40	MTU40	2	2	2	1
41	MEU41	3	3	3	2
42	MEU42	3	3	2	2
43	MTR43	1	2	2	1
44	MTU44	2	2	2	1
45	MEU45	3	3	3	3
46	MTR46	1	2	2	1
47	MER47	2	2	3	2
48	MEU48	3	3	3	3
49	MEU49	3	4	3	2
50	MTSU50	3	2	2	1

51	FTU51	2	2	2	1
52	MEU52	3	3	3	2
53	FEU53	3	4	3	3
54	FTR54	2	2	2	1
55	FEU55	3	4	3	2
56	MTU56	2	2	2	2
57	FEU57	3	3	3	3
58	FEU58	3	3	4	2
59	MTU59	2	2	2	1
60	FTU60	2	2	2	2