

A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar
N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

=====

Abstract

Several methodologies and approaches were offered in NCF-2005. These were expected to be adopted in the schools but these were found only partially implemented at the Elementary stage in Manipur. Probably this could be one of the main reasons that the problem of low achievement persisted in some schools and English language learners did not attain the level of proficiency in speaking skill required at the end of the Elementary stage in Manipur. There is need to address this issue because it may not help future careers of the children. After the identification of this problem, ten schools (5 Private English medium schools and 5 Government schools) were selected for our study. Among these 5 Private schools, 2 of them were Convent schools. Of the 5 Government schools, one is a model school where relatively more facility has been created by the Government. In order to carry out the investigation, language ability tests in speaking skill were conducted. Questionnaires were administered to the teachers of English, who are working in these ten schools and their responses were analyzed. In addition, the Heads/Principals were also consulted by the investigator in relation to teaching/learning process, evaluation systems and their administration. We found some discrepancies in methods, approaches and techniques.

Key words: NCF-2005, elementary school, Speaking skill, teaching methodology, English learning

Introduction

Speaking skill is a productive task. Speaking is a complex ability requiring simultaneous use of a number of different abilities which often develop at different rates whereas writing process involves the use of vocabulary, structure, organization of the material and the fluency or ease of communication. Hence, testing of oral is a challenging task. Speaking is the productive skill in the oral mode. Like the other skills, it is also more complicated than it seems at first and it involves more than just pronouncing words. Speech is the most important form of communication. It enlightens the minds of the people. Information is understood and processed easily through speech rather than writing. Speech is a biologically endowed behaviour of human beings. Speech is an activity. Whilst language is the structural pattern of system we use to convey our message in speech. The pattern

of the language consists of words and of the structured relationship between words and phrases, which is known as grammar. Speaking is interaction between two or more people in changing ideas and arguing something related to. Speaking skill is the art of communications and one of 2 productive skills, which must be mastered in learning a foreign language. Good speaking skill is the act of generating words that can be understood by listeners. A good speaker is clear and informative. Over the last four decades a considerable number of theoretical and research studies have been carried out on strategies of language learning in communication. In this regard, numerous studies were conducted to mention a few.

Chandran (1999) has investigated the communicative ability in speaking English of the higher secondary first year students. He has identified, in his study, the phonological, lexical and grammatical errors, and also he has proved that the communicative ability of the students in English with English as their medium of instruction is better than that of the students of Tamil medium. Further, he recommended that the syllabus designers and material producers may give top most priority for the communicative activities in the syllabus so that the learners would develop the acquired knowledge. Jayanthi (2002) has observed the classroom interaction of the graduate students. This study revealed that the factors like smartness of the students, shyness, evaluative, capacity, commitment, psychological conditions, observation of world knowledge, time factor, interactional awareness, interaction with text, etc., play some role over the effective and efficient interaction of the students. Further, she reported that the shyness of the students' psychological conditions of the students especially past failures, etc. leads to the avoidance of the interactive performance and that the other above said factors enhance the interaction of the students in English literature Teaching classes.

Some studies had been conducted to find out the teaching/learning problems of English in Manipur. Singh (2002) explored the problem, prospect and status of English in Manipur in his research "A Critical Scrutiny of the Position, Problems and Prospects of English in Manipur". Devi (2006) explored the difference between the sentence structures in English and Manipuri language in her research "Sentence structure in English and Manipuri Language, A contrastive study". Sujeta Beishamayum (2010) explored linguistic problems in learning English language in her research "communication and linguistic problems faced by Meiteiron speakers in learning English language. However, there is no study available with regard to the study of low achievement in Speaking skill in Manipur. This paper is an attempt to see whether the Speaking skill of the students is really low or not.

Before we begin the analysis of the problem, it is important that we need to understand the methodologies and approaches in the teaching/learning process of English which were recommended in NCF 2005. Since we have not seen much improvement in learning English in schools in Manipur, we will make an attempt to examine the probable factors that lead to low achievement of English learners.

One of the probable reasons for this low achievement could be that teachers have not fully understood or they were not aware of the methods and approaches recommended in NCF-2005, even though Government imparted training to Government school teachers through SSA, School Education Department and SCERT, Government of Manipur. It was also found that there were no teachers specifically appointed for teaching English in the Primary and Upper Primary Government schools (Elementary schools). For example, teachers of Mathematics and Science were found teaching English in the Government schools. We could see an adhoc policy in teaching English that head teachers/Principals deputed the teachers of Mathematics and Science to attend the training programmes in English.

In the light of the above background, we will investigate the root causes of low achievement of English language learners in the Speaking skill at the elementary stage in Manipur. The identification of this problem not only helps the learners to develop better Speaking skill, but it also could be of use to teachers. The findings of this study may be useful to teachers and teacher educators in choosing relevant methods and approaches at the lower and upper Primary stages in Manipur.

The Structure of the Paper

In section 1.1, we will discuss the methodology adopted in the study while section 1.2 deals with the analysis of language ability tests. In the next section 1.3, responses of questionnaires from the teachers are examined. This is followed by section 1.4, where we discuss the findings of the study conducted. In the section 1.5, we conclude with some of remedial measures in order to enhance the proficiency of the students in Speaking skill.

1.1 Methodology

For this research, we initially planned to take up 400 students of VIII standard, taking 40 students from each school for collection of data. But we could not get the number of students we had stipulated earlier for our study since there was less number of enrollments in some Government schools. It was found surprisingly while collecting data that out of the 5 Government schools we approached, only one school in the serial number 10 has got more than 40 students. This school is a model school to which more attention is given by the Government to create facilities, etc. The total number of students we could finally get as a sample of our study was only 290. First, the students will be given a language ability test consisting of 6 Speaking skill test items. These test items did not cover the Phonetic aspect of speaking skill. The proficiency of the students is assessed on the four grade points. If the school attains 85% to 100 % the school is rated as “Excellent”, while the school secures 75% to 84% it is graded “ Very good”. It is followed by next grade that is, “Good” if the school attains 60% to 74%. Finally the schools which have 40% to 59% is rated as ‘Weak’.

Secondly, the questionnaires consisting of 100 questions were administered to the teachers who were teaching English subjects in the respective schools. The responses of the teachers were analyzed. Among 100 questions in the questionnaires, we focused only on 30 main teaching points.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:8 August 2014

M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar and N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

Serial numbers 1 - 5 are Private English medium schools.

Number of students in the serial numbers in 1- 5 = 200

Serial numbers 6 - 10 are Government schools.

Number of students in the serial numbers in 6-10 = 90

Sl. No.	Name of the schools	Medium of instruction	Number of the students selected	
			Boys	Girls
1.	Nirmalabas High school (Imphal West)	English		40
2.	St. George High School (Imphal East)	English	20	20
3.	IPS (Imphal West)	English	20	20
4.	Ever Green High School (Thoual district)	English	20	20
5.	Paradise High School (Thoual district)	English	20	20
6.	Ngasi Rastrapili Girl High School (Imphal West)	Manipuri		10
7.	Kwakeithel Girls High School (Imphal West)	Manipuri		16
8.	Thangmeiban Lilasingkhongnangkhong High School (Imphal East)	Manipuri		14
9.	Meitei Mayek high School (Imphal West)	Manipuri		10
10.	Wangkhei High School (Imphal East)	English		40
	Total no. of students		80	210

Grand Total = 80+210 = 290

1.2 Analysis of Language Ability Tests

Test items of Speaking skill and test patterns are given in table 1:

For the assessment of speaking skill, we will be employing the following test items: **Colouring Boxes, Family Tree, and Road Mapping, Dialogue, Storytelling and Answer Questions.** The proficiency of the students will be assessed on the four grade points as mentioned above.

Table 1

Sl. No.	Test Items	Purpose
1.	Colouring Boxes	Inferring the speech based information.
2.	Family Tree	Inferring the Family Tree based information
3.	Road Mapping	Inferring the Road mapping based information
4.	Dialogue	Inferring the dialogue based information
5.	Story Telling	Inferring the story telling based information
6.	Answer Questions	Inferring Answer Question based information

Results of Speaking skill tests displayed in the following tables (2 to 7):

In the first test item of speaking skill, “**Colouring Boxes**” as shown in the **table 2** below, 40% to 55% of Private English medium school students responded correctly and 45% to 60 % of Private school students gave incorrect responses. All the students did not fare well, scoring only weak grade. Even the reputed school in 1st serial could score only 55% of the students correct. Similar result was obtained from Wangkhei High School in 10th serial number in the table, followed by St. George High school securing 50% of the students’ correct answers and the lowest being the school in 6th serial number while the remaining schools are in between the scores of 20% and 40% . Here in this test surprisingly the performance is very low as none of the schools could secure even “good” grade.

Table 2

Sl. no.	Name of the schools	No. of the students	Given text (Passage)	Mode of questioning (choosing the right option)	No of correct responses	No of Incorrect responses	Performance in percentage (%)	
							Correct responses	Incorrect responses
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			22	18	55%	45%

2	St. George High School, Imphal West	40			16	24	40%	60%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			16	24	40%	60%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			14	26	35%	65%
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal	40			14	26	35%	65%
6	Ngasi Rastralipi High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl's High School, Imphal West	16			4	12	25%	75%
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East	10			3	7	30%	70%
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhong High School, Imphal West	14			4	10	29%	71%
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			16	24	50%	50%

For the 2nd test item of speaking skill, “**Family Tree**” in **Table 3** of tracing relationship, it is observed that the comprehensive response given by the students of the Private schools ranged from 35% to 50% while 15% to 50% of the Private school students gave incorrect responses. The performance of Government schools except the one in the serial number 10 has been extremely low ranging from 20% to 29%. What we can see from the test of tracing relationship is, even though some individual students have performed well, the overall performance of the school is strikingly poor and categorized in the weak grade as the maximum performance given by the school (Nirmalabas High School) in the serial number 1 is only 55% achievement with regard to this list. The Government school (Wangkhei Girl's High School) in the serial number 10, though it comes under the weak grade, has followed the school (Nirmalabas High School) in the serial number 1.

Table 3

Sl.no	Name of the schools	No. of the students	Given text (Passage)	Mode of questioning (choosing the right option)	No of correct responses	No of Incorrect responses	Performance in percentage (%)	
							Correct responses	Incorrect responses
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			20	20	50%	50%
2	St.George High School,Imphal West	40			18	10	45%	55%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			16	24	40%	60%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			16	24	40%	60%
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal	40			14	26	35%	65%
6	Ngasi Rastralipi High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl's High School, Imphal West	16			4	12	25%	75%
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East	10			2	8	20%	80%
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhang High School,	14			4	10	29%	71%

	Imphal West							
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			20	20	50%	50%

The Test item 3 “**Road Mapping**” as shown in **table 4** indicates the same poor performance as in the Family Tree for the Private schools ranging from 30% to 55% correct while Government schools ranging from 20% to 50% correct. Even though the performance of the individual students is good, the overall performance of the schools is very low ranging from 45% to 80% which is rated as Weak grade only. This is seen in the performance of the reputed school in the serial number 1 which could perform only 55% correct.

Table 4

Sl. no.	Name of the schools	No. of the students	Given text (Passage)	Mode of questioning (choosing the right option)	No of correct responses	No of Incorrect responses	Performance in percentage (%)	
							Correct responses	Incorrect responses
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			22	18	55%	45%
2	St.George High School, Imphal West	40			14	10	35%	65%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			12	28	30%	70%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
6	Ngasi Rastralipi High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl's High School, Imphal West	16			4	12	25%	75%
8	Meitei Mayak	10			2	8	20%	80%

	High School, Imphal East							
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhong High School, Imphal East	14			4	10	29%	71%
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			20	20	50%	50%

Like in the previous test it is observed from the table above that the performance of the schools is very poor. In this fourth Test item “**Dialogue**” as shown in the table 5 above, 30% to 50% of Private school students responded correctly while 50 % to 70 % of Private school students responded incorrectly. The performance of all the schools are extremely poor, and rated as weak grade.

Table 5

Sl. no.	Name of the schools	No. of the students	Given text (Passage)	Mode of questioning (choosing the right option)	No of correct respons es	No of Incorre ct respons es	Performance in percentage (%)	
							Correct responses	Incorrec response
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			20	20	50%	50%
2	St.George High School,Imphal West	40			14	10	35%	65%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			12	28	30%	70%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
5	Paradise High	40			12	28	30%	70%

	School, Thoubal							
6	Ngasi Rastralipi High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl's High School, Imphal West	16			4	12	25%	75%
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East	10			2	8	20%	80%
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhong High School, Imphal West	14			4	10	29%	71%
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			20	20	50%	50%

In the fifth test item, “**Story Telling**” as shown in the **table 6**, 28% to 50% of Private school students could tell the stories comprehensively and 50 % to 72 % of Private school students could not tell the story properly. Though the Nirmalabas High School’s performance is relatively better than the remaining schools the performance of the school is extremely poor that only 50% of the students could tell the story which has led the school to achieved only Weak grade. Next to Nirmalabas High School, there comes Wangkhei High School securing 45% of students who could tell the story comprehensively. St. George High School having 40% of the students with communicative competency is closer to Wangkhei High school. The two Government schools-Ngasi Rastralipi High School and Meitei Mayak High School hit the bottom securing 20% of the students being able to tell story. It is very important to note here that overall performance of all the ten schools are rated as weak grade.

Table 6

Sl.no .	Name of the schools	No. of the	Given text (Passage	Mode of questioning	No of student	No of students	Performance in percentage (%)
---------	---------------------	------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------	----------------	-------------------------------

		students	i)	(choosing the right option)	s who could tell the story nicely	who could not tell the story properly	Could tell the story	Could not tell the story
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			20	20	50%	50%
2	St.George High School,Imphal West	40			16	24	40%	60%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			12	28	30%	70%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal	40			11	29	28%	72%
6	Ngasi Rastralipi High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl's High School, Imphal West	16			4	12	25%	75%
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East	10			2	8	20%	80%
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhong High School, Imphal West	14			4	10	29%	71%
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			18	22	45%	55%

The result of Test item 6 “**Answer Questions test**” in **table 7** shows that 30% to 50% of Private school students are willing to talk with the researcher while 50% to 70 % of Private school are not willing to talk with the researcher. 50% of students from Nirmalabas High School in the serial number 1 are willing to talk and 40% of

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:8 August 2014

M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar and N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

students from St. George and Wangkhei High School are willing to talk. Thus these two schools come to the next of Nirmalabas High School in the serial number 1. It has been observed that students hesitated to speak or talk with the researcher in English. Reasons for the hesitance are that the learners do not want to show their weakness in the English language to others. So, to conceal their weakness, the learners hesitated to talk. Further, the anxiety, language shock and culture shock are yet other factors which lead them to their hesitance. The students did not want to talk in a complete sentence. Upon questioning, the students have given one or two word answer instead of giving complete answers.

Table 7

Sl. no.	Name of the schools	No. of the students	Given text (conversati on)	Mode of questioning (questioning and seeking answer)	No of students who are willing to talk	No of students who hesitated to talk	Performance in pc	
							Willing to talk	Hesitate to talk
1	Nirmalabas High School	40			20	20	50%	50%
2	St.George High School,Imphal West	40			16	24	40%	60%
3	IPS, Imphal West	40			14	26	35%	65%
4	Ever Green School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal	40			12	28	30%	70%
6	The Ngashi Rastralipi High School, Imphal West	10			2	8	20%	80%
7	Kwakeithel Girl's High	16			4	12	25%	75%

	School, Imphal West							
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East	10			2	8	20%	80%
9	Lilashing Khongnangk ong High School, Imphal West	14			3	11	21%	79%
10	Wangkhei High School, Imphal East.	40			16	34	40%	60%

1.3 Analysis of Questionnaires Administered to Teachers

The questionnaires containing 100 questions were administered to teachers of ten schools in order to find out whether they were following and implementing the guidelines of NCF 2005 and MLL based teaching in the respective schools. Among these 100 questions, we focused only on 30 important teaching points in view of NCF 2005 and MLL based teaching in the ten schools. The data collected were used to find which items were followed by the teachers in the class-room transaction. Based on these 30 teaching points, schools were grouped into three categories: A, B and C; the schools following 10 teaching points mentioned in the Table 9 as A (Fully implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching), the schools following 10 teaching points mentioned in Table 10 as B (Partially implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching and the schools following 10 teaching points mentioned in Table 11 as C (Non implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching .

Table 8

10 questions in relation to core teaching of NCF-2005 and MLL in the class-room transaction

1. Interactive activities
2. Higher level of questioning.
3. Constructivist approach to teaching
4. Teaching speaking skill through Innovative techniques.
5. Students' exposure to learn speaking skill
6. Objective of teaching
7. Minimum level of learning.
8. Skill based teaching
9. Problem solving method.
10. CCE (Continuous And Comprehensive Evaluation).

Table 9

10 questions in relation to partial teaching of NCF-2005 and MLL in the class-room transaction

1. Activity based teaching.
2. Answer Question.
3. Higher level of Questioning.
4. Teaching speaking skill through written tests.
5. Remedial teaching
6. School based test and assessment.
7. Objective of teaching
8. Question design
9. Blue print
10. CCE (Continuous And Comprehensive Evaluation)

Table 10

10 questions in relation to traditional methods implemented in the class-room transaction

1. Introduction
2. Teaching aids
3. Lower level of questioning
4. School based evaluation
5. Reading aloud and asking questions.
6. Explanation
7. Content based teaching
8. Lecturer method
9. Grammar teaching
10. Vocabulary teaching

Based on the 10 questions each in relation to teaching points in Tables 8, 9 and 10, ten schools were categorized into three groups: **A (Fully implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching)**, **B (Partially implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching)** and **C (Not implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching)** as shown in **Table 11**.

6 schools were in group **B (Partially implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching)** and 4 schools were in **group C (Not implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching)**. Not a single school was in group A (Fully implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching). The Private schools in the serial numbers 1-5 were found partially implementing NCF-2005 and the MLL based teaching in the schools, whereas Government schools in the serial numbers 6 to 9 were in group C (Non implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching). Only one Government school in the serial number 10 was partially implementing NCF-2005 and MLL based teaching in the school and it had better performance than the rest of Government schools in the serial numbers 6-9.

3 Categories of Schools Based on the 30 Teaching Points in NCF-2005 and Implementation of MLL in Teaching

Group A = Fully Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching schools

Group B = Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching schools

Group C = Not Implementing NCF and MLL Based Teaching schools

Table 11

Sl. no	Name of the schools	Group A	Group B	Group C
1	Nirmalabas High School, Imphal West		Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school	
2	St. George High School Impal East		Partially Implementing NCF and MLL Based Teaching school	
3	IPS Imphal West		Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school	
4	Ever Green Flower High School, Thoubal		Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school	
5	Paradise High School, Thoubal		Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school	
6	Ngasi Rastralipi High School, Imphal West			Non Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school
7	Kwakeithel Girls' High School, Imphal West			Non Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school
8	Meitei Mayak High School, Imphal East			Non Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school
9	Lilashing Khongnangkhong High School, Imphal East			Non Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school
10	Wangkhei Girl High School, Imphal East.		Partially Implementing NCF-2005 and MLL Based Teaching school	

1.4 Discussion

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 **14:8 August 2014**

M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar and N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

According to the results displayed in **Tables 2 to 7**, performances of students varied from individual to individual and from school to school in different test items. None of the schools could get ‘Excellent’ ‘Very Good’ and ‘Good’. The performance of all the schools is extremely low and could be rated in the ‘Weak’ grade. Even the reputed school in the serial number 1 had low performance. The results of speaking skill tests displayed in the **Tables 2 to 7** show that (Nirmalabas High School) in the serial number 1 is the best performing school while the school (Ngasi Rasralipi High School) in the serial number 6 is the weakest school securing 20% in all the tests among ten schools. In these tests of speaking skill, it is surprisingly found that none of the schools secured ‘Excellent’, ‘Very good’ and ‘Good’ grade. It was also learnt from the principals and teachers of English that these ten schools never conducted tests for assessing the speaking skill of the students. This may be one of the reasons for low achievement of the students in the speaking skill. One of the reasons for low achievement for speaking skill may be that these schools used the old traditional methods of teaching and evaluation system. It can be concluded that traditional methods, improper assessments, weak administration and medium of instruction have great impact on low achievement of the English language learners in the speaking skill. The school (Wangkhei High school) in the serial number 10, a recently established model school to which the Government pays more attention, could secure 50%. Though the proficiency of all schools is low, this model school is found at par with the private schools in terms of language proficiency. The schools in the serial number 6 and 8 secured the lowest number of correct response, that is, 20% only. It is also important to note that none of the schools secured “Excellent” “Very good” and “Good” grade.

1.5 Conclusion

Knowing all these facts, some remedial measures may be taken up to improve the proficiency of students in the Speaking Skill. To enhance the speaking proficiency of the students in the English language, the following remedies are suggested. Different types of conversational discourses of L2 may be taught, and the students may be given enough time for the development of conversational discourses in the school hours. The conversational discourse training may be helpful in eliminating language shock and cultural shock. Further, in order to develop communicative competence of the students while teaching vocabulary of English, the grammatical functions and linguistic features of words should be taught. Further, the semantic values of words should be distinguished.

The similarities and differences between L1 and L2 should be taught especially while teaching syntax, which will eliminate the habits of literal translation from L1 to L2. Role play is perhaps the liveliest form to get the class involved in speaking.

Role play brings situations from real life into the classroom. Students imagine and assume roles. They create a pretend situation, and they pretend to be some different persons. Once they assume a role the students are forced to improvise and to produce words and sentences appropriate to the situation as well as to the roles they have assumed. Teachers should select the roles beforehand so that the roles to be assumed are familiar and

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:8 August 2014
M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar and N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)
A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

are within the linguistic competence attained until then by the students. Roles such as friends, brothers, sisters, parents, teachers, shopkeepers, police officers, characters from the textbook and popular television programs have been suggested to enhance the speaking skill.

As Doff (1988) points out, role play increases motivation. Always talking about real life can become very dull, and the chance to imagine different situations adds interest to a lesson. In addition, role play gives a chance to use language in new contexts and for new topics. Everyday life situations such as shopping, holidays, camps, local journeys, fables and folktales, etc., have been found very useful. Interviews are yet another excellent situation for role play. Students may have difficulty composing their thoughts in English or expressing them coherently, using appropriate grammatical structures and words. Teachers should give prompts wherever necessary, which would encourage students to guess and produce utterances appropriately. Role plays help reduce the common reluctance found among the second language learners in using English because of fear of committing errors in English.

Teachers can improve structure practice by encouraging students to give a variety of responses, rather than the usual set responses a situation and a role may demand. The focus of practice should be on producing a text of related sentences suitable for the role and the situation, rather than on the production and practice of single sentences. Role-play involves several students at once and holds the attention of the class, even as it enables students to be original and produce utterances often on their own. Begin first with the contexts of familiar stories. Go to local contexts including market situations, and then to contexts that may be peculiar to the native English speakers. This activity is recommended for all classes. Role-play for every lesson should be done whenever we teach.

Abbreviations

L1: First language.

L2: Second language.

LT: Language teaching

ELT: English language teaching.

LSRW: Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing.

CBTL: Competency Based Teaching Learning.

MLL: Minimal level of learning.

NCERT: National council of Education and Research and Training.

MHRD: Ministry of Human Resource Development.

ELT: English language teaching.

NCF: National Curriculum Framework.

MHRD: Ministry of Human Resource Development.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:8 August 2014

M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar and N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

CCE: Continuous And Comprehensive Evaluation.

SSA: Sarva Shiksha Avhiyan

SCERT: State Council Of Educational Research and Training

References

Beishamayum, S. 2010. *Communication and linguistic problems faced by Meiteiron speakers in learning English language* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis) Manipur University, Manipur.

Chandran, A 1999. A study of the productive skills with special reference to communicative ability in speaking English of the higher secondary first year students in Combatore District (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis) Bharathiar University. Coimbatore.

Devi, Aruna, Kh. 2006. *Sentence Structure in English and Manipuri Language: A contrastive study* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis) Manipur University, Manipur.

Doff, Adrian.1988. *Teach English - A Training Course for Teachers*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Jayanthi, M.D. 2002. *Class-room interaction with reference to English literature teaching at the Undergraduate level* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis), Bharathiar University: Coimbatore.

National Curriculum Frame Work, 2000.New Delhi: NCERT Publications.Report of the committee, MHRD, Minimum level of learning at Primary stage, NCERT.

National Curriculum Frame Work, 2005.New Delhi: NCERT Publications.Report of the committee, MHRD, Minimum level of learning at Primary stage, NCERT.

Singh, Rameshwor, M. 2002. *A critical scrutiny of the position, problems and prospects of English in Manipur* (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis) Manipur University, Manipur.

APPENDIX

Questionnaire

SECTION –1

Bio-data of teacher

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:8 August 2014

M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar and N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

1. Name of the teacher:.....
2. Age.....
3. Sex:
4. Education Qualification:.....
5. Any Additional Qualification:
6. Date and Place of Birth:.....
7. Monthly Income:.....
8. Caste/Community/Tribe/ :
9. Religion:
10. Mother Tongue:
11. Name of School where working presently:.....
12. For how long you have been teaching English:
13. In what medium you have received your education:
14. (a) Primary _____ (b) Middle _____
(c) Secondary _____ (d) Collage _____
(e) University _____ (f) Any other _____
15. Do you teach English only or other subject well?
English only.....(b) other subject as
well.....

SECTION -2

16. Which portion of the English text do you teach ?
(a) Prose----- (b) Poetry ----- (c) Grammar----- (d) Spoken English -----.....
17. Do you like teaching the portion assigned to you ?
(a) Yes (b) No (c) No
option
18. Are the classrooms in which you teach sufficient and proper in terms of space?
Do you have sufficient space and furniture in your classroom?
- Is it possible for you to freely move around the class?
19. Do you actually move around the class among the students or do you teach by standing in front of them
throughout the
period?.....
.....
.....
20. Do you organize classroom activities like:

a) Pair work..... b) Group work c) Role play d) Any other

Please describe in brief:

.....
.....
.....

If you do so, do you have necessary space, time and other requirements in the classroom? Please give some examples from your experience:

.....
.....
.....

21. How do you teach the lesson in the classroom? How do you begin the class?

.....
.....
.....

22. How do you teach the main body of the lesson? How do you conclude the class?

.....
.....

23. Do your students raise question in the classroom? If yes, please specify their manner and frequency?

.....
.....
.....

24. Do you encourage your students to raise question in the classroom?

If yes, how?

.....
.....
.....

If no, why?

.....
.....
.....

25. If so, how many types of question do you encourage them. Please name them and elaborate them.

.....
.....
.....

26. Does it create problems of discipline in your classroom?

.....
.....

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:8 August 2014

M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar and N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

.....
.....

SECTION-3

27. Are the classrooms in which you teach sufficient and proper in terms of space?

Is it possible for you to freely move around the class?

.....

28. Do you organize classroom activities like:

a) Pair work..... b) Group work c) Role play d) Any other

Please describe in brief:

.....
.....
.....
.....

29. If you do so you have necessary space, time and other requirements in the classroom? Please give some examples from your experience:

.....
.....
.....

30. What teaching aids are available for your classroom use?

a) Black board (b) Roller board(c) Cassette player(d)
Television (e) VCP/VCR (f) Computer(g) Any other

.....

31. Are there teaching aids conveniently supplied to you as and when you require them?

.....
.....
.....

32. Do you need any specific items like picture cards, overhead projectors etc.? Please specify:.....

.....
.....

33. Do you have a library in your school? : What kind of books, journals and other kinds of reading materials are there in the library?

.....
.....
.....

SECTION-4

34. How important do you think is English in Manipur?

- (a) Extremely Important(c) Very Important
(c) Quite Important.....(d) Not so Important(e) Not so Important at all
.....

35. In what particular areas is the use of English most important? Please list at least five items from your practical experience?

- 1)
.....
2).....
.....
3).....
.....
4).....
.....

36. Do you think that the students are aware of the reasons for learning English?

- (1) Yes (2) No(3) I don't know

37. Why do you think that your students are interested in learning English? Please tick the right choice:

- Because it is a compulsory subject
Because it is an important language
Because it is a necessary for getting jobs
Because it is a status symbols

38. What are your students' specific needs for learning English? Please specify.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

39. What do you think are the objectives of teaching English in Manipur? If yes, what are they? Please list?

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:8 August 2014

M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar and N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

- 1.....
- 2.....
- 3.....
- 4.....
- 5.....

40. Does the present syllabus specify the goal of teaching English in Manipur? Please list the most important ones below?

- 1).....
- 2).....
- 3).....

If no, can you make out the hidden goals and objectives?

- 1.....2.....3...
- 4.....5.....6.....

41. Do you focus more on:

- (a).Content based teaching.
- (b). Grammar based teaching.
- (c). Skill based teaching.
- (d). Functional grammar

42. Have you ever participated in course design either at your school level or at the State board level? Please describe your experience?

.....

.....

.....

43. Do you think that all the teachers must participate in the process of setting question design?

.....

.....

.....

44. How do you think that teachers can contribute course design?

.....

.....

.....

45. Have you read “minimal levels of learning “the publications by NCERT, New Delhi?

- a)
- YES b) NO

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:8 August 2014

M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar and N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

46. If yes, what are the minimal level of English from class (I) to (VIII), Please write a few minimal level of learning in school?

.....
.....
.....

47. Do you know the competency base teaching learning based on this minimal level of learning?

(a)YES (B) NO

.....

48. Have you ever attended any short term or long term orientation programmes of English language teaching methodology organized by SCERT or any other agencies?

(a) YES (B) NO

.....

49. How do you teach listening, speaking, reading and writing skill in your school?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

50. Do you take up any approaches and methods to develop these skills among the children and the students in the class?

(a) Yes (b) No

.....

51. If yes, what are those approaches, methods and techniques you employ in the classroom?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

52. How do you evaluate the students' listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

53. Do you have any pattern of evaluation from Standard I to Standard VIII? If so, what are the patterns from Standard I to Standard V and from Standard VI to VIII?

(A) Yes.....

(B) No.....

.....
.....
If yes, what are the patterns of evaluation for each class right from the beginning of Standard I to Standard VIII?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
54. How do you evaluate for the whole syllabus of English?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
55. How many marks do you set questions for the whole syllabus? (i) 100 (ii) 200.

If it is 100 marks, what are the components in the questions and tick these in the given components.

(i). Grammar (ii) listening skill (iii) Speaking skill (iv) Reading skill (v) Writing skill (vi) Functional grammar

How do you distribute marks?

56. If you are not satisfied with the achievement of the students in a period of 45 minutes, what do you do?

.....
.....
.....
57. How many minutes do you spare for evaluation in a class period?

.....
.....
Suppose there are 90 students in a class. Are you able to evaluate all the 90 students within the time kept for evaluation? (A) YES (B) NO

.....
58. If yes, what techniques or strategies do you adopt? Please elaborate the techniques or strategies.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:8 August 2014

M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar and N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

.....
.....
.....
59. Do you motivate them sometime?

(A) YES(B) NO

If yes, how do you motivate them ?

.....
.....
.....

SECTION 5

60. So, you have a system of Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation? If yes, please, specify.

.....
.....
.....

61. Does your school conduct different term-wise examinations? Please specify the frequency?

.....
.....
.....

62. Who sets the question paper for these term examination?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

63. Do you think that question papers are systematically and scientifically prepared? If yes, how?

.....
.....
.....

If no, how?

.....
.....
.....

64. Have you ever participated in setting papers for the Manipur Board? If yes, please describe your experience?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

65. If no, what is the reason?

.....
.....
.....

SECTION—6

66. Are you aware of different teaching methods?

A) Yes B) No

.....

67. Can you list the methods you know something about?

a).....
.....

If no, why?

.....
.....
.....

68. Do you think your classroom practice conforms to particulars methods?

A) Yes

B).....

Which one?

.....
.....
.....

69. How would you describe your classroom teaching methods?

.....
.....
.....

70. What you think should be the ideal approach for teaching English in Manipur?

71. Has this approach been adopted by you and your colleagues? If yes, how do you go about?

If no, why?.....

72: Have you read NCF-2005?. Yes or No. If yes, elaborate in two or three sentences about the ways of teaching mentioned in NCF -2005.

73: Do you know Constructivist Approach to Teaching ? Yes or No.

If yes, please elaborate the ways of teaching the approach in your school.

74: Do you know any new skill catering method or approaches Yes or No.

If yes, please elaborate them in two or three sentences.

75. Do you teach students to develop reading skill in the class.? If yes, please mention any approach or method and elaborate any one of them about how you teach it in the class?

76. Do you organize any activity for children to learn reading skill in the class? Yes or No. If yes, please elaborate how you organize them in the class.

.....
.....
.....
.....
77. Do you teach based on MLL (Minimum Level of Learning)? Yes or No. If yes, elaborate them.

.....
.....
.....
.....
78. Do you assess students on the basis of question design or Blue print? Yes or No. If yes, how many marks were allotted to reading skill in your question-setting with 100 marks?

.....
.....
.....
.....
79. Do you assess children based on the objective of teaching? Yes or No. If yes, please elaborate how you do you assess?

.....
.....
.....
.....
80. Do you take up any group activity based teaching to develop reading skill? Yes or No, If yes, elaborate how you take up.

.....
.....
.....
.....
81. Do you know how to develop question design? Yes or No. If yes, how much you emphasize on reading skill in question design.

.....
.....
.....
.....
82. Do you ask children questions in the class? Yes or No. If yes, mention the types of questions giving examples.....

83. Do you know how many levels of questions are there in questioning? Yes or No. If yes, please mention the levels.....
.....
.....
84. Do you teach students reading skill through only tests ? Yes or NO. If not, how do you teach them?
.....
.....
85. Do you assess reading skill in the class? Yes or No. If yes, mention how you assess the students.
.....
.....
86. Do you implement CCE in your school? Yes or No. If yes, please, mention a few steps how you implement CCE.
.....
.....
.....
.....
87. Do you take up any new or innovative practice to develop reading skill ? Yes or No. If yes, elaborate them?
.....
.....
.....
.....
88. Do you elaborate your teaching again and again? Yes or No. If not, how do you teach?
.....
.....
89. Do you repeat your teaching? Yes or No. If not, what approaches do you employ?
.....
.....
90. Do you teach children by reading the text book and asking questions ? Yes or No. If no, how you teach them?
.....
.....
91. How do you teach reading skill in the class? Please, elaborate your teaching.
.....
.....
92. Do you teach the content of English text book. Yes or No.
.....
.....

93. Do you go beyond the content of the text? Yes or No. If yes, please mention how you go beyond the content of the text.

.....
.....

94. Do you assess the students from only textbook? Yes or No. if no, please write how do you assess them.

.....
.....

95. Do you usually assess them based on the lesson in the text?

.....
.....

.....
.....

96. Do you ask students to review articles and journals written by eminent writers?

Yes.....No.....Sometimes.....

If yes, mention the name/s of article/s and journal/s.

97. What is your view about the articles?

.....
.....
.....
.....

98. Do you teach students by explaining again and again? Yes or NO. How many times?

.....
.....

99. Do you discuss matters relating to classroom teaching with your students? If yes, Please give some examples?

.....
.....
.....
.....

100. Do you discuss your problems with teachers/colleagues?

Yes.....No.....sometime.....

a) Your colleagues.....

b) Your Principal c) Member/s of school

administrationd) Concerned person in Manipur Board

.....

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:8 August 2014

M. Gunamani Singh, Ph.D. Scholar and N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)

A Study of the Low Achievement of English Language Learners in Speaking Skill at the Elementary Stage in Manipur

=====

M. Gunamani Singh, M.A. English, B.Ed., M.Ed., Ph.D. Scholar
Department of Linguistics
Manipur University
Imphal
Canchpur-795003
Manipur
India
mutum.gunamani@gmail.com

N. Pramodini Devi, Ph.D. (Corresponding Author)
Professor
Department of Linguistics
Manipur University, India
npdini@yahoo.co.in