Available online at www.elixirpublishers.com (Elixir International Journal)

Literature

Elixir Literature 36 (2011) 3177-3185



Enhancing second language proficiency: an experimental study on tertiary level

learners

Nageswari R and Sundarsingh J

ABSTRACT

Department of English, Karunya University, Coimbatore-641114, TamilNadu, India.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received: 2 May 2011; Received in revised form: 18 June 2011;

Accepted: 27 June 2011;

Language development in second language learner using metacognitive strategies is the primary focus of the paper. In this study we explored how the suggested activity affected students' conceptual knowledge of the domain and improved strategical implications in second language and developed the problem solving ability. The qualitative and quantitative findings proved positive effects of the experiments in facilitating cognitive and metacognitive strategies.

© 2011 Elixir All rights reserved.

Keywords

Second language development, Situational speaking task, Meta cognitive strategies.

Introduction

For past few decades' researchers and educators started shifting their focus from text based approach to experimental approach Second language teachers and educators started focusing on language learning strategies of learners. They are challenged to create an appropriate module for the learners to practice suitable strategies. Learning strategies vary according to the educational input and cultural background. Learners use amount of strategies according to their educational input and cultural background. Learners using minimum numbers of strategies understand and interpret information inaccurately. It has been found that a good learner is a better strategy user. Indian learners use very few strategies in language learning (Ravi Sheroy 2006) which inhabits them to communicate messages in second language. Activity based language teaching and learning may lead the learner to use appropriate strategies in second language communication. Situational speaking activity is chosen to enhance L2 learning strategies. This research analyzes the influence of situational speaking activity in unfolding metacognitive strategies. In particular, it illustrates reveals how situational speaking activities contribute in implementing metacognitive strategies in second language development. The present study focuses on analyzing the effectiveness of selected tasks in accomplishing strategies and in developing second language communication skills

Theoretical background:

Metacognition is an ability to understand and monitor one' own thoughts, assumptions and implications (Browm, Bransford, Ferrara & Campione, 1983: Flavell 1979).Learners are considered to be metacognitive to the degree they engage themselves to think about their own ability, strength and weakness. Effective learners are those who are aware of their ability and find ways to rectify their weakness (Branford, Brown and Cocking, 1999). Metacognitive activities enhance the learning capacity of learners. Weaker are found to be more benefited than stronger learners in metacognitive activities (White & Fredericksen, 1998). Spontaneous metacognitive activities are not possible unless learners are encouraged through carefully planned instructions (Berarde-coletta, et al. 1995; Lin & Lahman 1999). Peer interaction supports reflective discourse and it helps learners to consider multiple points of view (Lin et al. 1999) to improve the performance by employing selected suitable strategies (Johnson and Stane 1985;Johnson,Johnson, Stane and Garibaldi 1990(Scardamalia et al.,1989)provide an internalized support for problem solving and reflective thinking(Lin,Hmelo,Kinzer&Secules 1999). Learning can be enhanced through peer interaction inspite of the different abilities and background of the learner(Webb 1989).In such context situational speaking tasks proposed in the present research would provide more opportunities to enhance the metacognitive strategies so as to enable the learners to develop L2(second language) skills.

Conceptual Framework:

Methods of tasks determine the working of mind as mind selects appropriate strategies; the strategies choose the manner of application. Problem solving task requires domain specific knowledge and structural knowledge. Domain specific knowledge consists of cognitive components as prepositional information, concepts, rules and principles. Structural knowledge consists of the integrative ability to transform declarative knowledge into useful knowledge structures (Jona ssen et.al 1993) within the domain of knowledge. Metacognition regulates both the knowledge and cognition in the absence of domain specific knowledge and the structural knowledge (Wineburg 1998).In the absence of metacognition the actor fails to apply knowledge from one context to another context. Peer interaction, conversation and social interaction foster students' strategic application in the performance.

Situational speaking task (SST), a peer interactional problem solving activity, was encouraged among students. The formal and informal situations provided in the classroom facilitated linking the past with the present and known with the unknown. SST enabled the maturation of self control, comprehension and monitoring strategies. Learners' voluntary engagement and commitment bolstered their ability. SST related to life and society said to mould the learner into a socially competent metacognitive person. Planning, monitoring and evaluation occur naturally through the constant practice of multi-dimensional SST. It increases learners interest and involvement, leads to voluntary engagement and commitment. The underlying goal of the study was to promote metacognitive strategies in the development of second language which will enable the learners to deal with the society. The suggested learning cycle provided a strategical structure to the learners individually.

The study examines the following questions:

1. Does using situational speaking task affect metacognitive strategy of the learner?

2. Does using situational speaking task influence the developmental process of second language through metacognitive strategy?

Review of Literature:

Ann Brown and John Flavell introduced the concept 'metacognition' to American research literature(Brown, 1975, 1978; Flavell 1976; 1979). A number of research have been done on metacognition, some researchers suggested it as one of the necessary strategies for learning. While Naiman et.al (1978) measured strategies from interviews, Bialvstock and Fronhlinch(1978) used questionnaire and self reports to investigate specific strategies used by the learners. Politzer (1983) rated learning strategies of ninety university level learners of French, Spanish and German. After identifying learning strategies from interviews and classroom observation, O'Malley et.al(1985a,b) classified learning strategies into three major groups as cognitive, metacognitive and socio affective strategies. The finding reveals that successful learners are active users of strategies. It has proved that a good learner is a strategy user and influences of cultural and educational inputs as the pertinent variables on the choice of learning strategies. Sheroy (2006) ranked the strategic factors used by Indian, Chinese, Taiwanese and Japanese learners. Comparative analysis of the data indicated that the Indian learners prefer the strategies; cognitive memory, functional and metacognitive strategies ranked first second and third respectively. Xiaodong Lin (2001)insisted the importance of metacognitive activities in the learning process, strategy training and supportive social environment as two important factors for initiation of metacognitive process, natural initiation of frequent opportunities for the realization of self as learner, assistance to articulate own thinking, informed goals and transformation of learner through specific culture. Xun Ge Susan M. Land (2003) proved the effectiveness of guided peer and social interactions in fostering comprehension-monitor strategies. However, the research works seldom investigated the effectiveness of pair activity in implementing and improving metacognitive strategy of second language learner. In this study, we are specifically interested in examining the effectiveness of SST in fostering metacognitive strategies of second language learner.

Research Method: Design:

The experimental study designed to answer Research question 1 was conducted to measure the students outcome in using factors of metacognitive strategies (O'Malley et.al 1985 a,b), viz. a) directed attention, b) self management, c) self monitoring, d) self evaluation. Research question 1 served to explore research question 2, to gain insight into second language development through think aloud protocols, observation and interviews. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were implemented to seek triangulation of results from data; examine overlapping facts, contradictions and expand the scope of the study.

Participants and context of the study:

Participants in the experimental study were 66 fresh undergraduate students chosen from different branches of an Engineering Institution where the first Author has been doing her research. The course was designed to integrate metacognitive strategies in problem solving skills. It consisted of both classroom and laboratory session. There were one 50minute lecture session and two 100-minute laboratory sessions per week. The primary purpose of the language laboratory sessions was to provide hands on experience to improve second language communication skills. There were two major goals of English laboratory sessions as follows

(a) Developing basic communication skills (LSRW) in second language

(b) Developing thinking skills and problem solving ability

The Experimental study:

Two conditions in the experimental study were formal situation (FS) and Informal situation (IFS). We measured students' usage of metacognitive strategies like functional planning, directed attention, self management, self evaluation and self monitoring in SST. The results of SST were the answers to research questions 1 and 2.

Experimental Procedure:

A brief survey was conducted at the beginning of the study get participants profile, viz. educational background, to psychology, attitude towards second language and usage of strategies in different situations. Questions were put on scales from 1 to 5 and the description of scales was given based on the question. Background profile of learners was collected with the aim to show the effectiveness of SST on various levels of learners with various backgrounds. Questions regarding medium of instruction at school, parents' educational qualification were taken into account to frame the educational backgrounds of learners which helped the researcher to choose suitable SST for learners. The question on medium of instruction was given on scales as 1= never studied in English medium school, 2=1-3 years, 3=4-6 years, 4=7-9 years, 5 =10/more years. Results were found with the help of descriptive statistics frequency table. Table 1 and figure -3 illustrated the results on educational background of the learners.





It showed that 42.4% of learners studied in non-English medium school (medium of instruction was in regional medium),10.6% of learners studied in English medium school for 1-3 years, 3.0% of learners learned in English medium school for 7-9 years and 39.4% of learners studied in English medium school for 10/more than 10 years. The above mentioned results are illustrated in the table1 and figure 1.

The question on the educational qualification of learners' father and mother was considered as educational background of the parents. It was given in scales as 1= illiterate,2= passed 10th std, 3= graduate, 4= Post Graduate, 5= Doctorate. The results are illustrated in Table2 and Figure 2.

Figure 2 : Educational background of the learners' father



Table – 2 and Figure 2 illustrated that 18.2% of learners' fathers were illiterate, 28.8% of them have passed 10th std, 39.4% of them were graduates, 12.1% of them were postgraduates, 1.5% of them were Doctorates.Table-3 and Figure 4 illustrated the educational qualification of learners' mothers. The scale given for the educational qualification of mother was the same as the previous question on educational qualification of the father. It showed that 25.8% percent of learners, mothers were illiterate, 30.3% of them have passed 10th std, 25.8% of them were graduates, 16.7% of them were postgraduates and 1.5% of them were doctorates.





Table 1, 2 & 3 and Figure 1,2&3 illustrated that target learners were from various educational background. Identifying the educational background was to insist upon the fact that the group selected was a mixed one and it would be advantageous for administering SST.

Measurement and treatment of material:

The problem solving material was a complex real world problem related to the domain of life and education. The following situational topics were assigned to the learners.

- 1. The time I got caught
- 2. Escape of a culprit
- 3. Planning
- 4. Accident
- 5. Disgusting/pleasant experience
- 6. Permission

Students across all the background were instructed to analyze the situation and were asked to submit their presentation in written form as the first step of the first activity. They were instructed to perform oral presentation as the second step. Learners were measured individually according to their written and oral performance. The comparison of the reports were made between the first and the last performance of learners and because this study was focused on the effectiveness of the situations in the usage of metacognitive strategies and the influence of metacognitive strategies in developing second language.

Administering the study sessions:

The experimental study was conducted during five laboratory sessions in a couple of weeks. Study sessions were conducted in the classroom equipped with laptop computer and LCD projector. The participants were asked to work on the task based on assigned conditions. Topics were projected in the classroom in the above mentioned order for each session respectively. Students were frequently reminded of their situations. The first one hour was given for preparation and the remaining time was allotted for oral presentation. Participants were told to work with pre-assigned pairs for remaining four sessions. The study was conducted in the same way for five sessions particularly in the same classroom.

Data collection techniques:

Think aloud protocol was one of the major tools used for data collection. The verbal protocols were observed, recorded and transcribed verbatim. Actions and verbalizations were captured on audio recorder during the experimental study. The purpose of audio recording was to gain a complete understanding of the strategical process of learners at the time of SST. Performance of the presenters was evaluated with the help of evaluation sheet. Structured interview protocols such as why, what and how were used to examine the effects of SST in the interview. For example

• Would you please tell me how you planned and approached the problem?

• What were the steps you used to solve the problem?

• Do you think the provided situation helped you to direct your attention?

• Have you managed yourself to solve the problem by using appropriate thoughts and selection of words?

• Have you realized your mistakes? At which stage, when?

• Have you found any improvements in your presentation skills and thinking ability in second language?

The interview session lasted approximately for 60-75 min. Interviews were audio recorded and verbalized. Questionnaire 2 was used to find the effectiveness of SST in implementing strategies and the effectiveness of strategies in L2 development. **Qualitative data analysis:**

Pseudonyms were used for the cases to protect the identity of the participants. All the recorded data from think aloud protocols and interviews were transcribed for qualitative data analysis. Attribution of the rubrics was used to examine cognitive and metacognitive process of the learner in all the conditions. Paired sample t-test was used to examine the effects of SST. All the analysis was done with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 16.0 for windows).

Results:

Quantitative outcomes: Table1 summarizes the results of descriptive statistics for questionnaire given at the midst of tasks. The data is used as the proof for the progression of learners in metacognitive strategies. It consisted of frequencies and percentage for each question provided in the post task questionnaire.

Effects of the task:

The hypothesis on situational speaking tasks predicted that the students who practiced the SST would perform significantly.

The results of paired sample T-test revealed a significant main effect for SST is summarized in Table 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Table 2 summarizes the results of Paired – Sample t-test for prequestionnaire (responses from the learners at the beginning of the study for the questionnaire) and post-questionnaire (responses from the target learners at the end of the study for the questionnaire).

Variables were computed in two pairs as one as Prequestionnaire data and the pair of it was Post questionnaire data. Mean and standard deviation of the variables were -1.643 and 3.854.The p value was less than0.5, ie.,the tailed significant value p was 0.000,so it was assured that the results were significant. Therefore, it was found that there was a significant difference in the improvement of learners' strategies.

Table 4,5,6 and 7 are the results of analysis of students' responses for the task which also provided significant results. Analysis of learners responses were made with the help of scores given by the teacher-researcher in the evaluation sheet. Evaluation sheet consisted of five scales 1 to 5 as follows,

1-Not showing any ability

2- Minimal response,

3- Response to a certain extent,

4- Response fully,

5- Able to take initiatives, self selecting, wide repertoire of expression.

Learners were given scores according to their various abilities concerned with metacognitive strategies and second language proficiency. Evaluation was made on specific criteria, viz. A) Ability to keep a conversation going, B)Content of contribution, information, ideas, feeling expressed, C) Intelligibility in organizing ideas D)Intelligibility in communication skills(grammar/ vocabulary were considered).

Through the paired sample t-test, significance was shown on the learners' strategies and language proficiency after the effect of prior SST practice.

Table 4 shows means , standard deviations and tailed significance in the task pairs of first factor 'ability to keep conversation going'. The chosen pairs for this analysis were the scores of first task and forthcoming tasks. The first significance (2tailed) is the result of comparison between two pairs as first and second task scores. The third one is the result of first and third task score analysis. Significance has been found from the third task. Since the significance at the end of the task p≤.05, null hypothesis can be rejected.

Learners, strategies and their ability in English proficiency were evaluated in four features, viz. a) ability to keep conversation going, b) content of contribution as ideas and feelings and information c) Intelligibility in organizing ideas and d) Intelligibility in vocabulary, sentence formation. Evaluation scores of the first task and the final task were compared by using paired sample T-test to find the effectiveness of tasks.

The table -8 illustrate the following results of paired sample t-test. The mean and standard deviation of the first group 'ability to keep conversation going' were -1.864 and 1.006 respectively. Paired value p was 0.000. The mean and standard deviation of the second group 'content of contribution-ideas, information, feeling expressed' were -1.818 and 1.122 respectively. Paired value p was 0.000.

The mean and standard deviation of the second group 'Intelligibility in organizing ideas' were -1.924 and 1.071 respectively. Paired value p was 0.000. Paired value p was 0.000. The mean and standard deviation of the second group 'Intelligibility in grammar, vocabulary, sentence formation' were -1.924 and 1.100 respectively. Paired value p was 0.000.The results shown that the p value all groups of scores were less than 0.05. Hence the results were assured as significant and successful.

Effects of the situations:

The students who received their situational speaking tasks were engaged in the metacognitive activities, viz. a) making intentional efforts to identify the information related to the task, b) constructing arguments for the solution process explicitly c) providing justifications for the proposed suggestions d) evaluating the solutions intentionally, comparing alternatives and changing opinions to reach appropriateness. The examples presented below are selective and representative.

Verbalized performance of samples (a pair) A and B were given below as example. Various pseudonyms were used in the examples. Gradual improvement in strategies and language proficiency were found in each task.

Transcription of the excerpts of conversations of two subjects (learners) are attached in the annexure to show the improvement in both the strategical ability and communication ability.

The first and final task responses are given as an example for the study, the title- The time I got caught was given to them as the in first session, the topic-Disgusting experience was given for the last session of the study.

Conclusion:

The situation prompts served as an inducer to activate metacognitive function to help students recognize the necessity to know and to evaluate their abilities. The specific SST enabled learners' to go through language acquisition process systematically, viz. a) recollecting the past b) Connecting the present with past situations in order to carry out the task c) thinking in a multiple perspective d) benefiting from distributed cognition. The reports showed that the conditions provided and open ended SST topics had worked to make use of a wide range of factors and information in generating solutions.

Videotaped observations, reports, qualitative and quantitative analysis of data helped the study to maintain triangulation of the study. Findings showed that the cognition distributed equally with common goals and interests(Pea,1993; Perkins,1993;Salomon,1993).

Once learners become aware of advantages of using strategies in their language learning process they will be willing to employ appropriate strategies to facilitate second language learning.

According to the results of this study, SST enables all sorts of learners to become aware of their strategies, transforms L2 learners into strategical users of language and enables them to use correct language in various situations.

References:

1. Berarde-coletta B,Buyer LS, Dominowski RL,& Rellinger ER. Metacognition and problem solving: A process oriented approach. Journal of experimental Psychology 1995; 21(1),205-223

2. Bialystock E, Fronhlinch M. Variables of classroom achievement in second language learning.Modern Language Journal 1978; 62:327-335.

3. Bransford JD, Brown AL, Cocking RR. How people learn: Brain,mind,experience and school.Washington,DC:National Academy press;1999.

4. Brown AL, Bransford JD, Ferrara RA, Campione JC. Learning, remembering and understanding.In J.H Flavell, and E.M Markman(Eds.) Handbook of child psychology:Vol.3. Cognitive Development. 4th ed. Newyork. John Wiley and Sons. 1983; pp.77-166. 5. Brown AL ,The development of memory: Knowing,knowing about knowing how to know.In H.W Reese(Ed.),Advances in child development and behavior(Vol.10).New academic press;1975

6. Brown AL. Knowing when , where and how to remember: A problem of metacognition. In R.Glaser(Ed.) Advances in instructional psychology. New York academic press.1978; Vol.7.pp.55-111.

7. Flavell JH. Metacognitive aspects of problem solving in Resink,L.(Ed.) The nature of intelligence.Hillsdale,N.J: Laurance Erlbaum Associated;1976.

8. Flavell JH. Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive developmental inquiry. American psychologist. 1979; 34(10),906-911.

9. Flavell, J.H. Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive developmental inquiry. American psychologist 1979; 34(10),906-911.

10. Jonassen DH, Beissner K, Yacci M. Structural Knowledge.Hillsdale,NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum Associates ;1993.

11. Lin Xiaodong. Designing Metacognitive activities. Education Technology Research and Development 2001; 49(2):23-40.

12. Lin XD, Lahman J. Supporting learning of variable control in a computer based biology environment: Effects of prompting college students to reflect their own thinking. Journal of research in science teaching. 1999; 36(7),1-22

13. Lin XD, Hmelo C Kinzer C, & Secules T. Designing technology to support reflection. Educational Technology Research and Development;1999.47(3),43-62

14. Lin XD, Schwartz D, Holems J. Preparing adaptive learners for different learning settings. Paper presented at the annual Fellow meeting of Spencer Foundation.Pitsburg,P.A;1999

15. Naiman, N.M. Frohich, D.Stern ., A.Todesco. The good language learner.Canada:Ontorio Institute for studies in education;1978.

16. O'Malley J Michael, Anna Uhl Chamot, Gloia Stewner-Manzanares, Rocco P Russo, Lisa, Kupper. Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. TESOL Quarterly 1985b;19: 557-584

17. O'Malley J Michael, Anna Uhl Chamot ,Gloia Stewner-Manzanares ,Lisa Kupper , Rocco P Russo. Learning strategies used by beginning and intermediate ESL students. Language Learning 1985 a; 35: 21-46. University of Michigan.

18. Pea R. Practices of disturbed intelligence and designs for education. In G.Salomon(Ed.). Distributed cognitions: Psychological and educational considerations. Cambridge University Press. 1993; pp.47-87.

19. Perkins DN. Persons-plus: A distributed view of thinking and learning. In G.Salomon(Ed.). Distributed cognitions: Psychological and educational considerations Cambridge University Press. 1993; pp.88-110.

20. Robert L Politzer. An Exploratory Study of Self Reported Language Learning Behaviors and their Relation to Achievement. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 1983; 6(0): pp 54-68

21. Salomon G. No distribution without individuals' cognition: A dynamic interactional view. In G.Salomon(Ed.). Distributed cognitions: Psychological and educational considerations Cambridge University Press. 1993; pp.111-138.

22. Sheorey Ravi. Learning and Teaching in India. New Delhi: Sage publications; 2006.

23. Webb NM. Peer interaction and learning in small groups. International Journal of Educational Research. 1989; 13,21-39.

24. White BY, Fredericksen JR. Inquiry, modeling, and metacognition: Making science accessible to all students. Cognition and instruction 1998; 16(1),3-118

25. Wineburg SS. Reading Abraham Lincoln: An expert-expert study in the interpretation of historical texts. Cognitive Science. 1998; 22,319-346.

26. Xun Ge Susan M Land. Scaffolding students' problem solving processes in all ill-structured task using question prompts and peer interactions. Educational Technology Research and development 2003; 51(1):21-38

No.	Question	Range of scores	Frequency	Percentage	n
1.	I thought I make mistakes in speaking eng	1	4	6.1	
		2	17	25.8	
		3	15	22.7	66
		4	23	10.6	
		5	7	34.8	
		-			
2.	I Thought my proficiency was insufficient for speaking	1	9	13.6	
		2	17	25.8	
		3	15	22.7	66
		4	18	27.3	00
		5	7	10.6	
		5	,	10.0	
3.	I noticed the mistakes of others	1	3	4.5	
		2	11	16.7	
		3	14	21.2	66
		4	24	36.4	00
		5	14	21.2	
		5	14	21.2	
4.	I have organized thoughts, words and sentence for presentation	1	2	3.0	
		2	12	18.2	
		3	8	12.1	66
		4	28	42.4	00
		5	16	24.2	
		5	10	24.2	
5.	I managed to fit my behaviour thoughts with situation	1	1	1.5	
		2	7	10.6	
		3	12	18.2	66
		4	27	40.9	
		5	19	28.8	
		0		20.0	
6.	I thought to improve proficiency	1	2	3.0	
		2	5	7.6	
		3	13	19.7	66
		4	20	30.3	
		5	26	39.4	
		-	-		
7.	I delayed speech production to plan my performance	1	5	7.6	
		2	9	13.6	
		3	12	18.2	66
		4	21	31.8	
		5	19	28.8	
8.	I managed to remember the words related to the given task	1	0	0	
		2	9	13.6	
		3	10	15.2	66
		4	33	50.0	
		5	14	21.2	

 Table 1- Frequency and percentage of subjects' responses on Metacognitive questionnaire

S.No	Paired questions	Mean	Std.		Sig.(2
1.	Make mistakes in putting sentence together- organized thoughts, words and Sentences for presentation	773	1.238	-5.072	.000
2.	Forget to use English rules in speak - managed to remember words related to task	- 1.288	1.092	-9.580	.000
3.	Can u tell others mistakes in speaking eng - I noticed mistakes of others	- 1.076	1.522	-5.741	.000
4.	Do u fear of making mistakes when speaking with others - developed my ability to accept alternative perspectives	1.242	-1.561	- 10.209	.000
5.	Think don't know to speak right English with diff. people - linked memories of life to perform task	909	1.444	-5.116	.000
6.	Think don't know to speak English - thought I don't know to speak English	.470	1.511	2.525	.014
7.	Do u fear of making mistakes when speaking with others - confident in speaking l2	- 1.515	1.218	10.103	.000
8.	Think don't know to speak right English with diff. people - feel confident in dealing with a wide range of people	- 1.182	1.021	-9.400	.000
9.	Do u fear of making mistakes when speaking with others - thought i make mistakes in speaking eng	667	1.611	-3.362	.001
10.	Do u fear of making mistakes when speaking with others - satisfied with my performance at the end of the task	- 1.288	1.547	-6.764	.000

Table-2. Results of pre- and post questionnaire by using Paired sample T-test

Table 3 Results of Paired Sample T-test

S.No	Paired questions	Mean	Std. deviation	t	Sig.(2 tailed)
1.	Pre questionnaire with Post questionnaire	-1.643	3.85449	-34.645	0.000

Table 4 Results of analysis on	observation	(using first	evaluator	factor i	n the evaluatio	n sheet) —
	For twelve t	asks-Pair s	ample t-te	st		

S.No	Paired questions	Mean	Std. deviation	t	Sig.(2 tailed)
1.	1.Abilityto keep conversation going - 2.Abilityto keep conversation going	.061	.653	.753	.454
2.	1.Abilityto keep conversation going - 3.Abilityto keep conversation going	242	.725	-2.718	.008
3.	1.Abilityto keep conversation going - 4.Abilityto keep conversation going	379	.739	-4.162	.000
4.	1.Abilityto keep conversation going 5.Abilityto keep conversation going	682	.807	-6.865	.000
5.	1.Abilityto keep conversation going 6.Abilityto keep conversation going	894	1.125	-6.456	.000
6.	1.Abilityto keep conversation going 7.Abilityto keep conversation going	955	.952	-8.149	.000
7.	1.Abilityto keep conversation going 8.Abilityto keep conversation going	1.182	1.021	-9.400	.000
8.	1.Abilityto keep conversation going 9.Abilityto keep conversation going	- 1.318	1.040	- 10.296	.000
9.	1.Abilityto keep conversation going 10.Abilityto keep conversation going	- 1.485	.980	12.303	.000
10.	1.Abilityto keep conversation going conversation going - 11.Abilityto keep conversation going	1.591	1.022	- 12.641	.000
11.	1.Abilityto keep conversation going - 12.Abilityto keep conversation going	- 1.864	1.006	15.051	.000

S.No	Paired questions	Mean	Std. deviation	t	Sig.(2 tailed)
1.	1.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed - 2.content of contribution, .ideas, information, feeling expressed	.015	.868	.142	.888
2.	1.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed - 3.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed	242	.895	-2.199	.031
3.	1.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed - 4.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed	439	.979	-3.647	.001
4.	1.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed - 5.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed	682	.880	-6.296	.000
5.	1.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed - 6.content of contribution ; ideas, information, feeling expressed	924	1.232	-6.096	.000
6.	1.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed - 7.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed	1.000	1.109	-7.323	.000
7.	1.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed - 8.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed	- 1.167	1.117	-8.482	.000
8.	1.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed - 9.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed	1.303	1.163	-9.101	.000
9.	1.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed - 10.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed	1.470	.996	- 11.992	.000
10.	1.content of contribution : ideas, information, feeling expressed - 11.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed	1.576	1.096	11.677	.000
11.	1.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed - 12.content of contribution: ideas, information, feeling expressed	- 1.818	1.122	- 13.166	.000

Table5 Results of analysis on observation (using second evaluator factor in the evaluation sheet) –For twelve tasks-Pair sample t-test

P value at the end of the task is below 0.05 .So there is significant difference in the score of the first task and the final task.

Table 6 Results of analysis on observation (using third evaluator factor in the evaluation sheet) –For twelve tasks-Pair sample t-test

S.No	Paired questions	Mean	Std. deviation	t	Sig.(2 tailed)
1.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 2. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	.091	.717	1.029	.307
2.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 3. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	227	.740	-2.495	.015
3.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 4. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	409	.784	-4.239	.000
4.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 5. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	697	.822	-6.887	.000
5.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 6. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	879	1.130	-6.317	.000
6.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 7. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	939	.959	-7.959	.000
7.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 8. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	-1.167	1.090	-8.699	.000
8.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 9. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	-1.318	1.069	-10.015	.000
9.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 10. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	-1.515	1.011	-12.171	.000
10.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 11. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	-1.591	1.052	-12.284	.000
11.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 12. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	-1.924	1.071	-14.590	.000

Table 7 Results of analysis on observation (using fourth evaluator factor in the evaluation sheet) –For twelve tasks-Pair sample t-test

S.No	Paired questions	Mean	Std. deviation	t	Sig.(2 tailed)
1.	1.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation - 2.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation	.152	.749	1.643	.105
2.	1.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation - 3.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation	152	.827	-1.488	.142
3.	1.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation - 4.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation	364	.777	-3.801	.000
4.	1.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation - 5.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation	591	.894	-5.370	.000
5.	1.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation - 6.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation	788	1.157	-5.532	.000
6.	1.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation - 7.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation	955	1.014	-7.646	.000
7.	1.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation - 8.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation	1.152	1.167	-8.018	.000
8.	1.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation - 9.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation	- 1.227	1.134	-8.792	.000
9.	1.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation - 10.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation	- 1.515	1.026	- 11.992	.000
10.	1.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation - 11.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation	1.636	1.047	12.695	.000
11.	1.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation - 12.Intelligibility in grammar,vocabulary,sentence formation	- 1.924	1.100	- 14.214	.000

S.No	Paired questions	Mean	Std.	t	Sig.(2 tailed)
			deviation		
1.	1. Abilityto keep conversation going - 12. Abilityto keep conversation	-	1 006	-	000
	going	1.864	1.000	15.051	.000
2.	1.content of contribution-ideas, information, feeling expressed -	-	1 1 2 2	-	000
	12.content of contribution -ideas, information, feeling expressed	1.818	1.122	13.166	.000
3.	1. Intelligibility in organizing ideas - 12. Intelligibility in organizing ideas	-	1 071	-	000
		1.924	1.071	14.590	.000
4.	1. Intelligibility in grammar, vocabulary, sentence formation -	-	1 100	-	000
	12. Intelligibility in grammar, vocabulary, sentence formation	1.924	1.100	14.214	.000

 Table 8, Results of final evaluation through observation (Paired sample Test)