Strategies to Develop Communicative Competence in English among Undergraduate Students of Jazan University

Dr. Sobhana Nandyal Panduranga (Faculty), Ms. Seham Arishi (Head)

Dept. of English, College of Sciences & Arts, Samtah Campus, Jazan University, KSA
sobhananandyal@gmail.com

Abstract: The present research study is aimed to analyze, design material and conduct an intervention program to develop Communicative competence in English among undergraduate students of Jazan University. It comprised of both survey and experimental types of research. Survey included 30 English teachers and 100 student participants from three campuses (Academic Campus-2, Al-Dayer and Samtah) of Jazan University. Questionnaires were administered to measure the existing level of physical facilities, instructional facilities, classroom activities, students' evaluation and needs of students in English classrooms. Experimental study adopted pre-test and post-test research design. Competency based achievement test and questionnaires were the instruments to collect data from the students. The experimental sample included 90 student participants from Department of English, Samtah campus. The sample was divided into two groups, experimental and controlled. A teaching package (Teaching and Learning Material) was designed based on Communicative approach to develop communicative competence in English among the students of the experimental group. The statistical techniques that were used were measures of central tendency, chi-square test,'t' test and ANOVA.

The results and findings indicated a significant improvement in the subjects' communicative competence during the period of the research study. Communicative activities were based on Communicative learning and Co-operative learning, as they are effective communication strategies in an EFL classroom to improve communicative competence in English among the students. The student to student interaction helped to obtain ideas and negotiate with each other. They were enriched with potential in using appropriate vocabulary and expressions in real life communication. This created a beneficial/congenial environment/interactive ambiance for the subjects to learn the target language. Exposure to target language helped the subjects to become competent in communication.

The research study suggested a model comprising of language competence, socio-linguistic competence and pragmatic competence that will lead to an overall development of communicative competence in English. In a broader context, the research findings recommended that the students should practice more based on the suggested plan to eventually develop communicative competence in English. It has also proposed curricular reforms in the English curriculum of undergraduates. If the recommendations could be implemented well, it will greatly benefit the English Language Teaching and learning process soon.

Key Words: Communicative competence, communicative approach, communicative activities & EFL.

Introduction

There is unprecedented increase in the number of educational institutions at all levels and ironically this is done at the expense of quality. Knowledge of English is inevitable for a student of any discipline as English language is a living, growing, social and a global language. Indeed, it is the responsibility of the teachers to improve communicative competence in English among students who belong to different streams so that they will be able to survive and compete in the present world.

English Language Education in Saudi Arabia

Linah (2015) stated that Saudi students learn English for 9 years but are not able to speak or write a single flawless sentence in English. This has given rise to many questions about the English teachers' effectiveness and methods employed in ELT. In Saudi Arabia's Public schools, English is taught as a subject but not as a means of communication. Obviously, the classes are teacher-centered and the students are passive receivers of information. Methods such as Grammar-Translation and the use of Arabic as a language of instruction are still applied in Public schools to save time. Curricula and textbooks' contents are based on unrelated topics and deductive activities (Assalahi, 2013). Traditional teaching methods are only used in ELT and hence, communication skills and critical thinking skills are not being developed in the classroom. Lecture method is used as a method of teaching English because English teachers in Saudi Arabia are not well trained (Alharbi, 2015). She suggests that Saudi Arabian teachers should be equipped with the contemporary training to apply better and more communicative

approaches in their English classrooms. They should have access to modern technology in their classrooms. She recommends that teachers should be trained to use authentic teaching and learning materials to enhance students' critical thinking skills. She also recommends modernizing curricula by employing technology and redesigning textbooks and systems to suit the contemporary life of the Saudi Arabian students.

Rationale of the Study

English Language Teaching is a challenging task on the part of teachers and more challenging for the students to learn English as a foreign language. A preponderant number of students even after completion of their school do not have adequate language skills. The curriculum and textbooks for the preparatory courses in the universities are well prepared but the academic achievement of the students is much below the expectations. The universities in Saudi Arabia should take necessary measures to improve the academic achievement/ performance of the students. The students should at least possess the minimum levels of communicative competence in English language after the completion of their preparatory courses, as this is affecting their overall performance in the college and/or pursuing higher studies and careers globally. There is no adequate knowledge of speaking and writing skills among undergraduate students. They need to be trained to speak and write well by their teachers.

The teachers of English should move towards the recent approaches of language teaching like Communicative approach, which stresses more on communicative competence and leave behind the traditional methods. Some steps are being taken to improve the standards of teaching and learning of English at all levels. Despite indigenous efforts, the students are still not meeting the minimum levels of communicative competence in English.

The investigator being a teacher of English avers that communicative competence in English should be developed among the undergraduates. The present study is, therefore an attempt in this direction. It is interdisciplinary as it is related to both the fields of English Language Teaching and Linguistics.

Research Title

The research study has been entitled as "***Strategies to Develop Communicative Competence in English among Undergraduate Students of Jazan University***".

Objectives of the Study

1. To develop a Competency based achievement test for measuring the communicative competence in English at the entry level among undergraduate students;

2. To design teaching material and conduct an intervention program and develop a comprehensive strategy to improve the communicative competence of undergraduate students in English;

3. To study the impact of comprehensive strategy on the communicative competence of undergraduate students in English;

4. To study the association between performance of students in competency-based achievement test and variables in teaching and learning process;

5. To study the difference between the Pre-test score and Post-test score in competency-based achievement test in English for the variables in teaching and learning process; and

6. To suggest curricular reforms in the undergraduate programs.

Hypotheses

To realize the objectives, the following hypotheses have been formulated in null form:

1. There exists no significant difference between the different groups of students on the basis of location, physical facilities, instructional facilities, classroom activities, students' evaluation and needs of students in their competency-based achievement test in English;

2. There exists no significant association between performance of students in competency-based achievement test and the variables like location, physical facilities, instructional facilities, classroom activities, students' evaluation and needs of students in their competency-based achievement test in English; and

3. There exists no significant difference in competency-based achievement of students taught through either traditional method or communicative approach.

Research Variables

Dependent variable: Achievement or Performance of the undergraduates in the competency-based achievement test has been the dependent variable in this investigation.

Independent variables: The variables such as location, physical facilities, instructional facilities, classroom activities, students' evaluation and needs of students in English classrooms were considered.

Operational Definitions of Key terms

Strategy: It is the summation of all techniques and devices, employed by the teacher in a classroom, based on the sociological and psychological principles that underlie the language learning situation.

Communicative Competence: is a term in linguistics which refers to a language user's grammatical knowledge of syntax, morphology, phonology and the like, as well as social knowledge about how and when to use utterances appropriately.

Undergraduate students: An undergraduate is a college or University student who is not a

graduate student.   Undergraduates are students of universities and colleges who have graduated from high school and have been accepted to college but are yet to be graduated.

Significance of the Study

The rapid growth of the software and electronic communication is one of the achievements of the Saudi industry. There is a strong emphasis on global co-operation and exchange of information for which the knowledge of English is indispensable. As the world is moving towards globalization, there is a dire need for all the students to develop communicative competence in English to compete in this global competition. The students should be able to receive/assimilate the information and communicate it to the best of their ability which in turn helps them to improve their interpersonal skills and soft skills. The spread and use of English around the world is more than any other language in the field of global communication. English language has achieved the position and status of a global language in global communication. The global village we live in today requires the use of lingua franca to facilitate communication between people of diverse languages and cultures and English has provided such a platform to do so. Practically, English is today the most widely used lingua franca in all spheres of global communication.

Realizing the importance of English language in the present day global village as an international language, associate official language, link language, a language for opportunity and employment, no nation can avoid the study of English language. It is the responsibility of the teachers who are the powerful instruments in bringing about reforms in higher education and train the students to the global needs of the hour. Keeping in view the present-day needs, the teachers are to gear up the students to meet the global market. So, the teachers play a vital role in developing communicative competence in English among the students. Hence, they need to take up some innovative measures to improve the standards of the students.

Unfortunately, undergraduates coming out of the universities are lacking communicative competence in English and are not able to meet the global requirements in spite of their intellectual abilities. At this juncture, language difficulties should not be a barrier to their aspirations and hence need to develop communicative competence in English which is a global language to keep in touch with living currents of the knowledge.

Review of Literature

A Background of the concept "Communicative Competence"

Aaron Ralby (2011): In 1966 Dell Hymes coined a term Communicative competence in reaction to

Noam Chomsky's (1965) notion of "linguistic competence". Communicative competence is the intuitive functional knowledge and control of the principles of language usage. As Hymes observes: "…a normal child acquires knowledge of sentences not only as grammatical, but also as appropriate. He or she acquires competence as to when to speak and when not to, as to what to talk about with whom, when, where and in what manner. In short, a child becomes able to accomplish a repertoire of speech acts, to take part in speech events, and to get evaluated his/her accomplishment by others."(Hymes 1972, 277)

Linguistics being one of the four components of communicative competence viz., linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence, a language user needs to use the language not only correctly (based on linguistic competence), but also appropriately (based on communicative competence). The four components of communicative competence should be regarded while teaching a foreign language by modern teaching methods.

Linguistic competence is the knowledge of the language code, i.e. its grammar and vocabulary, and also of the conventions of its written representation (script and orthography). The grammar component includes the knowledge of the sounds and their pronunciation (i.e. phonetics), the rules that govern sound interactions and patterns (i.e. phonology), the formation of words by means of e.g. inflection and derivation (i.e. morphology), the rules that govern the combination of words and phrases to structure sentences (i.e. syntax), and the way that meaning is conveyed through language (i.e. semantics).

Sociolinguistic competence is the knowledge of socio cultural rules of use, i.e. knowing how to use and respond to language appropriately. The appropriateness depends on the setting of the communication, the topic, and the relationships among the people communicating. Moreover, being appropriate depends on knowing what the taboos of the other culture are, what politeness indices are used in each case, what the politically correct term would be for something, how a specific attitude (authority, friendliness, courtesy, irony etc.) is expressed.

Discourse competence is the knowledge of how to produce and comprehend oral or written texts in the modes of speaking/writing and listening/reading respectively. It is to know how to combine language structures into a cohesive and coherent oral or written text of different types. Thus, discourse competence deals with organizing words, phrases and sentences to create conversations, speeches, poetry, email messages, newspaper articles etc.

Strategic competence is the ability to recognize and repair communication breakdowns before, during, or after they occur. For instance, the speaker may not

know a certain word, thus will plan to either paraphrase, or ask what that word is in the target language. During the conversation, background noise or other factors may hinder communication; thus, the speaker must know how to keep the communication channel open. If the communication was unsuccessful due to external factors (such as interruptions), or due to the message being misunderstood, the speaker must know how to restore communication. Such strategies may be requests for repetition, clarification, slower speech, or the usage of gestures, taking turns in conversation etc.

A Review of Related Research Studies

Ali Algonhaim (2014) has conducted a research study on "Saudi University Students' Perceptions and Attitudes towards Communicative and Non-communicative activities and their relationship to foreign language Anxiety". He investigated the views of fifty two English-major students regarding the communicative and non-communicative activities in the EFL classroom. It also sought to determine the kinds of communicative and non-communicative activities in the EFL classroom that provoke the students' anxiety. Using multi-method, data was collected by means of a questionnaire and semi-structured interview. Quantitative data was supported by the qualitative data to provide more reliable results. The results suggest that, countries like Saudi Arabia need to modernize and update their EFL teaching methods, which means making changes, that will take students' previous educational habits into consideration. It was obvious from the study, that students in non-English speaking countries make better use of communicative language teaching (CLT) if communicative activities and non-communicative activities are combined in English classrooms. In other words, aligning the communicative approach with traditional teaching structures is beneficial for EFL students. Findings also suggested that oral activities which require a student to make a speech in front of other students, were seen as most anxiety provoking to the learners, whereas group-oriented activities increased the possibility of producing less anxiety.

Khalid Al-Seghayer (2014) in his paper "The Four Most Common Constraints Affecting English Teaching in Saudi Arabia" has addressed pertaining to the current major and persistent constraints that affect English education in Saudi Arabia. These constraints were observed in several areas, including students' beliefs, aspects of curriculum, pedagogy, and administrative processes. It has demonstrated that since its introduction into the Saudi educational system more than 80 years ago, English has continued to be seen as an essential vehicle for personal and national growth. It was also clear that, despite the tremendous efforts, the achievement level of students

was unsatisfactory and disproportionately low. Furthermore, although the curriculum has been continually revised over the years, this process has not been fast enough. Ever-changing developments in the field of second-language acquisition require prompt modification of the EFL curriculum. Addressing these considerations will enable the people involved to continue to advance in the right direction and will also enlighten them to the fact that identifying, analyzing, and suggesting corrective action for the existing problems or issues would be beneficial in bringing about much-needed curriculum reform. This awareness will also pave the way for, and aid in, the acquisition of resources to ensure a better future for English as a foreign language in Saudi Arabia, kindling bright hopes for the country and enhancing the country's ability to actively participate in the international community. Overall, the English proficiency level in Saudi Arabia is expected to remain at its current level unless all relevant factors are taken into consideration. A thorough and comprehensive needs analysis ought to be conducted. The school environment must be improved. Greater emphasis should be placed on teaching methods in teacher preparation programs. There must be a timely reform of the EFL curriculum to facilitate students' motivation and attitude. Furthermore, a realistic alignment of curricular objectives, teachers' quality improvement and merits of administration must be considered. With the implementation of these measures, positive results are anticipated in students' proficiency levels and the competency of English teachers.

Vipin Kumar Sharma (2015) has undertaken a study on "How does Motivation Influence Saudi Students' Communicative Competence?" The study was undertaken to find out and analyze how motivation influences students' communicative competence in English as a foreign language. The study was conducted on two groups that included 35 students from the College of Engineering and the College of Computer Sciences in one group and 50 students from College of Business Administration in the second group. The results obtained through the responses on structured questionnaire from the two groups were found almost similar and both are significantly affected by motivation. The results of the responses from EFL teachers of the Jazan University indicated that teaching strategies supporting motivation, curriculum and course material, directly affect students' motivation and communicative competence. It also recommended few measures to counter the problems to enhance students' communicative competence (L2).

Vipin Kumar Sharma (2015) in his research study "How do Productive Skills of Saudi Students'

Affect EFL Learning and Teaching?" stated that Language plays a crucial role in the development of human society. It is the main means of communication between individuals, groups and countries. Nowadays, more and more people are learning English as a foreign or second language, and their key objective is to get expertise in English. The abrupt changes in the broad field of economy, business, science, technology and education have triggered the youth and coming generation to improve their communication skills. Language acquisition involves four modules of teaching that includes Listening, Reading, Speaking and Writing. The teachers must be dynamic and updated to teach these language skills to the students. The researcher has interviewed the participants on various aspects involved in teaching-learning process to find out the root cause of the problems encountered by students studying at Jazan University to attain the speaking and writing skills. The problems are further critically analyzed, evaluated to derive at conclusions to suggest the most appropriate measures to be taken up by the language teachers to overcome the problems of the students and enhance their expertise in productive skills.

Uma Prasad (2003) in her article "Achieving Communicative Competence in English" stated that games play a fundamental role in the lives of children. They tend to see life in terms of games and anything else is seen as something they "have to" rather than "want to" do. If playing and learning could be integrated, English will become an important part of the child's daily reality. This is what language games set out to achieve. The aim of all language games ultimately is for students to "Know English". Knowing English means knowing how to communicate in English. This involves the productive skills (speaking and writing) and the receptive skills (listening and reading). "Knowing English" involves not only producing language correctly, but also using language for a purpose. When learners can perform the communicative functions that they need, "communicative competence" in the language is said to be achieved.

Research Methodology

The present study comprised of both the survey and experimental types of research. Please refer to Research Design in Appendix-A1.

Phase 1: Survey

Survey included 30 English teachers and 100 student participants from three campuses (Academic Campus-2, Al-Dayer and Samtah) of Jazan University. Questionnaires were administered to both students and English faculty to measure the existing level of physical facilities, instructional facilities, classroom activities, students' evaluation and needs of students in English classrooms.

Phase 2: Experimental Study

Experimental study adopted pre-test and post-test research design. Competency-based achievement test and questionnaire were the instruments to collect data from the students. The experimental sample included 90 student participants from the Department of English, Samtah campus. The sample was divided into two groups, experimental and controlled. A teaching and learning package was designed based on Communicative approach to develop communicative competence in English among the students of the experimental group. The statistical techniques used, were, measures of central tendency, chi-square test, 't' test and ANOVA.

Survey Sampling technique and Sample

A random sampling technique was employed in the selection of the sample. In the first stratum, Dept. of English in three campuses (Academic campus 2, Al- Dayer campus and Samtah campus) were considered as the sampling unit. They were divided into rural and urban areas. In the second stage, subjects were considered as the sampling unit, consisting of 100 subjects from the three campuses of Jazan University. The teachers sample consisted of 30 English teachers from the three campuses.

Instruments

Construction of Questionnaire for English Teachers

Questionnaire was developed to get information regarding the physical facilities, instructional facilities, classroom activities and time allotted to practice language skills, from English teachers. Experienced English teachers were consulted to prepare and finalize the relevant items for the questionnaire. Questionnaire developed in the preliminary try out was administered to 10 English teachers. They were asked to pick from the given options depending on relevancy. The items in questionnaire were selected keeping in view the highest frequency of the items.

Questionnaire for English Teachers was administered to English faculty to know the practices/ teaching strategies in teaching English. The question items were related to different parameters like physical facilities, instructional facilities, classroom activities, students' evaluation (of their students) and needs of students. Please refer to Questionnaire for English Teachers in Appendix-A2.

Questionnaire for Students was administered to the students to know the existing level of physical facilities, instructional facilities, classroom activities, students' evaluation (self-evaluation) and needs of students in English classrooms. Please refer to Questionnaire for Students in Appendix-A3.

Scoring of Data and Data Analysis

The data collected by administering the questionnaire to the English faculty and the students

were analyzed to identify the practices of teaching English.

Competency-based Achievement Test for Experimental Study

The test was conducted to measure the existing level of communicative competence among the students in the areas of morphology and syntax of English language.

Construction of Competency-based Achievement test: In the construction of the achievement test, different aspects were kept in mind:

Importance of English

In the present technological world, English plays a very important role and is very much essential for the present generation to develop communicative competence in English.

Objectives of teaching English

The objectives of teaching English in Undergraduate program were examined. The experts in educational research, educational administration and curriculum designers were consulted.

Identification of important components to be included for the Competency-based Achievement test: Morphology and syntax aspects related to develop communicative competence in English were identified and included in the test.

Selection of items for each component

Due weight was given for each component and a good number of items were collected from different sources of research studies. The items thus selected were organized logically in a preliminary form of the test. They were presented before a panel of experts which constituted English teachers, educationists, researchers and language experts. The panel was asked to scrutinize the items and comment critically on the adequacy and accuracy of the items. The suggestions given by the panel were taken into consideration and the items were modified and refined.

Details of the items in Competency-based Achievement test

The final form of the test had 60 items and the marks allotted were 60. Please refer to the Details of the items in Competency-based Achievement test in Appendix-A4.

Pilot study

A representative sample of 10 students was selected to conduct a Pilot study of the test. The students were asked to answer all the items without imposing any time limit to complete the test.

Item analysis

The answer scripts of the pilot sample were scored according to the scoring key prepared in the test construction. Based on the total score obtained by each student, the answer scripts were arranged in the ascending order. 27% of the top group and 27% of the

bottom group scripts were selected and the remaining scripts were discarded.

After examining each item in the lower group as well as the higher group, the marks obtained by each student for each question item were posted. The difference between the scores of the higher and lower groups has indicated the discrimination power of the item. The discrimination power and difficulty value of each item was calculated. Items possessing reasonable difficulty value and good discrimination power were retained for the final form of the test.

Scoring key

The scoring key was prepared for valuing the test and the manuscripts were valued.

Validity of the test

Content validity

The final form of the test was presented to a panel of experts (English teachers and language experts) for scrutiny. They were requested to examine the coverage of the content in the test items, keeping in view the objectives of teaching English and the future needs of the students.

Construct validity

While constructing the test, the scientific procedure of construction of a test was meticulously followed at each step. The experts examined the percentages and distribution of items given for each item in the test. The item analysis procedure was followed while selecting the test items and the table of components in the final form revealed that the test possesses construct validity.

Reliability of the test

Test-re-test method was adopted to determine the reliability of the test. The final form of the test was administered to a representative sample of students at the first instance and the same test was administered to the same group of students after a gap of 4 weeks. The scores obtained in the first trial were compared with the scores obtained in the second trial. The high correlation revealed that the test is reliable.

Phase 2: Experimental study

The study was experimental to the extent that an attempt was made to investigate the problem and conduct the experiment by adopting the pre-test and post-test experimental research design.

Experimental Design

The pre-test and post-test equivalent group design was used in the study.

Sample / Participants

The sample of study was from the Department of English, College of Sciences & Arts, Samtah, Jazan University. The experimental sample consisted of 90 subjects. The competency- based achievement test was administered to the experimental group. The pre-test scores were tabulated to know the entry behavior of the subjects. The sample was divided into 2 groups,

viz., experimental group (Batch 1= 45 students) and controlled group (Batch 2 = 45 students).

Intervention program / Conduct of the Experiment

A teaching and learning package or instructional material has been designed to train the students during the intervention program. The contents were related to lexical, semantic, morphological and syntactic aspects, to develop communicative competence in English.

Instructional material for its implementation demanded a framework based on certain principles. The investigator made use of the principles of Communicative approach like "information gap", "information transfer" and "task dependency" in the preparation of the instructional material. The instructional model consisted of 3 steps, Presentation, Practice and Production. The investigator used communicative activities like pair work, group work, dialogues and role play in English classes to develop the communicative competence in English among the Undergaduate students of Jazan University.

The experimental group was given the comprehensive strategies to improve their communicative competence in English, for three hours in a day, spread over a period of 3 months. The control group was not given any special training. A post-test was conducted at the end of 3 months.

Instruments

The Competency-based achievement test was the data gathering device for both experimental and control groups in the experimental study. The control group and the experimental group subjects with respect to pre-test and post-test have provided vital data for analysis and interpretation.

Results of the Study

Scoring of Data in Competency-based Achievement Test

The score obtained by the subjects in the Competency-based achievement test was taken as the competency-based achievement score. The difference between the pre-test and post-test of both experimental and control groups of subjects was analyzed. The analysis revealed that there was improvement between the pre-test and post-test of both the groups of subjects. But comparatively a larger difference has been found in the pre-test and post-test scores of subjects who were exposed to the intervention program, i.e., the experimental group.

Data Analysis of Competency-based Achievement Test

Pair wise comparison between Batch 1 and Batch 2 for all the variables (Question items in Competency-based Achievement Test) by paired sample statistics using paired t test showed that there is significant difference in the performance of the students between experimental group (Batch 1) and controlled group (Batch 2). The differences in value between groups

related to t value, p value, mean and SD showed that there is percentage decrease. This indicated that there is an impact of communicative approach on the experimental group (Batch 1). Please refer to Appendix-A6 for the analysis. Thus, the null hypothesis, "there exists no significant difference in competency-based achievement of students taught through either traditional method or communicative approach" is not accepted. From the above analysis, 'the objective to study the impact of comprehensive strategy on the Communicative competence of undergraduate students in English' has been achieved.

Data Analysis of Questionnaires for English Teachers and Students

The data gathered through questionnaires from English teachers and students has been analyzed and the results of the study have been presented.

Findings of the Study

1. Educational Qualifications of English Teachers: It has been found that only 6.70% of the sample is Doctorates, 10% are double Postgraduates, 33% have undergone training and 50% are just Postgraduates;

2. Teaching Experience: 33.30% of the sample is having less than 5 years of experience; 16.70% of the sample has 5 – 9 years of experience, 16.70% of the sample has 10-14 years of experience and 16.70% of the sample has 20 years and above experience.

Questionnaire Items - Responses of English teachers

I.   Physical facilities

1. 36.70% of the sample has responded that classes are overcrowded which means that teacher student ratio is more;

2. 86.70% of the sample has responded that they have a separate classroom for each class;

II.   Instructional facilities

3. 56.70% of the sample have responded that they use technology in classes;

III.   Classroom activities

4. 46.70% of the sample have responded that they set aside extra time apart from their usual timetable to provide practice in LSRW;

5. 70% of English teachers have told that they allot time for their students to do speaking tasks in the class;

6. 66.70% of English teachers told that they test their students in speaking tasks;

7. 66.70% of English teachers told that they give time for their students to do reading tasks in the class;

8. 80% of English teachers responded that they allot time for their students to do writing tasks in the class;

9. 66.70% of English teachers told that they give homework frequently to their students;

IV. Students' evaluation

10. 66.70% of English teachers have rated their students as poor in their vocabulary;

11. 56.70% of English teachers have rated their students as poor in their grammar;

12. 56.70% of English teachers have rated their students as poor in their listening skill;

13. 86.70% of English teachers have rated their students as poor in their speaking skill;

14. 56.70% of English teachers have rated their students as poor in their reading skill;

15. 73.30% of English teachers have rated their students as poor in their writing skill;

16. Entire sample expressed that the students lack interest in learning to express in English;

V.   Needs

17. 36.70% of the sample expressed that the English courses offered are not properly designed to suit the needs of the students;

18. Only 16.70% expressed that the existing foundation courses in English are suitable for higher studies;

19. Entire sample agreed that vocabulary, grammar and LSRW should be taught in the same order.

ANOVA Tables

Educational Qualification-wise Difference in Different Variables

I.   Physical facilities

The 'F' ratio (0.105 ns) is not significant and reveals that there is no significant difference among the groups in this dimension.

Thus, the null hypothesis formulated that; "there exists no significant association between educational qualifications of English teachers and the variable physical facilities", is accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association between educational qualifications of English teachers and the variable physical facilities' included in the study is realized.

II.   Instructional facilities

The 'F' ratio (5.007**) is significant at 0.01 level and reveals that there is significant difference among the groups in this dimension.

Thus, the null hypothesis formulated that; "there exists no significant association between educational qualifications of English teachers and the variable instructional facilities" is not accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association between educational qualifications of English teachers and the variable instructional facilities' included in the study is achieved.

III.   Classroom activities

The 'F' ratio (5.762**) is significant at 0.01 level and reveals that there is significant difference among the groups in this dimension.

Thus, the null hypothesis formulated that; "there exists no significant association between educational qualifications of English teachers and the variable classroom activities" is not accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association between educational qualifications of English teachers and the variable classroom activities' included in the study is achieved.

IV.   Students' evaluation

The 'F' ratio (2.128 ns) is not significant and reveals that there is no significant difference among the groups in this dimension.

Thus, the null hypothesis formulated that; "there exists no significant association between educational qualifications of English teachers and the variable students' evaluation" is accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association between educational qualifications of English teachers and the variable students' evaluation' included in the study is realized.

V.   Needs

The 'F' ratio (0.857 ns) is not significant and reveals that there is no significant difference among the groups in this dimension.

Thus, the null hypothesis formulated that; "there exists no significant association between educational qualifications of English teachers and the variable needs of students" is accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association between educational qualifications of English teachers and the variable needs of students' included in the study is realized.

ANOVA Tables

Teaching Experience-wise Difference in Different Variables

I.   Physical facilities

The 'F' ratio (3.258*) is significant at 0.05 level and reveals that there is significant difference among the groups in this dimension.

Thus, the null hypothesis formulated that; "there exists no significant association between teaching experience of English teachers and the variable physical facilities" is not accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association between teaching experience of English teachers and the variable physical facilities' included in the study is achieved.

II. Instructional facilities

The 'F' ratio (4.315**) is significant at 0.01 level and reveals that there is significant difference among the groups in this dimension.

Thus, the null hypothesis formulated that; "there exists no significant association between teaching experience of English teachers and the variable instructional facilities" is not accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association

between teaching experience of English teachers and the variable instructional facilities' included in the study is achieved.

III.   Classroom activities

The 'F' ratio (5.816**) is significant at 0.01 level and reveals that there is significant difference among the groups in this dimension.

Thus, the null hypothesis formulated that; "there exists no significant association between teaching experience of English teachers and the variable classroom activities" is not accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association between teaching experience of English teachers and the variable classroom activities' included in the study is achieved.

IV.   Students' evaluation

The 'F' ratio (2.968*) is significant at 0.05 level and reveals that there is significant difference among the groups in this dimension.

Thus, the null hypothesis formulated that; "there exists no significant association between teaching experience of English teachers and the variable students' evaluation" is not accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association between teaching experience of English teachers and the variable students' evaluation' included in the study is achieved.

V. Needs

The 'F' ratio (0.806 ns) is not significant and reveals that there is no significant difference among the groups in this dimension.

Thus, the null hypothesis formulated that; "there exists no significant association between teaching experience of English teachers and the variable needs of students" is accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association between teaching experience of English teachers and the variable needs of students' included in the study is realized.

Questionnaire for Students – Results
Urban and Rural Difference in Different Variables

It is quite evident from the study, that there is significant difference at 0.01 levels among urban and rural students in all the variables such as physical facilities, instructional facilities, classroom activities, students' evaluation and needs of the students. Thus, the null hypothesis formulated "there exists no significant difference between urban and rural students based on location, physical facilities, instructional facilities, classroom activities, students' evaluation and needs of students" is not accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association between urban and rural students in all the variables' included in the study is achieved.

Questionnaire Items

The chi-square value and p value have been calculated on the responses of Urban and Rural students -

I.   Physical facilities

1. Chi square value is 53.216 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

2. Chi square value is 100.000 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

II.   Instructional facilities

3. Chi square value is 100.000 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

III. Classroom activities

4. Chi square value is 2.051 and p value is 0.359@ which is not significant; the difference between urban and rural students is not significant.

5. Chi square value is 5.294 and p value is 0.359@ which is not significant; the difference between urban and rural students is not significant.

6. Chi square value is 52.273 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

7. Chi square value is 10.224 and p value is 0.006** which is significant at 0.01 level;

8. Chi square value is 31.563 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

9. Chi square value is 20.617 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

IV. Students' evaluation (self-evaluation)

10. Chi square value is 13.051 and p value is 0.001** which is significant at 0.01 level;

11. Chi square value is 45.226 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

12. Chi square value is 22.760 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

13. Chi square value is 38.889 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

14. Chi square value is 52.500 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

15. Chi square value is 20.137 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

16. Chi square value is 70.612 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

V.   Needs

17. Chi square value is 31.137 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

18. Chi square value is 20.176 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level;

19. Chi square value is 24.100 and p value is 0.000** which is significant at 0.01 level.

It is obvious from the above values that there is significant difference at 0.01 levels among urban and rural students in all the variables such as physical facilities, instructional facilities, some of the classroom activities, students' evaluation and needs of the students. Thus, the null hypothesis formulated "there exists no significant difference between urban and rural students based on location, physical

facilities, instructional facilities, some of the classroom activities, students' evaluation and needs of students" is not accepted. From the above analysis the objective 'to study the association between urban and rural students in all the variables' included in the study is achieved.

Analyses of the Questionnaires of English teachers and students have given insight about the problems of students. All the English teachers felt that the students should possess foundation skills in English language by the time they join the university courses. The problems of the students have been listed:

Problems of the Students

1. Students have phobia towards English language and are not interested to learn a foreign language like English as they lack intrinsic motivation. They feel that it is difficult to learn English and would not be of much use in their future; and

2. English teachers observed that lack of vocabulary and no proper understanding of English morphological and syntactic rules at the school level is a major problem in promoting English learning at the college level.

Recommendations by the English Teachers

1. English language classrooms should not be overcrowded;

2. English teachers should pay attention to individual student problems;

3. They should give home assignments and find time for script checking and feedback;

4. They should give enough practice in receptive and productive skills so that there will be improvement in their performance;

5. Rote memory should not be entertained at the college level;

6. Activities should be taken up in the classrooms to make students participate and interact in English classes;

7. Feedback should be given to the students constantly;

8. Technology should be used to teach and promote communicative competence among the students in English classrooms; and

9. Testing system in LSRW should be reformed to test receptive and productive skills and analytical skills among the students at the college level.

Suggestions by the Investigator

1. English Digital laboratories should be established by the university in all the campuses to enhance teaching and learning skills in English;

2. English teachers at the university level should take the responsibility to motivate the students, in a way to create interest towards learning English under stress free environment. They should use technology to teach and explore how LSRW skills could be

improved and what activities would be useful to promote English skills in the classrooms;

3. Communicative activities like pair work, group work, dialogues and role play should be taken up in the classrooms to make students participate and interact in the class so that it would help the students to develop their communicative competence in English; and

4. Technology should be used to teach and promote English learning in the classes. Teachers should help students to access vocabulary resources, reading materials and grammatical resources to improve their functional vocabulary and grammatical competence.

Potential Challenges of the Investigator

The investigator considered all the problems that were encountered and the way they were resolved. This has helped to understand the limitations of various methods and practical aspects of research. Typical potential problems included: Access to subjects, willingness of subjects to engage and permission letters to visit different campuses.

Conclusion

The present study was an effort to develop communicative competence in English among Undergraduate students of Jazan University, Jizan, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The results and findings indicated a significant improvement in the subjects' communicative competence during the period of the research study. Communicative activities were based on Communicative learning and Co-operative learning, as they are effective communication strategies in an EFL classroom to improve communicative competence in English among the students. The student to student interaction helped to obtain ideas and negotiate with each other. They were enriched with potential in using appropriate vocabulary and expressions in real life communication. This created a beneficial/congenial environment/interactive ambiance for the subjects to learn the target language. Exposure to target language helped the subjects to become competent in communication.

The research study suggested a model comprising of language competence, socio-linguistic competence and pragmatic competence that will lead to an overall development of communicative competence in English. Please refer to Appendix-A8 for the suggested model of developing communicative competence in English. In a broader context, the research findings recommended that the students should practice more, based on the suggested plan to eventually develop communicative competence in English. It has also proposed curricular reforms in the English curriculum of undergraduates. If the

recommendations could be implemented well, it will greatly benefit the English Language Teaching and learning process soon.

The results and recommendations of the research study have been disseminated to experts in the concerned field, colleagues, peers and others interested in the subject and subsequently, the research report was published.

Acknowledgment

References

1. Aaron Ralby (2011), Linguisticator - All you need - To say what you want, https://linguisticator.com/communicative competence.
2. Alharbi, H. (2015). *"Improving Students" English Speaking Proficiency in Saudi Public schools",* International Journal of Instruction, 8 (1), 105 – 116.
3. Ali Algonhaim, (2014). *Saudi University Students' perceptions and Attitudes towards Communicative and Non communicative Activities and their relationship to foreign language anxiety.* Research Journal of English Language and Literature, Vol.2, Issue 2, http://www.rjelal.com.
4. Amel Al Nooh and Marina Mosson-McPherson (2013) *The Effectiveness of Reading Techniques used in a Saudi Arabian Secondary School Classroom as perceived by Students and Teachers: A Study of Methods used in Teaching English and their Effectiveness*, Arab World English Journal, Vol.4, No.3, www.awej.org.
5. Angelica Galante (2015) *Intercultural Communicative Competence in English Language Teaching: Towards Validation of Student identity,* Brazilian English language Teaching Journal, Vol.6, No. 1, p 29 -39. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.15448/2178-3640.2015.1.20188.
6. Assalahi, H (2013). *Why is the grammar Translation Method still alive in the Arab World? Teachers' beliefs and its Implications for EFL Teacher education,* TPLS, 3 (4), doi:10.4304/tpls.3.4.589 – 599.
7. Byram, Michael. (1997). *Ideas for Teaching English as a foreign language.* https://teachingenglishmf.weebly.com/uploads/1/0/3/4/.../byram_icc_model.pdf.
8. Chomsky, Noam (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.
9. Fan Fang (2010) *A Discussion on Developing Students' Communicative Competence in College English Teaching in China*, Journal of Language Teaching and Research, vol. 1, No. 2, p 111-116. Doi: 10.4304/jltr.1.2.111-116.
10. Hussain Ahmed Liton (2013*) EFL Teachers' Perceptions, Evaluations and Expectations about English language Courses as EFL in Saudi Universities*, International Journal of Instruction, Vol.6, No.2. www.e-iji.net.
11. Hymes, Dell H. (1966). "Two types of linguistic relativity". In Bright, W. *Sociolinguistics*. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 114–158.
12. Hymes, Dell H. (1972). "On communicative competence". In Pride, J.B.; Holmes, J. *Sociolinguistics: selected readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. pp. 269–293.
13. Jason Willams (2006), *Combining Communication Strategies and Vocabulary Development*, The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. XII, No.2, http://iteslj.org/.
14. Kathaleen, S. Kitao and K. Kitao (1996) *Testing Communicative Competence*, The Internet TESL Journal, Vol.2, No.5, http://iteslj.org/Articles/kitao-testing html.
15. Khalid Al-Seghayer (2014). *The Four Most Common Constraints Affecting English Teaching in Saudi Arabia*. International Journal of English Linguistics,Vol.4,No.5.doi:10.5539/ijel.v4n5p17. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v4n5p17 .
16. Leticia Pires and D'Andrea (2010)" *Using Writing to develop Communicative Competence in the foreign language classroom"*, Belt Journal, Porto Alegre, v.1, n.2, p139-146, Julho/dezembro.
17. Linah, A. Sofi. (2015). *"Teaching English in Saudi Arabia through Use of Multimedia".* lsofi@dons.usfca.edu.
18. Muhammad U. Farooq (2015) *Creating a Communicative language teaching Environment for improving Students' Communicative Competence at EFL/EAP University level.* International Education Studies, Vol.8, No.4. doi:10.5539/ies.v8n4p179.URL:http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v8n4p179.
19. Saeed Ahmad and Nazeer Ahmad (2015) *Fostering Inter- Cultural Communication Skills among Learners through Teaching English as an International Language.* International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature,

Vol.4,No.6,http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ajac.ijalel.v. 4n.6p.52.

20. Suhair Eyad Al Alami (2014), *Promoting Communicative Competence within EFL Contexts: A UAE Case Study*, Journal of language Teaching and Research, Vol. 5, No. 6, pp 1245-1255. Doi: 10.4304/jltr.5.6.1245-1255.

21. Uma Prasad (2003) "*Achieving communicative competence in English*", published in the Online Edition of India's National Newspaper, Tuesday, July 29th.

22. Vipin Kumar Sharma (2015). *How does Motivation Influence Saudi Students' Communicative Competence?* Report and Opinion7(11):36-48 http://www.sciencepub.net/report.doi: 10.7537/marsroj071115.05.

23. Vipin Kumar Sharma (2015). *How do Productive Skills of Saudi Students' Affect EFL Learning and Teaching?* Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol.3, Issue.2, www.ajhss.org.

Appendix-A1
Research Design

Phases	Sampling Technique, Sample, Sample Size, Instruments for Data Collection	Statistical Techniques
Phase 1: Survey	Random sampling technique Sample: Students of Dept. of English 1. Urban - Academic Campus – 2, Jizan- 50 students 2. Rural - Al- Dayer Campus and Samtah Campus – 50 students Sample size: 100 (50 Ur + 50 Ru) Questionnaire for Students Questionnaire for English Teachers - 30	Mean, SD, Chi-square test, 't' test, ANOVA
Phase 2: Experimental Study	Sample: Students of Dept. of English, College of Sciences & Arts, Samtah Campus, Jazan University. Sample has been divided into two groups. 1. Experimental group - 45 students 2. Controlled group – 45 students Intervention program for Experimental group. Pre-test and Post-test Design.	Mean, SD, Chi-square test, 't' test, ANOVA

Appendix – A2
Questionnaire for English Faculty

Dear Madam

I am conducting a research study entitled "Strategies to develop Communicative Competence in English among Undergraduate students of Jazan University". I seek your valuable opinion and suggestions. I request you to give your responses in this questionnaire. I appreciate your kind cooperation.

Thank you

Primary Investigator: Dr. Sobhana Nandyal Panduranga
Co-investigator: Ms. Seham Arishi

Name	
Educational Qualifications	1. MA English 2. MA Eng & B.Ed 3. MA Eng & M.Ed 4. MA Eng & M.Phil 5. Ph.D in Eng. Lang.
Teaching Experience	1. Less than 5 years 2. 5 years to 9 years 3. 10 years to 14 years 4. 15 years to 19 years 5. 20 years and above.
Campus	
Contact number	
E mail ID	

Please tick (✓) the responses that you find relevant

I. *Physical Facilities*
1. Are your classes over crowded?
   1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
2. Do you have a separate classroom for each class?
   1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No

II. *Instructional Facilities*
3. Do you use technology (tape recorder, computer, laptop) in English class?
1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No

III. *Classroom Activities*
4. Do you set aside extra time apart from your usual time table to provide practice in LSRW?
   1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
5. Do you give time to students to do speaking tasks in the class?
   1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
6. Do you test students' in speaking tasks?
   1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
7. Do you give time to students to do reading tasks in the class?
   1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
8. Do you give time to students to do writing tasks in the class?
   1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
9. Do you give homework to students frequently?
   1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No

IV. *Students' Evaluation*
9. How do you rate your students' ability in Vocabulary?
   1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
10. How do you rate your students' ability in Grammar?
    1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
11. How do you rate your students' ability in Listening skills?
    1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
12. How do you rate your students' ability in Speaking skills?
    1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
14. How do you rate your students' ability in Reading skills?
    1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
15. How do you rate your students' ability in Writing skills?
    1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
16. Why are the students' not able to express well in English?
1. Lack of interest
2. Lack of exposure, lack of practice and lack of guidance,
3. Lack of vocabulary and lack of grammar

V. *Needs*
17. Do you feel that the English courses offered are properly designed to suit the needs of the students?
    1. Yes 2. To some extent 3. No
18. Do you think the existing Foundation courses in English are suitable to pursue higher studies?
    1. Yes 2. To some extent 3. No
19. In which order of priority should English courses focus the different aspects of language?
    1. Vocabulary, grammar, listening, speaking, reading and writing.
    2. Grammar and vocabulary only
    3. LSRW only

Appendix – A3
Questionnaire for Students

Name:	
Gender:	
College:	
Level:	
Campus:	1. Urban ----- Academic Campus – 2, Jizan 2. Rural ------ Al- Dayer Campus and Samtah Campus

Please tick (✓) the responses that you find relevant

I. *Physical Facilities*
   1. Are your classes over crowded?
      1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
   2. Do you have a separate classroom for each class?
      1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No

II. *Instructional Facilities*
   3. Does your teacher use technological aids (tape recorder, computer and laptop) in English class?
      1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No

III.   ***Classroom Activities***
   4. Does your teacher set apart any hours in your time table to provide practice in LSRW?
      1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
   5. Does your teacher give time to students to do speaking tasks in the class?
      1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
   6. Does your teacher test students' in speaking tasks?
      1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
   7. Does your teacher give time to students to do reading tasks in the class?
      1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
   8. Does your teacher give time to students to do writing tasks in the class?
      1 Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No
   9. Does your teacher give homework to students frequently?
      1. Yes 2. Sometimes 3. No

IV. *Students' Evaluation*
   10. How do you rate your ability in Vocabulary?
      1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
   11. How do you rate your ability in Grammar?
      1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
   12. How do you rate your ability in Listening skills?
      1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
   13. How do you rate your ability in Speaking skills?
      1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
   14. How do you rate your ability in Reading skills?
      1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
   15. How do you rate your ability in Writing skills?
      1. Good 2. Satisfactory 3. Poor
   16. Why are you not able to express well in English?
      1. Lack of interest
      2. Lack of exposure, lack of practice and lack of guidance,
      3. Lack of vocabulary and lack of grammar

V. *Needs*
   17. Do you feel that the English courses offered are properly designed to suit the needs of the students?
      1. Yes 2. To some extent 3. No
   18. Do you think the existing Foundation courses in English are suitable to pursue higher studies?
      1. Yes 2. To some extent 3. No
   19. In which order of priority should English courses focus the different aspects of language?
      1. Vocabulary, grammar, listening, speaking, reading and writing.

2. Grammar and vocabulary only

3. LSRW only

Appendix- A4

Details of the items in Competency Based Achievement Test – 60 Marks

S. No	Name of the Component		Marks	Number of items	Question Numbers
	Morphological competence		19 m		
I.	A)	Verb choice	4	4	I. A) 1to 4
	B)	Degrees of comparison	5	5	I. B) 1 to 5
II.	A)	Combining words	2	2	II. A) 1 & 2
	B)	Acronyms	2	2	II. B) 1 & 2
	C)	Short forms	2	2	II. C) 1 & 2
	D)	Prefix & Suffixes	4	4	II. D) 1to 4
	Syntactic competence		14 m		
III.	A)	Tense of verbs	8	8	III. A) 1 to 8
	B)	Frame sentences	3	3	III. B) 1 to 3
	C)	Identify NP & VP	3	3	III. C) 1 to 3
	Lexical & Semantic competence				
IV.	Lexical Vocabulary		10 m	10	IV. 1 to 10
	Syntactic & Writing competence				
V.	Complete Sentences		7 m		
	A)	Use conjunction	4	4	V. A) 1 to 4
	B) Co ordination & Sub ordination		3	3	V. B) 1 to 3
VI.	**Language Functions**		10 m	10	VI. 1 to 10
	Total Marks		**60 m**		

Appendix – A5

Competency Based Achievement Test Marks: 60

I.   A) Write down the correct verb choice that will agree with the collective noun. 4 m

1.	The *class* (describes, describe) their vacations.
2.	The whole *class* (meet, meets) at 3 pm
3.	The *family* (takes, take) a trip to Dubai.
4.	The chess *club* (compare, compares) their strategies so as to win the tournament.

B) Write the other degrees of comparison in the space provided. 5 m

Sn	Adjective	Comparative form	Superlative form
1.	great		
2.	beautiful		
3.	big		
4.	bright		
5.	hot		

C) Write the combined form of words. 2 m

1.	Smoke + fog =
2.	breakfast + lunch =

D) Write the acronyms. 2 m

1.	Kingdom of Saudi Arabia ----
2.	United States of America----

E) Write the short forms of words. 2 m

1.	Laboratory ----
2.	Examination ----

F) Fill in the blanks with the correct form of the word using the key words given in the brackets. You will have to use prefixes and/or suffixes. 4 m

1. I am sorry. I probably------------------------- your book, and now I can't find it. (placed)

a) dis- b) mis-
2. I found that this medicine is most ------------------ for colds. (effect)
a) -ly b) -tive
3. You must not be -------------------- to your teacher. (polite).
a) un- b) im-
4. She speaks -----------------. (Arab)
a) -ian b) -ic

II.   A) Write the correct tense of verbs in the blank spaces. 8 m
1. Sara (play)-------------------------------with her brothers.
2. Tom (move)----------------------to his home town in 2014.
3. She (take)-----------------------an umbrella because it is raining.
4. I (be)-------------------- working in the garden all day, and now I am extremely tired.
5. Yesterday evening Ahlam and Sara (play)--------------------together.
6. My brother (get)------------a new job a week ago.
7. We (decide)---------------------------to have a cup of tea.
8. Tomorrow I think I (start)---------------------------------my new project.

B)   Frame grammatically correct sentences. 3 m
1. We/ interesting /found/ the/ some/ library/ books/ in
----
2. football/ Khalid/ play/ does/ weekend/ every/?
----
3. Monday/ go/ bank/ I/ every/ the/ to

C)   Identify Noun Phrase (NP) and Verb Phrase (VP) in the given sentence. 3 m
1. The young Lassie applies mascara by herself.
----
2. The cat jumped over the chair.
----
3. Someone in this room is going to have a surprise!

III.   Choose the correct term that describes the document or piece of paper appropriate to the situation and fill in the blank space provided.
(statement, chart, prescription, title deed, will, draft, certificates, route map, recipe, receipt)   10 m
1. Ms. Khadija wrote to her bank to ask for an up-to date ------------------------------- of her account.
2. When you go for an interview, remember to keep all your ------------------------------- ready to prove that you are really qualified.
3. I finished work on my book a few days ago. I am sending the --------------------------- to the publisher tomorrow.
4. What a delicious pudding you have made! Could you please give me the ------------------?
5. Our house is rather difficult to find. I will draw you a little ------------------------------- to show you the way.
6. Two months before he expired, George made a new ----------------------- in which he left everything to Mary.
7. My tenant always insists that I give her a ------------------------------- for the rent she pays.
8. You can't buy that medicine without a --------------------------------------- from a doctor.
9. As the doctor came into the room, the nurse handed him the medical-------------------- of the patient.
10. If you want the estate agent to sell the house for you, you'll have to let him see the-- that show you're the legal owner.

IV.   A) Complete the sentences using the correct Conjunction: 4 m
1. I visit the Grand Canyon _____ I go to Arizona. (once, whenever, wherever)
2. I plan to take my vacation _____ in June _____ in July. (whether / or, either / or, as / if)
3. My car has a radio _____ a CD player. (but, or, and)
4. Binaca wore her rain boots; _____, her feet stayed dry during the storm. (however, therefore, on the other hand)

B)   Combine the simple sentences using the coordinating conjunction/ subordinating conjunction/ relative pronoun: 3 m
1. The football game has been postponed. We will have to do something else. (so)

----
2. The football game has been postponed. We will have to do something else. (because)

----
3. The lab results confirm our diagnosis. They have been sent to the attending physician. (that).

V. Match the following Language Functions.
Write numbers in the space provided. (10 x 1 = 10 marks)

S. No	Sentences		Language Functions	
1.	Please write your name at the top of the page.	a)	greeting	( )
2.	I left my handbook at home.	b)	inviting	( )
3.	Sorry, I'm late.	c)	refusing something	( )
4.	Well, I don't know about it.	d)	apologizing	( )
5.	No way.	e)	giving advice	( )
6.	You should do exercise to reduce your weight.	f)	disagreeing	( )
7.	Let's go for a walk.	g)	making an excuse	( )
8.	I'm watching you.	h)	instruction	( )
9.	Hello! How are you?	i)	concern	( )
10.	Wear a sweater to keep yourself warm.	j)	warning	( )

Appendix--- A6
Pair wise Comparison between Batch 1 and Batch 2 --- for all Variables

Pair	Variables	Groups Batch1=N 45 Batch2=N 45	paired sample statistics using paired t-test				Difference in value between groups		
	Morphological competence		mean	SD	t value	p value	mean	SD	% decrease
pair 1	Verb choice	Batch 1	3.930	0.252	1.633	0.110	0.130	0.548	3.31
		Batch 2	3.800	0.588					
pair 2	Degrees of comparison	Batch 1	4.600	0.863	1.809	0.077	0.400	1.483	8.70
		Batch 2	4.200	1.179					
pair 4	Combine words	Batch 1	1.980	0.149	2.693	0.010	0.240	0.609	12.63
		Batch 2	1.730	0.618					
pair 5	Acronyms	Batch 1	2.000	0.000	1.773	0.083	0.070	0.252	3.50
		Batch 2	1.930	0.252					
pair 6	Short forms	Batch 1	1.910	0.358	1.835	0.073	0.180	0.650	9.42
		Batch 2	1.730	0.539					
	Prefix & Suffixes	Batch 1	1.710	1.950	0.994	0.326	0.400	2.700	23.39
		Batch 2	1.310	1.703					
	Syntactic competence								
pair 7	Tense of verbs	Batch 1	6.870	1.455	1.667	0.103	0.470	1.878	6.84
		Batch 2	6.400	1.629					
pair 8	Frame sentences	Batch 1	2.290	0.589	3.317	0.002	0.330	0.674	14.41
		Batch 2	1.960	0.367					
pair 9	Identify NP & VP	Batch 1	2.270	1.214	0.507	0.615	0.130	1.766	6.17
		Batch 2	2.130	1.198					
	Lexical & Semantic competence								
pair 10	Lexical Vocabulary	Batch 1	8.910	2.494	0.871	0.389	0.360	2.740	3.93
		Batch 2	8.560	2.445					
	Syntactic & Writing competence								
pair 11	Complete Sentences Use conjunction	Batch 1	3.760	0.484	1.000	0.323	0.110	0.745	3.19
		Batch 2	3.640	0.570					
pair 12	Co ordination & Sub ordination	Batch 1	2.910	0.358	0.942	0.352	0.090	0.633	3.09
		Batch 2	2.820	0.490					

Appendix – A7
Teaching Package (Teaching and Learning Material)
The Contents were:
1. Morphology: Definition
2. Morphemes: free and bound
3. Affixes: Prefixes, Infixes, Suffixes
4. Morphological structures: Derivational, Inflectional
5. Words: Simple, Compound and Complex words
6. Structure and Content words

7. Word formation
8. Nouns: Singular and plural
9. Noun- possessive
10. Inflectional paradigms
11. Collective nouns, noun-verb agreement
12. Lexical Vocabulary;
13. Language functions
14. Syntax: Definition
15. Word order
16. English Phrase Structure rules: Noun Phrase, Verb Phrase
17. Frame grammatically correct sentences
18. Tenses: Past tense, Present tense
19. Co ordination Conjunctions
20. Sub ordination Conjunctions

Appendix – A8

Suggested Model for Developing Communicative Competence in English

Language Competence	Sociolinguistic Competence	Pragmatic Competence		
Lexical	Style	Discourse Competence	Functional competence	
Semantic	Register	Rules of Discourse	Functions of Language	Strategic competence
Morphological	Degree of politeness	Coherence	Dialogues Report Writing	
Syntactic		Cohesion	Group Discussion	
Phonological			Public Speaking	
Orthographic				

11/18/2017