Language Proficiency of English Among +2 Students In Relation To Their Locality and Stream Of Study

Nidhi Mahindroo
Himachal Pradesh University
nidhimahindroo@gmail.com

Abstract: The study compares the Language Proficiency of English among +2 Students of Shimla district in relation to their Locality and Stream of Study. A Sample of 600 students was selected randomly from the Shimla district of Himachal Pradesh. For comparing the data 2X2X2 ANOVA statistics technique was used. The result revealed that significant differences existed among rural and urban science and arts stream of English and Hindi medium students.

INTRODUCTION

"The first sound a child makes on coming into the world is one of discomfort, it is a cry, a reflex action, and the child does not expect a response."

A child's first cry makes sure that he is alive. In the beginning, the child does not know how to behave in a social context and cannot even express himself. Gradually he learns to crawl, walk and ultimately talk. As a child grows up he tries to express himself through his limited vocabulary. He soon learns to correlate the meanings. A child comes into the world with everything to learn or experience. The need of language can be realized best by those who suffer from the loss of speech, though it is beyond their power to explain it. In fact, we take speech for granted and are hardly aware of our interdependence upon it. It is difficult to conceive a society without it. Language seems to have born with the inception of the human race, so the credit goes to it for helping the survival of mankind. Not only this, it has also helped our race to mature by transmitting our culture and civilization to coming generations.

The enormous development in various walks of our life has been possible only through language. Science, Technology, Religion, Art could make progress only with the help of language. Bloomfield says that each community is formed by the activity of language. Hence in order to know the culture of some people, it is essential to know the language of these people. The man is gifted with a rare quality of speech, which is defined to the other living beings. No doubt, birds, insects and animals produce particular sounds in a given situation, but these sounds cannot be called 'speech' and hence they do not 'talk'. In other words, only man is gifted with this special type of communication. Dechant writes, ―Man like the animal, can communicate through taste, touch, and smell and through grunts and groans, but he also can learn to communicate through language or verbal symbolism. He alone has the ability to name his concepts."

Language

Language is not merely the medium of instruction at all levels of education, it is the medium of growth. It provides capacity for preservation and communication of intellectual life. At a higher level, language provides the medium of fresh and free thinking and research. In education, it is supposed to communicate knowledge, and in general life, it is the instrument to pick up information. We need language to learn, to retain and to recall our knowledge. It is the primary need of the child.

"A **language** is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group cooperates." (B. Bloch and G. Trager, *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*. Waverly Press, 1942)

"**Language** is behaviour which utilizes body parts: the vocal apparatus and the auditory system for oral language; the brachial apparatus and the visual system for sign language. Such body parts are controlled by none other than the brain for their functions."

English Language Proficiency

English language proficiency Means the ability of students to use the English language to make and communicate meaning appropriately in spoken and written forms in the context of their studies '*English Language Proficiency (ELP)*: refers to language proficiency (the ability to communicate in the English language) and academic language proficiency (the ability to:

• Participate effectively in a course of study delivered in English and to achieve expected learning outcomes without requiring significant English language support; and
• To gain entry for the further course of study.
Four language skills contribute to proficiency as follows:
1. *Reading* - the ability to comprehend and interpret text at the age and grade appropriate level.
2. *Listening* - the ability to understand the language of the teacher and instruction, comprehend and extract information, and follow the instructional discourse through which teachers provide information.
3. *Writing* - the ability to produce written text with content and format fulfilling classroom assignments at the age and grade-appropriate level.
4. *Speaking* - the ability to use oral language appropriately and effectively in learning activities (such as peer tutoring, collaborative learning activities, and question/answer sessions) within the classroom and in social interactions within the school.
Hence, the teacher should keep in mind while teaching English as a second language to the students.

OBJECTIVES
1. To Study the Language Proficiency of +2 students in English in relation to:
   (i) Locality
   (ii) Stream of Study
   (iii) Medium of Instruction
2. To Study the following two-way interactional effect of variables on Language Proficiency of +2 students in English.
   (i) Locality
   (ii) Stream of Study
   (iii) Medium of Instruction
3. To Study three interactional effect of Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on Language Proficiency of +2 students in English

HYPOTHESIS
1. There is no significant difference in Language proficiency of +2 students in English in relation to:
   (i) Locality
   (ii) Stream of Study
   (iii) Medium of Instruction
2. There is no significant two-way interactional effect of variables on Language Proficiency of +2 students in English.
   (i) Locality
   (ii) Stream of Study
   (iii) Medium of Instruction
3. There is no significant three interactional effect of Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on Language Proficiency of +2 students in English.

METHOD AND PROCEDURE
Sample- A Sample of 300 students of +2 class was drawn randomly from selected schools of Shimla district.

Tools used- in the present study a Self-developed tool was used. The questionnaire was administered to rural and urban students of +2 class of randomly selected schools of Shimla district of Himachal Pradesh.

Scoring- Language Proficiency high scores indicate proficiency in English. Students with low scores are not proficient in English.

ANALYSIS OF DATA
In order to study the effects of locality, the steam of study and medium of instruction on Language Proficiency of +2 students, 2X2X2 ANOVA involving two levels of locality, two levels of the stream of study and two levels of the medium of instruction at +2 level, was employed.

Table-1
Means at Different Levels
The Complete summary of ANOVA is given in Table 2 as under:

Table-2
Summary of ANNOVA: Language Proficiency of English of +2 Students in Relation to Locality and Stream of Study
*Significant at 0.05 level of Significance
** Significant at 0.01 level of Significance
Locality

The F-Value for Language Proficiency of Rural and Urban students has come out to be 9.18 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence for 1/312 df. In the light of this, hypothesis 1(i) stated as "There is no significant difference in Language proficiency in English among Rural and Urban students at +2 Stage" is rejected. It is indicated that there is significant difference in the Language Proficiency in English of Rural and Urban Students at +2 Stage

Further, it can be seen that mean scores of Rural students is 45.01 and that of Urban students is 46.9. Since the mean score for the Urban students is higher to that of Rural students, it shows that Urban students have better Language Proficiency of English as compared to Rural students.

Sources	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F
Locality	310.08	1	310.08	9.18
Stream of Study	25.88	1	25.88	.77
Medium of Instruction	10591.50	1	10591.50	313.62
Locality X Stream of Study	268.28	1	268.28	7.94
Locality X Medium of Instruction	.253	1	.253	.007
Stream of Study X Medium of Instruction	172.58	1	172.58	5.11
Locality X Stream of Study X Medium of Instruction	178.50	1	178.50	5.29
Within Groups	10536.68	312	33.78	
Total	695437.00	320		

MEDIUM OF INSTRUCTION	LOCALITY				TOTAL
	URBAN		RURAL		
	STREAM OF STUDY		STREAM OF STUDY		
	Science	Arts	Science	Arts	
ENGLISH	54.75	50.53	49.90	51.75	51.75
HINDI	40.22	41.93	37.97	40.35	40.11
TOTAL	47.48	46.23	43.93	46.09	45.93
Combined (Locality)	46.9 (Urban)		45.01 (Rural)		
Combined (Stream of Study)	46.79 (Science Stream)		46.16 (Arts Stream		

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Rural and Urban students differ significantly from each other in Language Proficiency of English and Urban students have better Language Proficiency in English as compared to Rural Students at +2 Stage

A stream of Study:

The F-Value for Language Proficiency of Science and Arts stream students has come out to be .766 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence for 1/312 df. In the light of this, hypothesis 1 (ii) stated as "there is no significant difference in Language proficiency in English among Science and Arts stream students at +2 Stage" is rejected. It is indicated that there is significant difference in the Language Proficiency in English of Science and Arts Students at +2 Stage

The mean scores of Science students are 46.79 and that of Arts students is 46.16. Since the mean score for the Science students is higher to that of Arts students, it shows that Science students have better Language Proficiency of English as compared to Arts students.

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Science and Arts stream students differ significantly from each other in Language Proficiency of English and Science students have better Language Proficiency in English as compared to Arts Students at +2 Stage

The medium of Instruction:

The F-Value for Language Proficiency of English and Hindi medium students has come out to be 313.62 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence for 1/312 df. In the light of this, hypothesis 1(iii) stated as "There is no significant difference in Language proficiency in English among English and Hindi students at +2 Stage" is rejected. It is indicated that there is significant difference in the Language Proficiency in English of English and Hindi Medium Students at +2 Stage

Further, it can be seen that mean scores of English medium students are 51.75 and that of Hindi medium students is 50.75. Since the mean score for the English medium students is higher to that of Hindi medium students, it shows that English medium students have better Language Proficiency of English as compared to Hindi medium students.

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that English and Hindi students differ significantly from each other in Language Proficiency of English and Science students have better Language Proficiency in English as compared to Arts Students at +2 Stage

Two-way Interaction
Locality X-Stream of Study:

The computed value of F for the interactional effect of Locality and Stream of Study on the Language Proficiency of +2 Student has come out to be 7.94 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence foe 1/312 df. It shows that there is the significant interactional effect of Locality and Stream of Study on Language Proficiency of English of +2 Students.

In the light of this, hypothesis 2 stated as, "There is no significant interactional effect of Locality and Stream of Study on Language Proficiency in English of students at +2 Stage.

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Locality and Stream of Study taken together effects the Language Proficiency of English at +2 Stage

Locality X Medium of Instruction:

The computed value of F for the interactional effect of Locality and Medium of Instruction on the Language Proficiency of +2 Student has come out to be .007 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence foe 1/312 df. It shows that there is the significant interactional effect of Locality and Medium of Instruction on Language Proficiency of English of +2 Students.

In the light of this, hypothesis 3 stated as, "There is no significant interactional effect of Locality and Medium of Instruction on Language Proficiency in English of students at +2 Stage.

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Locality and Medium of Instruction taken together affect the Language Proficiency of English at +2 Stage.

A stream of Study X Medium of Instruction:

The computed value of F for the interactional effect of Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on the Language Proficiency of +2 Student has come out to be 5.11 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence foe 1/312 df. It shows that there is the significant interactional effect of Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on Language Proficiency of English of +2 Students.

In the light of this, hypothesis 4 stated as, "There is no significant interactional effect of Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on Language Proficiency in English of students at +2 Stage.

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction taken together effects the Language Proficiency of English at +2 Stage.

Locality X-Stream of Study X Medium of Instruction:

The computed value of F for the interactional effect of Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on the Language Proficiency of +2 Student has come out to be 7.94 which is significant at 0.01 level of confidence for 1/312 df. It shows that there is the significant interactional effect of Locality and Stream of Study on Language Proficiency of English of +2 Students.

In the light of this, hypothesis 5 stated as, "There is no significant interactional effect of Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction on Language Proficiency in English of students at +2 Stage".

From above analysis, it can be interpreted that Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction taken together effects the Language Proficiency of English at +2 Stage.

CONCLUSION
On the basis of analysis and interpretation of data, the following conclusions can be laid down:-
1. Rural and Urban students differ significantly from each other in Language Proficiency of English
2. Urban students at +2 Stage have better Language Proficiency of English as compared to rural students.
3. Science and Arts stream students differ significantly from each other in Language Proficiency of English
4. Students from Science stream have better Language Proficiency of English as compared to students from Arts stream.

5. Students of +2 Stage with English and Hindi medium differ significantly from each other in Language Proficiency of English
6. English medium students of +2 Stage have better Language Proficiency of English as compared to Hindi medium students.
7. Locality and Stream of Study taken together affect the Language Proficiency of English at +2 Stage.
8. Locality and Medium of Instruction taken together affect the Language Proficiency of English at +2 Stage.
9. A stream of Study and Medium of Instruction taken together effects the Language Proficiency of English at +2 Stage.
10. Locality, Stream of Study and Medium of Instruction taken together effects the Language Proficiency of English at +2

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

1. The effects of English language proficiency and levels of scientific reasoning skills and their influence on the performance of +2 Class English language learners and native English language speaking students on Language Proficiency test and Content Knowledge.
2. There is perhaps a relationship between English language proficiency and English content learning. The effect of English language proficiency as factors on the learning of English content knowledge of English language learners.
3. A Higher-order of English language proficiency was shown to predict success in learning English language concepts.
4. The adoption and/or integration of some portions of the theoretical framework and research studies into the current school's science curriculum. Well implemented, both of these could be a potential tool to enhance the English language proficiency and cognitive reasoning skills of English language learners so as to help them achieve higher academic performance.
5. The language used in everyday communication is distinct from the language used in classroom discourse. It is all too easy to misinterpret a student's ability to communicate with classmates on the playground or in the lunchroom—that is, a student's facility with conversational English—as an ability to understand English in any setting, whether in chemistry labs or historical debates.

REFERENCES

1. Bag. Ahjali (1990) A Cross-Sectional Study on the Differential Aptitudes of the Students in English, Fifth Survey of Education Research, Vol. 11, NCERT. Shri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-16, p. 743,
2. Cook, H.G. (2007). Some thoughts on English Language Proficiency Standards to Academic Content Standards Alignment, Working Draft. Retrieved on 10/10/13 from http://www.nciea.org/publications/RILS_3_GC07.pdf
3. Good, Carter. A, A S Barr and Douglas, E. Scates (1941), Methodology of Educational Research New York Appleton-Century, Crofts, Inc.
4. Hector N. Torres University of Massachusetts and Dana L. Zeidler University of South Florida (2002) The Effects of English Language Proficiency and Scientific Reasoning Skills on the Acquisition of Science Content Knowledge by Hispanic English Language Learners and Native English Language Speaking Students. Retrieved on 24/10/14 from http://wolfweb.unr.edu/homepage/crowther/ejse/torreszeidler.pdf
5. Joshi, A.N. (1984). "Factors Influencing English Language Abilities". Fourth Survey of Research in Education (1983-88), National Council of Education Research and Training, 1991, p. 640.
6. Subrahmaniam. (1981). A Linguistic study of Language skills Attained in the English medium schools in India. Fourth survey of research in Education. 1983-1988. New Delhi. NCERT.