



THE ENGLISH TEACHER

An Online Journal

by

The Malaysian English Language Teaching Association

Volume 50 Issue 3

e-ISSN 2716-6406



The English Teacher 50(3)

Editor-in-Chief

Raja Nor Safinas Raja Harun

Editors

Premalatha Nair

Leong Lai Mei

Hamidah Yamat

Fitry Suraya Mohamad

Goh Hock Seng

Administrative Editor

Jane Cheok Mei Lick

Mak Kum Shi

Journal Advisory Board

Stefanie Pillai

Willy Ardian Renandya

Mario Saraceni

Publisher

Malaysian English Language Teaching Association

G-11-2, Putra Walk, Jalan PP 25, Taman Pinggiran Putra, Bandar Putra Permai, 43300 Seri Kembangan, Malaysia

The management of this journal is overseen by the Director of Journals, an elected committee member of the Malaysian English Language Teaching Association.

The opinions expressed throughout this journal are the contributors' own and do not necessarily reflect the view or policy of the Malaysian English Language Teaching Association. If there is a suspicion of misconduct after a paper is published, the journal will carry out an investigation, and the accused author will be contacted and given an opportunity to address the issue. If misconduct has been proven, depending on the nature and severity of the infraction, either an erratum will be placed with the article or in severe cases complete retraction of the article will occur. The reason will be provided in the published erratum or retraction note and the author's institution may be informed.

Copyright © Malaysian English Language Teaching Association. All Rights Reserved.

Permission is given to copy, store and redistribute the material in this publication for non-commercial purposes, in any medium or format as long as appropriate credit is given to the source of the material.

e-issn 2716-6406

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Effects of “English-Only Policy” on Students’ Fluency and Motivation Level in Speaking English Iliana Putri Azhar, Revathi Gopal	157
ESL Learners’ Obstacles in Learning Speaking Skills Rose Suzila Yahaya, Noor Alhusna Madzlan, Mazura @ Mastura Muhammad	173
Students’ Perception on Flipped Classroom Approach in Learning Communicative English among Community College Students Fathilah Begum Mohamed Maidin, Siti Shuhaida Shukor	183

Article



<https://doi.org/10.52696/EGJQ3860>

Reprints and permission:

The Malaysian English Language Teaching Association

Corresponding Author:

revathi@fbk.upsi.edu.my

Effects of “English-Only Policy” on Students’ Fluency and Motivation Level in Speaking English

Iliana Putri Azhar

Faculty of Languages and Communication
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI), Malaysia

Revathi Gopal

Faculty of Languages and Communication
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI), Malaysia

ABSTRACT

The study aims to examine the influence of English-only policy on students’ fluency and motivation level to speak English. The respondents of the study are 20 secondary school students in Hulu Perak who are divided into two groups; experimental group and control group. The research design of this study is quantitative through quasi-experimental and survey. A pre and post-speaking test and a questionnaire which consists of 9 items using 5-point Likert scale are used for data collection. The data is analysed through mean scores of pre and post-test between experimental and control group and the total score of each respondent. The findings of pre and post-test indicate that the mean scores in the experimental group yield a higher improvement (3.20) than in the control group (1.80). Furthermore, the survey findings show that most respondents have a moderate level of motivation (60%), followed by high motivation level (40%). It can be concluded that English-only policy is effective on students’ speaking fluency and students have moderate to high levels of motivation to speak English language in English-only policy lessons. The implication of this study is that teachers can use English-only policy in English language lessons to improve students’ speaking fluency and motivation level to speak English. Apart from that, it can be a benchmark for school administration to implement the approach at school level and for the Ministry of Education to provide training courses for teachers to ensure in-depth implementation of the teaching approach.

KEYWORDS: fluency, motivation level, English-only policy, speaking

Introduction

The choice of language use in English classes has been a controversial subject of debate in English language teaching particularly in the case of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Researchers in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) and English Language educators have been debating about the presence of students' first language (L1) in learning ESL or EFL classrooms. Past studies have highlighted that teachers and students should avoid the use of L1 because it does not benefit the progress of English as a second language (L2). This is due to the belief that the students' first language (L1) may interfere with their second language (L2) development. Also, one of the ways to successfully acquire a target language is by giving enough exposure to the students which cannot be achieved with the frequent presence of L1. The use of L2 is not only an issue in an English classroom. In response to globalization, several countries redefine the role of English in their national curriculum. As a result, English-only policy has become a global phenomenon as it is administered in most tertiary education, especially in EFL contexts such as in China and South Korea. The English-only policy is applied in all courses to attract more foreign students meant to internalise the universities and it is also due to the awareness of the importance of the English Language to cater the global demands.

Despite the growing number of universities, secondary schools, and primary schools implementing English as a medium of instruction, also known as English-only policy, there is not enough empirical research to prove the consequences of using English rather than the first language (L1) on teaching, learning, assessing, and teacher professional development.

It is commonly believed that one of the effective ways of teaching English as a second language is by exposing students to the language as much as possible. The English-only policy is meant to immerse the students in the English-speaking environment in which they will indirectly acquire the language, instead of learning it. It is part of the techniques used by most teachers in ESL classrooms in which the only language that is allowed to be used as a medium of communication is the English language. As English-only policy deals with the enforcement of using the students' second language in the classroom as a tool of communication, it affects the students' speaking skills the most. Thus, as much as it tends to increase the students' speaking skills, it also demotivates them to use the English language.

The implications of using English at all times by both teachers and students in the classroom have been debated over the years. Some believe that using the students' mother tongue is more effective especially in teaching weak students as they cannot improve their English proficiency without knowing the language. In addition, the policy may create an uncondusive environment in the classroom which will affect their process of learning. Rusli et al. (2018) proved that 80% of 20 students of a university in Selangor responded that they feel nervous and shy when they have to speak in English. Thus, it hampers their actual potential in responding to the lesson. Apart from that, 85% of the same group of students reported that they refuse to speak in English as they do not want to commit errors in front of their classmates. It shows that the English-only policy may hinder the students' speaking skills, especially weak students, as they will choose to remain silent instead of making mistakes while speaking in English. In addition, as the researcher is a school teacher, she has experienced that some weak students in her class refused to participate in

classroom activities when they had to use English. They would be participative when they were allowed to use their L1. On the contrary, the English-only policy is seen to be effective in motivating the students to speak in the English language because speaking skills need practice which they cannot achieve outside of the classroom. 96.2% of 214 foreign students who enrolled in the English Language Center (ELC) in the United States left positive comments regarding their perspectives on English-only policy on their open-ended responses. The comments include opinions that the policy positively forces and motivates them to use and to think in English (Shvidko, 2017). These findings indicate that the policy can motivate learners to speak in English. Additionally, the researcher became driven to use English in the classroom when she was in school because that was the only chance that she had to practise it.

As discussed in the previous paragraphs, most of the studies investigated students' and teachers' perceptions towards the presence of L1 in L2 classrooms. Although there are several researches conducted to measure the effects of English-only policy on students' motivation, most of the respondents were the students at tertiary level. Therefore, this research fills the gaps as it covers the effects of the use of the English-only policy on student's speaking fluency and the respondents are at secondary level of education.

Literature Review

Studies on English-only Policy in Foreign Education

Sa'd and Qadermazi (2015) examines the function of using L1 in EFL classes with English-only policy from the EFL learners' perspective. Debates pertaining to the use of L1 in EFL classes have continued over the years. Some researchers view it as destructive, while some see it as beneficial. In Arabic contexts, Sa'd and Qadermazi (2015), mentioned that L1 use by Saudi Arabian EFL learners is probably due to learners' low proficiency and cultural norms. However, the use of L1 is seen as beneficial as it inculcates positive attitudes among learners in an Iranian context.

The study involves 60 EFL learners in an Iranian institute and the data are collected through triangulation – class observations, questionnaire and semi-structured interview. The results show most respondents favour limited use of L1 in EFL classes, while some prefer English-only policy. One of the advantages of using L1 given by the respondents is it clarifies instructions and facilitates complex concepts. Additionally, the advantage of English-only policy is it widens exposure to the language and indirectly improves listening and speaking skills.

Ekawati (2014) examines students' attitude toward monolingual approach in English classes. Monolingual approach implies using only the target language as the medium of instruction. In the Indonesian context, the researcher shares her experience when she was in school. The teacher would punish students who used Indonesian language in the classroom, thus it forced them to only communicate in English. As a practicum teacher, she applies the same approach in her classes and notices different learners' attitude in different classes.

Questionnaire is used to collect data from 103 EFL learners at a high school in Salatiga, Central Java, Indonesia. The focuses of the study are learners' learning performance, opinions and feelings

based on their experiences in English classes with a monolingual approach. The findings indicate different results from the previous study because the majority of respondents show a strong tendency towards English-only. However, the approach does not aid their learning performance efficiently (Ekawati, 2014). It shows that the approach affects them psychologically, but not cognitively.

The Department of Education of the Philippines prioritises students' need and assure they learn the English language effectively as English is deemed as an official language. In fact, English language should be used in school as it maximises students' experiences (Calosor et al., 2020). As reported by Calosor et al. (2020), a study on teachers and students' perceptions in English-only policy involves a grade 11 and a grade 12 student and 6 teachers at St. Gregory College of Valenzuela. The data is gathered through interviews and questionnaires. The results show that most respondents see English-only policy as a beneficial approach as it helps them to communicate in the language. However, some teachers refuse to implement it because they want to appreciate the mother tongue.

The research studies in three foreign countries indicate that respondents are aware of the advantages and disadvantages of English-only policy. Moreover, the assumptions and perceptions of the policy are mostly similar to Malaysian context.

English-only Policy in Malaysian Education

It is already known that there has been a long debate about the use of L1 in second language learning and teaching. Pedagogically and ideologically, one of the main reasons of arguing for this view is the belief that exclusive use of the L2 will significantly increase learners' L2 exposure, thus developing comprehensible input (Krashen, 2009), which would then facilitate learners' understanding of and production in teaching and learning (Wang & Mansouri, 2017). As a result, one of the teaching approaches used in an English classroom is English-only policy. English-only policy restricts the use of students' L1 at any time within the confines of the language school (Shvidko, 2014). In other words, it is a setting in which neither the students nor the teacher are allowed to use the L1 when they are in the class (Sa'd & Qadermazi, 2015).

A review of research studies conducted to scrutinise the influence of L1 in L2 classrooms in Malaysia reveals that L1; Bahasa Melayu, plays an important role in L2 classrooms. Musa et al. (2012) explored the English language teaching (ELT) in Malaysia and factors contributing to learners' low proficiency in the language. The results disclosed heavy interference of L1 in L2 classrooms as one of the issues in the Malaysian ELT context that leads to inaccurate use of the language, particularly in writing skills. However, Stapa and Majid (2006) mentioned that limited proficiency learners construct better essays when L1 is used to generate ideas.

The English-only policy was hardly applied in the Malaysian ELT context in the past. This might be because the main focus in the previous language teaching was writing and reading skills as a result of examinations orientation approaches. Apart from that, Manty and Shah (2017) documents most respondents agree that the English-only policy should be implemented in English class. However, the respondents prefer to use L1 to socialise with their classmates in English class.

Speaking Proficiency in English-only Environment

Learners can achieve speaking proficiency by mastering sub-skills; such as pronunciation, stress, intonation, turn-taking ability, and others, instead of just being able to talk (Rianingsih, 2015). Brown (2004) mentioned that speaking comprises micro skills and macro skills. One of the micro skills includes producing speech naturally which involves suitable phrases, pause and breath groups, and sentence constituents. This micro skill is related to the definition of fluency which is defined as confidently using language with limited hesitations and natural pauses. Besides, macro skills indicate speaker emphasis on larger aspects – fluency, discourse, function, style, cohesion, nonverbal communication, and strategic options.

There were some studies done related to the learners' and teachers' attitudes towards the use of English-only instruction by the teacher and whether it is effective in ELT (Sa'd & Qadermazi, 2015; Ekawati, 2014). As stated in those studies, some of the learners agreed to have such instruction in their classroom as their English proficiency improved. As they were exposed to an English-speaking environment in the classroom, they became more comfortable speaking English. The learners in classes that use English as the sole medium of instruction also had higher English proficiency than those of the more L1 tolerant classes. Moreover, they enjoyed studying in the monolingual class and supported the use of this instruction in their English classes (Rahayu & Margana, 2018).

Several studies show different results in students' speaking proficiency in an English-only environment. Shahini & Shahamirian (2017) reported that some students of an Iranian university agree that tertiary education did not improve their speaking fluency as they have inadequate exposure to the English language. This is due to the limited chance of practising it in the classrooms with their classmates and lecturers. Some of the students feel that code-switching by the teachers sometimes restricts their exposure to English (Rahayu & Margana, 2018). In addition, they do not have any contact with English native speakers in English Language Departments and their lecturers also use the native language outside of the classrooms (Shahini & Shahamirian, 2017). This is supported by Rianingsih (2016), in which one of the problems that occurs in speaking activities is sharing the same mother tongue. As a result, students tend to use it as it feels natural to them instead of communicating in a foreign language. This results in students' difficulties in speaking at the English Intensive Program

Apart from that, according to Wei (2013), most university students in the English as Medium of Instruction (EMI) environment agreed that the policy can improve their English communication abilities. However, there was probably a misconception as the students might have understood getting more chances to speak in English as improving their proficiency (Wei, 2013). Additionally, Tavakoli et al. (2016) found that there is an improvement in speech fluency among English for Academic Purposes (EAP) learners at a university when they study L2 in the target language context. Albakri (2017) reports that most of the respondents believe that learning in English can improve their English proficiency, particularly in speaking skills. Chapple (2015) also states that most of the respondents assume that EMI classes can enhance their English ability.

Despite the many positive feedbacks regarding their English proficiency in an English-only environment, there are small numbers of respondents who perceive that there is no improvement

in their proficiency (Albakri, 2017; Chapple, 2015). Additionally, Andrew (2017) reveals that EMI in Eastern University Sri Lanka does not improve speaking skills among the respondents. This is because the mean values for other English proficiency skills indicate a high level, except for speaking skills which only indicate a moderate level. Several studies were also done regarding learners' and teachers' attitudes towards the presence of L1 in the ELT process and whether the use of L1 is effective in the ELT process (Fareed et al., 2016; Mareva 2016). The findings show that there are positive attitudes towards teachers' code-switching especially since the learners perceive L1 as a tool to facilitate their learning and to foster their understanding of materials.

Second Language Acquisition

Krashen's second language acquisition theories have affected language teaching and learning. The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis, The Input Hypothesis and The Affective Filter Hypothesis concepts are defined in the theoretical framework. Therefore, the main focus of this section is studies that are related to the hypotheses and ELT.

Abukhattala (2013) mentioned that acquisition as in The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis is hardly obtained in Libyan EFL classes as teachers tend to focus on form than content. It is a practice in most classrooms in which learners are provided exercises on form and are always conscious of the lesson. This differs from acquiring the language, for example when learners communicate in the L1. Learners are not conscious of the form as they focus on the meaning instead. Therefore, teachers must improvise teaching techniques to assist language acquisition (Abukhattala, 2013).

Regardless of the critiques of Krashen's Input Hypothesis, some researchers agree that language input can lead to SLA. Krashen (2009) proposed that language acquisition can be achieved in formal and informal settings if learners directly participate in comprehensive language input. This is supported by Bahrani et al. (2014), in which the information entrenched in the input and its regularity contribute to learners' language acquisition. However, the sources of language input are different in informal settings between ESL and EFL contexts (Bahrani et al., 2014). In ESL contexts, learners have the opportunity to interact in English with people from other countries. This is considered as language input and can lead to SLA as supported by Long's Interaction Hypothesis; conversational interaction embellishes SLA, (Bahrani et al., 2014).

In addition, Chao (2013) finds significant influence of the theory on teaching listening. Students' listening ability can be consolidated by applying the skills in three aspects; content, input means and evaluation. Moreover, Abukhattala (2013) stated roughly tuned input is recommended in the language classroom because the input is slightly above learners' level of proficiency which can extend their acquisition. This is different from finely rough input, which is mostly practised by teachers' in a language classroom. Thus, the hypothesis should be adapted according to the teacher's circumstance to achieve the utmost result (Abukhattala, 2013).

In the Affective Filter Hypothesis, the variables consisted of anxiety, motivation and self-confidence. Among the variables, anxiety in language learning is mostly covered by researchers. There is a negative influence of anxiety on speaking performance (Sutarsyah, 2017; Salem and Dyiar, 2014). Sutarsyah (2017) mentioned that learners with a lower level of anxiety get a better

score in speaking performance than higher-level anxiety learners. Besides, Mohamed and Wahid (2009) considered foreign language speaking anxiety as a damaging factor of oral performance and speaking skills. Nervousness, which is a dominant sub-factor of anxiety, may arise when learners are not competent in using the language (Sutarsyah, 2017). Hence, encouraging learners to communicate and create authentic use of language in the classroom are needed to refrain from speaking anxiety and increase motivation and self-confidence to help learners obtain accurate and fluent speaking performance (Sutarsyah, 2017; Salem and Dyiar, 2014).

Apart from that, Nath, Mohamad and Yamat (2017) reported that learners' proficiency is possible to remain low even when they are highly motivated in learning English. It shows that the other variables; anxiety and self-confidence, can still intervene in learners' acquisition process.

Motivation Level in English-only Environment

English as medium of instruction (EMI) is one of the strategies chosen by several universities which mandates English to be used as a medium of interaction in all the sectors of universities such as administration, research, and education (Kim, 2016). A previous study on Korean university students' speaking motivation under EMI policy found that the students felt motivated to learn to speak in English in the environment under the university EMI policy (Kim, 2016). Additionally, Kim (2016) stated that the university students felt comfortable with the class taught by the foreign instructors and responded positively as to the foreign instructor's contribution to their learning. One of the students stated that she was driven to speak English because of class requirements such as English presentation in a subject course. This is an example of extrinsic motivation. Atli and Ozal (2017) supported these findings as they found that among the groups that are being tested – elective, partial EMI and full EMI – the full EMI group has the strongest motivational intensity with an average of 64.2%. The study also found that the full EMI students work harder and are more focused to learn English. They also appreciate all the feedback they receive in their English classes.

On the other hand, another previous study on teachers' perception of Teaching English through English (TETE) benefits towards students in the classroom reported that about half of the teachers believed that TETE enhances learning interest (47.8%) and motivation (46.1%) of students (Kim, 2008). According to Wei (2013), the implementation of English-only instruction does not bring any significant change to students' learning anxiety, learning attitudes and learning motivation. Additionally, Calosor et al. (2020) mentioned students feel embarrassed in the English-only policy classroom and it might negatively affect their emotional security and self-worth. It also leads to lack of self-confidence and interest, nervousness while speaking and afraid of judgement.

Based on the literature review, it can be concluded that although there are several types of research have been done to identify the influence of English-only policy on students' motivation, a notable problem is not many studies have been conducted on secondary or primary school students' responses to TETE (Butler, 2004; Kim, 2002). Therefore, research on secondary school students is needed as the level of competency and attitudes between these two levels of learners are different. The findings may also yield differently (Tsao & Lin, 2004).

Besides, many researchers used a small set of survey items, for instance, just a single item for each construct. This lack of coverage lowers the validity of the scales used, and thus makes it difficult

to interpret the findings (Kim, 2008). Apart from that, most previous studies only investigated students' and teachers' perceptions of the English-only environment. Thus, empirical data is needed to determine the effects of the policy on students' speaking fluency. Meanwhile, this study covers the effects of the use of English-only policy in English lessons on student's fluency in speaking English. The result of students' performance in the speaking test will be quantitatively studied and statistically analysed. Not only that, the focus of most current research is on students' motivation in learning English; it does not focus on specific skills. There is not a lot of research that focuses on how the policy may affect their motivation in speaking in English.

Method

Research Design

The research design of this research is quantitative through quasi-experimental and survey. Quasi-experimental was used to show a cause-effect relationship between the variables – English-only Policy and students' speaking fluency in English. The type of quasi-experimental of this research is pre-test-post -test among non-equivalent groups design. The design is selected to establish a cause-effect relationship between English-only Policy and students' fluency in speaking in English. The approach is applied in two different forms of four classes. Therefore, the English-only policy was administered in one classroom – the experimental group – while another classroom was conducted in the usual medium of instruction, which is the bilingual – control group. The level of proficiency of these groups was almost similar to ensure the validity of this study. Besides, a survey was used to gather quantitative data on students' motivation level to speak in English in both classrooms.

Instruments

Two research instruments are used for this study. The two instruments are: (1) a pre-and post-speaking test and (2) a motivation questionnaire. Speaking fluency is usually measured through speech rate, pause rate and disfluency markers. Speech rate can be measured by calculating the words produced per minute (WPM) inclusively and exclusively. This study focuses on an exclusive rate which refers to a number of words per minute by omitting pauses and disfluencies. A pre-and post-speaking test was conducted for experimental and control groups to identify if there is a slight change in their fluency in speaking English.

Apart from that, a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire is used as the second instrument of this study ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The questionnaire comprises two sections. Section A contains items that obtain information on the demographics of the respondents and Section B comprises 9 Likert scale items on motivation to speak English in an English-only policy classroom. The questions were adapted and adopted from Resmini (2018), Sibarani (2019), Nursanti (2016) and Pyo (2009).

Data Analysis

The pre-and post-speaking test records are analysed through an exclusive rate in which the total number of words is divided by the total time the respondents take to deliver their speech. The result is then multiplied by 60. A comparison between the mean of test scores is used for data analysis.

Next, the questionnaire data to determine motivation level in speaking English is tabulated based on the total score of each respondent. Therefore, the total score for the items ranges from 9 to 45. Based on Toubot et al. (2018), a total score of more than 36 (above scale 4 of each item) indicates a high motivation level to speak in English, while a total score ranging from 27 – 36 (scale 3 – 4 of each item) indicates a moderate motivation level, and a total score of less than 27 (below scale 3 of each item) reflects a low level of motivation.

Results

Research Question 1: How Effective is the English-Only Policy Classroom on Secondary School Students' Speaking Fluency?

The first research question examines the effectiveness of the English-only policy classroom on secondary school students' fluency in speaking English.

Table 1: Comparison of Pre-Test Score

Participants	Pre-test Experimental Group (Wpm)	Participants	Pre-test Control Group (Wpm)
1	82	11	105
2	60	12	76
3	47	13	74
4	86	14	22
5	73	15	38
6	61	16	20
7	126	17	63
8	102	18	41
9	100	19	66
10	72	20	38
Total	809	Total	543
Mean	80.90	Mean	54.30

Table 2: Difference between Experimental and Control Group (Pre-test)

Total Words	Experimental Group	Control Group
----------------	--------------------	---------------

	(No of Participants)	Percent (%)	(No of Participants)	Percent (%)
Below 68	3	30 %	7	70 %
Above 68	7	70 %	3	30 %

Table 1 and 2 show the comparison of mean values and the differences between the experimental and control groups in the pre-test. Based on Table 1, the mean score of the experimental group in the pre-test is 80.90, while the mean score of the control group is 54.30. It can be seen that there is a distinct difference of mean results between both groups. Even though the students were selected based on their recent English examination results, the assessment was solely tested on reading and writing skills. Thus, it is an inaccurate indicator of their speaking skills which led to differences of mean value. As shown in Table 2, only 30% of the students produced less than 68 words per minute in the pre-speaking test, while the other 70% achieved above 68 words in the experimental group. This is opposed to the control group as 70% of them achieved less than 68 words.

A post-test was conducted after one-month implementation of the English-only policy in the experimental group to identify its influence on students' speaking fluency.

Table 3: Comparison of Post-Test Score

Participants	Post-test Experimental Group (Wpm)	Participants	Post-test Control Group (Wpm)
1	89	11	103
2	72	12	48
3	62	13	75
4	91	14	34
5	79	15	60
6	41	16	24
7	131	17	74
8	84	18	38
9	93	19	60
10	99	20	45
Total	841	Total	561
Mean	84.10	Mean	56.10

Table 4: Difference between Experimental and Control Group (Post-test)

Total Words	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	(No of Participants)	Percent (%)	(No of Participants)	Percent (%)
Below 68	2	20 %	7	70 %
Above 68	8	80 %	3	30 %

Table 3 and 4 show a comparison of mean values and difference between the experimental and control group in the post-test. Table 3 and 4 illustrate a slight change in the post-test results. There

is an increase of mean value in the experimental group from 80.90 to 84.10 and in the control group from 54.30 to 56.10. Apart from that, only 20% of students in the experimental group achieved below 68.

Table 5: Mean Difference between Experimental Group and Control Group

	Experimental Group	Control Group
Pre Test	80.90	54.30
Post Test	84.10	56.10
Differences	3.20	1.80

Table 5 shows the mean difference between the experimental and control group. Table 5 demonstrates that there is a 3.20 difference between pre-test and post-test mean value in the experimental group, whereas 1.80 difference in the control group. The differences indicate that the English-only policy in the experimental group is effective on students' speaking fluency. This is because it shows greater improvement from pre-test to post-test mean scores as compared to in the control group.

Research Question 2: What is the Level of Motivation of Students to Speak the English Language in an English-Only Policy Classroom?

The second research question determines the motivation levels of students in the English-only policy lesson.

Table 6: Motivation Level of Experimental Group and Control Group in Speaking English in English-only policy lesson

Motivation level in speaking English	Experimental Group		Control Group	
	Number of respondents	Percentage	Number of respondents	Percentage
Low level of motivation in speaking English (total score of less than 27)	0	0	0	0
Moderate level of motivation in speaking English (total score between 27 and 36)	7	70	5	50
High level of motivation in speaking English (total score of more than 36)	3	30	5	50
Total	10	100	10	100

Table 6 shows the levels of motivation of the experimental and control group to speak the English language in an English-only policy lesson. Based on Table 6, most students in the experimental group scored between 27 and 36 which signify that 70% of them have a moderate level of motivation. Meanwhile, the other 30% of the students demonstrate a high level of motivation with a total score of above 36. Apart from that, students in the control group illustrate equal distribution

in moderate and high motivation level with 50% each. Besides, the results reveal that the students do not experience low motivation level in English-only policy lessons as 0% of them in both groups scored below 27.

Table 7: Overall Motivation Level in Speaking English in English-only policy lesson

Motivation level in speaking English	Number of respondents	Percentage
Low level of motivation in speaking English (total score of less than 27)	0	0
Moderate level of motivation in speaking English (total score between 27 and 36)	12	60
High level of motivation in speaking English (total score of more than 36)	8	40
Total	20	100

Table 7 shows the overall levels of motivation to speak in the English language in an English-only policy lesson. The results reveal that most students scored between 27 and 36 which indicates that 60% of the students have a moderate level of motivation in speaking in the English language. In addition, less than half of the students scored more than 36 which makes 40% of the students experience a high level of motivation in speaking the English language. Surprisingly, 0% of the students scored less than 27 out of 45 which reflects that none of the students has a low motivation level in speaking the English language in an English-only policy lesson.

Discussion

The findings revealed that the respondents in the experimental group have higher proficiency after the implementation of the English-only policy as compared to the respondents in the control group. This is supported by findings in Ekawati (2014) and Sa'd and Qadermazi (2015) in which they found that the learners in class which had English as the only medium of instruction had higher English proficiency than those in the class that tolerated L1 presence. This is because several learners believed that when they had better exposure to the targeted language, they would feel complacent speaking in English. Hence, it leads to better proficiency.

As for the second research question, the respondents have a moderate to high motivation level to speak in the English language in an English-only policy lesson. This is supported by a previous study that found the university students felt motivated to learn to speak in English in the environment under the university English as a medium of instruction (EMI) policy (Kim, 2016). Also, it is found that the control group is more motivated than the experimental group. The finding contradicts Atli and Ozal (2017) that shows the full EMI group has the strongest motivational intensity compared to the other groups without full EMI. This is because students feel uncomfortable and anxious under the English-only policy environment as allowing students and instructors to choose the first language to communicate seems to lower students' anxiety, thus creating an encouraging atmosphere (Berger, 2011). Additionally, Calosor et al. (2020) stated that the English-only policy classroom negatively influences students' emotional security, self-worth, self-confidence and interest. It also causes anxiety while speaking and fear of judgement which indirectly leads to low motivation level.

Besides, as the English-only policy was not implemented in the control group, the respondents were more acceptive of and composed than the experimental group. This is because of the positive perceptions that most students have towards the English-only policy (Calosor et al., 2020; Manty & Shah, 2017; Ekawati, 2014). Students believe that the English-only policy provides wider exposure to the English language and advances speaking skills (Sa'd and Qadermazi, 2015).

Another interesting finding shows that even though the experimental group had a lower motivation level due to feeling anxious and uncomfortable in speaking the English language, they showed a better improvement of proficiency than the control group. This contradicts Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis in which SLA takes place significantly with a high affective filter; low anxiety level, high motivation and high self-confidence. As supported by Nath et al. (2017), the other factors – anxiety and self-confidence – are possible to impede the learner's acquisition process. Thus, a high motivation level may not lead to the advancement of proficiency.

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the English-only policy is effective in improving students' speaking fluency in the English language. Besides, the respondents have a moderate to high level of motivation in English-only policy lessons. Nonetheless, the respondents in the experimental group have a slightly lower motivation level which is due to a lack of self-esteem and fear of judgement.

Conclusion

In conclusion, applying the functional approach in English language lessons enhances comprehensive students' speaking proficiency, particularly in speaking fluency. It is probably due to its main focus which is communicative functions. For instance, the teaching approach utilised in the study, which is the English-only policy, exposes students to the target language through frequent and continuous verbal use of the language in the classroom which contributes to improvement in speaking fluency. However, in the psychology context, teaching approaches can be selected based on students' motivation level to promote exceptional language acquisition. Thus, educators play a fundamental role in determining applicable teaching approaches in English language lessons as long as it caters their students' needs.

The future researcher may consider taking respondents from different levels of proficiency. This is because different levels of proficiency may yield different findings and results and give a better reflection of students' fluency and motivation level. However, the levels of proficiency are only relevant to advanced and intermediate students only as it is impossible to use English-only policy in weak classes. Apart from that, the future researcher may increase the sample size to avoid major differences between the mean values of groups and to ensure high validity and reliability of data. Furthermore, as this study only measures one element in fluency, which is words per minute, it is recommended for future research to measure the other elements in fluency to achieve thorough speaking fluency measurement. Lastly, a survey on factors contributing to students' motivation level can be conducted to identify other possible reasons that affect motivation in language learning.

References

- Abukhattala, I. (2013). Krashen's Five Proposals on Language Learning: Are They Valid in Libyan EFL Classes. *English Language Teaching*, 6(1), 128-131.
- Andrew, A. (2017). English Medium Instructions on English Language Proficiency. *Asian Research Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, 4(4), 1-10.
- Atli, I. & Özal, D. (2017). Does English Medium Instruction (EMI) Make a Difference on Student Motivation? *Journal of Language Research (JLR)*, 1(1), 25-36.
- Albakri, S. (2017). Effects of English medium instruction on students' learning experiences and quality of education in content courses in a public college in Oman: A thesis in *TESOL (doctorate's thesis)*. University of Exeter, UK.
- Bahrani, T., Tam, S. S. & Nekoueizadeh, M. (2014). Second Language Acquisition in Informal Setting. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(8), 1714-1723.
- Berger, M. (2011). English-only policy for all? Case of a university English class in Japan. *Polyglossia*, 20, 27-43.
- Brown, H. D. 2004. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Butler, Y. (2004). What level of English proficiency do elementary school teachers need to attain to teach EFL?: Case studies from Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(2), 245-278.
- Calosor, M., Clarito, H., Alzaga, S., Rosca, A. & San Jose, S. (2020). *Teachers and Students Perception in English Only Policy. ST Gregory College Of Valenzuela*: A thesis in strand general academic strand. St Gregory College of Valenzuela, Valenzuela.
- Chapple, J. (2015). Teaching in English is not necessarily the teaching of English. *International Education Studies*, 8(3), 1-13.
- Ekawati, S.M. (2014). Students attitude toward monolingual approach in English classes at SMA Lab Salatiga: A thesis in English Language Education (master's thesis). Satya Wacana Christian University, Salatiga, Indonesia.
- Fareed, M., S. Humayun, & H. Akhtar. (2016). English language teachers' code-switching in class: ESL learners' perceptions. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4(1), 1-11.
- Krashen, S. (2009). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press Inc.
- Kim, E. G, Kweon, S. & Kim, J. (2016). Korean engineering students' perceptions of English-medium instruction (EMI) and L1 use in EMI classes. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 38(2), 130-145.
- Kim, S. Y. (2008) Five years of teaching English through English: Responses from teachers and prospects for learners. *English Teaching*, 63(1), 51-70.
- Kim, S. Y. (2002). Teachers' perceptions about teaching English through English. *English Teaching*, 57(1), 131-148.

- Manty, M. & Shah, P.M.(2017). Students' Perception: Reasons and Opinions on the Use of First Language in English Classrooms. *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 90-96.
- Mareva, R. (2016). Learners' code-switching in English as a Second Language (ESL) lessons: perspectives of four secondary school teachers in Zimbabwe. *IRA International Journal of Education and Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(1), 71-90.
- Mohamed, A. R., & Wahid, N. D. (2009). Anxiety and Speaking English as a second language among male and female business students in university Industry Selangor. *Segi Review*, 2(2), 65-84.
- Musa, N.C., & Koo, Y. L. & Azman, H. (2012). Exploring English Language Learning and Teaching In Malaysia. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 12(1) - 35-51.
- Nath, P. R., Mohamad, M., & Yamat, H. (2017). The Effects of Movies on the Affective Filter and English Acquisition of Low-Achieving English Learners. *Creative Education*, 8(8), 1357-1378.
- Nursanti, Y. (2016). Students' Perception of Teacher's Bilingual Language Use in an English Classroom. *Journal of English and Education*, 4(1), 159-176.
- Pyo, K. H. (2009). The relationship between students' perceptions of teaching English through English and their achievement. *English Teaching*, 64(1), 95-108.
- Rahayu, D.I., & Margana. (2018). Comparing the Effects of L2-based with Code-switching-based Instruction on EFL Speaking Classes. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(5), 946-942.
- Resmini, S. (2019). EFL Students' Perception towards the Use of Bahasa Indonesia in an English Classroom. *Eltin Journal, Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 7(1), 12-22.
- Rianingsih, R. (2015). *The Teacher Strategies in Overcoming Students' Difficulties in Speaking at English Intensive Program of Ma An-Nur Cirebon: A thesis in Islamic Education in English Language Education* (bachelor's thesis). IAIN Syekh Nurjati Cirebon, Indonesia.
- Rusli, R., Yunus, M.Y. & Hashim, H. (2018). Low speaking proficiency among the undergraduates: why and how? *E-prosidings persidangan antarabangsa Sains Sosial dan Kemanusiaan*, 678-689.
- Sa'd, S. H. T. & Qadermazi, Z. (2015). L1 use in EFL classes with English-Only policy: Insight from triangulated data. *CEPS Journal*, 5(2), 159-175.
- Salem, A.A.M. & Dyiar, M.A.A. (2014). The relationship between speaking anxiety and oral fluency of special education Arab learners of English. *Asian Social Science*, 10(12): 170-176.
- Shahini, G. & Shahamirian, F. (2017). Improving English Speaking Fluency: The Role of Six Factors. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 100-104.
- Shvidko, E. (2018). Learners' attitudes toward "English-Only" institutional policies: Language use outside the classroom. *TESL Canada Journal*, 34(2), 25-48.
- Sibarani, C. (2019). Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Use of Bahasa Indonesia in the English

- Classroom. *JET (Journal of English Teaching)*, 5(3), 217-229.
- Stapa, S.H., & Majid, A.H.A. (2006). The use of a first language in limited proficiency classes: Good, bad or ugly. *Journal e-Bangi*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Sutarsyah, C. (2017). An Analysis of Student's Speaking Anxiety and Its Effect on Speaking Performance. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(2): 143-152.
- Tavakoli, P., Campbell, C., & McCormack, J. (2016). Development of speech fluency over a short period of time: Effects of pedagogic intervention. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50, 447-471.
- Toubot, A. M., & Seng, G. H. (2018). Examining Levels and Factors of Speaking Anxiety among EFL Libyan English Undergraduate Students. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(5), 47-56.
- Wang, H. & Mansouri, B. (2017). Revisiting Code-Switching Practice in TESOL: A Critical Perspective. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 26(1), 1-10.
- Wei, D. (2013). The implementation of English-only policy in the tertiary EFL context in Taiwan. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 187-198.

Article



<https://doi.org/10.52696/WYZY7207>

Reprints and permission:

The Malaysian English Language Teaching Association

Corresponding Author:

rosesuzila@unikl.edu.my

ESL Learners' Obstacles in Learning Speaking Skills

Rose Suzila Yahaya

Universiti Kuala Lumpur,

Royal College of Medicine Perak (UniKL RCMP), Malaysia.

Noor Alhusna Madzlan

Faculty of Languages and Communication,

Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI), Malaysia.

Mazura @ Mastura Muhammad

Faculty of Languages and Communication,

Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI), Malaysia.

ABSTRACT

English is regarded as a second language in Malaysia and is part of the compulsory learning subject in primary and secondary school. However, the learning span of six years in primary school and five years in secondary school does not assure that the students will be able to master their speaking skills. Many of our students are still struggling to speak in English with correct sentence structures and pronunciations. Therefore, this paper aims to discuss the obstacles faced by ESL learners in their speaking skills. Learning perception, anxiety, and social-related problems as well as learning-related problems, were the focus of issues discussed in this paper. This study engaged a quantitative approach to collect the data. The online survey, through “Google Form” was used to obtain data from the 196 tertiary level ESL respondents at one of the higher learning institutions in Ipoh. An adapted questionnaire was used for this study. The questionnaire was constructed in the form of a 5-point Likert Scale from which the choices range from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The items on the questionnaire were analyzed using SPSS 26 and the mean score for each item constructed was calculated accordingly. Findings indicated that the respondents experienced interference of L1 when it comes to difficulty in speaking. The respondents also expected the teacher to correct every error that they say and want the teacher to use a variety of methods and latest approaches to teach speaking skills to boost their interest. This study suggests that ESL learners need to be given more motivation to develop their confidence in using the English language and teachers need to be more creative in implementing strategies that stimulate learners' interest to speak in English.

KEYWORDS: ESL learners, obstacles, speaking skills**Introduction**

Accuracy of speaking correct grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary is always emphasized, therefore fluency is difficult for the students to grasp especially the ESL learners. The flow of the speaker expressing his or her ideas in speaking with the correct pronunciation and tone without much hesitation and unnecessary pause is associated with fluency (British Council, 2021) . In contrast, accuracy points to the ability of the speaker to use appropriate vocabulary, grammar and punctuation correctly (British Council, 2021).

This aligned with the previous studies carried out by Bailey (2003) and Byrne (1986) which indicated that to be considered fluent, one should be able to use the target language smoothly and assertively without too much pausing that could initiate interruptions in his / her communication. This was further supported by Shahini and Shahamirian (2017) stating that fluency is one of the major traits in speaking competency. Meanwhile, Kaushik (2017) was of the opinion that in language learning, fluency and accuracy are equally important for conveying and expressing the speaker's ideas effectively. In Malaysia, Malaysian students were not at par in their English speaking fluency especially outside their classroom setting even though they learned the language for 11 years. Hence, the researchers would like to explore the challenges that ESL learners face in their English speaking skills.

Background of the study

This study aimed to understand the obstacles that obstructed the ESL learners' learning speaking skills at one of the private universities in Malaysia. The learners were the Health Sciences students of diploma and degree levels from various programs namely Pharmacy, Nursing, MBBS, Physiotherapy, and Pharma Technology. Some of them, especially nursing, had been exposed to the clinical environment in the government hospital where 90% of their clinical exposures were in Bahasa Malaysia. Learners were in mixed groups in terms of proficiency in English. The formal lessons that the learners obtained in primary and secondary schools for 11 years were unable to ensure their capability to speak English fluently and accurately. Taking into consideration that the learners came from various backgrounds, social levels, and different proficiency levels, it was important to understand how the learners perceive speaking skills from their perspective.

Methodology

This study engaged a purposive sampling technique to select the respondents. This technique was engaged by the researchers as it gave freedom to choose the right respondents based on the judgment of the researcher. Furthermore, this technique was suitable for the quantitative approach as used in this study. Through the purposive sampling technique, researchers were able to pre-set specific criteria that the respondents had undergone at least 11 years of learning ESL during their high school to ensure the selected respondents answered the research questions accurately. Based on this criteria, 196 ESL respondents of the tertiary level at one of the higher learning institutions

in Ipoh were selected. Aligned with this, the online survey, through “Google Form” was used to obtain data from the respondents. An adapted questionnaire, Moulida (2019), Afshar and Asakereh (2013) were used for this study respectively.

The questionnaire consisted of 30 items with 28 negative constructs and 2 positive constructs. There were various schools of thought regarding these negative and positive constructs. There were opinions stating that negative constructs will mislead the respondents and ruin the data. However, the researchers believed by including both negative and positive constructs, the respondents were exposed to the facts and data that the researchers want to obtain from them. The researchers' stance was supported by the study done by Kamoen (2012) that reported respondents responded better when the question was worded negatively. The items were further segregated into 3 parts, namely, learners' perception of speaking skills, anxiety, and social-related problems, and learning-related problems. It was constructed in the form of a 5-point Likert Scale from which the choices range from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The items on the questionnaire were analyzed using SPSS 26 and the mean score for each item constructed was calculated accordingly.

Table 1: Reliability Values for Variables

Variable	Reliability Statistics	
	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Learner Perception	.701	34
Learning Related Problem	.811	34
Anxiety and Social Related Problems	.858	34
All Variables	.915	34

As shown in Table 1, a pilot study was conducted to ensure the reliability of the questionnaire. The score of the Cronbach's Alpha for all the variables was 0.915, which indicated that the questionnaire possessed an acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.915$). This was supported by Cortina (1993), whereby the score above 0.70 is acceptable, but 0.80 or greater is preferred, therefore, the questions in the questionnaire were considered as reliable.

Findings and discussion

The findings of the first research question, which was on the perception of ESL learners in learning speaking skills is summarized in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Learning Perception (LP)

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
I am very interested in speaking English learning	196	1	4	3.36	.645
Speaking English is very important especially as a front liner in my field	196	1	4	3.55	.602
I always regard speaking as a difficult task to perform	196	1	4	2.54	.861

I hardly relate and applied my speaking lessons to my daily life	196	1	4	2.49	.826
--	-----	---	---	------	------

Table 2 shows the mean score of respondents' learning perception ranges between 3.55 (the highest) to 2.49 (the lowest). The respondents agreed that speaking English was very important in their career and they were interested in learning the skills ($m=3.55$). However, the respondents seemed to consider speaking as an uncomfortable task to perform as they were not able to relate and apply the speaking knowledge that they have learned to their daily life ($m = 2.49$) especially during their clinical attachment as doctors, nurses, and pharmacists were using a lot of medical terms. As a solution to this, speaking lessons in the ESL classroom should be authentic as this will make the learners feel comfortable and able to relate it to their daily life usage. Apart from that, teaching ESP for these groups of Health Sciences learners is another option that should be considered. Table 3 and Table 4, respectively, show the findings for the second research objective, which was to identify the obstacles faced by the ESL learners in learning speaking skills.

Table 3: Anxiety and Social Related Problem (ASRP)

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
I always feel anxious when I speak English in a public especially in front of strangers	196	1	4	2.89	.891
I am afraid of making mistakes	196	1	4	3.01	.894
I do not have good command of English speaking skills	196	1	4	2.74	.869
I feel afraid of being center of attention	196	1	4	2.89	.846
I have no motivation in speaking English	196	1	4	2.23	.873
Shyness prevents me from speaking English	196	1	4	2.64	.964
Some of my course mates speak English very fluently, unlike me, and this demotivates me.	196	1	4	2.57	1.003
I only speak English during English class	196	1	4	2.40	.856
I have difficulty finding opportunities to practice my speaking outside the classroom	196	1	4	2.43	.923
I do not think I will make use of English speaking skills in my career as I'm going to work in the government hospital	196	1	4	1.96	.828

Table 3 focuses on the obstacles related to Anxiety and Social Related Problems. Findings revealed that the respondents were afraid of making mistakes during the speaking process, ($m=3.01$). This finding is similar to the study performed by Al Nakhalah (2016), that indicated the reasons for speaking difficulties among English language students at Al Quds Open University included fear of making mistakes, shyness, anxiety, and lack of confidence. Making mistakes made the respondents feel that they were the center of attention ($m=2.89$), and alternatively made them reluctant to speak in English, especially in front of strangers ($m=2.89$).

Other obstacles faced by ESL learners were the lack of good command in English speaking skills. As mentioned in the study conducted by Zhengdong (2011), ESL students faced a stumbling block

in their spoken English as they had to respond immediately to the conversation and had little space to think much of what they were going to say. This was further supported by Krashen's (1988) argument that when second language speakers rely on "feel" for correctness without prior planning, they will make grammatical errors. This finding suggests that some ESL learners were unable to respond spontaneously to speaking conversation as they needed time to construct the sentence before responding accordingly.

Table 4 illustrated the obstacles of learning speaking skills in learning related problems.

Table 4: Learning Related Problem

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
I want to learn speaking skills well very much	196	1	4	3.59	.622
Choosing proper vocabulary in speaking is very difficult	196	1	4	2.88	.842
I want the teacher to correct every error that I say	196	1	4	3.32	.712
My mother tongue always interferes with my speaking English learning	196	1	4	2.46	.867
When I come to difficult sentences in speaking, I always think in Malay first and translate them into English	196	1	4	3.01	.832
I cannot choose the proper words in expressing meaning in speaking English	196	1	4	2.72	.845
I always make the same mistakes in choosing words in oral form and cannot correct them easily.	196	1	4	2.64	.821
My teachers' teaching methods do not encourage students to speak.	196	1	4	1.83	.823
I am afraid that other students will laugh at me because of my pronunciation.	196	1	4	2.66	.966
My teachers' teaching was too text book oriented.	196	1	4	2.13	.837
There is a lack of autonomy in my speaking lessons.	196	1	4	2.39	.818
My classes are teacher- centered, therefore, I cannot find the chance to express my ideas and participate in class discussion activities.	196	1	4	2.17	.783
My speaking class is overcrowded, therefore no personal attention could be given by the teachers.	196	1	4	2.34	.859
The intervention and error correction of my teacher is too harsh.	196	1	4	1.96	.793
My teachers do not encourage any group work or pair work; this inhibits student - student interaction in class.	196	1	4	1.84	.778

My teachers do not present interesting topics for discussion.	196	1	4	1.91	.827
I do not have enough vocabulary knowledge.	196	1	4	2.52	.807
My speaking teachers spend a large proportion of class time asking questions about things to which they already knew the answers; therefore, no real communication takes place.	196	1	4	2.27	.765
I am afraid of grammatical errors.	196	1	4	2.95	.846
Teachers should use a variety of methods and latest approaches to teach speaking skills to boost students' interest.	196	1	4	3.29	.725
Valid N (list wise)	196				

From Table 4, the respondents had the willingness to learn speaking skills well. However, it seems that they were too dependent on their teachers as they wanted the teachers to correct every error that they made. From findings by Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope (1986), Truscott (1996), Young (1991) and Walker (1973), error correction had negative effects as some students preferred not to be corrected for each speaking and writing error. This practice undermined their confidence and forced them to take so much effort on details that they lost the overall ability to use language. Excessive feedback can prevent learning to take place because if everything is being corrected, learners become too dependent on their teacher, it reduces self-confidence and ultimately, they would tend to avoid saying anything unless they are sure it was correct. It is suggested that teachers can identify students that preferred close guidance in their speaking skills instead of generalizing the finding that all students wanted to be corrected for every error that they made. Rewarding students that manage to speak English for the whole day in class, on one chosen day per week, could motivate them to speak without worrying about the correctness of each of their sentences.

Similarly, the interference of their L1 was another obstacle faced by the respondents when it comes to difficult sentences in speaking. They typically think of a particular sentence in Malay first, and then translate it into English. According to the study by Ye (2013), English learners in China had similar problems. These included the interference of L1 in their speech in the classroom, and too much emphasis was given to memorizing grammatical rules and vocabulary.

Finally, in terms of learning speaking skills, the respondents wanted the teachers to use a variety of methods as well as the latest approaches in teaching to boost the students' interest. Prabhu (1990), however, stated that there was no better method in teaching languages. Different methods were best for different teaching contexts and groups of learners. Teachers can use a variety of approaches to engage the students in the lesson accordingly.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the findings, it was indicated that the learners were fully aware that the ability to speak in English was crucial and they were immersed to learn the language. However, most ESL learners regard speaking as a tough task to perform. On top of that, they claimed that the speaking lessons they learned in ESL classes were not able to be adapted in their daily life.

Findings from the questionnaire stated that the obstacles to speaking English among ESL learners were based on two major factors; anxiety and social-related problems, and learning-related problems. Anxiety and social-related problems were the obstacles that were due to the learner's inner-self such as confidence, motivation, and self-esteem. In this study, most of the ESL learners were afraid to make mistakes as they wished that they could speak like a native speaker. In comparison, the study by Shen & Chue, (2019) and Zhang (2009) stated that speaking English created a challenge for most EFL learners too as the common difficulties included worries about making mistakes, fears for criticism, and shyness. Therefore, as ESL learners, these obstacles should not be the reasons not to learn speaking skills as EFL learners also have the same problems.

On the other hand, learning-related problems include aspects such as grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, teacher teaching method/approach, and learners' expectations. Based on the responses from the questionnaire, learners were enthusiastic to learn speaking skills. However, the ESL learners were too dependent on their teachers' guidance. They wanted the teacher to correct every error that they have made. Bartran and Walton (1994) were of the opinion that in learning speaking skills, teachers should only correct those errors that obstruct the communication; while areas related to grammar structure, function, or skill should be corrected separately. Too many error corrections will demotivate the learners and lead to a lack of self-confidence to speak English. Teachers should lead the learners to accept the errors as part of the learning process that will make them better speakers.

Subsequently, the learners wanted a variety of methods and the latest approaches to be used to teach speaking skills by the teachers. As mentioned by Prabhu (1990), there was no better method in teaching languages. Similarly, Roa (2019), stated that EFL and ESL teachers should employ different approaches and techniques of teaching speaking skills such as Padlet, Vlog and many others to enhance the learners' interest. The new generation of Gen Z (the newest generation between 1997 and 2012) and Gen A (Alpha generation born in 2012) are the generations that are highly attached to gadgets, social media, hip-hop, and rap music. All these elements should be used to get their engagement in more interesting speaking skills activities.

Another obstacle that was highlighted in the questionnaire was the interference of L1 where the learners always think in Malay first and translate them into English. Studies done by Premela and Oh (2020) on Chinese L2 students stated that the interferences were due to lack of opportunities for practice and the struggle for proper vocabulary. The researchers further suggest that it was important to have a good fundamental knowledge of linguistics as it could reduce conflict and misinterpretation of meaning in speaking. For instance, wrong pronunciation might lead to a different meaning which further creates misunderstanding to the other party that is unfamiliar with the slang. This was supported by Krashen's (1981) findings that the interference of L1 on L2 signaled poor fundamentals, but it can be reduced with speaking practice.

Recommendation

Since the present study focused on one particular institute, the results should not be generalized to all ESL speaking learners. The following suggestions are proposed to obtain better results. The first suggestion is to involve other campuses of the university in this study as this could generate more reliable results. The second recommendation is to compare speaking obstacles among other ESL learners specific to the different programmes offered at tertiary level rather than studying ESL learners in general, as each programme might face different obstacles. As such, adopting ESP to this particular group of learners is another option that should be considered.

References

- Afshar, S. H. & Asakereh, A. (2016). Speaking skills problems encountered by Iranian EFL freshmen and seniors from their own and their English instructors' perspectives. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 13(1), 112–130.
- Al Nakhalah, A. M. M. (2016). Problems and difficulties of speaking that encounter English language students at Al Quds Open University. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 5(12), 96-101.
- Bailey, K. M. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill Contemporary.
- Barnard, R. (2002). Peer tutoring in the primary classroom: A sociocultural interpretation of classroom interaction. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 37(1), 57-72.
- Bartran, M., & Walton, R. (1994). *Correction: A positive approach to language mistakes*. Language Teaching Publications: England.
- British Council Foundation Indonesia (2021). Fluency vs Accuracy. Retrieved from <https://www.britishcouncilfoundation.id/en/english/articles/fluency-vs-accuracy>
- Byrne, D. (1986). *Teaching Oral English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(1), 98-104
- Horwitz, E.K. M.B. Horwitz & J. Cope. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125-132.
- Kamoen, N. (2012). Positive versus negative: A cognitive perspective on wording effects for contrastive questions for attitude surveys: A thesis in English Language studies (Doctoral thesis). Tilburg University, Netherlands.
- Kaushik, B. (2017). Accuracy or Fluency First....? *Pune Research. An International Journal in English*, 3(4), 1-9.
- Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. University of Southern California: Pergamon Press Inc.

- Krish, P. & Oh, C.M. (2020). A case study of L1 interference in speech acts among Chinese L2 students. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 26(1), 106 – 118.
- Moulida, I. (2019). *Students' challenges in English public speaking at Dayah Darul Ihsan. A thesis in English Language Education* (Doctoral Dissertation). UIN Ar-Raniry, Banda Aceh, Indonesia.
- Palpanadan, S., Salam, A. R., & Ismail, F. B. (2014). Comparative analysis of process versus product approach of teaching writing in Malaysian schools: Review of literature. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 22(6), 789-795.
- Prabhu, N.S. (1990). *There is no best method-Why?* TESOL Quarterly, 24(2), 161-176
- Roa, P. S. (2019). The importance of speaking skills in English classrooms. *Alford Council of International English & Literature Journal (ACIELJ)*, 2(2), 6-18.
- Shahini, G., & Shahamirian, F. (2017). Improving English speaking fluency: The role of six factors. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(6), 100-104.
- Shen, M. and Chiu, T. (2019), EFL Learners' English speaking difficulties and strategy use. *Education and Linguistics Research*, 5(2), 88-102.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing Classes. *Language Learning*, 46 (2), 327–369., 1998.
- Walker, J. L. (1973). Opinions of university students about language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals* 7, 102-05
- Ye, R. (2013). Discussion on interference from L1 culture to L2 writing and handling suggestions. *International Conference on Education Technology and Management Science ICETMS*, 36-38.
- Young, D.J. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest?. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(4), 426-439.
- Zhang, S. (2009). The role of input, interaction, and output in the development of oral fluency. *English Language Teaching*, 2(4), 91-100.
- Zhengdong, G. (2011). Understanding L2 speaking problems: Implications for ESL curriculum development in a teacher training institution in Hong Kong. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 43-59.

Article



<https://doi.org/10.52696/ZZOD4338>

Reprints and permission:

The Malaysian English Language Teaching Association

Corresponding Author:

fathilahbegum@gmail.com

Students' Perception on Flipped Classroom Approach in Learning Communicative English among Community College Students

Fathilah Begum Mohamed Maidin
Kolej Komuniti Taiping

Siti Shuhaida Shukor
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris

ABSTRACT

Learning English as a second language has never been straightforward, especially when it requires the learners to speak in the target language during the lesson. Students have the tendency to keep quiet and refuse to communicate in English due to many factors. In encouraging students to speak in the target language during the class, many English language instructors have pursued new and interesting approaches. One of the approaches includes flipped classrooms. Flipped classroom allows students to learn the concepts of one particular topic at their own time and pace whilst spending the classroom session on hand-on activities. This study investigates students' perceptions of using flipped classroom approaches in their Communicative English classroom. The aim of this study was to determine whether a learning approach such as flipped classroom had any influence over students' attitudes and motivation. The participants of this study were 106 students at Taiping Community College. This study employed a quantitative research design via survey. Before gathering the students' opinion, the participants had experienced the flipped classroom approach during the Communicative English lesson. After that, a set of questionnaires were distributed to the participants and data were analyzed descriptively. Results revealed that most students had positive perceptions towards the use of flipped classrooms and were highly motivated to learn and had positive attitudes towards the implementation of the flipped classroom approach. This study provides insights for Malaysian community college lecturers to adopt flipped classroom approach in their teaching, especially in the Communicative English lesson.

KEYWORDS: Communicative English; community colleges; flipped classroom; higher education

Introduction

In this era of Industry Revolution 4.0, we need to have the language skills to show our ability in competing with more advanced countries. Apart from the need to communicate with others socially, we must have the skill of communication as it is a very crucial factor to win an employer's heart in terms of seeking a job (Idrus, Salleh, Abdullah, 2011). Research studies that have been conducted in various Asian countries came out with findings that identify better English mastery helps to improve job performance and boost the prospects of promotion. A study by Ojanperä Miina (2014) pointed out some problems that occurred for having poor English language skills which include misinterpretation for it will create frustration and barriers among the employees. According to Mehta & Mehta (2009), to meet the needs for international communication at a workplace, one needs to be proficient in English.

The teaching and learning process in higher education institutions, especially community colleges have proven to be a great challenge to lecturers in general. The need to boost students' English language proficiency is important as they will one day enter the workforce or further their studies to a higher level. According to Bruniges (2012), new forms of learning and creative expression for students have been introduced through the use of new technology. With the advancement of technology, educators are expected to integrate the innovation into their teaching and learning in order to meet the needs of new generations especially for communicative purposes. One of the promising innovations is called flipped classroom. The flipped classroom has become one of the approaches that have become increasingly popular in the higher education sector. According to Saitta, et al., (2016), in a flipped classroom, students are assigned with work through the basic content of a course on their own time. During the class time, students will usually proceed with hands-on activities focusing more on deep learning experiences.

Background of the study

The purpose of this study is to find out whether the flipped classroom approach for students at one of the community colleges in Malaysia will enable them to experience an English classroom in a different environment and whether this approach has imposed positive impacts to the teaching and learning. A research by Tucker (2012) shows that educators in higher education have started to slowly move parts of their class content outside of the classroom because learning within the confined four walls is deemed as insufficient especially when it comes to the deep learning experience. Due to that, time has been freed up inside of the classroom for meaningful exploration by students.

For the past few years, there has been a rise in the amount of literature on flipped learning studies in the second language learning context. These studies have found that the flipped learning approach is an effective English language teaching and learning approach in the L2 context. Some quantitative studies such as Lee & Wallace (2017) statistically quantified the effects of the flipped learning approach on South Korean learners. The results from the study indicated that the learners taught using the flipped learning approach scored significantly higher than the learners in the non-flipped classroom. From another quantitative perspective, the findings from a perceptions' survey showed that learners enjoyed learning in the flipped classroom. In the same vein, Doman and Webb

(2016) carried out the study to examine learners' attitudes toward the flipped learning model using a large-scale experiment at the University of Macau. The results showed that students in the flipped learning approach had also shown a positive attitude towards flipped learning than the students in the non-flipped classroom.

From the literature, it can be summarized that flipped classrooms bring a different way of teaching from the traditional teaching methods where the instructions are delivered online, outside the classroom hour and the homework is brought into the classroom. In the Flipped Classroom approach, teachers act as facilitators, in which teachers assist and guide the pupils in achieving their learning objectives. According to Bermann & Sams (2012), when the lecture is delivered to students via video outside of the classroom it means flipped learning is happening. Santikam. et al. (2018) showed that the flipped approach left a positive impact on the students. This supported the essence of the flipped approach whereas flipped instruction also facilitated student learning compared to traditional instruction.

Another perk of using flipped classrooms is it allows learning to be more individualized and personalized (Sota, 2016). This is in line with the notion that there is no one-size-approach that fits all students. Thus, a more individualized approach should be customized to students' differences and preferences. Besides that, motivating students of different proficiency levels can be increased and students' engagement is enabled. In this study, the objectives were to find out the students' perceptions regarding the use of flipped classroom approach in learning Communicative English as well as finding out whether the approach of flipped classroom influence the students' attitudes and motivation in learning Communicative English.

At community colleges, most of the students possess low grades for their English language subject in Malaysia Examination Certificate (SPM). In order to apply for a certificate programme in community colleges, it is not a requirement for the students to pass their English. However, students are required to complete all the subjects in their designated course including two English courses, which are Communicative English and Workplace English in order to receive their certificate. This study aims to introduce the flipped classroom approach to the students of Taiping Community College so that more time can be spent on activities and practical exercises in the classroom.

Findings and discussion

Findings from Questionnaire

The total population of the students during the study was 106. The population is made up of students of Taiping Community College. The study was done on convenience sampling as the students were presently available in English class during the questionnaire distribution. The respondents were gathered and briefed first to ensure they understand about the purpose of the study and how to answer the questions. Respondents were guided through the questionnaires as the researcher explained every detail of the questions. Students were given the choice whether to continue with the survey or not. Information regarding the study will be given to ensure transparency and clarity.

Table 1: Students' Perception Regarding the Use of the Flipped Classroom Approach in Learning Communicative English

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	SD
I heard about flipped classroom	17 (16%)	48 (45.3%)	40 (37.7%)	1 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	2.235	0.724
I understand the concept of flipped classroom	13 (12.3%)	46 (43.4%)	43 (40.6%)	4 (3.8%)	0 (0%)	2.358	0.745
I find the flipped classroom approach easy to adapt and more engaging	17 (16%)	35 (33%)	44 (41.5%)	10 (9.4%)	0 (0%)	2.443	0.873
I prefer the flipped classroom approach than traditional learning approach	33 (31.1%)	48 (45.3%)	23 (21.7%)	2 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	1.943	0.778
I understand the videos given by my lecturer	10 (9.4%)	34 (32.1%)	30 (28.3%)	28 (26.4%)	4 (3.8%)	2.83	1.046
I find the flipped classroom allows me to control my own learning	13 (12.3%)	32 (30.2%)	43 (40.6%)	16 (15.1%)	2 (1.9%)	2.641	0.948
The flipped classroom approach helped me understand the content easily	28 (26.4%)	46 (43.4%)	30 (28.3%)	2 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	2.056	0.79
I feel happy to learn Communicative English using the flipped classroom approach	9 (8.5%)	36 (34%)	39 (36.8%)	21 (19.8%)	1 (0.9%)	2.707	0.915
I am able to keep up my lessons in Communicative English classes using flipped classroom approach	19 (17.9%)	44 (41.5%)	35 (33%)	6 (5.7%)	2 (1.9%)	2.32	0.9
I want to continue learning using the flipped classroom approach	17 (16%)	40 (37.7%)	35 (33%)	14 (13.2%)	0 (0%)	2.434	0.915
Overall Mean						2.397	0.618

To obtain the reliability coefficient, Cronbach's alpha was performed to affirm the internal consistency of the variables (Hair, et al., 1998). The flipped classroom approach as the first construct had resulted in an alpha level of 0.94 which showed a high degree of reliability. Meanwhile, an alpha level of 0.89 was obtained from the motivation and attitude construct items, which also showed a high degree of reliability. As such with an overall alpha level of 0.91, the scale and its two constructs are highly reliable.

Table 2: Students' attitudes and motivation in learning Communicative English

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	SD
I learn language better when I have positive attitude	22 (20.8%)	37 (34.9%)	30 (28.3%)	17 (16%)	0 (0%)	2.396	0.992
My attitude in learning has improved when flipped classroom approach is introduced	8 (7.5%)	22 (20.8%)	51 (48.1%)	21 (19.8%)	4 (3.8%)	2.915	0.927
I feel that I am more motivated to learn when flipped classroom approach is introduced	26 (24.5%)	41 (38.7%)	23 (21.7%)	16 (15.1%)	0 (0%)	2.273	1.00
I am more actively engaged in the activities given by my lecturer using the flipped classroom approach	39 (36.8%)	43 (40.6%)	22 (20.8%)	2 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	1.877	0.801
Flipped classroom gives me greater chance to communicate confidently with my lecturer and friends	24 (22.6%)	49 (46.2%)	22 (20.8%)	11 (10.4%)	0 (0%)	2.188	0.906
Overall Mean						2.33	0.718

Santikam., et al (2018), showed that flipped approach had a positive impact on the students. The study revealed that the students' English scores were satisfactory after students were taught in flipped classrooms. From the same study, most students gave good perceptions on flipped classroom approach. They believe that this approach allowed them to be autonomous learners. The positive feedback from this study as well implies that students of Taiping Community College are open to accept new things.

Discussion

In line with globalization and modernization, educators in higher education institutions are always seeking the best tools and techniques to employ in order to increase students' achievement. As new technologies emerge, best practices in relation to these technologies should be thought critically by the educators. A progressive classroom change in culture is how one should describe flipped teaching. It suggests a synergy of 21st century learning styles with technology and social academia changes. In this present study, one instructional strategy was implemented which showed a promising outcome for student learning which is flipped classroom approach. This strategy, besides being evolved into a platform for promoting critical thinking, is also promoting collaboration work as well as social interaction with peers on an academic level. Students are encouraged and were provided with educational activities to be active in flipped classroom

approach. Based on the findings obtained, the respondents show good perception towards the approach introduced.

This study has a number of implications for the college management as well as the lecturers regarding the implementation of flipped classroom approach in learning Communicative English. As the top management, this study will enhance their understanding on the aspect which should be focused on enhancing the effectiveness of flipped classroom approach in learning Communicative English. Furthermore, it will create awareness to the management to ensure that students can adapt with the approaches introduced. This study will serve as a base for more analytical and comprehensive future studies. Better understanding of students' perceptions and impact of flipped classroom approach in students' learning process can influence lecturers' way of teaching in the community college.

Conclusion

Overall, it can be seen that the flipped classroom approach is an innovative strategy which is adopted in higher education because it suits the demands of students at higher academic institutions with the aid of development of technology. The present study showed that the students' perception of flipped classrooms in community college was high. The findings from this study confirm the results of these studies and highlight advantages associated with the flipped classroom approach. Referring to the finding in this study, it indicates that students' perception towards flipped classroom approach in learning Communicative English is good as they could well-understand with the concept introduced. This approach acts as the platform for the students to develop their ability to understand the learning easily. Besides that, it was found that flipped classroom approach was more engaging compared to the traditional classroom learning method. This situation gives positive influence towards students' achievement in the respective subject.

Investigation of the students' perception on the flipped classroom approach for other subjects can be extended further to evaluate its effectiveness. Also, this research can be extended to other community colleges in Malaysia to evaluate students' perception of flipped classroom approach in learning. Several potential areas for future study when considering the differences that exist in flipped vs. traditional classrooms can be suggested. The first is to determine whether the construct of the content or the instructional model came from a different level of learning. Different type of interaction as well as reducing cognitive load through flipped teaching are another point to ponder when researching the increased collaboration in classroom activities. Educators might want to consider researching the structure of the flipped classroom to be introduced in their institutions. The structure can cover some points such as targeted instructions in navigating classroom strategies and expectations and investigating the responsibility of students in accessing, navigating and collaborating their personalized learning.

References

- Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2012). *Flip your classroom: Reach every student in every class every day*. Oregon, Washington: ISTE.
- Bruniges, M (2012). *21st century skills for Australian students*. Report from 21st Century Skills Forum, Tokyo, Japan, 14 November, NSW Education and Communities, Sydney NSW.
- Doman, E., & Webb, M. (2014). The flipped and non-flipped EFL classroom: Initial reactions from Chinese university students. *Thai TESOL Journal*, 27(1), 13-43.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Idrus, H., Salleh, R. & Abdullah, M.R.T.L. (2011). Oral communication ability in English: An essential skill for engineering graduates. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educators and Education*, 26(1), 107-123.
- Lee, G., & Wallace, A. (2017). Flipped learning in the English as a foreign language classroom: Outcomes and perceptions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 1-23. doi: 10.1002/tesq.372.
- Mehta, D. & Mehta, N. K. (2007). Communication skill for Engineering professionals. *Adit Journal*, 4(1), 89- 95.
- Miina, O. (2014). *Effects of using English in Business Communication in 15 Japanese-Based Multinational Corporations*. A thesis in International Business. University of Oulu, Finland.
- Saitta, E., Morrison, B., Waldrop, J. & Bowdon, M. (2016). *Introduction: Joining the Flipped classroom conversation*. In J. Waldrop & M. Bowdon (Eds.), *Best Practices for Flipping the College Classroom* (1-16). New York: Routledge.
- Santikam, B. Wichadee, S. (2018). Flipping the classroom for English language learners: A study of learning performance and perceptions. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 13(9), 123-135.
- Sota, M. S. (2016). *Flipped Learning as a path to personalization*. In M. Murphy, S.Redding, & J. Twyman (Eds.), *Handbook on Personalized Learning for States, Districts, and Schools*, 73–87. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University, Centre on Innovations in Learning.
- Tucker, B. (2012). *The Flipped Classroom*. Education Next, 12(1).
<http://educationnext.org/the-flipped-classroom/>