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Abstract

The globalization of English and a growing demand for competent English language users in the job markets have placed a greater emphasis on English language teaching in Bangladesh. This article examines the language learning techniques in English speaking classes in response to the global influence at undergraduate level of Bangladeshi university. A survey and focused group discussion (FGD) based on an observation of recordings with the students have been done to draw the conclusions of students’ implicit and explicit understanding of speaking lessons. Also, an interview of the teachers has been conducted. Needless to say, all the methodologies were given an equal importance in the research with the equal contribution to the found data. This study also observes if “divergent thinking in English” can be used in the speaking classes as a tool to improve the oral production of the students. Findings from the study with relevant references from the literature suggest that the students have been overall satisfied with their speaking classes. Cross-functional analysis of teachers’ response and students’ response suggest that the tools which have been used in the classes have been successful to initiate more spontaneous communication and improve student’s ability of oral production. This has also been found from the FGD and the experiment of divergent thinking which has been done with the students that divergent thinking in English may influence language learning although its functionality and application in speaking classes of undergraduate level students of Bangladesh haven’t been proved. The study of socio-psychological variables and relative tests of brainstorming and divergent thinking to language processing will probably provide additional insights on the topic.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In this chapter, the background, context and purpose along with scope and significance of this research have been discussed. Finally, the outline of the remaining chapters is mentioned.

1.1. Background

William Shakespeare in his book *Henry V* said, “Men of few words are the best men”. In this world of globalization however, our students cannot excel in their professional life unless they can produce spontaneous speech in English as English has become the medium of communication in all tiers of today’s society.

The globalization of English and a growing demand for competent English language users in the job markets have placed a greater emphasis on English language teaching in Bangladesh. According to Farooqui (2007) “to raise people’s overall level of competency in English language, the Bangladesh government made changes in its education policy. The English Language Teaching Improvement Project (ELTIP) introduced communicative textbooks up to the higher secondary level. The project aims to facilitate the teaching and learning of English with a methodology that will encourage students to acquire communicative competence in English through regular practice of these skills in the classroom. She also said, the enactment of the Private University Act in 1992 marked another major breakthrough in the higher education system in Bangladesh. The law was approved with the expectation that these universities would open their doors to the education appropriate for the time. These universities emphasize developing English language skills. Good speaking ability is a must to meet the challenges of the new century as well as ensuring one’s place in the competitive world especially in the job market. But in many ways it is one of the marginalized skills and Bangladeshi students hardly have the scope to learn this at secondary and higher secondary levels in our country said Khan (2007). In language classrooms, the focus was on grammatical rules, memorization of vocabulary, translation of texts and doing written exercises said Frooqui (2007). Classes were taught in the native language ‘Bangla’ (also known as Bengali),
with little active use of English language. Since the English courses did not seem to improve the skill levels of the students, as expected, reform started to take place in education from early 1990s.

My contextual studies on speaking and condition of teaching speaking in various institutions in Bangladesh suggested that many educational institutions pay more attention to teach grammar and rules of English without emphasizing the fluent use of the language while speaking (in Bangla medium schools mostly as suggested by Huq, 2014); most of the times the learners learn the grammatical rules very well but they fail to speak fluently. Therefore, in order to develop the speaking skill more effective measures should be assumed and it is important for the teachers to design the lessons in a way that will make the learners motivated to learn and speak fluently.

1.2. Context
Teaching speaking in tertiary level has enabled me to rethink about the strategies we apply at various levels (i.e school, college, University) of learners to make them fluent in English speaking.

According to Farooqui (2007) and Alam & Sinha (2009) The teaching system of English at secondary and higher secondary levels have shifted from the traditional Grammar Translation Method (GTM) to the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) but the required qualitative changes have not been ensured yet suggested Bhattacharjee (2008). Therefore, students’ acquisition of the language English remains naively dependent on the primary language (Bangla) which impedes the process of replicating language into action specially while speaking as it allows less time to think. According to Zakin (2007) speaking requires a faster recalling of the vocabulary and grammar rules for producing the target language, therefore it is important for the student to be able to “think in English” more spontaneously in order to be able to speak in English fluently.
1.3. Purpose of the study

This research aims to find the various methods and practices of teaching English speaking in the private universities of Bangladesh. Also, how these students can speed up their cognitive ability of translating their primary language into target language and deliver the target language more effortlessly by applying the technique “thinking in second language” when they are talking to themselves or thinking on random topic during everyday life. This research tries to answer the following primary questions:

1. What are the tools used in the private universities of Bangladesh to teach speaking to its English students who take the two compulsory English courses?
2. From teachers’ and students’ perspective what are the most effective practices in English speaking classroom of private universities?
3. Can thinking in the target language (in this case English) help improve students’ cognitive abilities and achieve a better fluency?

1.4. Significance of the study:

Although, some universities in Bangladesh have introduced separate speaking courses (Farooqui, 2007), most of the universities are still unaware of the effectiveness of a separate English class. However, this paper will give an insight to the language teachers of the importance of having a separate speaking class and the tools which can be most effective in such classes in Bangladesh. It is expected that the findings of the study will help the language teachers to know better about the effectiveness of using “inner speech in the classroom. As a result, this study will be a future guideline for the English language teachers and universities regarding the issue.
1.5. Thesis outline

My study shall examine the challenges that are responsible for, students not being able to speak in English fluently. The study shall further enlighten on how thinking in second language can improve students’ fluency in speaking. Following is a quick overview of the study in brief.

Chapter I is the introduction of the study. In this chapter, I have discussed the background of the study and also contextualized the study in terms of Bangladeshi students. This section also includes the reasons and purposes of the study and will show the significance and scope.

Chapter II includes an insight of the literature review that is relevant to English language teaching in Bangladesh. The chapter also enlightens on various relevant theories to support the idea of thinking in second language.

Chapter III is about the information on the research design and research methodologies, including the research tools and instruments, analysis, ethics and limitation of the research.

Chapter IV includes the systematic and thematic results of the findings.

Chapter V includes analysis of the results where a connection between the findings and the literature reviews have been maintained.

Lastly, Chapter VI is the conclusion of the study culminating the result and the discussion of the study and providing the recommendation based on the “divergent thinning in second language” phenomena for the further improvement of the Bangladeshi students’ speaking English ability.
Chapter II

Literature review

2.1. Theoretical framework of teaching speaking

Among the four skills speaking is one of the most important productive skills. Brown and Yule (1983) have made a distinction between the two functions of language which are, ‘transactional language and interactional language’. Transactional language deals with factual and propositional information and deals with the transfer of that information, while interactional language is used to establish and maintain social relationships. According to Brown and Yule (1983), spoken language can be both interactional and transactional whereas interactional language is ‘listener oriented’ and transactional language is ‘message oriented’. Nunan (1989) states that, most spoken interactions “can be placed on a continuum from relatively predictable to relatively unpredictable”. He also states that, “transactional encounters of a fairly restricted kind will usually contain highly predictable patterns”. Examples of transactional language could be a conversation between shopkeeper and the customer or between a doctor and a patient, which are quite predictable dialogues or language. Teaching transactional language could be easier for the beginner level learners as the forms of language used are of quite predictable patterns.

Initially, practice in spoken English was conducted by having students repeating some sentences and then memorizing those sentences or dialogues. This method of teaching and learning is called audio-lingual method where students learn to speak by practicing grammatical structures, by repeating drills and then using them into conversations. In this method, accuracy in speaking is emphasized over fluency. The theoretical basis of this method is ‘behaviorism’ which believes that language is learnt through habit formation where errors cannot be overlooked. During nineteenth century, language acquisition researchers concluded that infants learn their first language and people acquire their foreign language in fragments by interacting with one another. Through constant studies by researchers of diverse fields in the mid twentieth century, a method called ‘Communicative Language Teaching’ came into being; in this method, what is emphasized is enabling learners to communicate meaningfully in the
target language and teachers often downplay accuracy and set the tasks where the students get the opportunity to speak and thus enhance their fluency in the target language. However, Ur (1991) mentions, “in order to communicate well in another language we must make ourselves understood by the people we are speaking with. And this is not an easy task- especially in the beginning and intermediate levels”.

According to Nunan (1989), to be successful in acquiring the speaking skill in the target language, the following sub skills should be developed:

1. The ability to articulate phonological feature of the language comprehensibly
2. Mastery of stress, rhythm, intonation patterns
3. An acceptable degree of fluency
4. Transactional and interpersonal skills
5. Skills in taking short and long speaking turns
6. Skills in the management of interaction
7. Using appropriate formulae and fillers

There are two approaches of teaching speaking which are ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ approaches suggested by Harmer. Top-down approach suggests that learners start working from the larger elements and gradually goes to the smaller ones. In this case learners begin with greater chunks of language, which are embedded in meaningful social contexts and use their background knowledge to grasp and to use the smaller components of language. The bottom-up view suggests that learners move from the mastery of the discrete elements of the language to the mastery of the larger components (Harmer, 1988), that is, it starts from the mastery of phonemes, syllables, morphemes, words etc. Ur (1991) believes that learners should be given opportunities to talk by using group work or pair work, and limiting teacher talk; because in pair work and group work, there would be wider opportunities for learners to interact and communicate meaningfully with others. Several activities can be conducted in groups or pairs like role play, debate, jigsaw tasks etc.
The American applied linguist, Krashen (1985) made a distinction between acquisition process and learning process. He claimed, “Language which we acquire subconsciously is language we can easily use in spontaneous conversation because it is instantly available when we need it. Language that is learnt on the other hand, taught and studied as grammar and vocabulary is not available for spontaneous use”. Ur (1991) has also made a distinction between ‘accuracy’ and ‘fluency’. According to him, “‘accuracy’ is the extent which students’ speech matches what people actually say when they use the target language” and ‘fluency’ refers to the ability of speakers to “use the language quickly and confidently, with few hesitations or unnatural pauses, false starts, word searches etc”. According to Harmer (1988), “Children subconsciously acquire languages with considerable ease. Yet adults find things more difficult, especially when they are learning in classrooms away from target- language communities;” According to Donough and Shaw (1993), “As a skill which enables us to produce utterances, when genuinely communicatively, speaking is desire and purpose driven, in other words we genuinely want to communicate something to achieve a particular end”. Learner’s age is a very important determinant in an individual’s approach to foreign language learning. It is best if learning the foreign language is initiated at the very early age. Lenneberg (1967) argues that, “the language acquisition device (LAD), like other biological functions, works successfully when it is stimulated at the right time- a time called the ‘critical period’. This critical period ends after adolescence and according to this argument, adult learners will hardly achieve native like proficiency if they start learning the foreign language after their adolescence. Krashen, Long, and Scacella (1982) say that, if acquirers begin to learn a second language early in childhood through natural exposure, they will be able to achieve higher level of proficiency than those beginning as adults. Many researchers have researched to see if age really makes a difference in learning a foreign language. The main question of Patkowski (1980) before his research was “Will there be a difference between learners who began to learn English before puberty and those who began learning English later?” and by his research this question was answered with a very resounding “yes”. This study further supports the critical period hypothesis that there is a critical period during which one can achieve native like mastery in foreign language. As noted by Skehan, “the
question is, are learners more highly motivated because they are successful, or are they more highly successful because they are highly motivated”. In teaching a foreign language to the beginner level learners, motivation is very essential factor to help the learners attain success. Gardner and Lambert (1972) (cited in: Rahman, 2005) talked about two types of motivation which are ‘integrative motivation’ and ‘instrumental motivation’. Integrative motivation refers to language learning for personal growth and cultural enrichment and instrumental motivation refers to language learning for more immediate and practical purposes and goals. However, in many cases, learning a second language can be both a fact of enrichment or of resentment. “If the speaker’s only reason for learning the second language is external pressure, internal motivation may be minimal and general attitudes towards learning may be negative.” (also cited by Lightbown and Spada, 1999).

2.2 Divergent - thinking (DT) in second language to improve language proficiency

In this section I have elaborated on the literature which explained how brainstorming and divergent thinking has helped improve language proficiency. The first part elaborates on different experiments which has been done in the past proving how brainstorming activity impact on different aspects of second language production. The second part enlightens on several studies that have examined the relation between divergent thinking and the processing and learning of language.

2.2.1 Brainstorming and foreign language learning

There is a small body of literature examining the impact of brainstorming (i.e. DT) on different aspects of second language production. Brainstorming is a standard pre-writing practice in second language classrooms (Badge & White, 2000; Taylor, 1981; Johnson, Mercado, & Acevedo, 2012) such that, in preparation for writing on a given topic, students spend time freely generating ideas and words associated with the topic.

With respect to oral proficiency, Khodadady, Shirmohammadi, and Talebi (2011) trained adult students learning English in a brainstorming strategy for discussion activities in English, the
second language. Over a period of a month, students in the training group engaged in eight 90 minute brainstorming sessions in which they freely generated ideas and words about a topic provided by the teacher. The teacher wrote the ideas and words on the board and then the class discussed and refined the ideas. Students in the control group participated in discussion activities that did not involve brainstorming. Oral proficiency was assessed before and after training with an interview test. Upon completion of training, participants in the brainstorming training group showed greater improvements in oral proficiency than the control group.

Focusing on essay writing, Rao (2007) conducted a training study in which participants (Chinese university students in advanced English courses) were trained to use brainstorming as a pre-writing technique over the course of a semester, instead of the standard method of writing instruction. Students first brainstormed on a topic individually and then discussed their ideas in pairs. They then presented their ideas to the class for feedback and discussion. The control group followed a traditional method of writing instruction which did not involve brainstorming. Participants wrote essays before and after training which were rated and given a grade based on content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. The training group made greater gains in writing grades from pre- to post-training assessments than the control group. This suggests that using brainstorming as a pre-writing activity does indeed facilitate the increase in foreign language writing competence.

Lally (2000) compared the effects of brainstorming in the first versus the second language on L2 writing performance in adults (native English speakers in their fourth semester of French) and found no difference in vocabulary use between the two but that brainstorming in the first language led to better organization of the essays. This result indicates that the relative ease of brainstorming in L1 and, perhaps, the access to a wider variety of lexical items in the first language facilitate the organization of ideas.

In summary, there is promising evidence from three of four studies that brainstorming improves L2 language production. A limitation of these studies is that they were not designed
to reveal whether the effect was due to students’ exposure to a variety of ideas or to their active generation of these ideas. It is this active generation process which is the crux of DT ability.

2.2.2 Divergent thinking (DT) and language processing

This section reviews the studies correlating divergent thinking and language. The available correlational studies have examined three aspects of language processing, semantic associative processing, bilingualism (vs. monolingualism), and foreign language proficiency. This section also discusses additional evidence that suggests that attention control may mediate performance in both domains.

2.2.2.1 Semantic associative processing

There is evidence that Divergent Thinking (DT) ability predicts certain aspects of monolingual language processing, specifically semantic processing. Gruszka and Necka (2002) found that individuals who exhibited high DT performance were more likely to judge remote associates to be related. Vartanian, Martindale, and Matthews (2009) found that individuals with high DT ability had faster reaction times when making relatedness judgments. Lastly, Benedek, Könen, and Neubauer (2012) found a strong association between associative abilities (as assessed by word association tasks) and performance on the alternate uses test. The connection between semantic associative processing and DT performance is not entirely surprising as the latter involves the flexible combination of words/concepts that may be weakly related or unrelated. These results suggest that semantic associative processing abilities may underpin DT skill. The exact nature of these abilities, including (but not limited to) the role of cognitive control, remains to be determined.

2.2.1.2 Studies on bilingualism:

More evidence for the connection between DT and language function comes from studies on bilingualism. There is a wealth of research indicating that bilingual’s exhibit enhanced cognitive control relative to monolinguals (Bialystok, 2006; Bialystok, Craik, & Luk, 2008). This is also true of DT ability. Comparisons of monolinguals and bilinguals have shown that bilinguals tend to
outperform monolinguals in both verbal and figural DT tasks (Ricciardelli, 1992; Simonton, 2008). Researchers have found that bilingual children outperform their monolingual counterparts on fluency (Carringer, 1974; Jacobs & Pierce, 1966), flexibility (Carringer, 1974; Konaka, 1997) and originality (Cummins & Gulustan, 1974; Konaka, 1997; Okoh, 1980). This has also been found in adults: Karapetsas and Andreou (1999) found that bilingual adults showed greater fluency in an alternate uses type task than their monolingual peers. Kharkhurin (2010) found that bilinguals showed enhanced fluency and flexibility in the Abbreviated Torrance Test for Adults (Goff, 2002), compared to monolinguals.

2.2.1.3 Studies on DT and second language acquisition:
There is evidence of a positive correlation between DT and second language acquisition. Otto (1998) found that all measures of performance on the Torrance Tests for Creative Thinking (TTCT) predicted foreign language course grades in high school students aged 14-16. Pishghadam, Khodadady, and Zabihi (2011) found that, in adults, performance on the Arjomand Creativity Questionnaire (ACQ; an instrument designed to measure creativity among Persian speakers in Iran) predicted foreign language course grades. Albert and Kormos (2011) found that students aged 15-16 with high fluency scores in the DT components of standard test of verbal and figural creativity spoke more in the second language, while those with high originality scores created more complex narratives in a story generation task in the second language. In contrast, Hajilou, Yazdani, and Shokrpour (2012) (cited in Haarmann, 2013) found no connection between performance on the TTCT and receptive and productive vocabulary abilities in adult learners. While small in number and not entirely unanimous, this group of studies suggests that DT ability predicts success at learning a second language.

2.3 English as a language in Bangladesh
Rahman (2005) mentions that English has a purely functional role in Bangladesh and there is seemingly no possibility of English becoming lingua franca unlike its neighboring country India. Akhter (2011) in her paper cited (page 13) “In the Indian subcontinent the use of English begun through British colonialism (Rahman, 1996: Farooqui, 2007), about two hundred years back
At the initial stage, the reasons behind using English linked with business among the people of different linguistic background (Rahman, 1999). With the development of business and communication, there was a rapid growing demand of using English (Rahman, 1999) and gradually it became the medium of communication in the field of education, administration, politics and so on (Das, 2009). English made the official language of law courts in 1837 and in 1844; it declared that in case of recruitment, competent English language users would be given preference (Rahman, 1999). This declaration greatly influenced the educational institutions like colleges, universities madrasas etc. (Rahman, 1999). English become firmly established as the academic and official language of India at the beginning of twentieth century and continued until 1947. After the establishment of India and Pakistan in 1971, English continued to play a very important role in multilingual West and East Pakistan (Rahman, 1999; Das, 2009). Although language movement for the status of Bangla language infused a strong feeling of linguistic nationalism among Bengalis and at the end government had to accept Bangla as one of the state language, even then English retained the same power and position in the field of education, administration, and politics in West and East Pakistan from 1947 to 1971. During this time, English used to teach as a second language (Das, 2009).

2.4. English language teaching (ELT) in Bangladesh

Akhter (2011) said in her article English is being taught as a compulsory subject in Bangladesh for over 150 years and even now, Bangladeshi students learn English as a compulsory subject from the primary school to higher secondary level. But the fact is that, still there is no clear policy on English Language Teaching and it is tied up with the general education policy (Rahman, 1999). A developing country like Bangladesh should have a clear policy for the teaching of English at different levels of education determined by the practical needs of learning the language. Ara (2009) pointed out that after the creation of independent Bangladesh ELT policy has been changes several times with the changes of governments but none of them is succeed. All the governments wanted to take the credit of formulating a good education policy without considering the previous one (Das, 2009). There is always been a
relation between education policy and politics. For this reason, it has not been possible to compile and implement any education policy even after the forty years of the independence.

After the independence, the status of English has changed to foreign language from second language and Bengali has given the status of official language (Ara, 2009: Das, 2009: Rahman, 1999). At the same time the medium of instruction at secondary and higher secondary levels were changed from English to Bengali but tertiary education continued in English (Rahman, 1999). According to the National Education Commission Report of 1974, with the constitutional recognition of Bangla language, all the English textbooks translated into Bengali (in Rahman, 1999: in Das, 2009). The same commission recommended that, it is unnecessary to introduce any other language other than Bengali up to class V and English should be introduced as a compulsory subject from class VI to XII. Das (2009) mentioned that, this commission has a number of lacking like; it did not have any recommendation about the effective classroom methodology for English Language Teaching and this remained silent about the type of texts for different levels of study. It does not say anything about the teaching of English as a compulsory or optional subject at college or university level (Das, 2009). He also figured out that this commission holed strong support to continue English as a second language. However, the recommendations were not implemented because of the political unrest during that period.

According to Farooqui (2007), In Bangladesh, English language teaching and learning has followed the traditional grammar translation method in all levels of general education since it emerged as an independent country in 1971. Farooqui (2007) in her article mentioned that English is a foreign language in Bangladesh and the country depends on it for various internal trades and conducting business with the outside world. Bangla is the native language of 95% of the total population of this country. People use this language in their everyday activities. She further mentioned that English is in much demand in job markets. In business, industry and government, workers are increasingly expected to develop proficiency in English. Students take English language courses from year 1 to 12 in schools. These courses are mandatory for all students. After passing the Higher Secondary Certificate exam which is held after completion of
twelve years of study, students move to tertiary education. In language classrooms, the focus was on grammatical rules, memorization of vocabulary, translation of texts and doing written exercises. Classes were taught in the native language ‘Bangla’ (also known as Bengali), with little active use of English language. Since the English courses did not seem to improve the skill levels of the students, as expected, reform started to take place in education from early 1990s.

2.5. Teaching speaking in the Bangladeshi classroom

Ur (1991) says that “speaking is the productive aural/oral skill. It consists of producing systematic verbal utterances to convey meaning.” He has made a distinction between second language and foreign language learning contexts. Ur (1991) also mentioned, “A foreign language context is one where the target language is not language of communication in the society and second language context is one where the target language is the language of communication in the society”. According to this definition English can be regarded as a foreign language in this country and the learners have least of possibilities to speak in English outside the classroom. Thus acquiring fluency in speaking in English becomes very challenging for the learners of Bangladesh. As a result, we find them using their LI (Bengali) in EFL classroom said Rahman (2009). According to Eldridge (1996), “Code switching between L1 and L2 is naturally developmental”. Learners are found to be using LI in pedagogical tasks where one student explains something to another (page 128). This is a habit, “that in, most cases will occur without encouragement from the teacher” (Harbord, 1992). However it can be considered useful to code switch for the beginner level learners and would be helpful for both teachers and learners “in an explanation or discussion of methodology, or the giving of announcements which would be impossibly difficult in English” (Harmer, 1988).

In our country Bangla is the mother language of 95% people of the total population (Farooqui, 2007) and 86% students of the tertiary level come from Bangla medium (Jahan & Jahan, 2006). Moreover, for the negative backwash effect speaking skills are generally excluded from the teaching objectives of the English language teachers and students do not get the opportunity to learn spoken English in the pre-university years (Farooqui, 2007). Therefore, it seems that there
is a necessity of specific and appropriate courses on speaking skills, which will help the students to be competent in spoken English. In our country, most of the universities both public and private teach speaking skills incorporating with other skills which courses are entitled by Foundation English or Basic English courses (Majid, 2006). These courses are compulsory for all and students have to attend the courses at the beginning of their studies (Farooqui, 2007). These courses give emphasis to teach all four skills and one of the main goals of these courses is to make the students competent in spoken English remembering that it has a high demand in job market (Farooqui, 2007 : Majid, 2006). Farooqui (2007) also pointed out that some of the universities offer separate courses on speaking skills. But in both cases courses on speaking are not being effective and students are failing to attain the expected level of fluency in English (Alam, 2005 : Jahan, 2008). Alam (2005) and Jahan (2008) also pointed out that the problems lie within the methods and materials that are using to teach the skills. In our education system, students do not get the opportunity to get familiar with CLT approach throughout their pre university years. They are habituated with GTM, teacher centered and Bangla medium classroom. So at the university level, where the medium of instruction is English and CLT is used they find themselves in a new world (Alam & Sinha, 2009). Most of the students have good command in grammar but they face great difficulty in expressing themselves in English. Teachers find it difficult to get the students to participate in class activities. They do not want to speak (Bhattacharjee, 2008). The major problems of doing speaking activities in the classroom are the students’ fear and lack of confidence because they do not want to be ridiculed in front of the whole class. Their fear of spoken English is so deep rooted that if the teacher ask them a very simple question like ‘what is your name?’ they lose their faces (Bhattacharjee, 2008). In this situation, it is challenge for the tertiary level teacher to provide meaningful and effective exposure to the learners, to motivate the learners, to teach them the effective strategies and to guide them on the right track (Majid, 2006). Alam (2005) said that most of the teachers of tertiary level are still the product of GTM who think if the learners are proficient in reading and writing, they will be able to speak in English fluently. Bhattacharjee (2008) said that fluent speaker will not be produced overnight; it needs a lot of practice. Majid (2007) said that some of the speaking courses of our universities required the students to do presentations on several
topics; students find this very useful in developing their oral skills. Interaction is also a very effective way to make the learners fluent in English (Majid, 2007) Classes focus on instruction based teacher talk rather than real spoken interaction (Alam, 2005). Most of the universities are not equipped with the needed audio visual aids to improve the speaking skills inside the classroom (Quase, 2007). Teacher should design more activities in the class so that the students can participate, talk, interact, do things; which will motivate them to practice spoken English unconsciously (Alam, 2005). Teacher should let the students talk in English in-group or in pair. Jahan and Jahan (2008) said that, tertiary level teacher should emphasize learners’ fluency rather than accuracy while they are teaching. The aim of fluency practice is to improve communicative ability of the learners (Alam, 2005). In this regard, Bhattacharjee (2008) said that if the learners gain fluency then accuracy would develop automatically.

According to CLT method, both authentic (bottom-up) and contextualized materials (topdown) should be used to teach spoken English. But Block (1991) supports contextual materials only because these make classroom activities much more relevant according to the context and culture of the learners. It also creates a kind of rapport between the teacher and students. In this regard, Peacock (1997) mentioned that authentic materials reduce learners’ motivation because they are too difficult for the EFL learners (in Peacock 1997). But in Richards (2008) said that in case of teaching spoken English at tertiary level, both authentic and contextualized materials should be used.

2.6 State of private universities in Bangladesh

This study has covered one of the private universities in Bangladesh that is why it is important to have some basic ideas of private universities of Bangladesh.

The government approved private universities under private university Act 1992 and amended the Act in 1998 to further improve and facilitate smooth running at the private universities. (Quase, 2007). The first private university established in 1992 and according to the website of the University Grants Commission (UGC) now the number is 56. There are many reasons behind
the establishment of the private universities. There is scarcity of seats in the government universities. Quase (2007) says that with the establishment of private universities, a good number of students get opportunity for higher education and the propensity to go abroad for higher education has reduced. Private universities offer job market oriented academic programs and subjects like BBA, MBA, CSE, ECE, EEE, Pharmacy, BTE, English etc. (Rahman, 2005).

The study environment of private universities is free of political influence (Azim, 2009), there is no session jam, and students can easily complete their academic study within a fixed time (Quase, 2007). In private universities students get opportunity to get familiar with actual working conditions (Chowdhury, 2005). They have to write reports, give presentations, and submit project assignments where teaching system is the combination of theory and practice. Besides these, every student has the opportunity to meet any individual teacher for any kind of academic purpose. Infrastructural facilities are available in almost all the private universities, like computer lab, library, multimedia projectors, OHP etc. (Quase, 2007: Azim, 2009). The most negative aspect of the private universities maybe their high tuition fees (Azim, 2009). In this regard, Quase (2007) says that it is a misconception that the private universities are charging higher tuition fees. He also shows the reasons; most of the private universities are in high-rated rented buildings and provide the facilities of air-conditioned classrooms, computer labs, resourceful libraries, and high salary for the faculty members. Besides these, almost all the universities have the system of providing 10-100% scholarship for the students. Quase (2007) thinks that as the private universities do not get any kind of financial support from the government or University Grants Commission (UGC), so they have no alternative way other than charging fees from their students. In other countries, public and private universities are working by supplementing efforts of each other but in our country, the persons at the helm of affairs at the UGC all are from public university background who do not have any idea or concept of income generation or modern management style. Our government is paying 45,000 taka in a year for per student of a public university and on the other hand private university students do not get a single taka. This is the fact the government and UGC should think about
Another complaint against the private universities is about the outer campuses. In this regard Quase (2007) thinks that, private universities should not restrict to Dhaka city and should extend its campuses all over the country. Other countries are operating distance campuses for a long time ago and this is definitely positive that this trend has started in our country Azim, 2009). He also recommended that, outer campuses should establish by following the rules and regulations of UGC (Quase, 2007).

2.7 Teaching speaking in Private universities

Farooqui (2007) in her article quotes “English language courses are compulsory for all students of the private universities. These courses are called ‘Foundation courses’. Students attend some courses at the beginning and some at the advanced level of their studies. In one university, there is a separate course for teaching speaking. Classes take place twice a week. There are around 15–25 students in a language class and classes usually run for 90 minutes. These courses emphasize the teaching of all four skills – writing, reading, speaking and listening. Teachers do not have to follow any fixed textbook to teach English in these universities. In two of these five universities, the course outline is given at the beginning. The syllabus is fixed but the teachers have freedom to choose the teaching material. Students have examinations on speaking. In some cases, students are given marks on class-performance which is basically on speaking activity. English is used as the medium of instruction in these universities. Teachers who talked to Farooqui (2007) stated, statement lectures have to be in English. Teachers have to talk in English to students inside and outside the class. It is compulsory for the students to speak in English in classes, especially in English language classes. She noted that the university authority emphasizes speaking skills to such an extent that students are supposed to come to the teacher and talk for some time in English if they receive a poor grade in their speaking test. If any student misses four classes, s/he is not allowed to sit for the final examination. Unlike the public universities of Bangladesh, the private universities provide students with opportunities to use a language laboratory where they can practice listening and speaking activities. Various competitions are arranged there. In some universities, there are even ‘self-accesscenters’. Thus it can be seen that English is the medium of instruction in these private universities and all
students have to take mandatory English courses during their candidature. Students also have tests on speaking and they can also practice the language outside the class through language clubs and self-access centers provided by these universities (Farooqui, 2007).

Thus it can be summarized that, it is very challenging to teach a foreign language to the intermediate level learners. In Bangladesh, in most of the cases, the students have hardly any exposure to the spoken English outside the classroom and thus it becomes very difficult for them to acquire this skill. The teachers should create such an atmosphere in the classroom which will create an opportunity for the learners to learn and acquire the foreign language.
Chapter III
Research Design

This chapter discusses the methodology used for the purpose of research. Further, the methodology adopted to conduct this research is explained. The overall design of data collection, instrumentation that was used, the procedure adopted for sampling, the strategies of analysis and interpretation is clarified in this chapter. A qualitative as well as quantitative method of educational research was used because it is an integrative study.

3.1. Research methodology:
Firstly, a survey and focused group discussion (FGD) based on an observation of recordings with the students have been done to draw the conclusions of students’ implicit and explicit understanding of speaking lessons.

Secondly, an interview of the teachers have been conducted where the respondents belong to a well reputed institute of Bangladesh. Needless to say, all the methodologies were given an equal importance in the research with the equal contribution to the found data.

3.2. Research design and participants:
A mix method combining with both qualitative and quantitative methodologies have been used by the researcher to analyze the data.

All the student participants in this research are students of renowned private University and the teacher participants are from the language institute under same University. I chose this University because of two reasons, firstly, as I have been associated with this institute as a faculty member of English Language Teaching (ELT) for the last two years, which allows me a first-hand experience of the students’ attitude towards the learning of English, and secondly, it gives me an opportunity to access the students easily and comfortably. The respondents were
the native speakers of Bangla and learned English as a foreign language. Further details of the respondents are discussed below.

3.2.1. The quantitative part:
This included a set of questionnaire distributed among the students of a renowned private university. The details are as discussed below:

3.2.1.1 The questionnaire:
A questionnaire based on both quantitative closed-ended and open-ended questions was distributed among students of ENG-102 class of a renowned private university in Dhaka. English Composition (ENG – 102) is the second compulsory credit course most students (Unless they were given 102 directly during the admission test) have to undergo regardless of the departments or schools they belong to. A total of 70 students from two different sections of ENG -102 classes responded to the interview.

The researcher have used two sets of Likert scale to collect and analyze the numeric data. The first psychometric scale included the sets “strongly disagree...strongly agree” to acquire an understanding of students’ general perception of speaking English both outside and inside the classroom. The second set included the scales “Always...never”to grasp students’ ability to think in the target language (in this research English).The questionnaire also included a set of priority listing to attain the information about the activities students do in their speaking class and the ones they find to be most effective. Finally, the questionnaire incorporated the open-ended part by enquiring about other relevant comments.

3.2.2 The qualitative part:
The qualitative parts of the research included a focused group discussion and an interview of the teachers of English. All the participants including the teachers are from the same institute.
3.2.2.1 Focused group discussion (FGD):
25 students of an English fundamentals (ENG-101) class were gathered for the focused group discussion (FGD). All these students take 4 separate classes of ENG-101 in each week, of which 2 classes are for writing and 2 for speaking. Prior to the FGD all these students were asked to record their spontaneous thinking on 6 randomly selected topics over a period of 21 days. These participating students would bring their recordings on every Monday and Tuesday (days assigned for speaking classes) for three consecutive weeks. Much of the FGD was based on the experience of their (students) recordings. Later the recordings were also observed to analyze the findings of the FGD.

3.2.2.2 Interview with the teachers:
Five teachers were selected according to convenience for individual structured interviews. Qualitative research data was collected and interpreted from the interviews to get the final results. The purpose of conducting interviews was to find out the correlation between teachers’ beliefs about teaching speaking and their classroom practices.

3.3. Research questions:
This study provides information about various techniques of teaching speaking to learners in Bangladesh private universities. Also, it seeks to analyze the impact of thinking in second language to improve fluency. The study considered the following research questions:

1. What are the reasons behind the lack of fluency in speaking for the students of private universities?
2. What are the most effective tools used in classrooms to teach speaking in private universities?
3. How can the ‘divergent - thinking in second language’ be incorporated with existing tools to produce more fluent outcome?
3.4. Instruments of the study

This study utilizes the following sources of data:

1. Quantitative survey questionnaire (Appendix 1)
2. Interview questionnaire (appendix 2)
3. Recordings of students’ ‘divergent thinking’.
4. Questionnaire of focused group discussion (Appendix 3).

3.5 Procedure and timeline

Firstly, the questionnaire was passed down to the students of 102 classes during the last ten minutes of the class in presence of their instructor. The students of two different sections were surveyed on two different days. Secondly, on the fourth week of the commencement of the semester, the students of the ENG-101 speaking class were gathered in a classroom provided by the university to conduct the FGD. The recordings on the 6 different topics by the same participants were gathered prior to the FGD. As mentioned in the research design, the recordings were collected over a period of three weeks during their speaking classes.

3.6. Data collection and analysis

As mentioned above, both qualitative and quantitative types of data were collected through the survey questionnaires, FGD and structured open-ended interviews. The quantitative portion of the questionnaire was analyzed statistically; percentages and graphs were made by the software generated program to compare various answers of each question. Whereas the qualitative research data obtained from the interview questionnaires and FGD were analyzed descriptively by compiling similar views. All the information gathered was interpreted to study correlation between teachers’ beliefs, their reported instructional practices and their actual instructional practices. Underpinning reasons which created the differences between teachers’ beliefs and their classroom practice were explored and presented in the research finding. Some recommendations were given for further improvement.
3.7 Limitations

Although the time period of the study was six months most of the data have been gathered during the last two months of the research. Therefore, time constraint was one of the major limitations. Nevertheless, the socio-political situation of the country while the research has been going on adversely affected the data collection process. Moreover, the subjects of this research were from only one language institution which may not represent the complete scenario of teaching speaking in the tertiary level.
CHAPTER IV
Findings

In this chapter, the findings of the research have been presented. The first section shows the finding from the closed-ended questions answered by the students of two English 102 (English Compositions) classes of a renowned private university which were examined with the help of the statistical analysis. The second section presents the data collected from the teachers’ interview. It contains the response from the different language teachers and their experiences and opinions of teaching speaking. Finally, the findings from the FGD have been mentioned in three segments. Here, the perspectives of the students of using the thinking in second language technique and the relevant findings have been discussed.

4.1 Findings from the questionnaire for the students:
The questionnaire is the first tool used in this research to address the issues that are relevant to students’ speaking outside and inside the classroom. This also enquires about students’ level of satisfaction about their classes and the tools which they find to be most effective. Finally this talks about students’ ability to think in second.

4.1.1 General information about the students:
A total of 71 students replied to the questionnaire out of which 51% were male and rest were female. 91% of the respondents belongs to Bangla medium schools whereas only 9% were from English medium schools. Almost all the respondents said they did at least one English course in this institute before, except for 6 of the respondents who left the boxes blank. 58 students mentioned they did ENG 101 courses whereas 50 students said they also did ENG 091 courses too. A graph presenting the details of these students is presented below.
4.1.2 Generals questions about speaking in English:
This part of the research included five separate questions which were asked (appendix 1) in order to find out students’ general perception about speaking in English in their local context. The students were enquired about how comfortable they would feel when they talk to their family members, friends, peers, teachers and random people. It has been found that only 18.31% of the students find it difficult to speak in English with their friends while 57% agreed that they felt comfortable to speak with their friends who are much higher in comparison to the number of students (32%) who are comfortable to speak in English with their family members. In contrast to that, students remained indifferent with their response on the level of comfort they experience while talking to their peers or unknown people (35% were comfortable).
4.1.3 Students’ level of satisfaction about English class:

It is important to find out students’ level of satisfaction with their speaking class to understand if they were really benefitted from the classes. Firstly it was asked if the students were happy with their ability to speak in English before doing the class and then they were asked if they felt they improved after doing the classes. Later it was asked if they felt motivated to speak up in the class and whether the materials which were used were effective and contextual.
While 35% students were not satisfied by the level of their speaking before instruction and 28% remained neutral 83% of them responded that they had improved in speaking after the instructions made in class. 72% students said they found the materials used in the class to be effective and most of the students (60%) have also mentioned that the materials are contextual too. Some of them commented positively that teachers are very friendly, always inspire them to speak and share ideas and thought. Some students responded negatively. While some of the students wrote that only the good speakers get chance to take full participation 76% of the students said they felt motivated to speak up in the class. This finding seems to suggest that the materials which are used in these classes are effective and contextual and the teachers are able to motivate the students to speak up in the class. Overall,

4.1.4 Activities used in speaking class:
One of the prime questions this research intends to answer is about the various tools that are used in the speaking classes of the private universities and their effectiveness. In this part the researcher have used both open ended and close ended questions to peruse the queries. The close ended part included a list of probable tools/activities which has also been suggested as effective activities by Harmer (1991). Although the graph below shows the names of the tools students have used in their classes and the ones they found to be effective, in this section I have only mentioned about the ones which had the highest of the response. It is important to mention that the teachers’ interview revealed that tools/activities used in various different modules of this institute are mutually exclusive although their nature could be same. For example, both 091 and 101 modules have final presentation in the end of the semester but in 091 the students do a presentation on a persuasive topic whereas in the 101 they present on an argumentative topic. The questionnaire revealed, over 90% of the students said they did argumentative presentation and 71% students said this was the most effective task in their speaking class too. Other activities which were thought to be effective by at least more than 50% of the respondents are persuasive presentation (57%), listening tests (54%) speaking tests (50%) and listening to English songs (51%). Also 53% of the students vowed for impromptu speech, cause & effect presentation and videos.
### Tasks done in English Speaking Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad/film making</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzzle solving</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation games</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar games</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking tests</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word games</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English debate</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English drama</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to English songs</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching videos</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause &amp; Effect presentation</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive presentation</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative presentation</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impromptu speech</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening tests</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to English songs</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Most effective tasks in English Speaking Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad/film making</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puzzle solving</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation games</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar games</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking tests</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word games</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English debate</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English drama</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to English songs</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching videos</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause &amp; Effect presentation</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive presentation</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative presentation</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impromptu speech</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening tests</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to English songs</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.5 Students ability to think in English:

In this segment, I have tried to look into the matters which concerns about the students’ language of thinking. The questionnaire (section 1.2) asked four simple questions to find out the answers and the response was very much conclusive. 71% of the students said that they would always or often think in Bangla while they are thinking on any random incident which is concerns their personal, professional or educational matters while only 1.43% said they would use English and their language of thoughts. Also, 74% of the students claimed they find it difficult (always, often or sometimes) to think on a specific topic in English while 25% said they don’t find it difficult. As said byZakin (2007), speaking requires a faster recalling of the vocabulary and grammar rules for producing the target language, therefore it is important for the student to be able to “think in English” more spontaneously in order to be able to speak in English fluently. Therefore, as a researcher it was also important for me to understand if the students believed they could find the right vocabulary while they try to think on a topic in English. It was revealed from the questionnaire that, 15% of the respondents think that they always can’t find the right vocabulary while 39% said they often cannot find the right vocab while 27% said sometimes. On the contrary only 2% said it never happens to them while 14% said it rarely happens to them. In short at least for 82% of the respondents this problem makes sense even if they have to encounter with such situation only sometimes. The last question in this parade was the most important enquiry on my part. This question elaborated a classroom situation where the student is assumed to have assigned a random topic for an impromptu speech. The students were asked if they are capable of thinking about such topics using the second language directly or they have to translate their thoughts into target once they have gathered enough information in their first language. The response found in this regard is that, 30% students does it always or often while 19% students do it sometimes whereas only 7% and 14% of the students responded saying “never” and “rarely” respectively. The findings from this part of the questionnaire are presented on a glimpse in pie charts below.
4.2. Findings from the teachers’ interview (Appendix 2)

Findings from the teacher’s interview have been divided into four different parts. In the first and second part general information about the respondents and the details of (speaking) classes conducted by these respondents have been discussed. The third part discusses about the tools and materials used in the class and last part enlightens on the teacher’s perception of students’ thinking in second language has been discussed.
4.2.1 General information about the respondents:

Out of 5 teachers who were interviewed 3 were female and 2 were male and all of them were permanent faculties of the language institute of a renowned private university. Although none of the respondents had a doctorate nevertheless, all the respondents had completed at least one M.A. degree along with their bachelor’s degree, ranging from TESOL and M.A. in ELT or Literature. Almost all of them started teaching at the university level right after completing their M.A. They did not have any special or professional training but they became trained by attending different workshops, conferences and paper publication as well.

Furthermore, of the five teachers who were interviewed, 4 of them have been in teaching for at least 5 years now and have the experience of teaching at least two different courses in the same institute they are teaching now. Two of the teachers have taught the highest English course (ENG 204) taught under the institute, although at this moment they are teaching English composition (ENG 102) course. Out of the rest of the three respondents two of them are teaching English fundamentals (ENG 101) course and one is teaching Pre-University at this moment, although all three of them have the experience of teaching other courses such as ENG-091 and Pre-University courses.

4.2.2 Dynamics of the speaking courses taught by the respondents:

Although the university offers the three credit compulsory courses (see also Rahman, 2005) the respondents explained that all the courses in their institute offers separate English speaking courses for all its students. The courses from the down below (pre-university to English fundamentals) are mostly divided into two different parts; the first part includes speaking & listing (Sp/l) and the second part is consisted of reading & writing (R/Wr), except for the ENG 102 and ENG 204 courses. ENG 204 is basically an advanced writing course for the tertiary level students only offered to those who have advanced level of competence in English and whereas ENG 102 is a compulsory course for the students of the university where the main focus is on writing. Although English 102 course is divided into reading and writing part only but the reading part includes various presentations which force the students with a hint of speaking
too. Out of these 5 courses Pre-University and Eng-091 are the non-credit courses imposed on the students who doesn’t meet the requirements of language competence during the admission test. The respondents also mentioned that the admission test takes place in two segments; the first segment includes a writing test and those who could prove their competence in writing during the admission test are later called for viva. Therefore, a conclusive result based on both writing and speaking decides where the students should be placed after their admission.

The speaking courses usually go on for eighty minutes and it is compulsory for both the teachers and students to use English as the medium of instruction during these classes. The speaking classes include different interaction patterns starting from teacher to student (ts – ss) and student to teacher (ss-ts) and students to students (ss-ss). Although during any of these interactions the language used by any of the corresponding parties is English but when students talk amongst themselves (not as a part of class discussion) they usually use Bangla, as suggested by the respondents. According to the course outline this course aims at improving students speaking ability; reduce learners’ shyness, nervousness and inhibition of speaking; functions and notions of speaking; communicative skills. This course is mainly activity based and there are marks for classroom participation and presentation. All the teachers said that the courses are mandatory for all the students of all departments and the students have to do the courses in the first year.

4.2.3. Materials used in English classrooms

The respondents mentioned that the materials which they use in their classes are mostly provided by the institute. The materials include the lesson plans, questions, listening tracks, Audio-visual aids etc. These materials are made by the senior teachers with the help of various fellows and consultants who come from abroad with higher level of expertise and experience. But a material isn’t handed over to a teacher instantly once it is made. First it has to go to the academic steering committee who will approve or suggest necessary changes. Once the final approval of the steering committee is done the material then goes to the module leader who is
in charge of his/her respective module, who then discuss the changes in a meeting in presence of all the members taking that particular course. The respondents also stretched that, the module leader also explains and elaborates the materials to the new faculty who then goes to visit the classes of the older faculties to learn about the approaches and techniques before them being finally prepared to take the class themselves. The respondent further mentions, the faculty members have the scope to change or modify any material but in order to do that they have to go through the aforementioned process.

4.2.3.1 Materials used in non-credit courses:
Out of 5 interviewees 3 have the experience of teaching (or is currently teaching) non-credit courses in the same institute. They mentioned that most of the students who are selected for the non-credit courses and are from Bangla medium schools, have impediments in producing grammatically error free writing and fluent speech. Whereas, their English medium counterparts who are given a non-credit course are most likely to have problems with regards to their organization and sentence structure in writing though they appear better in producing a fluent speech. However, lack of motivation and shyness during public speaking along with insufficient explanation of content for both speaking and academic writing is a common factor that hinders the process of producing an affluent language for all students, said the non-credit course teachers.

Therefore, the materials which are used in these courses are mostly contextualized in accordance to students’ understanding so that they grasp the loop holes of their understanding of grammar and sentence structure. Contextual materials also help the students to relate their pre-conceived ideas with their topic and bridge the gap between the materials provided and the students’ previous perceptions which help them to come up with more creative ideas from their surroundings and well explained content. In the speaking classes however, the focus remains on improving students fluency and make them feel more comfortable to speak in a public speaking set up. The teachers use different motivational toolsto overcome shyness and
scaffold them to achieve a better fluency. Hence the materials used during this process is the secondary preference although much thought is given on the tools which is discussed later.

4.2.3.2 Materials used in credit courses:
Students who do the credit courses offered under this institute either have an Intermediate (in some cases advanced level who are assigned with 204) level of proficiency or completed at least one non-credit course previously. Therefore, they are expected to deal with most situations likely to arise in class interaction or discussions where the language is spoken and can produce connected text on topics that are familiar or of personal interest. Two of the four respondents who enlightened this researcher on the materials used in the credit courses also have the experience of teaching English courses (204 and 203) to advanced level students. They mentioned, these students can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognize implicit meaning in them. They can also express ideas fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions while using language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Therefore the materials used in these courses are often detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organizational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.

4.2.4 Activities used in speaking classroom:
It has been found that most teachers apply different activities in the classroom, like group work, pair work, presentation on several topics, role-play, debate, telling jokes, language games, listening activities and so on. Most of them said that they use contextualized topics/situation for the activities mentioned above especially in the two non-credit courses and the first two credit courses. However, with the advanced level students the classes are mostly filled with ideas and fluent interaction therefore the activities are designed to focus on advanced writing than on speaking.
4.2.5 Tools used in speaking classroom:
According to the teachers who were interviewed the tools include Listening to English songs and impromptu speech, presentations on persuasive, argumentative and cause & effect topics, watching videos of great speech and presentations etc. But the tools are chosen and spread carefully within the different courses so that the students don’t find it repetitive and monotonous. For example, the final speaking presentation of the non-credit course is persuasive in nature (based on topic and mode of presentation) whereas the final speaking presentation of the first credit course is argumentative. Listening activities and tests are offered in the Pre-university, ENG 091 and ENG 101 courses though the listening tests are partaken in the ENG 102 course. The courses also use debate to instigate the qualities of academic argumentation. Nonetheless, in ENG 101 course the students have to present an advertisement made by them which according to the respondents is very interesting to the students. Teachers also mentioned they use rubrics for all speaking encounters that comprise marks which is added to decide the final grade of the students at the end of the semester. They said the rubrics were very important as it not only breaks down the categories based on which the students will be marked but also gives an idea about the aspects which the students should keep in mind during any formal speaking encounter. Although the rubric hasn’t been seen by this researcher but the respondents mentioned it included categories such as content, ideas, adequate explanation, fluency, pronunciation, grammatical errors, intonation, volume, eye contact etc. The rubric for final presentation also includes small fraction for formal attire as it is expected from the students to know about the widely accepted professional norms. One of the teachers said: “We expect our students to know what to wear when they go for an interview after they are done with their under-grad and we prepare them from the beginning”

4.2.6 Effectiveness of the tools used in speaking classroom:
As revealed by some of the teachers, many of the students do not have sufficient proficiency specially in pre-university and non-credit modules, teachers find it hard to do any oral communicative activity with them. Teachers provide students with easy topics to help them getting started with speaking. The respondents mentioned that all the tools used in these
classes are well thought-out and have been selected based on the accumulated experience of teaching language gathered over a long period of time. Therefore, the effectiveness of these tools are already tested. In particular, the impromptu speech and vocabulary tests help improve student’s box of words whereas the presentations make the students overcome their shyness and make them feel motivated to speak in public. On the other hand, the listening activities help students acquire a better grasp over the pronunciation of different words and they work as raw materials for producing more meaningful speech. The listening test is a formal introduction to most the students of a standard listening test and many of the students who come from different background of schooling and have never been exposed to such facilities thus making it a very effective tool. The teachers also mentioned about two other presentations which are done on posters. Students do the first poster presentation while they’re in ENG 091. This presentation is done based on a reading which is provided before the presentation and students work in groups to make the presentation where they explain the situations and encounters of different characters from the reading. Another poster presentation is done in the English fundamentals course where the students are shown a video on human rights and are provided with the constitution of human rights and are asked to come up with their own examples of rights which are denied and acknowledged all over the world. This presentation in particular are found to be very interesting by the students as it doesn’t only give them new offerings in English but also make them relate this experience to their own thus making learning a fun-filled experience.

4.2.7 Problems faced by the students in speaking class:

Different problems were identified by the participants regarding students’ skills in spoken English. Three out of five participants said that the students usually have a small English vocabulary. They do better in reading and writing skills but do very poorly in speaking. They feel shy and do not want to speak in front of the class. One participant mentioned a very important factor that inhibits students from practicing speaking in the EFL context. Since people are monolingual in Bangladesh (Farooqui, 2007), students do not need to use English outside the
class. All the teachers mentioned, many of the students are very poor in English and this problem excels when they are asked to speak in the class as a part of classroom interaction or during public speaking/presentation sessions. They said Because of the education system of SSC and HSC, students are not familiar with CLT classroom therefore, the other most common problem they find in fluency. Teachers also mentioned that, many of the students of private universities are from rural background and are considered to be somewhat inferior to their urban counterparts in the cross-cultural setting of a private university. Also many students lack proper pronunciation as their schools or colleges were not exposed to CLT classrooms nor were they exposed to a situation where English in frequently used. One of the teachers mentioned, it is often found that the students mispronounce words such as “zoo” and biology. The way they pronounce would sound something like “joo” or “biolozy”. Which is why, they lack confidence and do not want to speak in English in the classroom and it is very difficult to motivate them. One of the respondents said: “The lessons during students’ school and college focus on all four skills of English language, but only reading and writing are tested in their final examination so many of the students possibly have never practiced speaking in their schools hence I have to spend much of my energy on motivating the students to talk”

4.2.8. Teachers’ perception of students’ language of thinking:
Upon asking the question about the primary language for random thoughts of the students of the teachers who had the experience of teaching ENG 102/204 courses replied “English”. But they also added that this is not the same case for all students especially in the ENG 102 course where many students come after finishing their previous English courses. They added that many students who get a direct 204 are from a background where they are exposed to English in their regular life (family, school friends) or lived outside the country during their schooling thus having a wider exposure to the language. The respondents mentioned that they knew about it through their personal interaction with the students and in many cases these students are cable of producing native-like proficiency.
On the other hand, the three respondents who have the experience of teaching the two non-credit courses and the fundamentals of English course were certain that their students would most likely think in Bangla if they were given a random topic. They also mentioned that in many of the cases in the two non-credit courses the students would not only primarily think in Bangla but they would also translate their thoughts from Bangla to English in order to produce the meaningful speech. The assumptions behind such perception is based on their teaching experience with these students. One respondent mentioned, the students would often refer to a Bangla word and ask for its English equivalent which suggests that they first think about the content in Bangla (many a times if not always) and then translates it into English which proves their primary language for thought is Bangla.

4.2.9 Final discussion of teachers’ thought on speaking classes:
Students come to tertiary level in Bangladesh with the educational background where “classroom activity is characterized by the teacher delivering the syllabus which students ingest, leaving little room for genuine enquiry, questioning or criticism” as said Thornton(2006). This study illustrates that most of the teacher participants blame the educational system for making the students fearful about using the English language. In such a situation, teachers allow the students to talk about themselves to promote conversation. They encourage dialogue and discussion through asking questions, which helps students minimize their shyness and hesitation in speaking English. They develop a congenial atmosphere in class and friendly relations with students. The teachers’ comments remind us of Brown (2001) who said: “One of the major obstacles learners have to overcome in learning to speak is the anxiety generated over the risks of blurtling things out that are wrong, stupid or incomprehensible. Our job as teachers is to provide the kind of warm, embracing climate that encourages students to speak, however halting or broken their attempts may be.”
4.3. Findings from students’ focused group discussion (appendix 3):
The findings from the FGD are divided into three different parts namely, 1) Challenges of speaking in English outside and inside the classroom. 2) What language do the students use to ‘think’? and 3) Challenges faced while to producing the thoughts on the assigned topic.

4.3.1. Background of the respondents:
All the students who participated in the FGD are in the first or second semester of their bachelor’s degree and were undergoing English fundamentals course (ENG 101) at the time of the research. The students come from various different backgrounds including different medium of schooling (Bangla and English) from both rural and urban and one foreign location. Out of 25 respondents 11 were female and 14 were male.

4.3.2. Challenges of speaking in English outside and inside the classroom
Although there are several challenges I, as a teacher of English speaking course have identified over the past few years; this part of the study only includes the challenges I, as a researcher could figure during the FGD which was conducted with the same group of students who submitted their “thoughts” on the five topics which was assigned by the researcher (Which is discussed in the later parts). The challenges were identified based on three different questions which came forward over and over during the time of the FGD.

The first question revealed the answers if the students felt comfortable to speak in English in the class (see Appendix 3). The students responded that their speaking teacher is very friendly and he would often use humor to break the ice between him and the students. They said he is very open to discussions and would often motivate them to participate in the classroom interactions. He was welcoming to an extent that they would also ask him problems regarding their writings too. Moreover, he created an environment of mutual respect ensuring that no one would feel ashamed even if they had mispronounced a commonly mistaken word. Therefore, it was very comfortable for the students to interact with their teacher even if they were not content with their fluency or other aspects of speaking. However, they also
mentioned that it is not always possible to speak freely in the class as they fear of making a mistake in front of their peers.

The second question revealed the answers if the students were comfortable to speak in English outside the classroom during their day to day life. Most of the respondents said they are not always motivated to speak in English outside the classroom as in their surroundings Bangla is the language which is used mostly everywhere. They would speak in Bangla when they interact with their parents and siblings. They would also speak in Bangla with people like shopkeepers, rickshaw pullers, CNG drivers etc. Although they would speak in English with their faculties outside the classrooms too.

The final question actually revealed the challenges students face while attempting to speak in English. Most students mentioned that while speaking, they often cannot find the right vocabulary for a particular expression which makes them sound less fluent as it hinders their flow of speaking. Therefore, the students identified this as their biggest challenge. On the other hand students also mentioned that they would feel nervous when they are asked to speak in front of a crowd as they have never done this before coming to these speaking classes.

4.3.3 Which language did the students use to brain-storm on the assigned topics?

In order to find the answer to this question first the students were asked about their opinion on this and 7 out of the 25 students responded that they would think in Bangla while the rest mentioned they think in mixed languages i.e. sometimes in Bangla and sometimes in English. In order to check the relativity of their response, during the FGD session, the students were asked to close their eyes and think about the things they would eat for lunch on that day. It is important to mention that the interview was not totally conducted in English to make the students feel more comfortable to answer in whatever language they preferred. In this particular question however, the word “lunch” have been intentionally mentioned. Students
replied in varying degrees some said they would have “rice” “beef” and “fish” while others mentioned they would have “Bhaat”, “Mangsho” “Mach” “daal” etc. Some students also mentioned “Burger” and “sandwich” too.

4.3.4 Challenges faced while producing the thoughts on the assigned topic

The five topics (as discussed earlier) which were assigned to the students were selected keeping in mind that the students need to be able to relate the topic to their own experience and they are somewhat related to the emotional aspects of human interaction. The topics are 1) Love 2) Mother 3) Revenge 4) Street beggars in Dhaka 5) Solution of the current political unrest in Bangladesh. The students were asked to record their thoughts, feelings and emotions or anything they get reminded of when think on the above mentioned topics. They were also told that they should do it in a comfortable setting where nobody is around to listen to what they speak of most likely during the time they spend alone before they go to sleep and they should talk their thoughts aloud at least for three minutes. It was unveiled during the FGD session that many students could comply with the instructions while others (6) couldn’t quite manage a comfortable setting either because there were other interventions during their time of recordings or they shared their rooms with another person. They also mentioned that they did not feel nervous since no body was in front of them or anyone was listening to them except for the researcher who kept the recordings anonymous and were unable to know respondents’ identity himself. Some students said that they recorded whatever came to their mind but most others mentioned they organized whatever they wanted to mention in the recordings and then spoke about it. Upon asking what language they used while organizing their thoughts 11 said they organized their thoughts using the English words and 6 mentioned that they used Bangla on most instances to organize the thoughts while they translated their thoughts into English to produce the final sound. All the students who said they did not organize their thoughts before the recording said they were either thinking in Bangla and translating their thoughts in English while recording at the same time or they were remembering various memories from their past and speaking about them spontaneously at the same time. The latter remembered their memories in English and were 4 in number. All the respondents mentioned that this task were
far easier than when they need to speak in-front of the whole class and they felt more comfortable.
Chapter V

Analysis of the results

In this chapter, the findings of the study have been discussed and explained in light of the research questions, based on the findings from the interviews, FGD and the literature review.

5.1. Effectiveness of the speaking classes in the private university:

Effectiveness of the speaking classes in the study has been measured based on the findings from the questionnaire for students (appendix 1) and teachers’ interview (appendix 2) in light of 1) Relevance of the materials used 2) Motivational factors 3) Tools used in the speaking class.

5.1.1. Relevance of the materials used in speaking classes:

From my two years of teaching experience in EFL classroom, it appears to me that Students are often reluctant to speak because they are shy and are not predisposed to expressing themselves in the front of other people, especially when they are being asked to give personal information or opinions. Nunan (2003) in his book “Practical English language teaching” talks about the principles for teaching speaking where he mentioned about making proper selection of appropriate material for the learner to enhance the possibility of the success of teaching speaking. A teacher should make sure that the materials are suitable for the learners’ level of competence, their age and experience. This research reveals during the teachers’ interview (appendix 2, Q7) that some students (especially in the pre-university classes) do not have sufficient proficiency in English, therefore, teachers may find it hard to do any oral communicative activity with them. Teachers provide students with easy topics to help them getting started with speaking. As the teachers mentioned during the interview (appendix 2, Q8), they start working with the students giving them very simple topics like ‘Introduce yourself to other students’ or ‘world cup football’ or ‘world cup cricket’, subjects with which they are familiar. Sometimes students are asked to talk about a movie they have watched recently. Students often do activities in groups, for example, the whole class is divided into groups and students are given stories with no ending and are asked to provide the ending. These activities
create interest among the students. This statement has been crosschecked with the students’ response which was gathered from the questionnaire (appendix 1, 2.1) where only 4.35% student said they didn’t find the materials to be relevant or contextual and the rest were either neutral (36.23%) or found it relevant (59.42%).

5.1.2 Motivational factors:

Our language teachers need to be careful about their roles in a speaking classroom. When students are involved in classroom activities, a language teacher needs to perform his duty efficiently, encouragingly and supportively thus making the students feel motivated. According to Breen and Candlin (1980), “the teacher has two main roles: the first role is to facilitate the communication process between all participants and the various activities and the texts. The second role is to act as an independent participant within the learning-teaching group”.

It has been found from the teachers’ interview (appendix 2) that, since students have a problem in initiating speaking, the teachers try to help them speak up in class. They do not teach grammar separately and emphasize fluency rather than accuracy. The teachers try to enable the students to communicate effectively by placing importance on the socio-cultural features of communication and oral production. Therefore the students do not feel interrupted while they begin to communicate which makes the teacher act as a participant than playing as an authority.

One of the respondents mentioned, to try to help students overcome their shyness, the university authority made it mandatory for teachers speak in English. It was also revealed from the interview that the medium of interaction of these classes is English (appendix 2). One of the interviewers mentioned, as it is mentioned in the objective of a course outline one of the courses of English language, the course aims to improve students’ speaking ability; the course itself also aims to considerably reduce learners’ overall shyness, nervousness and inhibition in speaking. Since there are small numbers of students in a class, teachers can manage to speak with everyone in the class. They ask questions to of all the students, asking them to speak up in
their class. Although that doesn’t seem to affect the student’s motivation to speak up in the class as revealed by the questionnaire (appendix 1, 2.1) where 76% of the students said they felt motivated to speak in English in the class. Moreover, while 14% students remained neutral upon being asked if they were uncomfortable to speak in English with their teachers, more than half (58%) of the students said they weren’t. Which suggests, English as the compulsory language for communication in these speaking classes does not hamper most students’ motivation to interact and communicate in the class.

5.1.3 Tools used in the speaking classes:

This is the only section of this research where disputes have been found between teachers’ opinion with regards to the tools used in the speaking class and those that of the students’. In order to find out the tools which are used in the speaking classes a list of tools were mentioned in both teachers’ interview (appendix 2, Question 12) and students’ questionnaire (appendix 1, 2.2). Their cumulative response suggested that the tools which are most frequently used in these speaking classes would include different forms formal and informal presentations, speaking and listening tests, debate, audio visual materials etc. Although the response of both teachers and students were similar with regards to the tools which are being used in the class the dispute was evident in their preferences. For example, teachers who had the experience of teaching English fundamentals class mentioned that their course includes a presentation where the students have to make an audio-visual/newspaper advertisement in English and later present it in the class. The teachers (who took 101) in their interview mentioned, they thought it to be one of the most exciting tasks done in this module. However, the questionnaire revealed that only 35% of the students thought this task to be effective which is very less in comparison to the highest response regarding effectiveness of tasks which is argumentative presentation (71%). Although one student however, in the open-ended part of the questionnaire mentioned, “As a student of BBA I found the ad making activity very interesting and informative”. 
However, the most important understanding which has been gathered from this part of the research isn’t form the response regarding the tools or tasks which are being used in the speaking class but is underlying in those which are not being used in the speaking classes of this institution. Both the teachers’ and students’ responses confirms that they were not interested in doing tasks such as grammar games, pronunciation games, puzzle solving or word games which suggests that the courses here focus more on communication and interaction parts rather than grammar and error correction, which is also in parallel line with Hymes’s (1972) theory of communicative competence which includes a definition of what a speaker needs to know in order to be communicatively competent in a speech community. In Hymes’s view, a person who acquires communicative competence acquires both knowledge and ability for language use. Therefore he mentions, when we teach speaking, we need to focus on some characteristics of this communicative view of language which are 1. Language is a system for the expression of meaning 2. The primary function of language is to allow interaction and communication 3. The structure of language reflects its functional and communicative uses 4. The primary units of language are not merely its grammatical and structural features, but categories of functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse. Using such tools also comply with Rivers and Temperley (1978) who made the point that there is a goal to be kept in mind when activities are selected, in that students are to be able to interact freely with others regarding understanding what others want to communicate and to be able to communicate information or ideas which they wish to share with others. Now

To sum up, in recent years, communicative language teaching and learning has become a salient feature in ESL/EFL contexts across many countries. And the adult learners, especially in the target language situation directly benefit from the use of communicative skills. From the practical perspective speaking strategy is one of the most important aspects in dealing with communication skills, particularly in second or foreign language situation, as it enhances learners’ confidence and fluency. The communicative approach implicitly encourages learners to take greater responsibility for their own learning and to use a wide range of language learning strategies. Speaking is a prime medium of communication. Therefore speaking skill is
connected with the view of communicative competence. Lastly, With regards to the question related to the effectiveness of the materials (see appendix 1, 2.1) most students (72.46%) mentioned they found the materials to be effective. Therefore, it can be said that most students of these speaking classes can relate to the materials which are articulated in the class, and also feel motivated to speak up. Also the tools which are used in these speaking classes are mostly focused on the communicational aspects of teaching speaking which in turn enhance the possibility of the success of teaching speaking as suggested by Nunan (2003).

5.2 “Thinking in English” as a tool to improve fluency in private university’s classes:
This aspect has been elaborated in three parts as mentioned below.

5.2.1 Did Divergent thinking help improve fluency of the students?
Rahman(2005) in his article mentions “An input rich environment is required where the learners can be relaxed, motivated and self-confident in acquiring the second language successfully”. In the experiment which has been done with the students where they were asked to speak their thoughts into a recorder, the above mentioned requirements with regards to the environment of learning as suggested by Rahman has been met. The students revealed it during the FGD that they felt totally comfortable to record their thoughts as there was no one ‘looking at them’ or ‘to look at’. One student said, the whole experience of recording was ‘great’, it was “cozy” as it was winter and she was “free” to talk her “heart out” about her ‘mother’ (who happened to live in Canada at that time) whom she missed most. One student said he spoke more than he would have spoken in the class because he didn’t feel “threatened” or “judged” to talk about ‘revenge’ (appendix 3). As mentioned in the literature review (chapter 2), Krashen (1985) made a distinction between acquisition process and learning process. He claimed, “Language which we acquire subconsciously is language we can easily use in spontaneous conversation because it is instantly available when we need it. Language that is learnt on the other hand, taught and studied as grammar and vocabulary is not available for spontaneous use”. Ur (1991) has also made a distinction between ‘accuracy’ and ‘fluency’. According to him, “‘accuracy’ is the extent which students’ speech matches what people actually say when they
use the target language” and ‘fluency’ refers to the ability of speakers to “use the language quickly and confidently, with few hesitations or unnatural pauses, false starts, word searches etc”. As revealed from the FGD (appendix 3), the students while performing the recording felt more comfortable and less hesitant to speak. It has also been observed in the recordings that students who did not sound to be very fluent would still continue their speech with “ums” and “aas”. There were unnatural pauses although many evidence of pauses have been observed while this researcher went through the recordings.

Although most of the studies which were mentioned in the literature review cited correlation between brain-storming and writing there was one evidence where it talked about how it affects oral production too. It has been mentioned that Brainstorming is a standard pre-writing practice in second language classrooms (Taylor, 1981) such that, in preparation for writing on a given topic, students spend time freely generating ideas and words associated with the topic. However, the experiment conducted by Khodadady, Shirmohammadi, and Talebi (2011) found out that upon completion of training, participants in the brainstorming training group showed greater improvements in oral proficiency than the control group. Which refers that brainstorming activity may be particularly effective on oral proficiency too. As discussed earlier in the chapter 4, the FGD revealed that most students brain-stormed on the topic prior to beginning to record, which was also evident form some of their recordings too as they sounded more organized and narrowed down the topics well.

However this method may particularly be less effective with the students of Bangladesh as they are mostly monolingual in nature (Rahman, 2005). The studies mentioned in chapter 2 which refers to Bilingualism and language association suggests that comparisons of monolinguals and bilinguals have shown that bilinguals tend to outperform monolinguals in both verbal and figural DT tasks (Ricciardelli, 1992; Simonton, 2008). Therefore such activity may not outperform the expected effect on the students of private university in Bangladesh.
5.2.2 Can “thinking in English” be used as an activity to teach speaking in Bangladeshi classroom?

Although the above mentioned analysis does not show any empirical evidence of improvement in oral production of students but the relevant discussion based on literature review does show a correlation between brain storming, divergent thinking (DT) and language production. The experiment which was conducted with the students did not consider any fixed variable to determine the oral production proficiency from the recordings therefore it couldn’t be tested if the students can really excel in their speaking fluency by applying such methods. However, like it has been successfully used in English student’s pre-writing activities (as discussed in 5.2.1), it could also be used as a tool to improve oral proficiency by merging the brain storming and divergent thinking in English tasks. Nevertheless, more research needs to be done on how this can be effectively successfully articulated in the speaking classrooms of private university.
Chapter VI
Conclusion

Though English has been taught as a compulsory subject in primary and secondary levels in Bangladesh, it has not had the desired impact on learners in terms of basic competence in the language. However, the findings reveal, this private university has been successfully using different strategies to develop students’ English speaking skills. They make students speak in class by making it compulsory for all of them. All students have to take compulsory English courses and they have separate classes and tests for speaking skills which work as motivation for the students to develop oral production as it is proven that, if something is tested, it is important (Shohamy, 1993). The findings suggest that the language teachers in this university are successful at engaging learners intellectually with clear, systematic and relevant tools and the students are able to transfer their knowledge and skills they gain from the English language classroom to the outside world. It was evident that the materials should were related to the needs, age and interests of learners. Topics were related to “real life” which included language-based ‘realia’, such as magazines, advertisements, and newspapers, or graphic and visual sources around which activities were built. There were variety of activities and tasks that covered speaking and listening skills. It included functional communication activities such as advertisement, solving problems from shared clues etc. It also had social interaction activities drama, debates argumentative presentation etc. The teachers here are well aware that negative words from them can demotivate the students and cause substantial harm to student’s initiatives and enthusiasm to speak at all. There were learners in the pre-university module with unusual sensitivity of shyness therefore the teachers kept their focus on motivating the students. The research also reveals that the students cannot practice the language outside the class, in such a situation, teachers allow the students to talk about themselves in the first class to break the ice to promote conversation. They encourage dialogue and discussion through asking questions, which helps students minimize their shyness and hesitation in speaking English. They develop a congenial atmosphere in class and friendly relations with students. The accumulated understanding gathered from the interview and the
questionnairesuggests that teachers in the speaking classes of this institutes have been able to overcome one of the major obstacles which the learners have to face that is the anxiety generated over the risks of blurting things out that are wrong, stupid or incomprehensible. The teachers’ role in these classes remind me of Brown (2001) who said: “Our job as teachers is to provide the kind of warm, embracing climate that encourages students to speak, however halting or broken their attempts may be.” The initiatives taken by these speaking classes have so far been successful in helping students to develop their speaking skills. With fluency in English, they stand a better chance of securing a good job. But only 30% (Farooqui, 2007) of all students in the country can afford to study in private universities. A question swivels around the complex conduits of my mind - what about the rest who are studying elsewhere?
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APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENT(S)

(The Questionnaire is a part of academic research program and will never be used for any sort of commercial purpose. I would like to assure you that this response will be kept confidential and ethics will be maintained at all levels)

General Information about students:

Name of the institution:

Type (tick the right box) □ Private: □ Public:

Gender (Tick the right box) □ Male: □ Female

Medium of school □ Bangla (S.S.C/H.S.C): □ English (O/A Levels)

Please tick mark the English courses you have done in this University (tick multiple if necessary):

□ Pre- University □ Eng 091 □ Eng 101 □ Never did any English courses here

Part 1: Personal questions about speaking/thinking in English

(1.1 Questions related to speaking in English of the students)

1. I feel comfortable to speak in English with my friends □ □ □ □ □ □

2. I feel comfortable to speak in English with the members of my family □ □ □ □ □ □

3. I feel uncomfortable to speak in English with my peers □ □ □ □ □ □

4. I feel uncomfortable to speak in English with my teachers □ □ □ □ □ □

5. I feel uncomfortable to speak in English with unknown people □ □ □ □ □ □

1.2 Questions related to students’ ability to think in English (target language)

1. I use Bangla while I am thinking on any random topic (personal, professional, educational etc.) by myself. □ □ □ □ □ □

2. I find it difficult to think on a topic using English as the language of thinking. □ □ □ □ □ □

3. I find it difficult to find the right vocabulary when I try to think on a topic in English. □ □ □ □ □ □

4. When I am given a random topic (impromptu/extempore speech) in the English class to speak about, first I think about it in Bangla, later I translate it to English and deliver my speech □ □ □ □ □ □
Part 2: Questions related to English Speaking classroom

2.1. Students' level of satisfaction about English speaking class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
I was satisfied with my English speaking ability before doing the class | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
I have improved in English speaking after doing the speaking English classes | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
I find the materials (i.e. topic, Audio, video) used in the speaking class to be effective. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
I find the materials which were used in the class, were contextual (i.e. related to Bangladesh) and relevant (i.e. World cup, Mobile phone etc.) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
I felt motivated to speak up in the speaking English class | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

2.2 Tasks/Activities done in English speaking class

Please tick the boxes below if you have done/participated any of the following in your English class (tick multiple if necessary)

☐ Listening to English songs  ☐ Listening tests  ☐ Impromptu speech  ☐ Argumentative presentation
☐ Persuasive presentation  ☐ Cause & Effect presentation  ☐ Watching videos  ☐ Listening to English songs
☐ English drama  ☐ English debate  ☐ Word games  ☐ Speaking tests
☐ Grammar games  ☐ Pronunciation games  ☐ Puzzle solving  ☐ Ad/film making

Other comments: (Specific comments please):

2.3. Most effective Tasks/Activities done in English speaking class

Please tick mark the boxes below if they were effective or helped improve your English speaking (tick multiple if necessary)

☐ Listening to English songs  ☐ Listening tests  ☐ Impromptu speech  ☐ Argumentative presentation
☐ Persuasive presentation  ☐ Cause & Effect presentation  ☐ Watching videos  ☐ Listening to English songs
☐ English drama  ☐ English debate  ☐ Word games  ☐ Speaking tests
☐ Grammar games  ☐ Pronunciation games  ☐ Puzzle solving  ☐ Ad/film making

Other comments: (Specific comments please):
Appendix 2: Interview questions for teacher(s)

1. How long have you been teaching English in this institute?
2. What courses are you taking now?
3. Have you taught any other courses before?
4. How long is your each English class?
5. What is the language of instruction in your English class?
6. What is the language used for interaction in the class?
7. If yes, do you find it difficult to use English as the language of interaction in the class?
8. How do you overcome this difficulty?
9. Do your university offer separate course for speaking?
10. Do you prepare your own materials? If not who does?
11. What are the activities you do in your speaking class?
12. Which of the following tools you use in your speaking class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening to English songs</th>
<th>Listening tests</th>
<th>Impromptu speech</th>
<th>Argumentative presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive presentation</td>
<td>Word games</td>
<td>Watching videos</td>
<td>Grammar games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English drama</td>
<td>English debate</td>
<td>Pronunciation games</td>
<td>Speaking tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ad/film making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Which of the tools you found to be most effective to teach speaking?
14. What are the problems students mostly face while speaking in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate explanation</td>
<td>Body language</td>
<td>Eye contact</td>
<td>Relevant examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Intonation/tone</td>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What do you think is your students’ primary language of thinking on any random topic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Bangla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. What are the assumptions behind thinking so?
15. Any other feedback on improving the techniques of teaching speaking?
Appendix-3

Questionnaire for students’ focus group discussion

1. Do you feel comfortable to speak in English in the class?
2. What are the challenges you face while trying to speak in English?
3. What is the language you primarily use to ‘think’ about your regular activities (i.e. Feeling, Emotion)?
4. Which language did you primarily use to brainstorm about the ideas on the topic you were assigned?
5. Do you feel comfortable to speak in English during the recording?
6. What challenges did you face to produce your thoughts on the assigned topics?
7. Did you organize your thought or spoke spontaneously?
8. Do you think practicing to think in English may help you improve your fluency in speaking?