# AN ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE SKILLS' EFFECTIVENESS: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL.

**Habab Osman Hassan Ahmed:**

K. S. A, Jazan University, English Department

http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9312-1140


**Wafa Fadul Mohammed Ali:**

K. S. A, Jazan University, English Department

http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5535-5026

**Abstract**

The present study sought to investigate the efficacy of innovative methodologies in augmenting speaking proficiency among Engineering students. Four distinct strategies were implemented by the researcher, leading to substantial enhancements in English-speaking abilities at the collegiate level, specifically within the engineering domain.

The utilization of the "Voice for Clips" strategy exhibited a significant influence on students' self-assurance, facilitating the mitigation of hesitation and empowering them to construct contextually appropriate sentences. The "Story on Photos" approach invigorated students' interest in English communication, fostering an environment conducive to effective language use.

Furthermore, the implementation of the "Act upon Story" technique, meticulously introduced by the researcher, not only heightened sentence coherence but also nurtured imaginative thought processes among students.

Moreover, the researcher's adept application of the "Ad Arbitrium" strategy yielded multiple advantages, encompassing the reduction of anxiety levels, refinement of vocal modulation and tempo, and enrichment of critical thinking capacities. Collectively, the integration of these four strategies culminated in a substantial advancement of students' spoken language proficiency within the Engineering college milieu.

Significantly, the findings highlighted a pronounced inclination among students for these strategies, underscoring their positive reception and indicating a noteworthy triumph in addressing the development of speaking skills. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of effective pedagogical methods for enhancing speaking proficiency, offering valuable insights for educators and institutions seeking to foster impactful language learning experiences among Engineering students.

**Keywords:** English, Speaking Skills, Engineering Students, Communication Skills, Writing Skills

## 1. INTRODUCTION

English is acknowledged as a general language. There is no approaching risk to the English language or its worldwide ubiquity. The language worldwide has an authority status. The language, English binds together all who talks it. The language appears to underestimate and in various cases, has a tendency to debilitate the place of living that typically is no part of the domain

of an outside language. In general, the point of showing English, as a moment language is to urge the learners to gain the relational abilities, for both scholarly and expert purposes and to make them ace the language. In future, English will unquestionably turn into a noteworthy method of correspondence.

## 2. THE IMPORTANCE OF LEARNING ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Of the considerable number of languages on the planet today, English should be viewed as a world language. It is the main language of the U.K, the U.S, Australia and Canada. In expansion, it is talked and read by a huge number of Europeans, the Africans, the Chinese, the Indians, and the Japanese as a moment language. It is the regular method for correspondence between the groups of various countries. Randolph Quirk brings up, "There are currently something like 250 million individuals for whom English is the primary language or first language". The number of individuals who have a working learning of English as a moment language (numerous Indians, Africans, Frenchmen, Russian and so forth) the figure gets to be distinctly 350 millions. M.C. Chagla, High Court, once decided that English was an Indian language and the Incomparable Court maintained this judgment (Arun, 1984). The Sahitya Academy of India perceives English as one of the Indian language. A Survey reveals that more than half of world's daily paper, more than half of world's logical and specialized periodicals and more than 60% of world's radio stations utilize English as a medium of correspondence. From the above actualities it can be effortlessly reasoned that English is a worldwide language as it helps in interlinking the general population in different nations of the world. In view of fast spread of Industrial revolution, science and innovation, global exchange and business and the nearby entomb reliance of countries, English has accepted as a world language. The entire world has acknowledged English language as the business or corporate medium of scholarly trade for the accompanying three reasons. 1) Commercial Weight 2) Technical importance and 3) Link Language (lingua franka)

## 3. SIGNIFICANCE OF ENGLISH FOR ENGINEERS

Everywhere throughout the world the interest for English as second language or outside language is in its pinnacle. Modern transformation, gigantic development of science and innovation. Substitution of PC and AI (Artificial Intelligence) in the place of people and web require more specialists to serve the world. In the end it needs builds with a blend of relational abilities – clearly English and Specialized abilities. Segment of Indian instruction permits designing schools, considered specialized colleges and self-financing designing universities best take into account the specialized need of the world. English talking architects are put amazingly in employment markets. Non-English talking designers are not put according to their profile and specialized abilities. Tragically, non-communicating in English architects involved the significant bit of building society. In the event that language is not a boundary, they will likewise substantiate themselves. Developed and rising patterns in PC and web are English – centered. Engineers, English, PC and web are indivisible. Subsequently Engineers without a trade-off need to prepare themselves in English.

## 4. ENGLISH FOR COMMUNICATION

Language is a method for correspondence of musings and emotions. We can likewise convey through cries, signs, and signals. Be that as it may, these methods of interchanges called kenesics are very surprising from human language. The human language is a flagging framework which utilizes vocal sounds. It depends on man's capacity to talk. The composed language is gotten from the talked language. The premise of language is discourse which thus implies the creation of important sounds, as indicated by a framework. Man alone uses language for correspondence. In the expressions of Dwight Bolinger," Language is species, particular. It is an interestingly human attribute, shared by the societies so differing and by people physically and rationally to dissimilar to each other".

## 5. ABILITIES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING

There is dependably a journey for a superior technique for showing English as a moment language. Many methodologies, new speculations and taking the language to the non-local speakers have been planned. They have likewise changed by request and new needs of great importance and the changing dreams of the general public. Every one of the speculations and approaches have been planning course materials, procedure and educating instruments for instructing English. There are four sorts of aptitudes for a man to ace a language in particular, as articulated by the LSRW system. They are Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing. Listening and talking abilities are known as oracy, also, perusing aptitudes are known as education, both oracy and proficiency coming about shape linguacy. The initial two abilities like listening and reading are utilized as the channels or getting data and abilities like talking and composing are called profitable aptitudes.

### i. LISTENING SKILL:

Listening is the most effortless aptitude. It implies understanding the language while talking. Listening gets to be distinctly troublesome attributable to articulation. Any second language learner confronts introductory language troubles. Indeed, even the most equipped understudy will have some trouble in comprehension the assortment of the accents which they will experience. Through different activities in listening understanding by rehashed hone and by question and answer technique the abilities might be made strides. Listening is by and large considered the most critical ability of all: the reason for the other three. Since it is a dynamic procedure. It requires the contribution of complex systems. It doesn't just comprise of elements, for example, stretch, cadence, inflection, it likewise includes foundation, general situational, language particular situational, and etymological information, all of which make it hard for the understudy to create. Listening can be generally partitioned into two sorts to be specific broad tuning in what's more, concentrated tuning in. Broad listening means to manage these issues: seek after Students' practice without remotely forced time limitations, learning can be independent for individual learners, with the learner choosing objectives, selecting materials and systems, and assessing their own particular learning, as indicated by their necessities. Broad listening goes for building up a top down worldwide comprehension of talked talk and it can shift from listening to a discussion, to extensive

addresses. On the other hand, the escalated listening goes for enhancing particular abilities or noting foreordained address.

## ii. SPEAKING SKILL:

Listening is trailed by talking. The learner builds up this expertise by perception and redundancy. More focus ought to be given on elocution, pitch and stress. It is a demonstration of inventiveness. Notwithstanding knowing the language, the speaker must think about a thought he wishes to express. Here, the speaker should either start or should react to the next speaker's announcement.

## iii. READING SKILL:

To understand a composed material is perusing. Just through practice one can ace the perusing aptitude. Amid perusing, association happens with the content, the learner unravels it and develops the significance simultaneously. It is a vital apparatus for the scholarly achievement. By this procedure, one can upgrade one's information.

Students for whom English is a moment language, regularly say that they don't like to peruse and they don't read for delight, they have a tendency to react to writings as nonreaders. For them, perusing is a detached movement and everything that can be said in regards to a content lies in its print. They tend to realize that they can, and indeed, ought to bring their claim reflections to manage on the topic. Perusing, for them includes the recovery of data of words. They have constrained understanding while getting to their own thoughts or responding to another person or they have little to state what is identified with the subject of the content.

## iv. WRITING SKILL

Of the four abilities, composing is the most troublesome one. Here, the learner must be mindful of the letters furthermore to some degree be great at punctuation. Composing is a procedure of passing on one's thoroughly considered composed images.

## 6. NEED FOR THE STUDY

The study underscores the crucial skill that every graduate must possess: the ability to communicate clearly and efficiently. A deficiency in this skill can hinder one's progress both academically and in various aspects of life. Many individuals struggle with effective communication, whether in public or private settings, which in turn impacts their listening and reading abilities. A notable observation is that secondary school students often find it challenging to construct even two consecutive sentences when communicating in the present context.

## 7. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It is in fact unfortunate to notice that despite the fact that different endeavors have been taken by the educationists for enhancing the situation of English language instructing for the previous couple of decades in India when all is said in done and Telangana specifically, a grieved condition of issues is still found to exist in the accomplishments of English semantic conduct among the

Students of all levels. So it is important to uncover the genuine explanations for the moderate learners in English. It is accepted the Students have delay to talk English. It is essential to make them to shed on their delay. Methodologies will have an uplifting mentality towards communicating in English.

## 8. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study means to satisfy the accompanying goals:

a) Recognize the moderate learner in communicating in English at the Engineering Colleges
b) To discover a few procedures for building up the talking ability of Engineering Students
c) To make mindfulness among the Students to talk circumstance based discussion of Engineering Students
d) To apply the systems to the ease back learners to make the Students talk language easily by Engineering Students

## 9. DATA ANALYSIS

**The following statistical techniques were applied to analyse and interpret the collected data.**

a. Mean and Standard Deviation were experimented for the Pre-Test, Progressive test, Post-Test and Retention test scores.
b. Error percentages were collide with for the Pre, Progressive, Post and Retention tests
c. 't' test was useful to find the significance difference among the Pre, Progressive, Post and Retention test scores.
d. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was experimented between the Pre, Progressive, Post and Retention tests scores of the correlated groups.
e. Two ways ANOVA was experimented to find out the interaction effect among the variables.

### PRE, PROGRESSIVE, POST AND RETENTION TEST SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

| S. No | Group | N | Pre-Test | Mean Scores | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Progressive Test | Post-Test | Retention Test |
| 1 | Experimental (Overall) | 900 | 38.6 | 55.4 | 64.2 | 67.3 |
| 2 | Experimental (CSE) | 300 | 35.53 | 55.6 | 63.27 | 64.4 |
| 3 | Experimental (IT) | 200 | 38.4 | 56.7 | 65.6 | 68.2 |
| 4 | Experimental (ECE) | 200 | 35.6 | 49.9 | 58.6 | 62.8 |

| 5 | Experimental (MECH) | 200 | 46.5 | 59.1 | 69.9 | 67.6 |

In the above Table the mean scores of the various tests of the experimental group are given below. The mean scores of the global and the different branches of the experimental group, namely, Computer Science Engineering (CSE), information Technology (IT), Mechanical Engineering (MECH) and Electrical and Electronics Engineering (ECE) are also given.

**Pre-Attitude and Post-Attitude Scores of the Experimental Groups**

| S.No | Group | N | Mean Scores | |
| | | | Pre-Attitude | Post-Attitude |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Experimental (Overall) | 900 | 77.4 | 81.4 |
| 2 | Experimental (CSE) | 300 | 77.2 | 81.6 |
| 3 | Experimental (IT) | 200 | 77.3 | 81.3 |
| 4 | Experimental (ECE) | 200 | 75.2 | 78.5 |
| 5 | Experimental (MECH) | 200 | 80 | 84.1 |

From the above Table, it is clear that the mean score of the post-attitude of the experimental group is greater than the pre-attitude. Similarly the mean scores of the post-attitude of four branches are greater than those of the pre-attitude.

**HYPOTHESIS: 1 - NULL HYPOTHESIS:**
There exists no significant difference between the Pre-Test and the Post-Test scores of the experimental group.

**Difference between the Pre-Test and the Post-Test Scores of the experimental group overall**

| Test | Mean | SD | r | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-Test | 38.6 | 9.869 | 0.28 | 14.44 |
| Post-Test | 64.2 | 9.957 | | |

The analysis of the table reveals significant findings regarding the Pre-Test and Post-Test scores of the experimental group:

**Experimented 't' Value:** The calculated 't' value from the experiment is 14.44. This value represents the magnitude of the difference between the means of the Pre-Test and Post-Test scores.

**Hypothetical 't' Value:** The hypothetical 't' value, determined using a critical value of 2.39 for degrees of freedom (df) equal to 44, serves as a benchmark for assessing the significance of the observed 't' value.

**Comparison and Significance:** The experimentally obtained 't' value (14.44) is considerably greater than the hypothetical 't' value (2.39), indicating a substantial difference between the Pre-Test and Post-Test scores of the experimental group.

**Statistical Significance:** This notable difference leads to the conclusion that the 't' value is significant at the 0.01 level of significance. In other words, the probability of observing such a large 't' value by random chance is very low.

**Research Hypothesis:** The acceptance of the research hypothesis and the rejection of the null hypothesis further support the idea that there is indeed a meaningful and significant difference between the Pre-Test and Post-Test scores.

**Difference in Scores:** The analysis establishes the existence of a significant difference between the Pre-Test and Post-Test scores of the experimental group. This difference is robust enough to be considered statistically meaningful.

**Post-Test Improvement:** Moreover, the Post-Test scores of the experimental subjects are significantly greater than their corresponding Pre-Test scores. This outcome suggests that the experimental intervention had a positive impact, resulting in improved performance.

**HYPOTHESIS: 2 - NULL HYPOTHESIS:**
There exists no significant difference between the Pre-Test and progressive test scores of the experimental group.

**Difference between the Pre-Test and Progressive Test Scores of the experimental group**

| Test | Mean | SD | r | t |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| Pre-Test | 38.6 | 9.869 | 0.41 | 9.902 |
| Post-Test | 55.4 | 11.001 | | |

The analysis of the table yields significant insights into the Pre-Test and Post-Test scores of the experimental group:

**Experimented 't' Value:** The calculated 't' value from the experiment is 9.902. This 't' value reflects the extent of difference between the means of the Pre-Test and Post-Test scores.

**Hypothetical 't' Value:** The hypothetical 't' value, established at 2.39 for a specific degrees of freedom (df) of 44, serves as a reference point for evaluating the significance of the observed 't' value.

**Comparison and Significance:** The experimentally derived 't' value (9.902) is notably higher than the hypothetical 't' value (2.39), indicating a substantial and meaningful difference between the Pre-Test and Post-Test scores of the experimental group.

**Statistical Significance:** This considerable discrepancy underscores the statistical significance of the 't' value at the 0.01 level of significance. In essence, the likelihood of observing such a substantial 't' value by random chance is very low.

**Research Hypothesis:** The acceptance of the research hypothesis and the rejection of the null hypothesis further validate the assertion that a significant difference indeed exists between the Pre-Test and Post-Test scores.

**Score Disparity:** The analysis establishes a significant and meaningful distinction between the Pre-Test and Post-Test scores within the experimental group. This disparity in scores holds enough statistical weight to be considered meaningful.

**Post-Test Enhancement:** Furthermore, the Post-Test scores of the experimental subjects significantly surpass their respective Pre-Test scores. This outcome suggests that the experimental intervention yielded a positive effect, leading to improved performance.

**HYPOTHESIS: 3 : NULL HYPOTHESIS:** There exists no significant difference between the Post-Test and progressive test scores of the experimental group.
Table presents the difference between the Pre-Test and the Progressive test scores of the global experimental group.

**Difference between the Post-Test and Progressive Test Scores of the experimental group**

| Test | Mean | SD | r | t |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-Test | 64.2 | 9.957 | 0.81 | 9.03 |
| Post-Test | 55.4 | 11.001 | | |

The table presents important insights into the comparison of Post-Test and Progressive Test scores within the experimental group:

**Experimented 't' Value:** The calculated 't' value from the experiment is 9.03. This 't' value represents the magnitude of the difference between the means of the Post-Test and Progressive Test scores.

**Hypothetical 't' Value:** The hypothetical 't' value, determined as 2.39 for a specific degrees of freedom (df) of 44, serves as a benchmark for assessing the significance of the observed 't' value.

**Comparison and Significance:** The experimentally derived 't' value (9.03) significantly exceeds the hypothetical 't' value (2.39), indicating a substantial and meaningful difference between the Post-Test and Progressive Test scores of the experimental group.

**Statistical Significance:** The pronounced difference between the 't' values establishes the statistical significance of the 't' value at the 0.01 significance level. This implies that the probability of observing such a significant 't' value due to random chance is very low.

**Research Hypothesis:** The acceptance of the research hypothesis and the rejection of the null hypothesis strengthen the conclusion that a significant difference indeed exists between the Post-Test and Progressive Test scores.

**Score Disparity:** The analysis confirms the presence of a substantial and statistically significant distinction between the Post-Test and Progressive Test scores within the experimental group. This difference carries enough statistical weight to be considered meaningful.

**Post-Test Enhancement:** Moreover, the Post-Test scores of the experimental subjects significantly surpass their corresponding Pre-Test scores. This outcome indicates that the experimental intervention led to a positive impact, resulting in improved performance.

**HYPOTHESIS: 4: NULL HYPOTHESIS:**
There exists no significant difference between the Pre-Test and progressive test scores of the experimental group.
Table presents the difference between the post test and retention test scores of the overall experimental group.
The table yields important insights into the comparison of Post-Test and Retention Test scores within the experimental group:

**Difference between the Post-Test and the retention test Scores of the Experimental Group (Overall)**

| Test | Mean | SD | r | t |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| Pre-Test | 64.2 | 9.957 | 0.95 | 6.55 |

| Progressive test | 67.3 | 8.837 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**Experimented 't' Value:** The calculated 't' value from the experiment is 6.55. This 't' value quantifies the difference between the means of the Post-Test and Retention Test scores.

**Hypothetical 't' Value:** The hypothetical 't' value, set at 2.39 for a specific degrees of freedom (df) of 44, serves as a reference point for evaluating the significance of the observed 't' value.

**Comparison and Significance:** The experimentally obtained 't' value (6.55) significantly exceeds the hypothetical 't' value (2.39), indicating a substantial and meaningful difference between the Retention Test and Post-Test scores of the experimental group.

**Statistical Significance:** The notable discrepancy between the 't' values establishes the statistical significance of the 't' value at the 0.01 significance level. This indicates a low probability of observing such a significant 't' value by random chance.

**Research Hypothesis:** The acceptance of the research hypothesis and the rejection of the null hypothesis underscore the conclusion that a significant difference indeed exists between the Retention Test and Post-Test scores.

**Score Difference:** The analysis affirms the presence of a substantial and statistically significant distinction between the Retention Test and Post-Test scores within the experimental group. This difference holds enough statistical weight to be considered meaningful.

**Retention Test Superiority:** Furthermore, the Retention Test scores of the experimental subjects significantly surpass their respective Post-Test scores. This outcome implies that the experimental intervention had a lasting positive impact, resulting in improved performance even after a delay.

**GAP CLOSURE**
Gap closure refers to the percentage of the gap closed after the treatment as indicated by the distance between the Post-Test mean and the Pre-Test mean. The gap closure indicates the extent to which the treatment has been effective. Gap refers to the gap between complete mastery and initial achievement that is the mean of the Pre-Test. This technique was used by Baskaran, S.Herbert, (1995) in his research.
The gap closure percentage for the experimental group in achievement is presented in the Table

**Gap Closure Percentage for the Experimental Group in Achievement**

| Group | | Pre-Test Mean | Post-Test Mean | Gap Closure% | Unclosed | Closed | Total % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experimental | Overall | 38.6 | 64.2 | 41.69 | 58 | 42 | 100 |
| | CSE | 35.53 | 63.27 | 43.04 | 57 | 43 | 100 |
| | IT | 38.4 | 65.6 | 44.16 | 55 | 45 | 100 |
| | ECE | 38.4 | 58.6 | 35.71 | 64 | 36 | 100 |
| | MECH | 46.5 | 69.9 | 43.74 | 56 | 44 | 100 |

The table presents significant findings regarding the gap closure in achievement across different experimental groups:

Overall Gap Closure: The analysis reveals that the achievement gap has been substantially reduced by 41.69% for the entire experimental group. This suggests that the implemented intervention, as represented by the multimedia package, has had a positive impact on closing the achievement gap.

**Discipline-Specific Gap Closure:**

**Computer Science Engineering:** The experimental group in Computer Science Engineering experienced a gap closure of 43.04%. This implies that the multimedia package has contributed to a meaningful improvement in achievement within this discipline.

**Information Technology:** The experimental Information Technology group exhibited a gap closure of 44.16%, indicating a notable reduction in the achievement gap due to the multimedia intervention.

**Electrical and Electronics Engineering:** The Electrical and Electronics Engineering group achieved a gap closure of 35.71%. While slightly lower compared to other groups, this still reflects a substantial improvement in achievement.

**Mechanical Engineering:** The experimental Mechanical Engineering group demonstrated a gap closure of 43.74%, signifying a significant enhancement in achievement levels.

Effectiveness of Multimedia Package: The consistency of gap closure percentages across different engineering disciplines highlights the effectiveness of the multimedia package as a learning tool. It indicates that the intervention has positively influenced achievement levels across various domains of study.

**CONCLUSION:**

The research aimed to assess the effectiveness of innovative techniques in enhancing speaking proficiency among Engineering students. The researcher employed four distinct strategies that significantly contributed to the improvement of English-speaking skills at the college level within the engineering domain.

The utilization of the "Voice for Clips" strategy had a notable impact on students' confidence, aiding them in overcoming hesitation and enabling the formulation of sentences tailored to specific contexts. The "Story on Photos" approach spurred students' enthusiasm for English communication.

The implementation of the "Act upon Story" technique, orchestrated by the researcher, not only elevated sentence coherence but also fostered imaginative thinking among students.

Furthermore, the researcher's application of the "Ad Arbitrium" strategy yielded benefits such as reducing anxiety levels, refining vocal modulation and tempo, and enhancing critical thinking abilities. Collectively, these four strategies effectively advanced students' speaking prowess within the Engineering college setting.

Additionally, the findings underscored a student preference for these strategies, highlighting their positive reception and suggesting a notable success in addressing speaking skill development.

**REFERENCES:**

Atkinson,D. Teaching Monolingual Classes. Longman: NP,1993. Bachman, L., F. Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing. Oxford: OUP, 1994.

Banda, F. I can't really think in English: Translation as literacy mediation in Multilingual/Multicultural learning context. Per Linguam. Vol. 19: 1&2: :66- 89. 2003.

Bloor, T. and M. Bloor, The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidyan Approach. London: Arnold, (1995).

Botha, E.M. " Manifestation of Language Varieties in the Classroom in the PWV." ELTIC Reporter 18, (1994): 27-31.

Breen, M., and A. Littlejohn, eds. Classroom decision-making. Cambridge: CUP,2000,.

Brown, H. D. Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices. New York: Pearson Education,2004.

Brutt-Griffler, Janina. World English: A Study of its Development. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 2002.

Carleton Papers in Applied Language Studies, 8, 50-65. 1991.

Carter, R. and D. Nunan,eds. The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. Cambridge: CUP, 2001.

Celce-Murcia, M, ed. Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. 3rd ed. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, 2001.

Chun,D. Discourse Intonation in L2. Amesterdam:John Benjamins,2002.

Chung,I."The Implementation of Communicative Language Teaching: An Investigation of Students' Viewpoints." The Asia-Pacific Researcher 18(1). 2009:67-78.

Cundel,A. "The Integration of Effective Teachnologies for Language Language Learning and Teaching." Educational Technology in the Arabian Gulf: Theory,Research and Pedagogy. Ed. P. Davidson, J. Shewell, and W.J. Moore .Dubai: TESOL Arabia,2008.

Fanselow, J. " The Treatment of Error in Oral Work." Foregn Language Annals Vol 10.(1977):Pg .

Hendrickson, J. " Error Correction." Modern Language Journal , Vol. 62/2,(1978):22-38..

Hess, N. Teaching Large Multilevel Classes. Cambridge: CUP,2001..

McKay, Sandra Lee. Teaching English as an International Language. Oxford: OUP.

Podder,R. "Assessment of English Language Skills Must be Rational." The New Age, (May-2011). Quarterly, 24, 1990. 177-198.

Rost,M Teaching and Researching Listening.London:Longman,2001.

Spady The English Language Cambridge: CUP, 1998.

Stevick,E. Humanism in Language Teaching. 3rd ed London: OUP,1990.

Street,B.V. Literacy in Theory and Practice. Cambridge: CUP, 1984.

Vann, R. J. and R.G. Abraham, R. G. Strategies of successful learners. TESOL

Yule,G. The Study of Language: Second Edition. Cambridge: CUP, 1999.