

Instructional Directions for Foreign Students' Productive Skills

Maria Eden C. Zarate, EdD

Cebu Normal University

Email: mariaedenzarate@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research examined at the English productive skills (speaking and writing) of foreign students at CPILS. The Japanese and Korean respondents' pre-test levels, as well as the differences in their speaking and writing skills, were examined. In this quantitative-qualitative analysis, fifteen Japanese and fifteen Korean students took part in a descriptive survey. The International English Language Testing System (IELTS) was used to assess their English pre-test standard level. They were all clustered in one room and took the IELTS tests simultaneously. A specialist in the field tested and assessed the responses on the Speaking and Writing tests using IELTS band descriptors. To translate the scores into individual band scores, the IELTS nine-band scale was used.

In the General Training Module, the Japanese and Korean respondents did not meet the required English Language Proficiency (band 6). Speaking, followed by writing, was regarded as their weakest ability.

Keywords

Foreign Students, English Proficiency, IELTS, Productive Skills (Speaking and Writing), Instructional Directions

Introduction

The linguistic engine that propels the global economy is English. It is the common language that allows people from all over the world to communicate with one another. English is important not only for landing call center workers, but also for conducting business transactions, communications, and international job placements.

In certain cases, a student's level of performance is determined by their command of the English language. Many people consider one's English proficiency and success to be indicators of preparation and adaptability to college work (Bloom, 1987), as cited by Parcon (2012). Within academic environments, students must be able to read, write, speak, and comprehend English. Studying English necessitates the creation of two productive skills: a) speaking, which improves the ability to use oral language properly and efficiently in classroom activities such as question and answer sessions and social interactions, and b) writing, which fosters the ability to create written text content and style that is suitable for the age and level of the student.

So many countries recognize the need to improve their citizens' English competence and proficiency. Despite this, studies and polls show that student performance in English, especially in reading and speaking, is consistently poor (Gonzales, 1982). One of the Korean students at

CPILS (Mi Jin "Richel" Noh, as quoted in the Red Letter, p.5) said, "Speaking and listening are among the four skills that I find more difficult."

As an outcome, the study was carried out to assess the effective skills of Japanese and Korean learners as well as their current difficulties at CPILS. This will serve as the foundation for instructional directions on foreign students' development skills, such as Japanese and Koreans.

Literature Review and Theoretical Background

The research is based on Canale and Swain's (1980) Integrative Theory as well as other related theories. There are many commonalities in instruction among theories that help to improve learning. The majority of hypotheses assume that students move through different stages or phases of learning that can be differentiated in various ways.

The integrative theory of Canale and Swain (1980) urged all language teachers to combine structure or form with meaning in order to improve students' communicative skill in learning English. To achieve this, every language learner will be taught English in a comprehensive manner, using these two fundamental components of language as a sign system that allows them to express themselves freely and without difficulty. Furthermore, Munby (1978) substantiated Canale and Swain's assertion of communicative competence, which specifically concerns a person's awareness or capacity to properly

organize the rules of language structure and the rules of language usage. Linguistic competence, he claims, is a necessary component of communicative competence that cannot be separated from the other components. Successful language learning would not be far from reality if language teachers were only aware of their immediate function in inspiring students to apply their skills in real-life communication situations.

Language ability is a multifaceted concept that encompasses a range of abilities and domains (Carrasquillo, 1994). Oral (listening and speaking) and written (reading and writing) elements, as well as academic and non-academic language, are all included (Hargett, 1998). The four basic skill areas of language are also referred to as listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

The ability to produce language in written or spoken form is referred to as productive skills (i.e. speaking and writing.) The importance of productive language skills, such as speaking and writing, is that they are visible evidence of language learning. The more appropriate and cohesive language the speaker or writer produces, the more evidence of improvement in the learner's language system we have. Since written and oral communication are basic life skills, teaching constructive skills is also essential. People can need to educate, persuade, or share ideas in the real world. They may also be asked to take notes, fill out forms, and compose emails, letters, papers, or stories.

The research looks at the stages of speech, such as fluency and coherence, lexical resource, grammatical range and accuracy, and pronunciation. The very first stage of the speaking process, fluency and coherence, involves speaking as naturally and spontaneously as possible without having prepared precise responses. This refers to the ability to speak with normal levels of consistency, pace, and effort, as well as the ability to combine ideas and language to shape coherent, connected expression. The second part is lexical resource, which describes a person's vocabulary and the accuracy with which meanings and attitudes can be conveyed. The third stage is grammatical range and consistency, which applies to the grammatical resource's range as well as its correct and appropriate application. Eventually, there's pronunciation, which entails using simple sounds, stress, intonation, and rhythm patterns to

create comprehensible and natural-sounding voice.

Coherence and continuity, vocabulary and sentence structure, correct grammar and spelling, variety of vocabulary, and range of sentence structures are the five sub-skills defined in writing. Coherence and consistency are the first sub-skills in the writing process, which means that all phrases and sentences must adhere to the paragraph's intent and subject. Each detail must contribute to the core concept and must cohere and stick together. The use of correct grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, as well as the range of sentence structures and vocabulary, is the second sub-skill, vocabulary and sentence structures. Accurate grammar and spelling, the third sub-skill, is the deliberate and precise application of grammar and spelling in the construction of sentences. The fourth subskill, vocabulary range, requires the student to illustrate relevant and appropriate vocabulary awareness through the use of a specific range. Finally, the use of precise and direct basic and complex sentences in writing is part of the spectrum of sentence structure. In addition, there are several elements that are mostly involved in the writing process. These include describing and explaining details, debating problems, building a case, and speaking in the proper tone and register.

Evidently, Canale and Swain's Integrative Theory (1980) and some other relevant theories have a long-term effect on both teachers and learners, with a positive impact on teaching that increases learning. As a result, successful teaching necessitates teachers determining the best theoretical perspectives for the various forms of learning and applying the consequences of those perspectives to teaching in order to enhance classroom instruction. These provide a foundation for understanding and improving English language skills in ESL teaching and learning at CPILS. The results of this study can be used to determine foreign students' English language abilities, their challenges in learning a second language, and what instructional directions could be utilized in language learning.

Objective of the Study

The primary aim of the study was to determine how well foreign students at CPILS could speak and write in English.

It was created to assess the English entry level of Japanese and Korean students in terms of productive abilities including speaking and writing. The differences in the subjects' productive skills in terms of speaking and writing were also looked at, as well as what instructional directions for EFL instruction might be prepared once the study's results were identified.

Methodology

In this study's quantitative-qualitative analysis, the descriptive survey method was used. The IELTS band descriptors were used to describe the active skills levels of Japanese and Korean students at CPILS. It also required statistical treatment in order to compute simple percentages and statistically explain the data.

The respondents in this study were Japanese and Korean students who arrived by June 2006 and stayed for at least a month of study. There were fifteen Japanese and fifteen Koreans, both males and females, among the thirty students. Japanese people were mostly between the ages of 20 and 65, while Koreans were mostly between the ages of 20 and 35. Women outnumbered men. Purposive sampling was used to select the participants for this analysis. The International English Language Testing System (IELTS) was used to assess their English entry level, specifically in speaking and writing. They were all grouped in one room and took the IELTS writing exams at the same time, while the speaking tests were performed one at a time with a time limit. A specialist in the field graded the Speaking and Writing exams. The findings were converted into individual band ratings using the IELTS nine-band scale.

Findings

In terms of IELTS bands, the Japanese received a 2 for Intermittent User and a 3 for Extremely Limited User. The Japanese were classified as Intermittent Users at level 2, while the Koreans were classified as Limited Users at level 4. Writing exams yielded better results compared to speaking for both Japanese and Korean students.

They did not, however, achieve the necessary degree of English proficiency. This was due to the fact that they spent more time in school learning how to write. Nevertheless, they lacked speaking experiences. In terms of speaking and writing, the Japanese were found to be inferior to the Koreans. The study found that Korean students consistently outperformed Japanese students in terms of academic achievement. Because of their educational context, language interactions or exposure, age, ability or personal motivation to learn the language, and the educational system in Japan and Korea, they were found to be linguistically incompetent. Furthermore, the skills learned in school are not reinforced at home.

Conclusion

The Japanese and Korean students did not achieve band 6, the standard level of English proficiency expected of them, in the General Training Module, which is said to be easier than the Academic Module. Despite the fact that only a few of them were, the history knowledge of these subjects showed that they were not well-equipped in productive skills (speaking and writing).

References

A. Books

- [1] Alcantara, et.al. (2000). Introduction to world literature: An adventure in human experience. Katha Publishing Co., Inc.: Quezon City, Manila.
- [2] Cummins, J. (1994). The acquisition of second language. Delaware: International Reading Association.
- [3] De Witt, R. (2003). **How to Prepare for IELTS**. New Edition. British Council, IDP IELTS Australia and University of Cambridge ESOL.
- [4] Ellis, R. (1999). Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford New York: Oxford University Press.
- [5] IELTS Specimen Materials 2003 (updated January 2006). British Council, IDP IELTS Australia and University of Cambridge ESOL.
- [6] Krashen, Stephen D. (1988). Second language acquisition and second language learning. Prentice-Hall International.

- [7] Krashen, Stephen D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon.
- [8] Krashen, Stephen D. & Terrel, Tracey D. (1983). The natural approach of language acquisition in the classroom. California: Alemarz Press.
- [9] Lindeck, Jeremy and Kerry O' Sullivan (2002). Focusing on IELTS Reading and Writing Skills. Macquarie University. Sydney Australia.
- [10] Oxford, R. (1990). Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- [11] Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and output in its development. Rowley, M.A. New Bury House.

B. Periodical

- [12] **The Red Letter**. Official Newsletter of CPILS. Volume 2, Issue 1 January-March 2005. Cebu City.

C. Unpublished Materials

- [13] Angco, Dominador C. (2006). Learner factors and second language proficiency. Cebu Normal University. Cebu City.
- [14] Baluma, L. (1994). The Communicative proficiency of freshmen students of the teachers' college. Cebu State College. Cebu City.
- [15] Ramos, L. T. (2005). Listening and speaking skills of second Year BSN students of CNU. Cebu Normal University. Cebu City.

D. Others

- [16] **IELTS Information for Candidates 2005**. British Council, IDP IELTS Australia and University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations.