A STUDY ON EFFECT OF INSTRUCTIONAL CONVERSATION PROGRAMME IN IMPROVING KANNADA LANGUAGE SPEAKING SKILLS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

*Rajesh N M, Assistant Professor, B E A College of Education, Davanagere.
** Dr. Umadevi M.R, Professor (Retired), Department of Education, Davanagere University. Davanagere.

Abstract:

The present research study aims on how the Instructional conversation programme affects on the secondary school students in improving kannada language speaking skills. In this method the students are involved through the discussion. These lessons are discussion based and encourage the students to create the opportunity to develop the students conceptual and the language ability.

In this study the Instructional conversation method which is one of the learning approaches of constructivism have been selected to improve the kannada language speaking skills of secondary school students. This Instructional conversation programme has constructed to develop the kannada language skills among the secondary school students on the basis of 10 Elements of Instructional conversation method. Through this programme the following subskills of kannada language speaking skills have been improved among the secondary school students i.e., 1) Pronunciation 2) Accuracy 3) Appropriateness 4) Coherence 5) Paraphrase.

Key Words: Speaking skills, Instructional conversation, Pronunciation, etc.

INTRODUCTION

The human world without the language is unimaginable. Since language is the valuable property earned by the human. The skills of language made the human beings differ from the other living beings. The learning of language means acquiring the basic skills of learning such as comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing by the child. The child achieve the proficiency in language by acquiring mastery over all the skills. But the child will not get mastery equally in all these. Therefore the present research reveals that how writing skill can be improved through the Instructional conversation method.

NEED AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

It is necessary to give attention towards developing the competencies like expression, thinking and creativity in the next levels. Hence the present research gives importance in improving the speaking skills. By conducting the Instructional conversation programme students can be motivated by providing natural

learning environment. This will provide opportunity to learn with interest and participated by self-motivated learning and active learning. In the opinion of Vygotsky a well-known constructivist Instructional conversation programme is the highly effective way to increase the child's language skills. All these perspectives leads to decide that the present study is significant.

OBJECTIVES:

❖ To construct Instructional conversation programme to improve the kannada language speaking skills in secondary school students.

❖ To construct Instructional conversation programme to improve the pronunciation in kannada language in secondary school students.

❖ To construct the Instructional conversation programme to improve accuracy in kannada language in secondary students.

❖ To study the Instructional conversation programme to improve the coherence skills kannada language in secondary school students.

❖ To study the Instructional conversation programme to improve the appropriateness skill in kannada language in secondary school students.

❖ To study the Instructional conversational programme to improve the Paraphrase in kannada language in secondary school students.

HYPOTHESIS:

❖ No significant difference between pretest and posttest scores of speaking skills of secondary schools in control group and experimental group.

❖ No significant difference between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e. pronunciation of students of secondary schools in control group and experiment group.

❖ No significant difference between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e. accuracy of students of secondary schools of control group and experiment group.

❖ No significant difference between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e. appropriateness of students of secondary schools of control group and experiment group.

❖ No significant difference between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e. coherence of students of secondary schools of control group and experiment group.

❖ No significant difference between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e. Paraphrase of students of secondary schools of control group and experiment group.

METHODOLOGY:

For the present study parallel group experimental method was used by the researcher.

SAMPLING:

Each 30 students from 9th standard secondary school have been selected as experiment and control group for this research study.

TOOLS USED FOR THE COLLECTION OF DATA:

Instructional conversation programme was used by the researcher. The tool was prepared by the researcher to improve the writing skills of secondary students.

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUE USED TO ANALYSE THE DATA:

The data were analyzed with reference to the objectives and hypothesis by applied different kinds of statistical tools in analyzing and establishing the related variables using independent t test for comparison of control group and experiment group, dependent t test was applied to compare the pretest and post test scores and analysis of covariance by considering between pretest scores as a covariate (ANCOVA) was performed to assess the differences between control group and experiment group. The one way ANOVA was applied to see the significant difference between two groups with respect to their variations I pretest scores for homogeneity.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS OF THE STUDY:

Table-1:- Comparison between pretest and posttest of speaking skills of students of secondary schools in control group and experiment group.

Groups	Test	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	SD Diff.	Paired t	P-value
Control Group	Pretest	20.07	2.49	-0.60	1.68	-1.9520	0.0607
	posttest	20.67	2.16				
Experiment Group	pretest	20.30	3.48	-15.41	5.60	-15.0704	0.0001*
	posttest	34.90	1.79				

*p<0.05

From the results of the above table, it can be seen that:

➢ No significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of speaking skills of students of secondary schools in control group(t=-1.9520,p>0.05) at significance level of 5 percent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected. It means that, the pretest(20.07±2.49) scores and posttest (20.67±2.16)scores of speaking skills of students of secondary schools are similar in control group. In another words, the traditional teaching is not effective in increasing the writing skills scores.

➢ A significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of speaking skills of students of secondary schools in experiment group (t=-15.0704,p<0.05) at significant level of 5 percent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the posttest (35.71±3.84) scores speaking skills of students of secondary schools are significantly higher as compared to pretest scores (20.30±3.48) in experiment group. In another words,the Instructional conversation programme is effective in increasing the speaking skills scores.

Table-2:- Comparison between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e. pronunciation of students of secondary schools in control group and experiment group.

Groups	Test	Mean	SD	Mean Diff.	SD Diff.	Paired t	P-value
Control group	pretest	4.20	1.19	-0.17	0.79	-1.1534	0.2582
	posttest	4.37	1.25				
Experiment group	pretest	4.20	1.16	-3.70	2.71	-7.4901	0.0001*
	posttest	7.90	2.67				

*p<0.05

From the result of the above table, it can be seen that

➢ No significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e. pronunciation of students of secondary schools in control group (t=-1.1534,p>0.05) at significant level of 5 percent. Therefore the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected. It means that,the pretest (4.20±1.19) and posttest (4.37±1.25) scores of components of speaking skills i.e., pronunciation of students of secondary schools are

similar in control group. In another words, the traditional method is not effective in increasing the pronunciation scores.

> A significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of components of speaking skills i.e. pronunciation of students of secondary schools in experiment group (t=-7.4901, p<0.05) at significance level of 5 percent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the posttest (7.90±2.67) scores of component of speaking skills i.e. pronunciation of students of secondary schools are significantly higher as compared to pretest scores (4.20±1.16) in experiment group. In another words, the Instructional conversation programme is effective in increasing the pronunciation scores.

Table-3:- Comparison between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e. Accuracy of students of secondary schools in control group and experiment group.

Groups	Test	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	SD Diff	Paired t	P-value
Control group	pretest	1.67	0.83	-0.07	0.45	-0.8118	0.4235
	posttest	1.73	0.82				
Experiment group	pretest	1.63	0.80	-1.24	1.02	-6.6829	0.0001*
	posttest	30.00	1.70				

*p<0.05

From the results of the above table, it can be seen that

> No significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e. accuracy of students of secondary schools in control group (t=-0.8118,p>0.05) at significance level of 5 percent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis was rejected. It means that, the pretest (1.67±0.83) and posttest (1.73±0.82) scores of component of speaking skills i.e. accuracy of students of secondary schools are similar in control group. In another words, the traditional teaching method is not effective in increasing accuracy scores.

> A significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of speaking skills i.e. accuracy of students of secondary schools in experiment group (t=-27.7694, p<0.05)at significance level of 5 percent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative

hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the posttest (2.88±0.71) scores of component of speaking skills i.e. accuracy students of secondary schools are significantly higher as compared to pretest scores (1.63±0.80) in experiment group. In another words, the Instructional conversation programme is effective in increasing the accuracy scores.

Table-4:- Comparison between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e. Appropriateness of students of secondary schools in control group and experiment group.

Groups	Test	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	SD Diff	Paired t	P-value
Control group	pretest	2.17	1.02	-0.20	0.71	-1.5334	0.1360
	posttest	2.37	0.89				
Experiment group	pretest	2.33	0.99	1.87	0.90	-11.3658	0.0001*
	posttest	4.20	0.81				

*p<0.05

From the results of the above table, it can be seen that

➢ No significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of component of speakingskills i.e. Appropriateness of students of secondary schools in control group (t=-1.5334,p>0.05) at significance level of 5 percent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis was rejected. It means that, the pretest(2.17±1.02) and posttest (2.37±0.89) scores of component of speaking skills i.e. appropriateness of students of secondary schools are similar in control group. In another words, the traditional teaching method is not effective in increasing appropriateness scores.

➢ A significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of speaking skills i.e. appropriateness of students of secondary schools in experiment group (t=-11.3658, p<0.05)at significance level of 5 percent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the posttest (4.20±0.81) scores of component of speaking skills i.e. appropriateness students of secondary schools are significantly higher as compared to pretest scores (2.33±0.99) in experiment group. In another words, the Instructional conversation programme is effective in increasing the appropriateness scores.

Table-5:- Comparison between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e. Paraphrase of students of secondary schools in control group and experiment group.

Groups	Test	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	SD Diff	Paired t	P-value
Control group	pretest	3.73	1.20	-0.10	0.84	-0.6483	0.5219
	posttest	3.83	1.32				
Experiment group	pretest	3.80	1.58	-2.87	1.96	-8.0087	0.0001*
	posttest	14.07	1.86				

*p<0.05

From the results of the above table, it can be seen that

➢ No significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e., Paraphrase of students of secondary schools in control group (t=-0.6483,p>0.05) at significance level of 5 percent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis was rejected. It means that, the pretest (3.73±1.20) and posttest (3.83±1.32) scores of component of speaking skills i.e.Paraphrase of students of secondary schools are similar in control group. In another words, the traditional teaching method is not effective in increasing paraphrase scores.

➢ A significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of speaking skills i.e. Paraphrase of students of secondary schools in experiment group (t=-8.0087, p<0.05) at significance level of 5 percent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It meansthat, the posttest (6.67±1.09) scores of component of speaking skills i.e. paraphraseof students of secondary schools are significantly higher as compared to pretest scores (3.80±1.58) in experiment group. In another words, the Instructional conversation programme is effective in increasing the Paraphrase scores.

Table-6:- Comparison between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e., coherence of students of secondary schools in control group and experiment group.

Groups	Test	Mean	SD	Mean Diff	SD Diff	Paired t	P-value
Control group	pretest	8.27	1.86	-0.13	0.97	-0.7504	0.4591
	posttest	8.40	1.50				
Experiment group	pretest	8.33	1.97	-5.73	2.66	-11.7862	0.0001*
	posttest	14.07	1.86				

*p<0.05

From the results of the above table, it can be seen that

- ➢ No significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of component of speaking skills i.e., coherence of students of secondary schools in control group (t=-0.7504,p>0.05) at significance level of 5 percent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis was rejected. It means that, the pretest(8.27±1.86) and posttest (8.40±1.50) scores of component of speaking skills i.e., coherence of students of secondary schools are similar in control group. In another words, the traditional teaching method is not effective in increasing coherence scores.

- ➢ A significant difference was observed between pretest and posttest scores of speaking skills i.e. coherence of students of secondary schools in experiment group (t=-11.7862, p<0.05)at significance level of 5 percent. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that, the posttest   (14.07±1.86) scores of component of speaking skills i.e. coherence of students of secondary schools are significantly higher as compared to pretest scores (8.33±1.97) in experiment group. In another words, the Instructional conversation programme is effective in increasing the coherence scores.

CONCLUSION:

In this point of view, there is very much essential to develop the speaking skills programmes among the secondary school students. We can improve the kannada language skills through the Instructional conversation programme among the secondary school students. By this research study we may prove that this programme is very important to develop the ability of expression, thinking capacity and creativity among the secondary students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Anitha Woolfolk (2011), "Educational Psychology", Dorling Kindersly (India) Pvt Ltd, New Delhi.

2. Best John.W (1977), "Research in Education", Prentice hall of India pvt Ltd, New Delhi.

3. LokeshKoul. (2002), "Methodology of Educational Research" Vikas Publications, New Delhi.

4. Lakshmi.N (2005), "Educational Statistics" VidyanidhiPrakashana, Gadag.

5. Dr.Umadevi.M.R(2008), "Educational Psycology" SathkruthiPrakashana, Davanagere

6. Vamadevappa.H.V(2010), "Evaluation and Statistics in Education" Shreyas Publication, Davanagere.

7. Yashodhara.K. (2007), "Statistics in education" SheebaPrakashana, Mysore.

WEBLIOGRAPHY:

1) www.Shodhaganga.inflibnet.com

2) www.chea.org

3) http://trove.nla.gov.au