

Evaluating Oral English Program for Non-English Major Students: Focusing on Self-Assessment of Students' Speaking Abilities and Their Needs

La DUNIFA

Ph.D., Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin, INDONESIA

ladunif1968@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0001-7116-9178

Article information

Submission	06/07/2023	Revision received	20/08/2023
Acceptance	14/09/2023	Publication date	20/10/2023

Keywords:

English as a foreign language,
oral English skills,
program evaluation,
self-assessment,
students' needs

Abstract: Due to the rising importance of oral English skills (OES) in the globalization of English, Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin, Indonesia, has changed the focus of English for non-English major students (NEMS) from teaching language components to OES. The present study aims to assess the extent to which the OES program impacts the development of students' speaking skills and to reveal the students' needs in learning the OES. A self-assessment of speaking ability was used to evaluate the OES degree of 462 NEMS, and a stimulated recall instrument was applied to investigate the needs of 230 students in learning OES. The results revealed that the OES program for NEMS has not yielded satisfactory results. Overall, the students' OES are weak and insufficient. Fluency is the speaking assessment category in which the learner has the most severe problems. There are six main protuberant needs of students when learning OES: the opportunity to speak English in the classroom, the possibility to learn OES in a small classroom, continuity in learning OES without interruption by other classes, and learning OES with their classmates from the same major. Students' needs in learning OES may serve as a starting point for future efforts to improve oral English teaching and learning outcomes.

Anahtar Sözcükler:

Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce,
Sözlü İngilizce becerileri,
program değerlendirme,
öz-değerlendirme,
öğrenci ihtiyaçları

Anadal Eğitimi İngilizce Olmayan Öğrencileri için Sözlü İngilizce Programının Değerlendirilmesi: Öğrencilerin Konuşma Becerileri ve İhtiyaçlarının Öz Değerlendirmesine Odaklanmak

Özet: İngilizcenin küreselleşmesinde sözlü İngilizce becerilerinin artan önemi nedeniyle, Endonezya Dayanu Ikhsanuddin Üniversitesi, anadal eğitimi İngilizce olmayan öğrencilere yönelik İngilizce öğretimini, dil bileşenlerinin öğretilmesinden daha çok sözlü İngilizce becerilerine odaklanacak şekilde değiştirmiştir. Bu çalışma, sözlü İngilizce becerileri programının öğrencilerin konuşma becerilerinin gelişimine ne kadar etkisi olduğunu değerlendirmeyi ve öğrencilerin sözlü İngilizce becerilerini öğrenmeye yönelik ihtiyaçlarını ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Anadal eğitimi İngilizce olmayan toplam 462 öğrencinin sözlü İngilizce becerilerinin seviyesini değerlendirmek için öz değerlendirme yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Sözlü İngilizce becerilerini öğrenmeye yönelik ihtiyaçlarını tespit edebilmek için ise 230 öğrencinin katıldığı çağrışım tekniğine dayalı veri toplama aracı kullanılmıştır. Bulgular programın tatmin edici sonuçlar vermediğini, öğrencilerin sözlü İngilizce becerilerinin zayıf ve yetersiz olduğunu ve en ciddi sorunun akıcılık konusunda yaşandığını ortaya koymaktadır. Ek olarak, sözlü İngilizce becerilerini öğrenme sürecinde öğrencilerin altı temel ihtiyaç alanı tespit edilmiştir. Bunlardan en belirgin olanları ise sınıfta İngilizce konuşma fırsatı, küçük sınıflarda sözlü İngilizce becerilerini öğrenme imkânı, diğer derslerle kesinti olmadan bu becerileri öğrenmeye devam etme, aynı ana dalda olan sınıf arkadaşlarıyla birlikte bu becerileri öğrenme olasılığı olarak sıralanmıştır. Çalışmadan elde edilen bulgular uygulanmakta olan programı ve genel olarak İngilizce öğretimini geliştirmeye yönelik adımların tespiti için oldukça önemlidir.

To Cite This Article: Dunifa, L. (2023). Evaluating oral English program for non-English major students: Focusing on self-assessment of students' speaking abilities and their needs. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 17(2), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10015757>

1. Introduction

Oral English proficiency is of the utmost importance in today's competitive world. It plays an important role for individuals working in business, education, science, and technology as well as for those seeking jobs. Those who speak English well are more likely to succeed in these circumstances. Crystal (1997) asserted that learning English can guarantee the availability of opportunities for career, travel, higher education, and even a better life. Therefore, higher education institutions should shift their emphasis away from teaching students about the English language and toward using it in a practical context (Yu & Liu, 2018). Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin, Indonesia (henceforward UND), from the 2017-2018 academic year, has transformed the focus of English for non-English major students (henceforth NEMS) from teaching language basics (grammar and vocabulary) to a real-world application of the language. The English course previously, in this institution, was taught for 90 minutes a week for one semester (26 weeks) or equivalent to 39 hours with a weight of 2 credits. However, currently, it is taught 180 minutes a week for two consecutive semesters (52 weeks) or equivalent to 156 hours with a weight of 8 credits. The course name has been changed from General English to English Conversation, and it aims to improve students' all-around proficiency in using English, particularly in speaking and listening.

The shift in emphasis to English teaching and learning for NEMS aligns with national education restructurings that go hand in hand with decentralization in Indonesia. Indonesian national education has prioritized granting higher education institutions more autonomy while also focusing on what the universities must create to increase the nation's competitiveness on the global stage. The Indonesian educational system permits institutions to enhance their curricula as long as they follow the fundamental regulations set forth by the Indonesian government. The institutions are allowed to fulfill the needs of their students and impart stimulating, pertinent lessons. The focus of language education in the twenty-first century, according to Eaton (2010), has shifted from learning grammar rules to using language and cultural knowledge to connect and engage with people worldwide. The UND was aware that due to the fast changes in industry and technology standards, English language teaching objectives can be defined as employment positions, and the program's curriculum can be specified as being necessary to fulfill those roles. This policy is in keeping with the global consensus among institutions that enhancing students' communication skills will boost their employability (Mercer-Mapstone & Matthews, 2017; Karakaş, Uysal, Bilgin, & Bulut, 2016).

The current study aims to evaluate the extent to which the oral English program for NEMS at UND contributes to students' OES development and the needs of the students in learning OES and seeks answers to the research questions given below.:

1. To what extent does the program contribute to students' OES development?
2. What are the students' needs in learning OES?

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Oral English Skills of EFL Learners

Due to English's role as a worldwide language, oral fluency in the language is essential. Speaking is considered a sign of one's linguistic proficiency (Hişmanoğlu & Çolak, 2019; Nowicka & Wilczynska, 2011; Richard, 2008). Speaking is a participatory method of generating meaning that incorporates information production, reception, and processing (Richard, 2008). According to Renandya, Hamied, and Nurkamto (2018), oral English skills

are indicated by (1) accuracy: the capacity to produce words with proper grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary; (2) complexity: the ability to use complex language; that is, whether we are able to use a wide range of vocabulary and grammar; (3) appropriateness: whether the language we use is appropriate and pertinent for the circumstance, intended audience, and context; (4) capacity: how much of our knowledge can be used to speak and write about a range of topics in formal and informal settings with different levels of sophistication (superficial and profound); and (5) fluency: the ability to use linguistic resources to maintain and avoid gaps in the flow of our speech. These performance indicators can be used to categorize people's communicative skills into a variety of competency levels, such as elementary, intermediate, or advanced. For the purpose of instruction and assessment, each level may be further divided into sublevels. Pre-elementary, elementary, and post-elementary levels can be used to divide up elementary (Renandya et al., 2018).

The objective of oral English language instruction is to develop student's communicative competence, which enables them to talk successfully in the actual world. Chaney and Burk (1998) stated that speaking is the process of creating and exchanging meaning in many contexts using both verbal and nonverbal symbols. It is acknowledged as a crucial skill in teaching and learning a language. Many second or foreign language learners place great importance on mastering speaking abilities; yet, for many language learners, learning speaking is not a simple process, especially in EFL settings where they have little exposure to the actual language outside of class (Richard, 2008; Namividia, Mobaraki & Malekzadeh, 2019). As the goal of teaching speaking is to improve students' oral production, language teaching should maximize language use in the classrooms, which is achieved through implementing proper teaching techniques to require students to learn and practice the language in classes (Bahador & Mofrad, 2020).

Research on the speaking skills of EFL students so far typically shows that they are still far below expectations and are tied to particular problems. According to Tekir (2021), Turkish EFL students have a lot of problems in speaking due to poor lexical control, a lack of speaking opportunities, and cultural restraints relating to the teaching methods used in ELT classrooms. Since language learners frequently interact with people from different cultures and backgrounds, it is crucial to incorporate these teaching methods into ELT classrooms (Zorba & Çakir, 2019).

In Iran, Afshar and Asakereh (2016) reported that social and teacher-related issues, a lack of efficient and sufficient facilities in language laboratories, and the nation's educational system's curricula are some of the main reasons that hinder students' ability to speak English. Liu and Dai (2003) reported that Chinese university students' proficiency in English, particularly in listening and speaking, is quite low. Chinese EFL learners' speaking problems are closely related to psychological issues like anxiety, fear of making mistakes, reluctance, and fear of receiving a poor grade (Amoah & Yeboah, 2021).

IbnaSeraj, Habil, and Hasan (2021) conducted a systematic review to provide a critical overview of recent findings and investigate the factors influencing the poor oral performance of EFL learners. For this purpose, 51 empirical studies conducted in EFL countries (e.g., China, Japan, Indonesia, Pakistan, Thailand, Yemen, Iran, Taiwan, and others) were analyzed thematically. It was revealed that environmental factors (limited practice, learners' passiveness, large class size, and mixed ability) were the primary factors for students' poor speaking performance in an EFL context.

2.2. EFL Students' Needs: Demands, Expectations, Wants

A plethora of research has been focused on seeking and interpreting EFL learners' needs from different contexts and perspectives. Mazdayasna and Tahririan (2008) investigated the EFL needs of undergraduate medical science students of nursing faculty and midwifery in Iran. The research found that more than one-third of students expressed disappointment with the number of classmates in each class, the manner of instruction, the way in which they were evaluated, the information in the textbook, and the quantity of foreign culture taught in the class.

Kim (2006) conducted a survey to learn how East Asian international graduate students felt about the standards for academic speaking and listening in their university courses, their own struggles to meet these needs and their suggestions for how English for Academic Purposes (EAP) teachers could better prepare them through speaking and listening exercises. According to the survey, taking part in whole-class conversations, improving the ability to listen, asking questions in class, and participating in small-group discussions are the four most common needs for academic oral communication.

Moslemi, Moinzadeh, and Dabaghi (2011) evaluated the English language demands of Iranian graduate students majoring in biology, psychology, physical education, accounting, and Western philosophy. In this study, 25 lecturers and 80 graduate students from an Iranian institution participated in interviews and responded to the questionnaire. The research found that students were unhappy with their English classes and advocated an immediate revision and reevaluation of English teaching methods in Iranian schools and universities. The reason was said to be a lack of exposure to the English language during their studies.

Mahmoudikia and Ahmadi (2020) examined the needs of Iranian undergraduate and graduate students from their English instructors' perspectives. Four English instructors from Shiraz University contributed to the study by participating in an unstructured interview regarding the severity of their students' speaking issues, their most likely causes, and potential remedies. The results revealed that the participants believed there to be a speaking ability issue with their students, and the causes of the issues were reported to be a lack of gatekeeping and post-admission speaking assessments, ineffective prior education, and an insufficient focus on speaking skill improvement. The results of the studies mentioned above are significant since they add to the body of knowledge that can guide this study.

2.3. Self-Assessment of Oral Skills

It is commonly acknowledged that evaluating a student's oral proficiency in a foreign language is a complex endeavor that could result in serious issues at any point in the process (Castañeda & Rodríguez-González, 2011; Chang, Wu & Kun, 2005; Konzet, 2015). Ur (1995) asserted that speaking is very challenging to evaluate quickly and effectively; although it is possible to make recordings, this way is time-consuming and does not ensure objectivity. The problems in assessing oral skills are not only linked to the choice of the appropriate elicitation technique and procedure of assessment, but they may also occur while designing or managing the test, including 'the authenticity of the environment' (Amoah & Yeboah, 2021; Chang et al., 2005). Therefore, self-assessment of oral skills is presented as a response to this problematic circumstance (Léger, 2009).

Many studies have supported the use of self-assessment as a substitute tool to measure learners' language proficiency (c.f., Farooq, Ahmed & Farooq, 2020; Kim, 2019; Seifert &

Felix, 2018; Wang, 2016). Self-assessment is a helpful tool for learners to reflect on themselves and can help them develop into self-regulated learners who are in charge of their own education (Anh, Dong, & Trang, 2022; Kim, 2019). In authentic assessment, involving students to participate in their own assessment is essential. Students have the chance to apply standards to work samples and establish learning purposes by reflecting on and evaluating their own work as well as that of their peers (O'Malley & Pierce, 1996). These are frequently referred to as alternative assessments and comprise student portfolios, self-assessments, peer assessments, teacher observations of classrooms, and interviews. Since it encourages students' self-regulatory learning and autonomy, self-assessment has been thought to be effective for learning (Dann, 2002; Paris & Paris, 2021). At that point, Paris & Paris (2021) affirmed that governments have heavily supported various non-traditional kinds of assessment in place of traditional accomplishment assessments (such as objective tests).

Formally, self-assessment is a powerful tool for improving students' performance since it allows them to examine their own progress, areas for improvement, and areas of strength, but it is the most underutilized tool in language courses (Farooq et al., 2020). Self-assessment can give students the opportunity to feel in control of their activities and develop good attitudes about learning, which will increase motivation because it involves reflection and appraisal of one's own performance (Paris & Paris, 2001). In addition, according to Ma and Winkle (2019), self-assessment is a valuable instrument to monitor students' proficiency gains and to globally track the way in which language programs promote proficiency growth. Despite a few drawbacks, the majority of the learners' assessments on the success of speaking self-assessment were favorable (Babaii, Taghaddomi & Pashmforoosh, 2016).

3. Method

3.1. Research Design

This study evaluated the degree of students' oral English performance and their needs in oral English teaching and learning. Evaluation research is the systematic assessment of a program to determine its efficiency and effectiveness and provide suggestions for enhancing its results (Kellaghan, 2010; Mertens, 2005). This study was a mixed-methods in nature. A mixed-methods research design is a technique for collecting, analyzing, and integrating both qualitative and quantitative research and methods to understand a research problem (Creswell, 2008). To comprehend the first research question proposed in this study, it needs quantitative data, i.e., the score of the students' self-assessment of their speaking ability. The second research question, on the other hand, calls for qualitative data or participant comments and explanations of their needs in learning oral English.

3.2. Participants

The participants in the study are NEMS of UND from 15 different majors during the academic year 2021-2022; they were those who have taken the English Conversation course. The total number of participants was 462 (256 males and 206 females). The background information of the participants is shown in Table 1. A number of 230 participants (128 males and 102 females) agreed to participate in completing the stimulated recall instrument.

Table 1.

Background Information of the Participants in Self-Assessment of Speaking Ability and Stimulated Recall

Major	Self-Assessment of Speaking Ability			Stimulated Recall		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Public Administration	11	14	25	5	7	12
Sociology	8	4	12	4	2	6
Legal Science	12	8	20	6	4	10
Management	20	19	39	10	9	19
Accountancy	28	24	52	14	12	26
History Education	8	6	14	4	3	7
Mathematics Education	10	6	16	5	3	8
Economic Education	8	6	14	4	3	7
Agribusiness	9	7	16	5	3	8
Water Resource Management	6	7	13	3	3	6
Mechanical Engineering	30	20	50	15	10	25
Civil Engineering	30	20	50	15	10	25
Information Technology	32	30	62	16	15	31
Mining Engineering	20	15	35	10	8	18
Public Health	24	20	44	12	10	22
Total Number	256	206	462	128	102	230

3.3. Data Collection

3.3.1. Self-Assessment of Speaking Ability

Students' OES development was assessed using a self-assessment of speaking ability adapted from O'Malley and Pierce (1996). The instrument covers three main attributes: accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. Students' oral English proficiency is categorized by adopting Ari's proficiency classification (2023), where six equals 'very good,' five refers to 'good', four denotes 'sufficient', three symbolizes 'insufficient', two represents 'weak', and one indicates 'very poor' or 'no performance'. Poor performance is indicated by grades below 4.

To determine validity and reliability of the self-assessment of speaking ability, a pilot test was conducted. The extent to which a measurement tool measures what it is meant to measure determines its validity and reliability (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004). For this purpose, 42 non-English major students who have taken an English Conversation course during the previous academic-year (2020/2021) were approved to contribute. The validity of this instrument was examined using Pearson's product-moment formula. Based on the number of respondents (n= 42), the value of the r-table at $\alpha= 0.05$ is 0.304. The criteria for testing item validity are: (1) if item X r-count > r-table, then item X is valid; (2) if item X r-count < r-table, then item X is invalid or dropped. The calculation results demonstrate that the r-table coefficient reaches 0.34, while the minimum and maximum r-count values are 0.43 and 0.77, respectively. It can be decided that the instrument is valid and meet the requirements for use. The Cronbach's alpha approach was also used to evaluate the instrument's reliability. The results of calculation revealed that the reliability coefficient reaches 0.77, which indicate that the instrument is reliable for use in the field of study.

3.3.2. Stimulated Recall

Stimulated recall methodology in second or foreign language research gives researchers the practical skill to elicit deeper data in their own research (Gass & Mackey, 2017). The

stimulated recall methodology was applied to obtain backdated data about students' needs in learning oral English. Students were requested to reflect on the entire OES learning process, recall their learning experiences, and then indicate what they needed, wanted, demanded, or expected.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

There were 462 students who took part in the paper-based self-assessment of speaking ability. The 230 students who were randomly chosen to participate in this study got the stimulated recall worksheets, as well. The participants took part effectively and punctually submitted their work. To facilitate students' ability to express themselves in the stimulated recall task, they were asked to write their responses in their national language. Like the self-assessment of speaking ability, they also had one week to complete the stimulated recall task.

3.5. Data Analysis

The findings of self-assessment of the speaking ability were quantitatively analyzed using the Microsoft Excel program to obtain descriptive statistics like frequency (f), percentage (%), and means (M). The participants' responses to the stimulated recall were hand-analyzed. According to Creswell and Creswell (2022), the hand analysis of qualitative data means that the researchers read the data, mark it by hand, and divide it into parts. A hand analysis may be preferred when analyzing a small database, for example, less than 500 pages of transcripts or field notes (Creswell, 2008; Creswell & Creswell, 2022). In this research, the analysis of the stimulated recall data comprises two steps. The first step was to read every participant's comment and group them according to the similarity in themes. The second phase involved determining the frequency (f) and percentage (%) of each theme identified in participant responses.

4. Findings

4.1. The Results of Self-Assessment of Speaking Ability

The first research question is set out to disclose the extent to which the oral English program contributes to students' oral English skills development. As shown in Table 2, in terms of accuracy, the mean scores of pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary are 2.29, 2.57, and 3.10. Meanwhile, the mean score of fluency is 2.18, and the mean score of comprehension is 3.01. This suggests that in the speaking component, the students are weak in fluency, pronunciation, and grammar. They have insufficient vocabulary and comprehension. The speaking performance of NEMS, as indicated by the overall average mean score, is in the weak category, which indicates poor performance.

Considering the outcomes of self-assessment of speaking ability, as shown in Table 2, in terms of pronunciation, 138 of 462 students (29.87%) felt that their pronunciation was frequently unintelligible, and 135 of 462 students (29.22%) reacted that they frequently made mistakes, and they have very strong accent, which made understanding difficult and necessitated repeated explanations. A total of 105 of 462 students (22.73%) felt that they have mispronunciation, which occasionally leads to misunderstandings and obstructs comprehension. A number of 84 of 462 students (18.18%) felt that their occasional pronunciation errors do not prevent others from understanding them. However, none of the students admitted that their pronunciation was perfect, native-like, or natural, with no indication of a foreign accent.

In relation to grammar, 102 of 462 students (22.08%) thought that practically, all of their English grammar was incorrect, and 158 of 462 (34.20%) agreed that they frequently hindered communication by making consistent grammar mistakes in English. A number of 128 of 462 students (27.71%) believed that they frequently erred, displaying some significant language patterns out of control and occasionally leading to misunderstanding, and 74 of 462 students (16.02%) assured that they occasionally make mistakes that reflect their inconsistent command of various sentence structures, but they do not have any flaws that lead to misunderstandings. However, none of the students assured that their grammar was generally correct and their sentence structure was sound. It was also shown that none of the students believed that they had no more than two grammatical mistakes.

In terms of vocabulary, 77 of 642 students (16.67%) stated that they have inadequate vocabulary, even for a simple conversation, and 55 of 642 students (i.e., 11.69 %) felt that their vocabulary is restricted to terms related to time, food, transportation, family, and other necessities of life. A number of 143 of 462 (30.95%) confessed that their word choices tend to be inaccurate, and they have restricted vocabulary that hinders them from describing basic social and professional topics. A number of students, i.e., 122 of 462 (26.41%), admitted that they have enough vocabulary to discuss various social contexts and complex problems. A few of the students, i.e., 66 of 462 (14.29%), believed that they had an extensive and exact vocabulary and that their general vocabulary was sufficient to deal with complicated issues and a variety of social situations. However, none of the students believed that they had a wide range of precise vocabulary.

Regarding fluency, 143 of 462 students (30.90%) felt that their conversation is almost impossible for them because their speech is so sluggish and jumbled, and 158 of 462 students (34.20%) admitted that they speak very slow and uneven, except for short or routine sentences. A total of 97 of 462 students (21%) believed that their speech is frequently uncertain; a sentence may go unfinished, and 64 of 462 students (13.85%) confessed that they occasionally speak hesitantly and unevenly. However, none of them affirmed that their speech was understandable, but it is obviously not native in its speed and evenness, and no one admitted that they spoke fluently and easily on all professional and general themes.

In terms of comprehension, 74 of 462 students (15.58%) believed that their comprehension was insufficient for even the most basic of conversations. A total of 68 out of 462 (14.7%) confessed that they can only grasp slow, extremely simple talks about general societal issues; it necessitates constant repeating and rephrasing. Next, 150 of 462 students (32.47%) admitted that when speaking in a conversation, they can understand cautious, slightly simplified communication, but they require a lot of repetition and rephrasing. Of 462 students, 128 of them (7.71%) believed that they could comprehend everyday speech rather well, but occasionally, they need to hear something repeated or rephrased. A total of 42 of 462 (9.09%) said that they understand anything said in everyday conversation and rapid speech. A number of 2 of 462 students (0.43%) said that they are conversant in both formal and informal speaking.

Table 2.

The Results of Self-Assessment of Speaking Ability

Score	When I used English to talk with ...	f	%	M
Pronunciation	1 I felt my pronunciation was frequently unintelligible.	138	29.87	0.30
	2 I frequently made mistakes, and my accent was very strong, which makes understanding difficult and necessitated repeated explanations	135	29.22	0.58
	3 My mispronunciation occasionally leads to misunderstandings and obstructs comprehension.	105	22.73	0.68
	4 My occasional pronunciation errors do not prevent others from understanding me.	84	18.18	0.73
	5 I thought my pronunciation was perfect, but I doubt anyone would mistake me for a native speaker.	0	0.00	0.00
	6 I thought my pronunciation was natural, with no indication of a foreign accent.	0	0.00	0.00
	Total	462	100	2.29
Accuracy Grammar	1 I thought that practically all of my English grammar was incorrect.	102	22.08	0.22
	2 I frequently hindered communication by making consistent grammar mistakes in English.	158	34.20	0.68
	3 I believed I frequently erred, displaying some significant language patterns out of control and occasionally leading to misunderstanding.	128	27.71	1.03
	4 I occasionally make mistakes that reflect my inconsistent command of various sentence structures, but I do not have any flaws that lead to misunderstandings.	74	16.02	0.64
	5 I thought my grammar was generally correct, and my sentence structure was sound.	0	0.00	0.00
	6 I have no more than two grammatical mistakes.	0	0.00	0.00
	Total	462	100	2.57
Vocabulary	1 My vocabulary in English is inadequate, even for a simple conversation.	77	16.67	0.17
	2 My vocabulary is restricted to terms related to time, food, transportation, family, and other necessities of life.	54	11.69	0.23
	3 My word choices tend to be inaccurate, and I have a restricted vocabulary that hinders me to describe basic social and professional topics.	143	30.95	0.93
	4 I have enough vocabulary to discuss various social contexts and complex problems.	122	26.41	1.06
	5 I believed I had an extensive and exact vocabulary and that my general vocabulary was sufficient to deal with complicated issues and a variety of social situations.	66	14.29	0.71
	6 I have a wide range of precise vocabulary.	0	0.00	0.00
	Total	462	100	3.10
Fluency	1 Conversation is almost impossible for me because my speech is so sluggish and jumbled.	143	30.95	0.22
	2 My speech is very slow and uneven except for short or routine sentences.	158	34.20	0.68
	3 My speech is frequently uncertain; a sentence may go unfinished.	97	21.00	0.63
	4 I occasionally speak hesitantly and unevenly.	64	13.85	0.55
	5 My speech is understandable, but it is obviously not native in its speed and evenness.	0	0.00	0.00
	6 I speak fluently and easily on all professional and general themes.	0	0.00	0.00
	Total	462	100	2.18
Comprehension	1 I believed my comprehension was insufficient for even the most basic of conversations.	72	15.58	0.16
	2 I can only grasp slow, extremely simple talks about general societal issues; it necessitates constant repeating and rephrasing.	68	14.72	0.29
	3 When speaking in a conversation, I can understand cautious, slightly simplified communication, but I require a lot of repetition and rephrasing.	150	32.47	0.97
	4 I can comprehend everyday speech rather well but occasionally I need to hear something repeated or rephrased.	128	27.71	1.11
	5 I understand anything said in everyday conversation and rapid speech.	42	9.09	0.45
	6 I am conversant in both formal and informal speaking.	2	0.43	0.03
	Total	462	100	3.01
	Total Mean			13.15
	Average Mean Score			2.63

4.2. The Stimulated Recall Results

As shown in Table 3, there are three themes that may be used to categorize the six main needs of students in teaching and learning OES: classroom practice, scheduling, and class management. The first students' major need is related to the chance to speak English during class, as 188 of the 230 students (81.73%) cited that they wish there would be enough chance to practice oral English during class. The second student's major need is connected to class management, as 183 of 230 (79.56%) of the students stated that they wish they could learn English in a small class since their class is too large. The third student's major need is linked to scheduling, as 183 of 230 students (79.56%) needed their English classes not interspersed with other classes since their enthusiasm faded because of the long interval. The way the students are grouped has also caused them discomfort, as 174 of 243 students (73.34%) prefer not to group them with students from different majors for the reason that they shy away from other majors to speak English.

Table 3.

The Results of Stimulated Recall

Theme	Students' Needs (samples of excerpt)	f	%
Classroom practice	Chance to speak during class	188	81.73
	"I wish there were enough chance for me to practice oral English during class."		
Class management	Small class	183	79.56
	"I wish I could learn oral English in a small class as our class is too large."		
Scheduling	Continue English class	177	76.95
	"I expect to learn OES every day, and I want my English class is not interspersed with other classes. My enthusiasm faded because of the long interval."		
Class management	Grouping	162	70.43
	"Do not group us with students from different major because we shy away from them to speak English."		

5. Discussion

5.1. The Degree of Oral English Skills of Non-English Major Students

The analysis results of the self-assessment of the students' speaking ability as a whole showed that the oral skill performances of the students are at a weak level. It means that the students still struggle with oral communication even though they have learned the skills for 156 hours. This clarifies that the extension of learning time from 39 to 165 hours and the shift of the focus from general English to oral English are not enough to make the students competent in communicating orally in English. This shed light on Thomas and Collier (2002) who believed that for some non-native English language learners, it took longer than five to seven years to become proficient in English. Even more surprisingly, Malcolm Gladwell (2011) declared in his book *Outlier* that 10,000 hours are required to become an expert in any field. In reality, Gladwell used the 10,000-hour rule to illustrate how some people do succeed and become extraordinary in any field with significantly longer support. However, the number of hours spent studying English is not the only variable that can determine the success of learning; it is also influenced by other variables, such as the student's motivation, teacher factors, instructional strategies, teaching and learning facilities, etc. Ur (1996) identified four common factors that contributed to speaking difficulties: (1) inhabitation: the barrier to

speaking, such as fear of errors, being sensitive to criticism, and shyness; (2) nothing to say: no motivation to express ideas orally; (3) little participation: having merely a brief speaking engagement; and (4) native tongue use: the use of speakers' native tongue when speaking in another language. Similarly, Abrar et al. (2018) emphasized that a lack of vocabulary, native tongue influence, pronunciation, grammar, and fluency entirely make it difficult for EFL students to communicate effectively and fluently in the language. To make learners competent speakers, it is essential for teachers to be well-informed about what speaking competence comprises and how various facets of speaking proficiency connect to one another. Johnson (2010) designates speaking as a 'combinatorial skill' that includes doing various things at the same time. Speaking competence, according to Johnson (2010), includes: (1) familiarity with language and discourse, that is, understanding the sound pattern of the language, knowing the grammar and vocabulary, and understanding discourse, genre, register, pronunciation, core speaking skills, and communication and discourse strategies; (2) core speaking skills, i.e., developing the capability to process speech quickly to increase fluency (e.g., speech rate, chunking, pausing, formulaic language, discourse makers); (3) communication strategies, includes constructing cognitive strategies to reimburse for restrictions on language proficiency (e.g., circumlocution, paraphrasing, gestures, word coinage, approximation, avoidance), metacognitive strategies (e.g., planning in advance what to say, consciously deciding how to say something), and interaction strategies (e.g., reformulating, asking for clarification/repetition, checking comprehension, and rephrasing). Learning to produce spoken language in a second or foreign language requires developing the abilities required to use these components within the constraints of a speaker's cognitive processes to do so in a fluid, accurate, and socially acceptable manner.

The results of the self-assessment of speaking ability showed that the component of speaking with which students have the most problems is fluency, which is deteriorated by bad pronunciation and a lack of grammar mastery. Shumin (2002) stated that speaking is the most difficult skill for learners of foreign languages to master since it needs complex cognitive skills beyond grammatical and semantic knowledge. To speak a foreign language, the speaker must have the required linguistic, sociolinguistic, and rhetorical skills (Nunan & Bailey, 2009). Indonesian EFL learners have to deal with characteristics of the language that are distinct from those in the Indonesian language, their mother tongue, when it comes to English pronunciation. Many English phonemes are absent from the Indonesian language, for example, vowel sounds: /æ/, /ə/, /ʊ/, /ɔɪ/, /aɪə/, and /aʊə/, and consonant sounds: /ð/, /θ/, /ʃ/, /dʒ/, and /tʃ/. As a result, Indonesians have difficulty pronouncing English words that contain these phonemes. According to Kenworthy (1988), a significant amount of study has been done comparing the sound systems of English and other languages and predicting the issues and challenges that learners would face due to the crucial role that the native language plays. The serious problems, according to Lado (1986), are those elements and patterns that fundamentally deviate from the first language and denote a more complex system.

5.2. Students' Needs in Learning OES

As presented in Table 3, the first main student needs in learning OES is an opportunity to speak English during class. This means that they do not get enough chance to speak English during the OES class. The students are aware that limited time to speak during class has prevented them from practicing oral English skills. According to Gan (2012), a lack of speaking opportunities in class may be one factor contributing to problems with speaking. It is generally known that the paramount way to learn speaking skills is by speaking and not

just by doing exercises and drills in grammar or vocabulary. Stryker and Leaver (1997) metaphorically stated that learning to communicate is quite similar to learning to ride a bike. Students' poor speaking abilities are caused by the lack of sufficient opportunities for them to practice speaking. Amoah and Yeboah (2021) stated that lack of speaking opportunities in the classroom is one of the reasons why students have difficulty expressing themselves.

The limited chances for students to take turns in speaking practice during the OES class are connected to class sizes (i.e., overcrowded classes with 40 to 60 students). The instructor will have difficulty managing the length of the available learning time due to the number of students. A smaller class size is described as having 20 or fewer students, and a larger class size is designated as having 35 or more students (Kamuiche, 2006). The overcrowded class phenomenon in the OES class was put in place as a result of a scarcity of both university facilities and English instructors. Indeed, this way of managing classes is ineffective and has a negative psychological impact on students. Most students reject this scheme, as they claim that it makes them feel uncomfortable and shy around students from other majors. This supports Sha'ar and Boonsuk (2021), who assert that students' reluctance to speak English or take part in class activities is made worse by the diversity of the English class (students from many majors are mixed together to study in one classroom). They feel uncomfortable with classmates from other majors.

The second student need is the desire to learn oral English in a small class. As their class is big, most of them lacked sufficient opportunities to practice speaking English orally. This confirms Mazdayasna and Tahririan (2008), who stated that students need their class to be smaller as they feel despondency to the number of students in their big class. The amount of students in a class has an impact on the successful performance of students. Johnson (2010) affirms that small classes tend to be effective as students actively process the material rather than just listen and read. Reducing class size can be an alternative solution to this problem; however, according to Shin and Chung (2009), "class-size reduction is one of the most expensive policy alternatives available in the field of education because it requires adding more classrooms and teachers."

The third student's expectancy is related to scheduling. They expect to learn OES daily, and they want their English class not to be interspersed with other classes as their enthusiasm faded because of the long interval. This finding tends to be rather peculiar, however. Block scheduling could possibly accommodate student needs as it has become the current trend in curriculum delivery (Wallinger, 2008). Block scheduling arises as a consequence of an argument among education theorists vis-à-vis the value of instructional depth versus breadth (Imbimbo and Gilkes, 1999). The essential idea behind block scheduling is to enroll students in fewer classes but for longer periods of time. This is different from the practices of the traditional instructional model, which are based on the tendency for in-depth instruction and prolonged learning arrangements (Wallinger, 2008). Block scheduling can be used to produce a more individualized and student-centered learning environment, foster stronger relationships between teachers and students, or create curricula that encourage in-depth study (Wallinger, 2008; Imbimbo & Gilkes, 1999).

6. Conclusion

The current study seeks to assess to what extent the OES program for NEMS at UND contributes to students' English speaking improvement. It also attempts to determine the students' needs in relation to studying OES. The following conclusions are made in light of the research's findings.

First, the oral English program for NEMS has not yielded satisfactory results. Overall, the students' OES are weak and insufficient with the following characteristics: (1) they speak slowly and unevenly; (2) they frequently make mistakes in their pronunciation, which makes understanding them challenging; (3) they consistently make mistakes in their grammar, demonstrating a limited command of the major patterns and impeding communication; (4) their word choices are inaccurate, and their vocabulary limitations prevent them from discussing several common professional and social topics; and (5) they can only understand easy and sluggish conversation.

Second, the students' poor performance in oral English skills is interrelated with some factors, namely: (1) a lack of chance for students to practice their oral English skills during class as there are too many students contained in each class; (2) a lack of students' enthusiasm as psychologically they feel embarrassed to speak English with students from different majors in their class; and (3) a long interval of time that makes students' enthusiasm in learning OES fade. It is implied that these issues need to be carefully taken into account in order to improve students' oral English abilities. Principally, the needs of the students identified in this study may serve as a starting point for future efforts to improve oral English teaching and learning outcomes, exclusively for faculty members and decision-makers at the institution.

Finally, this study solely included students, and there was no data triangulation from on-call English instructors. The data gathered from self-assessment and stimulated recall might not fully represent the genuineness of the oral English performance and the needs of the students. It is expected that this study can be extended and replicated by involving conventional oral English assessment, English instructors' viewpoints, and/or observations. However, despite the disadvantages, this current study can still contribute to a better understanding of oral English skills within the context of English as a foreign language in a developing country. Self-assessment of speaking abilities enables students to evaluate their own development, areas for improvement, and areas of strength. Additionally, the self-assessment technique would inspire students to contribute more enthusiastically in oral English class (thus encouraging class participation) by fostering individual learning, creating personal goals, and nurturing learners' awareness of their own learning.

Note on Ethical Issues

The author confirms that the study does not need ethics committee approval according to the research integrity rules in Indonesia (Date of Confirmation: 05/07/2023).

References

- Abrar, M., Mukminin, A., Habibi, A., Asyraf, F., Makmur, M., & Marzulina, L. (2018). "If our English isn't a language, what is it?" Indonesian EFL student teachers' challenges in speaking English. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(1), 129–145. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2018.3013>
- Amoah, S., & Yeboah, J. (2021). The speaking difficulties of Chinese EFL learners and their motivation towards speaking the English language. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(1), 56–69. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.4>
- Anh, K. H., Dong, M. H., & Trang, N. H. (2022). An investigation into English-majored students' self-assessment of their speaking performance. *International Journal of Instruction*, 15(3), 191–208. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15311a>.

- Ari, A. (2023). A good start to school life, Switzerland Basel primary schools. *International Journal of Instruction*, 16(2), i–v. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.1620a>
- Asfar, H. S., & Asakereh, A. (2016). Speaking skills problems encountered by Iranian EFL freshmen and senior from their own and their English instructors, perspectives. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 13(1), 112–130.
- Babaii, E., Taghaddomi, S., & Pashmforoosh, R. (2016). Speaking self-assessment: Mismatches between learners' and teachers' criteria. *Language Testing*, 33(3), 411–437. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532215590847>
- Bahador, H. & Mofrad, M. H. (2020). Classroom dynamic assessment of EFL learners' oral production: A case of female intermediate learners. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 18, 83–97.
- Belcher, D. D. (2004). Trends in teaching English for specific purposes. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 165–186. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026719050400008X>
- Castañeda, M., & Rodríguez-González, E. (2011). L2 speaking self-ability perceptions through multiple video speech drafts. *Hispania*, 94(3), 483–501. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23032122>
- Chaney, A. L., & Burk, T. L. (1998). *Teaching oral communication in grades K-8*. Boston: Pearson.
- Chang, Y. J., Wu, C. T., & Ku, H. Y. (2005). The introduction of electronic portfolios to teach and assess English as a foreign language in Taiwan. *Techtrends Tech Trends*, 49(1), 30–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02784902>
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. London: Sage.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dann, R. (2002). *Promoting assessment as learning: Improving the learning process*. London: Routledge.
- Eaton, S. E. (2010). *Global trends in language learning in the twenty-first century*. Calgary: Onate Press.
- Farooq, M., Ahmed, K., & Farooq, S. (2020). Introducing self-assessment for evaluating learners in Pakistan. *Global Social Sciences Review*, 5(4), 120–136. [https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2020\(V-IV\).14](https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2020(V-IV).14)
- Gan, Z. (2012). Understanding L2 speaking problems: Implications for ESL curriculum development in a teacher training institution in Hong Kong. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), 42–59. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2012v37n1.4>
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2017). *Stimulated recall methodology in applied linguistics and second language research* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Gladwell, M. (2011). *Outliers: The story of success*. Monticello, Florida: Black Bay Books.
- Hişmanoğlu, M., & Çolak, R. (2019). A study on Turkish EFL teachers' perspectives on using drama to develop students' speaking skills in the EFL classroom. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 13(2), 188–206. Retrieved August 11, 2023, from <https://novitasroyal.org/volume-13-issue-2-october-2019/>
- IbnaSeraj, P. M. I., Habil, H., & Hasan, M. K. (2021). Investigating the problems of teaching oral English communication skills in an EFL context at the tertiary level. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(2), 501–516. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14228a>
- Imbimbo, J. & Gilkes, A. (1999). *Block scheduling*. New York: Center for School Success, New Vision for Public School.
- Johnson, K. (2010). *Language teaching and skill learning*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Karakaş, A., Uysal, H., Bilgin, S., & Bulut, B. (2016). Turkish EFL learners' perceptions of native English-speaking teachers and non-native English-speaking teachers in higher

- education. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 10(2), 180–206. Retrieved August 10, 2023, from <https://novitasroyal.org/volume-10-issue-2-october-2016/>
- Kamuche, F. U. (2006). Does smaller class size affect students performance in basic statistics class? An empirical study. *International Business & Economics Research Journal (IBER)*, 5(8), 39–44. <https://doi.org/10.19030/iber.v5i8.3496>
- Kellagan, T. (2010) *Evaluation research in international encyclopedia of education* (3rd ed.). Netherland: Elsevier Science.
- Kenworthy, J. (1998). *Teaching English pronunciation*. New York: Longman.
- Kim, J. (2019). Effects of rubric-referenced self-assessment training on Korean high school students' English writing. *English Teaching*, 74(3), 79–11. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.74.3.201909.79>.
- Kim, S. (2006). Academic oral communication needs of East Asian international graduate students in non-science and non-engineering field. *English for Specific Purposes* 25(4), 479–489. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.10.001>
- Konzett, C. (2015). Who says what's correct and how do you say it? Multimodal management of oral peer-assessment in a grammar boardgame in a foreign language classroom. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 9(2), 157–173. Retrieved August 10, 2023, from <https://novitasroyal.org/volume-9-issue-2-october-2015/>
- Lado, R. (1986). *Language teaching*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.
- Léger, D. S. (2009). Self-assessment of speaking skills and participation in a foreign language class. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(1), 158–178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2009.01013.x>
- Liu, R., & Dai, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Foreign language teaching reform in higher education in China: A study of current status and developmental strategies* [in Chinese]. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Ma, W., & Winke, P. (2019). Self-assessment: How reliable is it in assessing oral proficiency over time? *Foreign Language Annals*, 52(1), 66–86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12379>
- Mahmoudikia, M., & Ahmadi, A. (2020). Iranian university instructors' perception on English-majoring students' speaking needs: A case of Shiraz University English Department. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(4), 15–30. Retrieved from https://journalscmu.sinaweb.net/article_117527.html
- Mazdayasna, G., & Tahririan, M. H. (2008). Developing a profile of the ESP needs of Iranian students: The case of students of nursing and midwifery. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 7, 277–289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2008.10.008>
- Mercer-Mapstone, L. D., & Matthews, K. E. (2017). Student perceptions of communication skills in undergraduate science at an Australian research-intensive university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(1), 98–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1084492>
- Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology*. London: Sage Publication.
- Moslemi, F., Moinzadeh, A., & Dabaghi, A. (2011). ESP needs analysis of Iranian MA students: A case study of the University of Isfahan. *English Language Teaching*, 4(4), 121–129. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n4p121>
- Namividia, H., Mobaraki, M., & Malekzadeh, F. (2019). Investigating the effect of noticing on EFL students' speaking accuracy. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 83–98. doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.1216a.
- Nowicka, A., & Wilczynska, W. (2014). Authenticity in oral communication of instructed L2 learners. In M. Pawlak, E. Waniek-Klimczak, & J. Majer (Eds.) *Speaking and Instructed Foreign Language Acquisition* (pp. 24–41). New York: Multilingual Matters.

- Nunan, D., & Bailey, K. M. (2009). *Exploring second language classroom research: A comprehensive guide*. Boston: Heinle CENGAGE Learning.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Pierce, L. V. (1996). *Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Paris, S. G., & Paris, A. H. (2002). Class application of research on self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychology, 36*(2), 89–101. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15326985EP3602_4
- Renandya, W. A., Hamied, F. A., & Nurkamto, J. (2018). English language proficiency in Indonesia: Issues and prospects. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 15*(3), 618–629. doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.3.4.618
- Richard, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rossi, P., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Seifert, T., & Feliks, O. (2018). Online self-assessment and peer-assessment as a tool to enhance student-teachers' assessment skills. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(2), 169–185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1487023>
- Sha'ar, M.Y.M.A., & Boonsuk, Y. (2021). What hinders English speaking in Thai EFL learners? Investigating factors that affect the development of their English-speaking skills. *MEXTESOL Journal, 45*(3), 1–16. Retrieved from: https://www.mextesol.net/journal/index.php?page=journal&id_article=23677
- Shin, I., & Chung, J. Y. (2009). Class size and students' achievement in the United States: A meta-analysis. *Kedi Journal of Educational Policy, 6*(2), 3–19.
- Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to Consider: Developing Adult EFL Students' Speaking Abilities. In J. Richards & W. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice* (Cambridge Professional Learning, pp. 204–211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stryker, S., & B. Leaver. (Eds.). (1997). *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: models and methods*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Tekir, S. (2021). Dealing with Turkish EFL learners' speaking anxiety. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 13*(3), 3424–3442. Retrieved from: <https://ijci.globets.org/index.php/IJCI/issue/view/18>
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2002). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. Retrieved from ERIC database: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED475048>
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practices and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallinger, L. M. (2008) The effect of block scheduling on foreign language learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*(1), 36–50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2000.tb00888.x>
- Wang, W. (2016). Using rubrics in student self-assessment: student perceptions in the English as a foreign language writing context. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 1*(14), 1280–1292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1261993>
- Yu, X., & Liu, C. (2018) Curriculum reform of college English teaching in China: From English for general purposes to English for specific purposes. *ESP Today, 6*(2), 140–160. <https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2018.6.2.1>
- Zorba, M. G., & Çakir, A. (2019). A case study on intercultural awareness of lower secondary school students in Turkey. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 13*(1), 62–83. Retrieved on August 11, 2023, from <https://novitasroyal.org/volume-13-issue-1-april-2019/>