Non-English Majors Students' Motivational Orientation and Problems They Perceived in Learning Oral English Skills

La Dunifa
English Language Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin, Indonesia, *ladunifa@unidayan.ac.id*

This study investigated the motivation and motivational orientations along with the most prominent problems the students of non-English majors (SNEM) encounter in learning oral English skills (OES). To this end, a mixed method design was applied in this study by using a questionnaire to elicit quantitative data and a stimulated recall to generate qualitative data. The questionnaire was administered to 942 students, among whom 128 participated in a stimulated recall. This study took place at Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin, Indonesia, during the academic year 2020/2021. The results of the questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively using the Microsoft Excel Program, and the participants' responses to stimulated recall were qualitatively analyzed by hand as prescribed by some experts. The findings revealed that SNEM are interested in learning OES, and their motivational orientation is employment. The students believe that OES: (1) will help them to get a good job; (2) is important for their future job; and (3) is beneficial for their future career. The three most significant issues that the SNEM face while learning OES are (1) insufficient class time, (2) a lack of opportunities to use English, and (3) a large class size. The findings are discussed, and some implications are provided.

Keywords: TEFL, non-English major, oral English skills, motivational orientation, Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin

INTRODUCTION

In tertiary institutions in Indonesia, English is classified as an expertise subject (for students of English majors) and a general-supporting subject (for non-English majors). As a general-supporting subject, it aims to prepare students to read and to understand English learning resources that support the learning process of subject areas. In teaching English as the general course for non-English majors, the grammar translation method is primarily employed, which indicates that speaking and listening skills are of secondary importance. Mainly, there is an emphasis on teaching grammatical structures and vocabulary out of context, which results in ignorance of their application in communicative situations. As a result of teaching grammatical structures and vocabulary out of context, students know and master the usage of the target language but they fail to speak and use it (Warren & Karen, 2020). This phenomenon can be criticized as' Deaf and Dumb English ', because the students neither speak English nor understand it when they hear the language spoken. The decision to teach general English, according to Harmer (2003:10), is partly made because teachers 'do not know how, why, and when our students will need the language in the future, and so we give them a language with the broadest range of use possible.' General English 'teaches learners enough English to survive in certain narrowly defined venues but not enough to thrive in the world at large' (Belcher, 2004, p. 165).

Nowadays, however, globalization has made English a necessity, not only in academic scope but also in work competition. Those who are fluent in English have a better chance of being successful in academic and professional competition. Crystal (1997) stated that English acquisition can guarantee

the availability of opportunities for employment, travel, higher education, and even a better life. Goals for the ELT can be set as the job roles and defining the objective of the subject as to meet the requirements for the outcome as required by the stakeholders and meet the job role requirement that is the ability to use English in real communication, for example, expressing opinions, making arguments, transmitting information, offering explanations, and making impressions upon others in their personal lives, future workplaces, social interactions, and political endeavors (Rahman, 2010). Therefore, Yu & Liu (2018) insisted that higher education institutions are expected to shift from teaching students about the English language to its practical use both in course design and in methodology.

To address this issue, Universitas Dayanu Ikhsanuddin (henceforth UND), from the 2017/2018 academic year, has transformed the focus of English for students of non-English majors from teaching language foundation (grammar and vocabulary) to a practical use of the language (oral English skills). Table 1 presents the comparison focus of teaching English for students of non-English majors at UND as contained in the current and previous university curriculums. As shown in the table, in the previous curriculum (before 2017), English was taught for 120 minutes a week, and the main objective was to help students build a solid language foundation to enable them to read English for science and technology; it is focused on grammar and vocabulary. However, after 2017 (the current curriculum), the time allocation has been prolonged to be 480 minutes per week and the course name has been changed from 'General English' to be 'English Conversation'. The course focus is on oral English skills; it is aimed at developing students' comprehensive ability to use English in a well-rounded way, especially in listening and speaking.

The transformation of focus in the teaching and learning of English for non-English major is in accordance with the national education reforms accompanying decentralization in Indonesia, which have placed emphasis on giving greater autonomy to higher education institutions while concurrently stressing what they must produce as long as it is capable of raising the nation's global competitiveness (Indonesian Ministry of National Education, 2003). The National Education grants institutions the chance to improve their own curricula, and as long as they fulfill the government's general nation-strengthening procedures, they have freedom to meet their students' needs and provide relevant, motivating lessons. For these reasons, UND prioritizes the practical use of English, reflecting a supporting tendency towards departure from a stress on language foundation to a practical use of language. According to Eaton (2010, p.5), the emphasis in language education in the twenty-first century is no longer on grammar, memorization, and rote learning, but rather on using language and cultural knowledge to communicate and connect with others around the world. The university realizes that with the rapid changes in technologies and industry requirements, goals for ELT can be set as the job roles and the curriculum of the program can be defined as required to meet the job role. This is consistent with the worldwide agreement of universities that communication skills are essential to enhancing the employability of students (Mercer-Mapstone & Matthews, 2017).

Table 1
The transformation focus of teaching english for students of non-english major

Curriculum	Time Duration (in a Week)	Credit	Course Name	Teaching Objectives	Focus
Previous Curriculum (before 2017)	120 minutes	2	General English	Help students to put a solid language foundation to enable them to read English for science and technology	Grammar and vocabulary
Current Curriculum (after 2017)	480 minutes	8	English Conver-sation	Develop students' comprehensive ability of using English in a well-rounded way, especially in listening and speaking so that they will be able to communicate effectively in English.	Oral English skills

It is true that, however, the success of learning English is affected by a multitude of variables, and among them is the motivational factor of students toward the skill being learned. Motivation is a concept that helps us understand why people behave in certain ways (Ertem & Ari, 2022). The study of motivation in EFL learning has been a popular issue in recent eras. Scholars, mainly, believe that motivation is supposed to be the main determinant factor in learning a foreign language and one of the affective variables that can influence language learning (c.f. Littlejohn, 2001; Dörnyei, 1994; Freeman, 1991, *etc*.). Motivation also appears as a predictor of performance in a foreign language, as stated in a remarkable number of articles (c.f. Polat, 2020; Alshenqeeti, 2018; Yadav & BaniAta, 2012, *etc*.).

Literature Review

Previous research on non-English major students' motivation to learn English was conducted by Ngo, Spooner-Lane, & Mergler (2017). They compared motivation to learn English between English majors and non-English majors at a Vietnamese university. This research reports on the findings of a quantitative study designed to investigate the types of motivation demonstrated by English major (n = 180) and non-English major students (n = 242) and their levels of effort expended in learning English at a Vietnamese university. The findings revealed that both groups demonstrated high levels of motivation to prepare for their future profession. The latest research on non-English majors' motivation to learn English was conducted by Nguyen & Habók (2021). They investigated Vietnamese students' motivation to learn English based on the activity theory perspectives. The data was collected by means of a questionnaire and an interview. The participants included 1,565 students with at least one semester of university-level English, of whom 13 participated in the semi-structured interview. The results indicated that the participants were highly motivated to learn English. The sources of motivation included obtaining a good job in the future, achieving success in academic studies, maintaining effective communication with foreigners, having personal enjoyment, and being influenced by other people. However, limited studies have focused on the motivation of non-English major students to learn oral English. The research findings can be reported by Quadir (2011), who examined the differences in motivations of English and non-English major university students in Bangladesh to learn English oral communication. Altogether, 355 university students (184 English and 171 non-English majors) participated in this study. The research discovered that students of English major possess higher intrinsic motivation compared to non-English major students.

Motivation in the present study is principally based on the work of Ryan & Deci (2000), which is known as the self-determination theory. The concept, which is well known in psychology, consists of two types: intrinsic and extrinsic. When people are intrinsically motivated, they pursue an activity "in the absence of a reward contingency or control' since they find it "interesting and fun." Extrinsic

motivation refers to any motivational orientation that is regulated by some instrumental means, such as a monetary reward or a good job.

However, motivation is clearly not the only factor affecting foreign language learning. It has become clear that EFL students, regardless of their linguistic knowledge, may face a variety of difficulties in developing their speaking skills (Al Hosni, 2014). Thus, EFL teachers are expected to be familiar with problems faced by EFL learners so that they can seek a solution to the problems. So far, studies encountered by EFL students in learning oral English have been conducted in different countries; for example, in China (Amoah & Yeboah, 2021), in Bangladesh (Ibna Seraj, et. al., 2021), in Saudi Arabia (Alrasheedi, 2020), in Iran (Afshar & Asakereh, 2016); in Libya (Diaab, 2016); in Jordan (Al-Jamal & Al-Jamal, 2014). The findings of the research are almost similar. The problems are mainly connected to the use of mother tongue, inappropriate teaching methods, learners' passiveness, lack of motivation, lack of an oral practice environment, lack of supporting tools, lack of authentic materials, and large class size.

Research Questions

Hitherto, studies on motivation and problems in learning oral English skills for non-English major students in an Indonesian context have been restricted due to a scarcity of studies. Therefore, this study aims to fill this knowledge gap. Then, the research questions are formulated as the follows:

1) How motivated are the students of non-English majors to learn oral English skills?
2) If the students of non-English majors are well-motivated to learn oral English skills, what are their motivational orientations?
3) What are the most prominent problems that students of non-English majors encounter in learning oral English skills?

The answers to questions numbers 1 and 2 were investigated by using a questionnaire, whereas the question number 3 was explored using a stimulated recall in which the students were asked to recall their oral English learning experiences (Sanchez & Grimshaw, 2020; Trang & Baldauf Jr., 2007; Gass & Mackey, 2000).

METHOD

Design

A mixed methods research design was adopted in this study. A mixed methods research design is a procedure for collecting and analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data in a single study as it provides a better understanding of the research questions (Creswell, 2008, p.552). To understand the first and second research questions proposed in this study, they need quantitative data, i.e., the score of the questionnaire; meanwhile, the answer to the third research question requires qualitative data, i.e., commentaries and explanations from participants based on their experiences during the teaching and learning OES.

Participants

The whole population of this study consisted of 2,145 students. It was the year 3 students of non-English majors at UND during the academic year 2020/2021, which was spread over 15 different majors. A stratified sampling technique proposed by Gay, et.al (2006) was adopted in drawing the sample for this research. The numbers withdrawn were 942 students (597 males and 345 females) who voluntarily cooperated in the present study for the questionnaire, and there were 128 students (75 males and 53 females) participating in filling out the stimulated recall instrument.

Instrumentation

Questionnaire

To answer research questions numbers 1 and 2, an 18-item survey questionnaire was used. Participants' responses were measured using a Likert scale with five options: *Strongly Agree*, *Agree*, *Undecided*, *Disagree*, and *Strongly Disagree*. The scores ranged from 1 to 5. The components of motivation investigated in this study included intrinsic and extrinsic goal orientation toward OES (see Appendix A). A pilot test was administered with respondents from the population to ascertain the validity and reliability of the instrument. The reliability of the instrument, however, was tested using Cronbach's method, and it was found that the coefficient of reliability reached 0.782. The coefficient reflects a high degree, which indicates the instrument is suitable to be used in the field of the study. To avoid any threat to face, the questionnaires are anonymous, and the students give their responses to the questionnaires outside of the university class time.

Stimulated Recall

The stimulated recall methodology was focused on obtaining backdated data concerning the students' problems they face during teaching and learning OES. Stimulated recall, according to Gass & Mackey (2000), is one of the introspective methods for obtaining data in second and foreign language research. In this research, students were asked to recall their learning experiences, to think back across the whole learning process, and then to fill in 7 parts of related-factors. The prompts were provided to focus the students' attention on their own experiences of specific factors (see Appendix B). The factors are namely: (1) learning condition, (2) time duration, (3) chance to use English, (4) teaching and learning method, (5) instructors, (6) linguistics, and (7) psychology.

Data Collection Procedure

The 942 participants voluntarily cooperated in responding to the paper-based questionnaire. They had two weeks to complete the questionnaire. After giving the questionnaire, the next step is to distribute the stimulated recall sheets to 128 students (who were also randomly selected) to participate in this research. Some of the participants who took the questionnaire were also selected to work on this stimulated recall. All participants selected to do this task participated well and submitted their work on time. Similar to the questionnaire, the participants wrote their answers anonymously outside of university class time. To facilitate students' ability to express themselves, they were asked to write their responses in their national language. Like the questionnaire, they also had two weeks to complete the stimulated recall task. The researcher collaborated with 3 fellow lecturers to participate in distributing the questionnaire and stimulated recall sheets. They are responsible for this matter, ensuring that each participant returns the questionnaire and stimulated recall sheets that have been filled in.

Data Analysis

The results of the questionnaire, which are addressed to answer the first and second research questions, were analyzed quantitatively using the Microsoft Excel Program in order to figure out descriptive statistics (frequency (*f*), percentage (%), means (*M*), and standard deviations (*SD*)). Higher means of motivation may be the most prominent orientation for students to learn oral English skills.

The participants' responses to stimulated recall, which is addressed to answer the third research question, were analyzed by hand. According to Creswell (2008, p.246), the hand analysis of qualitative data means that the researcher reads the data, marks it by hand, and divides it into parts. A hand analysis may be preferred when the researcher is analyzing a small database, for example, less than 500 pages of transcripts or field notes. In this research, the steps of the analysis of the stimulated recall

data comprise three steps. The first step was cutting and separating each factor of the participant's response sheet into 7 parts; each factor came to be 1 separate part. The second step was to read all the participants' comments for each factor and separate them based on similarities in themes. Finally, the researcher carried out quantification of each theme found in participant responses by calculating the frequency, percentage, and rank of each theme that appears in each factor. The problems with the highest frequency and percentage may be the most prominent problems for students who are having difficulty learning oral English skills.

FINDINGS

The Results of Questionnaire

The results of the first research question, which set out to investigate the motivation level of SNEM to learn OES, are presented in Table 2. As indicated in the table, the mean values for the intrinsic motivation components exist between 3.78 and 4.24, with standard deviations falling between 0.74 and 1.41. The most important aspects, which intrinsically motivate students to learn oral English, are that they strongly agree or agree with item 2: *I am interested in learning English skills* ($M = 4.24$, $SD = 0.74$), and this is followed closely by another major factor, item 1: *I enjoy learning oral English skills* ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 1.01$), item 4: *Learning oral English is a challenge that I enjoy* ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.41$), and item 3: *Learning oral English is a hobby for me* ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 1.01$). This suggests that SNEM are well-motivated to learn OES.

The inclination of the SNEM to learn OES is triggered by some extrinsic factors. As shown in Table 4, the major trigger factors are item 13: *Oral English skills will help me to get a good job* ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.78$); item 8: *Oral English skills are important for my future job* ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.75$); and this is followed closely by another major factor, item 9: *Oral English skills are beneficial for my future career* ($M = 4.08$, $SD = 1.10$). The participants mainly strongly agree or agree with these three statements.

Meanwhile, most of the participants agree and a few are undecided on item number 14: *I learn oral English skills in order to be able to communicate with the speaker of the language* ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 1.33$). Only a few participants agree with item 7 *Item 14: Oral English skills are important for my academic studies at university* ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.37$), and item 15: *Oral English skills are important for me as they are useful when traveling in many countries* ($M = 3.22$, $SD = 1.26$); most of the participants are undecided with these two statements.

Table 2
SNEM responses to the motivation questionnaire

	SA & A		U		D & SD			
Item	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean	St.Dev.
1	856	90.87	15	1.59	69	7.33	4.23	1.09
2	896	95.18	12	1.27	34	3.61	4.25	0.74
3	696	73.89	48	5.10	198	21.20	3.78	1.40
4	707	75.05	40	4.25	195	20.70	3.80	1.41
5	74	7.86	15	1.59	853	90.55	1.82	0.90
6	174	18.47	47	4.99	547	58.07	2.17	1.10
7	511	54.25	109	11.57	322	34.19	3.25	1.37
8	780	82.80	87	9.27	75	7.96	4.32	0.75
9	469	49.79	150	15.92	323	34.29	4.08	1.10
10	370	39.28	215	22.82	357	37.90	3.10	1.40
11	445	47.24	66	7.01	331	35.14	3.00	1.70
12	469	49.79	312	33,12	161	17.09	3.08	1.37
13	889	94.37	20	212	33	3.50	4.40	0.78
14	563	59.77	157	16.67	222	23.57	3.51	1.33
15	508	53.93	205	21.76	229	24.31	3.22	1.26
16	485	51.49	46	4.88	411	43.63	3.09	1.43
17	442	46.92	140	14.86	360	38.22	3.13	1.50
18	340	36.09	419	44.48	523	55.52	3.05	1.00

Furthermore, the majority of the participants are undecided with item 17: *Being able to speak English is really an important goal in my life* (*M = 3.13, SD = 1.50*), and item 10: *Being able to speak English will enhance my social status* (*M = 3.10, M = 1.40*), item 16: *I am learning oral English to make friends with foreigners* (*M = 3.09, SD = 1.43*), item 12: *I am learning oral English because I want to live for a period of time in an English-speaking country* (*M = 3.08, SD =1.37*), and item 18: *If I can speak English, I will have a wonderful life* (*M = 3.05, SD =1.00*). For item 11: *If I have good oral English proficiency, it will impress people around me* (*M = 3.00, SD = 1.40*). All the participants were totally undecided about this statement.

However, the participants are against or disagree with the idea that they learn English just because it is a compulsory subject (*M = 1.82, SD = 0.99*). The majority of them also disagree with item 6: *I must learn oral English in order to pass the examination* (*M = 2.17, SD = 1.10*). Only a few of them are undecided about this statement.

The Results of Stimulated Recall

Table 3 presents the results of the stimulated recall methodology. As shown in the table, the first and most prominent problem that SNEMs face when learning OES could be attributed to the time duration factor, as the majority of participants (94.53%) cite insufficient class time as a problem. The second major problem is the chance to use English since the majority of the respondents (92.97%) claim they have *a lack of opportunity to use English.* Big class size is the third major problem as admitted by the majority of the participants (90.63%). The participants also disclosed that instructors *use too much national language* (84.38%) and that *instructors speak more than students* (75.00%). In terms of linguistic factors, they were confronted with *confusing grammar* (71.09 %), *difficult pronunciation* (70.31%), and a *lack of English vocabulary* (44.53%). Meanwhile, the next problems are allied to psychological problems such as *anxiety* (52.34%) and *diffidence and shame* (44.53%). In terms of teaching and learning methods, the participant claimed that the instructors tend to apply a *teacher-centered style* (30.47%) and *focus more on teaching grammar and vocabulary* (27.34%). Finally, only

9.38% of the participants regard out-of-date language laboratories as a problem in the teaching and learning of OES.

Table 3
Non-English major students' problems in learning oral English

Factor	Problems	f	%	Rank
1. Learning condition	● out of date language laboratory	12	9.38	13
	● big class size	116	90.63	3
2. Time duration	● insufficient class time	121	94.53	1
3. Chance to use English	● lack of opportunity to use English	119	92.97	2
4. Teaching & learning method	● teacher-centered teaching style	39	30.47	11
	● focus more on teaching grammar and vocabulary	35	27.34	12
5. Instructors	● Instructor speak more than students	96	75.00	5
	● Instructor using too much national language	108	84.38	4
6. Linguistics	● Difficult pronunciation	90	70.31	7
	● Confuse grammar	91	71.09	6
	● Lack of English vocabulary	56	43.75	8
7. Psychology	● Diffidence and shame	57	44.53	9
	● Anxious	67	52.34	10

DISCUSION

Motivation and Motivational Orientation of SNEM in Learning OES

The main assumption of this study was the results of previous research (e.g., Nguyen & Habók, 2021; Quadir, 2008; Bradford, 2007; Jin, 2014), in which this research proved that non-English major students are well-motivated to learn English. In the same way, the findings of this study demonstrate substantial proof that the students of non-English majors at UND have strong motivation to learn oral English; they find it interesting, enjoyable, and challenging. It is also certain that the majority of students disagree and strongly disagree with learning oral English just because it is a compulsory subject, and they also strongly disagree or disagree if they learn English simply in order to pass the examination. This implies that they are well-motivated to learn OES as they are aware of the importance of English in this era. Since motivation appears as a predictor of performance in foreign language learning (Polat, 2020; Alshenqeeti, 2018) and to be the main determinant factor and effective variable that can influence language learning (Littlejohn, 2001), the transformation focus of teaching English for SNEM at UND from grammar and vocabulary (General English) to the practical use of the language (oral English skill), possibly, the program could be successful if it is supported by other variables, for example, environmental and contextual factors (Nguyen & Terry, 2017).

Furthermore, it is revealed that the students' motivational orientation to learn oral English is triggered by employment factors, i.e., future job and career. These findings support Nguyen & Habók (2021), who revealed that the source of non-English major students' motivation to learn English included obtaining a job in the future. They realize that having oral English capability will help them get a better job because the world of work will give higher appreciation to people who have good English skills. English acquisition can guarantee the availability of opportunities for employment, traveling, higher education, and even a better life (Crystal,1997).The students see English as an important tool for obtaining well-paid jobs (Bradford, 2007). Al-Tamimi and Shuib (2009) stated that because of

poor performance in English, most university graduates have been rejected by the companies they apply for work. It is indisputable that the impact of globalization and economic development has made English the language of opportunity and a vigorous means of refining an individual's prospects for well-paid employment. Idrus (2016) asserts that it has become an aphorism in EFL contexts that a graduate with a good command of oral English communication skills has a better opportunity in their professional life than one who does not. As the students' motivational orientation to learn oral English is triggered by employment factors, then the curriculum of the OES program may well be focused specifically on English for employment.

The most Prominent Problems the SNEM Encounter in Learning OES

The majority of the participants consider large class sizes (overcrowded classes) to be a problem in learning oral English. Kamuche (2006) defines a small class size as fewer than 20 students, while a larger class size is defined as more than 35 students. Over-crowded classes are a common problem in the EFL context (c.f. Afshar & Asakereh, 2016; Al-Jamal & Al-Jamal, 2014; Chen & Goh, 2011,etc.) and it is ineffective and inefficient to increase students' performance (c.f. Keil & Partell, 2004; Krugger, 2003; Iacovou, 2002, *etc.*). Considering the availability of resources and facilities at UND, in the process of oral English learning, the students from several different study programs are combined to form classes consisting of 36 to 40 students. This policy is taken due to the lack of university facilities and a limited number of English instructors. Shin & Chung (2009) asserted that class-size reduction is one of the most expensive policy choices in the educational policy arena because it requires more classrooms and teachers. The large number of class members will cause problems for the instructor in managing the duration of the available learning time so that it has an impact on the lack of opportunities for students to take turns in speaking practice. As shown in Table 3, the majority of the participants (94.531%) admitted that there is not sufficient time to take turns in speaking practice. As a result, most of the students did not find enough opportunities to practice oral English. Kasumi (2015) states that class size has an impact on the successful performance of students. Johnson (2010) affirms that small classes tend to be effective since students actively process the material rather than just listen and read.

The result of the stimulated recall also revealed that the English instructors were trapped by their old habits when teaching general English, focusing on and explaining grammar and vocabulary, which indicates that speaking and listening skills were ignored. As a result, this type of instruction does not allow students to express themselves and learn to collaborate with other students. Their communication skills may suffer as a result. Acad & Dörmez (2009) stated that in teacher-centered learning, teachers usually use particular textbooks, which are mostly grammatical-oriented and to compare the language structures of native and target languages. In this situation, students tend to be more competitive and individualistic because they have fewer opportunities to think aloud or interact. The reasons for choosing a teacher-centered style could be ascribable to large class sizes and insufficient class time. As stated by Nagaraju, et al. (2013), several advantages of teacher-centered learning are that it is suitable for large classes and it takes less time to do the class activities.

However, fascinatingly, only 9.38% of the participants regard the out-of-date laboratory as a problem in learning oral English. As we understand, the purpose of a language laboratory is for students to gain auditory exposure to the language they are studying. The language laboratory offered the students an opportunity to hear the language they were studying in the voice of the native speaker. However, nowadays, the function of the language laboratory has been replaced by TV programs, radio, YouTube, and others. In today's world of digital, it is easy to find free or at a small cost, audio and video for foreign language exposure. Chen (1996) predicted long ago that language laboratories would become extinct.

The other main problem the students experienced was that *instructors spoke more than the students did.* When instructors speak more than students, the students will have fewer opportunities to practice their oral English skills. The students are aware that this issue will prevent them from becoming proficient communicators, which will allow them to obtain jobs and succeed in the workplace. It is an agreed fact that language is learnt by speaking it first, after a lot of listening to the sounds, words, phrases, and sentences from the surroundings. Stryker & Leaver (1997:1) confessed that communication is very much like learning to ride a bike or learning to play an instrument. Despite the fact that it is generally known that the best way to learn these skills is by doing them, and not just by studying them or doing exercises and drills. The availability of adequate opportunities for students to practice speaking English will be a solution to their linguistic problems such as lack of vocabulary, grammar problems, and pronunciation problems, even including psychological problems such as embarrassment, anxiety, nervousness, worry, etc.

Furthermore, when an instructor explains a lesson by using too much national language–as admitted by the majority of students (84.38%)–it could lead to a lack of oral English exposure for students. Language learning exposure refers to the total contact with a target language that a learner receives, both in verbal and written forms (Al-Zoubi, 2018). Using oral English in explaining lessons and talking to students can be an effective exposure for students. Researchers agree that in language acquisition and learning, exposure to language plays an essential role. Researchers also agree that exposure to language plays an essential role in second and foreign language learning. Exposure can directly improve a target language (Al-Zoubi, 2018; Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). Oral English exposure can help students with linguistic issues such as pronunciation difficulties, confusing grammar, a lack of English vocabulary, and so on.

Related to linguistic-related problems, the most prominent problems the students face are difficult pronunciation (70.31%), confused English grammar (71.09%), and a lack of English vocabulary (44.53%). In learning English, Indonesian students confront the elements of English language that are different from the elements of their first language (Bahasa Indonesia). There are a number of English phonemes which do not exist in Bahasa Indonesia. For example, consonant sounds: /θ/, /ʃ/, /ɜ/, /ð/, /tʃ/, /dʒ/, etc.; vowel sounds: /æ/, /ʊ/, /ə/, /ɔɪ/, /aɪə/, /aʊə/, etc. Due to the absence of these phonemes in the students' first language, they have a great deal of difficulty pronouncing English words that contain these phonemes. Kenworthy (1988: 4) states that because of the role that native language plays, there has been a great deal of research in which the sound systems of English and other languages are compared and the problems and difficulties of learners are predicted. The more different they are, the more difficulty the learner will have in pronouncing English. Lado (1986:75) asserts that those elements and patterns that differ structurally from the first language and represent a more complex system are the real problems. With such problems, strategy requires that they be brought to consciousness, understood, practiced consciously, and then practiced extensively with attention to communication. Meanwhile, as shown in Table 7, learning English grammar is more problematic than learning English vocabulary. This is consistent with the findings of Alhaysony and Alhaisoni (2017), that in an EFL context, learning grammar is more difficult than learning vocabulary. The existence or non-existence of a particular grammatical feature in the mother tongue affects the mastering of that feature in an EFL context. Learning an element which is absent in L1 might be more difficult for EFL learners (Ellis, 2006). Shiu (2011) affirms that it might be helpful if teachers knew what language features were possibly more difficult for their students, as this may provide useful information as to when and how they might be taught.

Finally, the psychological problems the students face in learning oral English, as shown in the table, are diffidence and shame, and emotional interference, such as anxiety. The students are afraid to speak English because they fear that they might go wrong and make mistakes. It seems that, possibly, the students think that making mistakes is a transgression and take it as a prestige issue. The instructors

must remind the students that no one can learn a new language without making mistakes, and most language learners experience a feeling of anxiety. Riasati (2011) reported that the number of students who feel anxious when learning a second or foreign language is surprising. Anxiety is experienced by one third to one half of foreign language learners (Worde, 1998). Hence, oral English instructors should be aware of students' anxiety and be able to minimize this problem.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This research has proved that the SNEM are well-motivated to learn OES, and their motivational orientations to learn the skill is an employment goal. The students believe OES will help them get a good job, which is important for their future job and beneficial for their future career. The findings of the study also revealed the most prominent problems the students encounter in learning oral English skills. The three main reported problems, which have been highlighted by this study, are insufficient class time, lack of time to use English, and big classes. The other problems are: the instructor using too much national language, the instructor speaking more than students, confusing grammar, difficult pronunciation, anxiety, lack of vocabulary, psychological-diffidence, teacher-centered teaching style, focusing more on teaching vocabulary and grammar, and out of date language laboratory.

Based on the findings of the study, some practical implications could be suggested. First, the findings of the present study could encourage EFL instructors, curriculum developers, and syllabus designers to consider more efficient and effective OES courses and sufficient class time to meet the students' needs. Second, instructors need to encourage EFL students to create opportunities for themselves to practice oral English skills either inside or outside the classroom and to give students enough exposure to the target language. Third, EFL instructors must be trained to utilize important strategies and techniques to teach OES. The recruitment of capable and experienced English instructors must be regarded as an important consideration to anticipate the lack of experienced English instructors. They must also be supported by their institutions in setting proper class size, developing appropriate and sufficient teaching and learning facilities. The idea of moving from teaching about English to its real-world practice is a worthwhile policy in this age. These findings could add to the body of knowledge on EFL teaching and learning and could serve as the basis for further research in this field.

REFERENCES

Acat, B., & Dörmez, I. (2009). To compare student-centered education and teacher-centered education in primary science and technology lesson in terms of learning environments. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Science, 1*, 1805-1009. Available online at www.sciencedirect.com.

Afrough, T, Rahimi, A. & Zarafshan, M. (2014). Foreign language demotivation: a construct validation study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 136*, 49-53. Available online at www.sciencedirect.com.

Afshar, H.S. & Asakereh, A. (2016). Speaking skills problems encountered by Iranian EFL freshmen and seniors from their own instructors' perspectives. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 13*(1),112-130. Retrieved from https://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v13n12016/

Alhaysony, M. & Alhaisoni, E. (2017). EFL teacher's and learner's perception of grammatical difficulties. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 8*(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.8n.1p.188.

Al-Hosni, S. (2004). Speaking difficulties encountered by young EFL learners. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 2* (6), 22-30. Available at www.arcjournals.org.

Al-Jamal, D.A. & Al-Jamal G.A. (2014). An investigation of the difficulties faced by EFL undergraduate in speaking skills. *English Language Teaching 7*(1), 19-27. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n1p19.

Alrasheedi, S. (2020). Investigation of factors influencing speaking performance of Saudi EFL learners. *Arab World English Journal, 11*(4) 66-77.DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol11no4.5

Alshenqeeti, H. (2018). Motivation and Foreign language learning: exploring the rise of motivation strategies in the EFL classroom. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 7* (7). Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3709415.

Al-Tamimi, A., & Shuib, M. (2009). Motivation and attitudes towards learning English: A Study of Petroleum Engineering Undergraduates at Hadhramout University of Science and technology. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 9*(2), 29-55.

Available at https://www.semanticscholar.org

Al-Zoubi, S.M. (2018). The impact of exposure to English language on language acquisition. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 5*(4), 2018, 151-162. Available online at www.jallr.com.

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. DOI: 10.52462/jlls.4

Belcher, D. D. (2004). Trends in teaching English for specific purposes. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 24,* 165-186. DOI: 10.1017/S026719050400008X

Bradford, A. (2007). Motivational orientations in under-researched EFL contexts: findings from Indonesia. *Relc Journal*, *38*(3), 302-323. DOI: 10.1177/0033688207085849.

Brown, H. D. (1991). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs.

Chen, J.F. (1996). CALL is not a hammer and not every teaching problem is a nail! Changing expectations of computers in the classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal, 2*(7). Retrieved from https://iteslj.org/Articles/Chen-CALL.html.

Chen, Z. & Goh, C. (2011). Teaching Oral English in higher education: challenges to EFL teachers. *Teaching in Higher Education, 16*(3), 333-345. DOI: 10.1080/13562517.2010.546527

Creswell, J.W. (2008). *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Pearson.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Diaab, S. (2016). Role of faulty instructional methods in Libyan EFL learners' speaking difficulties. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 323*, 338-345. Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

Dornyei, Z. (1994). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*(iv). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02071.x

Eaton, S.E. (2010). *Global Trends in Language Learning in the Twenty-first Century*. Calgary: Onate Press. Available at https://www.researchgate.net.

Ellis, R. (2006). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ertem, Z. S., & Arı, A. (2022). Investigation of the relationship between motivational persistence, procrastination tendency and achievement orientation. *Anatolian Journal of Education*, *7*(1), 17-30. https://doi.org/10.29333/aje.2022.712a.

Freeman, D. L. (1991). Second language acquisition research: Staking out the territory. *TESOL QUARTERLY, 25*(2), 133-168. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587466.

Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational Research.* New Jersey: Pearson Marill Prentice Hall.

Glasser, B.G., & Strauss, A.L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Aldine.

Harmer, J. (2003). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd edition). London: Longman.

Iacovou, M. (2002). Class size in the early years: Is smaller really better? *Education Economics*, *vol. 10*(2), 261-291. DOI:10.1080/09645290210127499.

Ibna Seraj, P. M., 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

Idrus, H. (2016). Enhancing Oral Presentation Skills of ESL Students: The Use of Oral Communication Strategies. In: Tang, S., Logonnathan, L. (eds) Assessment for Learning Within and Beyond the Classroom. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0908-2_37

Jin, M. L. (2014). A case study of non-English major college students' motivation in English language learning. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, *4*, 252-259.http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2014.42020.

Johnson, I.Y. (2010). Class size and students' performance at a public research university: A cross-classified model. *Research in Higher Education, 51*(8), 701-723. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11162-010-9179-y

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). https://doi.org/10.19030/iber.v5i8.3496

Kasumi, H. (2015). Class size in correlation with students' performance in English language. *American research Thoughts, 1*(7). DOI:10.6084/M9.FIGSHARE.1425134

Keil, J. and Partell, P.J. (2004). The Effect of class size on student performance and retention at Binghamton University. *Office of Budget & Institutional Research.* Available at https://www.semanticsscholar.org.

Kenworthy, J. (1998). *Teaching English pronunciation.* New York: Longman.

Krugger, A.B. (2003). Economic considerations and class size. *Economic Journal*, *113*(485), 34-64. DOI 10.3386/w8875.

Lado, R. (1986). *Language teaching.* New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.

Littlejohn, A. (2001). *Motivation, where does it come from? Where does it go? Karen's linguistics Issues.* Retrieved from http://www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/motivation.html. Accessed on January 23rd 2022.

Mercer-Mapstone, L. D., & Matthews, K. E. (2017). Student perceptions of communication skills in undergraduate science at an Australian researchintensive university. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 42*(1), 98-114. doi:10.1080/02602938.2015.1084492.

Nagaraju, C., Madhavaiah, G., & Peter, S. (2013). Teacher-centered learning and student-centered learning in English classroom: The teaching methods realizing the dreams of language learners. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Reviews, 2*(3), 125-131. Available at https://www.semanticscholar.org

Nguyen, H. and Terry, D.R. (2017). English Learning Strategies among EFL Learners: A Narrative Approach. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning, 3*(1). Available at https://files.eric.ed.gov.

Nguyen, S.V. and Habók, A. (2021). Vietnamese non-English major students' motivation to learn English: from activity theory perspective. *Heliyon 7, e06819.*https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06819.

Peregoy, S.F., & Boyle, O.F. (2005). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: A resource book for K12 teachers.* Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Polat, M. (2020). Measuring Language Learners' Success Oriented Motivation. *Anatolian Journal of Education*, *5*(2), pp.151-162. https://doi.org/10.29333/aje.2020.5213a.

Quadir, M. (2011). A comparative study on English and non-English major university students' motivation to learn English oral communication. *EWU Institutional Repository, 2*(2). URI: http://dspace.ewubd.edu/handle/2525/2836

Rahman, M.M. (2010). Teaching oral communication skills: A task-based approach. *ESP world, 9*(1), 1-11. Retrieved from http:// https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282842757

Riasati, M., (2011). Language Learning Anxiety from EFL Learner's Perspective. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research, 7*(6), 907-914.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation: Classic definition and new direction. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*, 56-67. https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020

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. *Available at http://end.kedi.re.kr.* Accessed on Januari 23rd 2021.

Stryker, S., & B. Leaver. (Eds.) (1997). *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: models and methods.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Trang, T.T. & Baldauf Jr.,R.B,. (2007). Demotivation: understanding resistance to English language learning-the case of Vietnamese students. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 4*(1), 79-105. http://journal.asiatefl.org/

Warren, J.E. & Karen, O. (2020). Raising the volume of Students' Voices through Grammar Instruction. *English in Texas, 50*(1). Retrieved from www.eric.ed.gov

Worde, R., (1998). An investigation of students' perspective on foreign language anxiety. *Doctoral Dissertation*. George Masson University. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov.

Yadav, M. & BaniAta, H. (2013). Factorizing demotivation, finding motivation: A constructive approach to quality enhancement. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*, 120-130. Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

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

Appendix A
Motivation Questionnaire
Direction:
Please indicate your response to each statement by CYCLING the rating that best describes your feeling. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree.

No.	Item	SA	A	U	D	SD
	Intrinsic motivation					
1.	I enjoy learning oral English skill.	5	4	3	2	1
2.	I am interested in learning oral English.	5	4	3	2	1
3.	Learning oral English is a hobby for me	5	4	3	2	1
4.	Learning oral English is a challenging that I enjoy.	5	4	3	2	1
	Extrinsic motivation					
5.	I learn oral English just because it is a compulsory subject	5	4	3	2	1
6.	I learn oral English in order to pass examination.	5	4	3	2	1
7.	Oral English skill is important for my academic study at the university.	5	4	3	2	1
8.	Oral English skill is important for my future job.	5	4	3	2	1
9.	Oral English skill is beneficial for my future career.	5	4	3	2	1
10.	Being able to speak English will enhance my social status.	5	4	3	2	1
11.	If I have good oral English proficiency it will impress people around me.	5	4	3	2	1
12.	I am learning oral English because I want to live for period of time in an English-speaking country.	5	4	3	2	1
13.	Oral English skill will help me to get a good job.	5	4	3	2	1
14.	I learn oral English skill in order to be able to communicate with the speaker of the language.	5	4	3	2	1
15.	Oral English is important for me as it is useful when traveling in many countries.					
16.	I learn oral English skill in order to make friend with foreigners.	5	4	3	2	1
17.	Being able to speak English is really an important goal in my life.	5	4	3	2	1
18.	If I can speak English, I will have a wonderful life.	5	4	3	2	1

Appendix B

Stimulated Recall

Direction:

You are required to recall the problems you face during learning oral English skills related to the following 7 factors.

Write them down in the problem(s) column of the following table.

No	Factor	Problem (s)
1.	Learning condition	
2.	Time duration	
3.	Chance to use English	
4.	Teaching and learning method	
5.	Instructors	
6.	Linguistics	
7.	Psychology	