International Journal of Current Advanced Research

Research Article

DESIGNING PROTOTYPE SYLLABUS FOR ENHANCING COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE OF ENGLISH IN HASMUKHGOSWAMI COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Bindi Bharatkumar Mehta and BipinParmar

Bhakta Kavi Narsinh Mehta University

A B S T R A C T

Communication skills are significant to have for a student in any field. For engineering students, being students of multidisciplinary field, communication competence is the asset through which they can gain and depart their knowledge and communicate their unique ideas to the world. The major source for students to improve their communication skills is their syllabus. Language needs analysis/assessment is the process of determining the needs for which a learner or group of learners requires a language and arranging the needs according to priorities. Needs analysis is also a part of curriculum development and is normally required before syllabus can be developed for language teaching. The inclusion of needs analysis in second language curriculum development began in earnest in 1960s as language programs started emphasizing English for specific purposes instruction. But GTU has recently changed the old syllabus of English for engineering students. Researcher has reviewed old syllabus of GTU and existing syllabus of GTU. From this study, researcher has found that the existing syllabus of GTU is not helpful for the students to improve their communication skills. In this research, researcher has tried to study the communication competence of such students and also studied their syllabus. The researcher has implemented the Prototype syllabus and checked the effects of it on students' level of communication skills. Researcher has checked the level of communication competence of students through pre-test and post-test. Researcher has tried to prepare a prototype syllabus in order to help technical students of Alpha College to learn and enhance communication skills. Through the quantitative analysis of their marks in the test, researcher has found that the students are still in a need to improve communication skills. The Prototype syllabus designed by the researcher is partly helpful to students to improve their communication skills.

INTRODUCTION

There are several factors that make the English language essential to communication in our current time. First of all, it is the most common foreign language. This means that two people who come from different countries (for example, an American and a Canadian) usually use English as a common language to communicate. That's why everyone needs to learn the language in order to get in touch on an international level. Speaking it, will help you communicate with people from countries all over the world, not just English-speaking ones. English is also essential to the field of education. In many countries, children are taught and encouraged to learn English as a second language. Even in countries where it is not an official language. At the university level, students in many countries study almost all their subjects in English in order to make the material more accessible to international students. Interviews are conducted in English and in various fields the language of communication is English only.

So communication competence is must for a candidate in any Profession.

The problem to be investigated

In GTU, Communication skills was one subject for Engineering students which included communication, basic communication skills, learning language through literature, etc. which didn't focus on Communicative competence specially speaking skill.

Recently, GTU has changed the syllabus and added English and Communication as a humanity subject for the technical students. This course content includes vocabulary building, phonetics, common errors in writing, basic writing skills, nature and style of writing and writing practices which has no relevant with speaking and reading.

Researcher wish to analyse the old syllabus and the existing syllabus critically. Also, with communication becoming fast paced and accessible to all- the modern scenario has changed forever. It has helped in improving the standard of living and

Corresponding author: **Bindi Bharatkumar Mehta**
Bhakta Kavi Narsinh Mehta University

has enabled faster, clearer and more accurate outcome to the designated tasks. Thus, the researcher wishes to study communication that takes place through electronic medium; and attempts to analyse its impact on the English language by carrying out research in the proposed topic.

Definitions of the Terms under Study

Prototype

"A Prototype is a partial implementation of a product expressed either logically or physically with all external interfaces presented." Kan 2003

Syllabus

Hutchinson and Waters define Syllabus as: "A Statement of what is to be learnt."They further added that, "A language-teaching syllabus involves the combination of subject matter (what to teach) and linguistic matter (how to teach)."

Enhancement

"Enhancement is an increase or improvement in quality, value, or extent."

Communicative Competence

Davies (2003) defines Communicative Competence as: "Representing the articulation of linguistic competence in situation; that is the practice of interaction and the recognition of appropriacy."

English

"English is a language- originally the language of the people of England. Today English is the main language of many countries i.e. UK, US, Ireland, Canada, etc. and used as second language or official language in many countries like India, Pakistan Bangladesh, etc. Worldwide English is accepted as the Global Language."

Research Objectives

- To check the level of engineering students in Communicative competence in English.
- To know the needs of communication skills in English for engineering students.
- Review the different syllabus of engineering students.
- Design the prototype syllabus for the engineering student.

Hypothesis

Mismatch between objectives and course content and teaching and testing techniques.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research methodology is essential in the research. It's a way to systematically solve the research problem. For this research, Researcher will use Experimental Method. Experimental research is any research conducted with a scientific approach, where a set of variables are kept constant while the other set of variables are being measured as the subject of experiment. Researcher will study the three types of experimental research: Pre-experimental research design, True experimental research design and Quasi-experimental research design.

Researcher will visit selected engineering colleges and conduct the pre-test of students to check their level of communication competence. Then Researcher will design the syllabus keeping

in mind basic communication skills LSRW Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing. One group of students will study the course designed by Researcher and the other group will not. After completion of the treatment, Researcher will conduct post-test. Researcher will critically analyse the data collected through pre-test and post-test.

Significance of the study

Communicative competence in English language is must for a student in almost every field. For engineering students, it's very helpful in their profession. They can learn it through their syllabus, so it's necessary to check whether the present syllabus is helpful for students to improve their communication skills or not. Through this research, Researcher willtry to know whether the present syllabus is helpful to improve student's communication competence or not and design Prototype Syllabus for them.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A Review of Literature is the analysis, critical evaluation and synthesis of existing knowledge relevant to the research problem, thesis or the issues the researcher aims to say something about.

A paper entitled*Needs analysis for language course design. A case study for engineering and business students*by LTodea and R Demarcsek

These days, teaching languages – English in particular – has become an ever more complex and challenging task due to the fact that groups of students are eclectic in terms of knowledge of English and level of competence. Teachers try to adapt to this challenging environment by providing a wide variety of activities and materials so as to satisfy the students' demands. This may sometimes prove counterproductive, is usually time consuming, and requires material and financial resources that are not always available. Under the circumstances, we considered that a needs analysis would benefit all parties involved: teachers on the one hand, in that it would somewhat simplify their effort and make it easier to work with the aforementioned groups of students, and the students on the other hand, in that the activities would be better tailored to suit their needs and requirements in terms of knowledge, abilities and skills. To this end, we conducted a survey in which we requested students to state their level of satisfaction with regard to the English course, as well as provide suggestions in terms of topics and language issues they would like to approach during these courses. In this paper we analysed and interpreted the responses in an attempt to adapt the content of the course so as to better meet the expectations of the end beneficiaries, i.e. the students.

Data collection

The researcher has first, conducted the pre-test of group of the students of Hasmukh Goswami College of Engineering. The pre-test contained questions regarding communications kills via Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. Students have given the test based on what they had learnt from the syllabus of Gujarat Technological University. Then, researcher has prepared the prototype syllabus for those students that students have been taught then. After completion of the prototype syllabus, researcher has conducted the post-test of students. Among those students there were two parts: the first who have been taught the prototype syllabus and then appeared in the

post-test, and the second, students who have been taught existing syllabus of Gujarat Technological University and then appeared in the post-test.

Pre-test

Result of Pre Test Treatment					
Sr No	Name of Student	Listening (40)	Speaking (20)	Reading (20)	Writing (20)	Total
1	Jainam Shah	18	16	9	8	51
2	Jalpan Vaishnav	18	8	14	17	57
3	Javia Jaykumar Rameshbhai	15	7	7	14	43
4	Jeswani Chirag Rajkumar	21	8	11	12	52
5	Joshi Deval	23	13	9	13	58
6	Kacha Harshil Dilipkumar	24	12	8	14	58
7	Kacha Niraj Amrutbhai	26	13	14	16	69
8	Kadiya Shivam Jaydipkumar	19	12	12	15	58
9	Kadiya Sunilkumar Bachubhai	25	13	11	12	61
10	Kakadia Kaushalkumar Mansukhbhai	24	15	8	12	59
11	Kakdiya Jay Rameshbhai	21	14	7	14	56
12	Kantawala Nisarg Sanjay	16	13	6	12	47
13	Karulkar Rachit Mayank	17	10	14	8	49
14	Kayastha Smeet Premalkumar	24	11	17	4	56
15	Maniar Mohak Hemantbhai	18	14	14	5	51
16	Shekhawat Manishsingh Devisingh	24	11	12	12	59
17	Mansuri Mohsin Ayubbhai	17	9	11	14	51
18	Mardia Anik	24	8	8	14	54
19	Mayank Bhatnagar	21	14	7	12	54
20	Mehta Rohan Jayendrabhai	24	12	6	9	51
21	Mehta Rushi Kalpeshbhai	21	13	9	11	54
22	Melvin Mathew	26	15	8	8	57
23	Modi Vivek Sanjaybhai	21	11	11	14	57
24	Mundhava Reena	21	12	9	8	50
25	Nair Vivek Rajeev	16	14	18	13	61
26	Naresh Pghelot	17	14	15	7	53
27	Narkhede Pavan Rameshbhai	24	15	14	11	64
28	Nayak Harsh Bhaskar	24	16	16	9	65
29	Panchal Brijesh	21	18	14	8	61
30	Panchal Vivek Hasmukhbhai	23	14	11	14	62
31	Panchal Yash	25	17	12	12	66
32	Pandit Kushal Pranavkumar	27	18	14	13	72
33	Pandya Bhavik Vinubhai	15	18	14	15	62
34	Pandya Kartik	17	18	15	11	61
35	Parekh Darshankumar Harishbhai	24	6	7	14	51
36	Parikh Rupeshbhai Bipinbhai	21	14	6	8	49
37	Parmar Noel Rameshkumar	24	17	14	7	62
38	Patel Aarjav	21	18	8	8	55
39	Patel Abhipsa Hasmukhbhai	23	9	8	18	58
40	Ronak Rakesh Shah	25	8	16	9	58
41	Ronit Nipen Gandhi	27	14	14	18	73
42	Sagar	15	9	14	15	53
43	Salot Bhavya Atulkumar	24	7	16	14	61
44	Sandeep Kumar Pal	26	9	8	16	59
45	Santoki Sarth Ajitbhai	15	8	14	14	51
46	Savnani Abhishek Kumar	17	14	8	18	57

Result of Pre Test					
Sr No	Name of Student	Listening (40)	Speaking (20)	Reading (20)	Writing (20)	Total
1	Trivedi Sujal Sanjaykumar	18	11	8	14	51
2	Sunasara Kamiyabali Mahendi Hasan	18	9	8	8	43
3	Thakkar Divyang Dineshkumar	15	18	7	13	53
4	Thakkar Meet Rajeshkumar	21	15	15	18	69
5	Thakkar Vijay Dilipkumar	23	14	18	14	69
6	Thakkar Vijay Ghanshyambhai	24	16	14	17	71
7	Thakor Prakashji Rajeshji	26	14	17	18	75
8	Trivedi Lokesh Ketankumar	26	11	18	18	73
9	Vacheta Jaykumar	27	8	14	18	67
10	Vatsal Shah	16	13	14	11	54
11	Vikas Kumar Rana	19	7	15	13	54
12	Vyas Karan Suryakantbhai	18	11	16	12	57
13	Wadhwani Manish Nariandas	24	15	8	14	61
14	Engineer Aryan Bipinchandra	27	18	7	15	67
15	Ashish Desai	26	14	8	18	66
16	Panchal Ayush Nimishbhai	25	14	14	14	67
17	Bafna Jenil Surendrakumar	25	17	15	17	74
18	Gajjar Bhakti Nayshilbhai	24	17	16	14	71
19	Bhatt Bhaumik Dipakbhai	26	17	14	14	71
20	Bhatt Dharm Sanjaykumar	27	18	12	8	65
21	Bohare Shivam Manoj	24	11	13	7	55
22	Buddhdev Ravi Devendrakumar	19	12	15	8	54

23	Chauhan Rahul Rajeshsingh	24	14	11	18	67
24	Chavda Pavankumar Dineshbhai	21	14	15	9	59
25	Choriwala Mushahidhusen Abuhusen	23	12	17	13	65
26	Gadhvi Hardikkumar Mohandan	26	14	17	14	71
27	Gajera Gaurang Mukeshbhai	24	14	14	16	68
28	Gajjar Minal Jayeshbhai	24	12	13	15	64
29	Gangani Ravi Mukeshbhai	21	14	14	12	61
30	Gohil Nayankumar Nagjibhai	23	11	12	12	58
31	Gothaliya Chetankumar Vithhalbhai	26	8	15	14	63
32	Hannanbeig Mirza	27	15	8	12	62
33	Shah Harsh Bhadresh	24	9	14	13	60
34	Harshit Agrawal	19	7	9	14	49
35	Jain Anshul Hemant	25	11	7	14	57
36	Jayani Tejaskumar Dalsukhbhai	24	8	11	8	51
37	Bhuva Kishan Jayantibhai	21	14	8	7	50
38	Mangroliya Krupal Bharatbhai	24	13	14	8	59
39	Langnecha Vivek Shantilal	26	18	12	18	74
40	Naik Leeroy Pinkesh	21	14	16	11	62
41	Makwana Pallaviben Dayabhai	14	17	14	9	54
42	Mansuri Mohammedafan Sabirhusen	18	18	14	11	61
43	Mehta Aesha Birjubhai	25	18	12	8	63
44	Nayan Kakadiya	24	18	9	14	65
45	Pahadia Ajay Ganeshbhai	27	17	11	8	63
46	Palak Patel	24	14	8	7	53

Prototype Syllabus

Sr. No.	Topics	Teaching Hours	Module Weightage
1.	**Introduction to Communication:** What is Communication? Types of Communication Process of Communication Basic Communication Skills	06	10%
2.	**Listening Skill:** What is Listening? Hearing v/s Listening Types of Listening Barriers of Listening Traits of a good listener Use of Podcast	06	20%
3.	**Speaking Skill;** What is Speaking? How to Speak effectively Traits of a good speaker Presentation Skills Public Speaking	07	25%
4.	**Reading Skill:** What is Reading? Types of Reading Strategies of Reading Use of Blog	06	20%
5.	**Writing Skill:** WhatisWriting? Howtowrite effectively Paragraph writing Letter writing Application Writing E mail writing Wiki	07	25%

Post-Test

Result of Post Test_Treatment					
Sr No	Name of Sudent	Listening (40)	Speaking (20)	Reading (20)	Writing (20)	Total
1	Jainam Shah	24	9	14	14	61
2	Jalpan Vaishnav	21	11	5	12	49
3	Javia Jaykumar Rameshbhai	24	13	8	12	57
4	Jeswani Chirag Rajkumar	24	14	7	11	56
5	Joshi Deval	21	15	7	11	54
6	Kacha Harshil Dilipkumar	27	18	15	9	69
7	Kacha Niraj Amrutbhai	16	18	12	14	60
8	Kadiya Shivam Jaydipkumar	19	17	12	5	53
9	Kadiya Sunilkumar Bachubhai	18	14	14	8	54
10	Kakadia Kaushalkumar Mansukhbhai	18	15	13	7	53
11	Kakdiya Jay Rameshbhai	15	13	16	7	51
12	Kantawala Nisarg Sanjay	21	14	14	11	60
13	Karulkar Rachit Mayank	21	16	12	11	60
14	Kayastha Smeet Premalkumar	23	15	17	13	68
15	Maniar Mohak Hemantbhai	25	12	12	14	63
16	Shekhawat Manishsingh	27	14	13	13	67

	Devisingh					
17	Mansuri Mohsin Ayubbhai	15	12	14	12	53
18	Mardia Anik	26	13	16	14	69
19	Mayank Bhatnagar	23	14	8	11	56
20	Mehta Rohan Jayendrabhai	24	7	11	11	53
21	Mehta Rushi Kalpeshbhai	21	11	12	9	53
22	Melvin Mathew	28	9	12	9	58
23	Modi Vivek Sanjaybhai	27	11	8	9	55
24	Mundhava Reena	29	4	12	11	56
25	Nair Vivek Rajeev	30	5	14	14	63
26	Naresh Pghelot	22	12	13	16	63
27	Narkhede Pavan Rameshbhai	24	14	11	15	64
28	Nayak Harsh Bhaskar	25	14	14	12	65
29	Panchal Brijesh	27	11	15	9	62
30	Panchal Vivek Hasmukhbhai	21	8	13	14	56
31	Panchal Yash	21	7	12	12	52
32	Pandit Kushal Pranavkumar	16	6	8	13	43
33	Pandya Bhavik Vinubhai	17	12	8	5	42
34	Pandya Kartik	14	5	7	10	36
35	Parekh Darshankumar Harishbhai	15	9	11	17	52
36	Parikh Rupeshbhai Bipinbhai	16	11	12	14	53
37	Parmar Noel Rameshkumar	14	8	12	13	47
38	Patel Aarjav	25	14	14	8	61
39	Patel Abhipsa Hasmukhbhai	26	8	12	8	54
40	Ronak Rakesh Shah	23	13	12	8	56
41	Ronit Nipen Gandhi	16	8	7	7	38
42	Sagar	14	13	5	11	43
43	Salot Bhavya Atulkumar	24	12	7	5	48
44	Sandeep Kumar Pal	26	5	11	9	51
45	Santoki Sarth Ajitbhai	25	9	12	11	57
46	Savnani Abhishek Kumar	14	11	12	13	50

Result of Post Test						
Sr No	Name of Sudent	Listening (40)	Speaking (20)	Reading (20)	Writing (20)	Total
1	Trivedi Sujal Sanjaykumar	27	11	15	15	68
2	Sunasara Kamiyabali Mahendi Hasan	16	12	17	18	63
3	Thakkar Divyang Dineshkumar	26	14	15	18	73
4	Thakkar Meet	25	15	14	17	71
5	Thakkar Rajeshkumar Dilipkumar	24	17	16	18	75
6	Thakkar Vijay Ghanshyambhai	25	18	17	9	69
7	Thakor Prakashji Rajeshji	25	9	14	11	59
8	Trivedi Lokesh Ketankumar	18	11	19	17	65
9	Vacheta Jaykumar	21	8	17	15	61
10	Vatsal Shah	14	13	18	16	61
11	Vikas Kumar Rana	18	15	18	13	64
12	Vyas Karan Suryakantbhai	27	9	17	14	67
13	Wadhwani Manish Nariandas	24	17	15	14	70
14	Engineer Aryan Bipinchandra	19	18	15	16	68
15	Ashish Desai	25	18	18	12	73
16	Panchal Ayush Nimishbhai	24	8	17	18	67
17	Bafna Jenil Surendrakumar	26	8	14	16	64
18	Gajjar Bhakti Nayshilbhai	25	7	15	14	61
19	Bhatt Bhaumik Dipakbhai	25	9	18	15	67
20	Bhatt Dharm Sanjaykumar	24	11	18	14	67
21	Bohare Shivam Manoj	25	15	17	17	74
22	Buddhdev Ravi Devendrakumar	26	12	18	15	71
23	Chauhan Rahul Rajeshsingh	26	12	9	9	56
24	Chavda Pavankumar Dineshbhai	25	12	11	18	66
25	Choriwala Mushahidhusen Abuhusen	24	13	8	18	63
26	Gadhvi Hardikkumar Mohandan	16	14	13	19	62
27	Gajera Gaurang Mukeshbhai	19	18	13	13	63
28	Gajjar Minal Jayeshbhai	18	9	15	14	56
29	Gangani Ravi Mukeshbhai	28	11	14	16	69
30	Gohil Nayankumar Nagjibhai	29	8	16	14	67
31	Gothaliya Chetankumar Vithhalbhai	25	13	12	19	69
32	Hannanbeig Mirza	28	8	18	17	71
33	Shah Harsh Bhadresh	29	8	17	18	72
34	Harshit Agrawal	24	9	13	14	60
35	Jain Anshul Hemant	21	18	13	15	67
36	Jayani Tejaskumar Dalsukhbhai	15	15	15	25	70
37	Bhuva Kishan Jayantibhai	24	14	15	24	77
38	Mangroliya Krupal Bharatbhai	26	16	16	15	73
39	Langnecha Vivek Shantilal	27	14	19	17	77
40	Naik Leeroy Pinkesh	16	15	18	16	65
41	Makwana Pallaviben Dayabhai	24	17	18	19	78
42	Mansuri Mohammedafnan Sabirhusen	26	17	15	18	76
43	Mehta Aesha Birjubhai	27	14	21	18	80
44	Nayan Kakadiya	18	13	23	15	69
45	Pahadia Ajay Ganeshbhai	28	18	24	21	91
46	Palak Patel	24	9	26	16	75

Data interpretation

Researcher will interpret the data of pre-test and post-test of students in five parts. First four parts will focus on the students' basic communication skills respectively, Listening skill, Speaking skill, Reading skill, and Writing skill. And in the last part, researcher will analyze the results of pre-test and post-test as a whole, which include all the four basic communication skills of the students.

Table 1

Listening Skill Average Marks out of 40				
College	Treatment Given		Treatment not Given	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
Hasmukh Goswami College of Engineering	21.28	21.56	22.89	23.39

There were forty marks for Listening skill in both pre-test as well as post-test. Table 1 shows the average marks of students in listening skill out of total forty marks. Students of HasmukhGoswami College of Engineering who have been given treatment got average 21.28 marks in pre-test and 21.56 in post-test. And the students who have not been given treatment got 22.89 in pre-test and 23.39 in post-test. So, result of all the students is increased in post-test.

Table 2

Speaking Skill Average Marks out of 20				
College	Treatment Given		Treatment not Given	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
Hasmukh Goswami College of Engineering	12.59	11.39	13.28	12.83

There were twenty marks for Speaking skill in both pre-test as well as post-test. Table 2 shows the average marks of students in speaking skill out of total twenty marks. Students of HasmukhGoswami College of Engineering who have been given treatment got average 12.59 marks in pre-test and 11.39 in post-test. And the students who have not been given treatment got 13.28 in pre-test and 12.83 in post-test. So, result of all the students is decreased in post-test.

Table 3

Reading Skill Average Marks out of 20				
College	Treatment Given		Treatment not Given	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
HasmukhGoswami College of Engineering	11.26	11.43	12.63	16.17

There were twenty marks for Reading skill in both pre-test as well as post-test. Table 3 shows the average marks of students in Reading skill out of total twenty marks. Students of HasmukhGoswami College of Engineering who have been given treatment got average 11.26 marks in pre-test and 11.43 in post-test. And the students who have not been given treatment got 12.63 in pre-test and 16.17 in post-test. So, result of all the students is increased in post-test.

Table 4

Writing Skill Average Marks out of 20				
College	Treatment Given		Treatment not Given	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
Hasmukh Goswami College of Engineering	11.96	10.91	12.5	16.09

There were twenty marks for Writing skill in both pre-test as well as post-test. Table 4 shows the average marks of students in writing skill out of total twenty marks. Students of

HasmukhGoswami College of Engineering who have been given treatment got average 11.96 marks in pre-test and 10.91 in post-test. And the students who have not been given treatment got 12.05 in pre-test and 16.09 in post-test. So, the result of the students who have not given treatment is increased whereas students who were given treatment got less marks in post-test than pre-test.

Table 5

Overall Average Marks out of 100				
College	**Treatment Given**		**Treatment not Given**	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
HasmukhGoswami College of Engineering	57.09	55.30	61.30	68.48

In, HasmukhGoswami College of Engineering students who have been given treatment got average 57.09 marks out of 100 marks in pre-test and55.30 marks in post-test. So, the result of those student was decreased in the post-test. Students who have not been given treatment got average 61.30 marks out of 100 marks in pre-test and 68.48 marks in post-test. So, the result of those student was decreased in the post-test. Thus, the result of the students who have studied prototype syllabus is decreased and who have studied existing syllabus of GTU is increased in the post-test.

Findings

The findings of this research are as follows:

- Engineering students are lacking significant communication skills.
- Listening skill of students in both the groups is poor. Average score is 57% i.e. 22 to 23 out of 40.
- Speaking skill of students in both the groups is good compared to Listening skill. Average score is 65% i.e. 13 out of 20.
- Reading skill of students in both the groups is good compared to Listening skill. Average score is 65% i.e. 13 out of 20.
- Writing skill of students in both the groups is well compared to Listening Speaking and Reading skills. Average score is 70% i.e. 14 out of 20.
- Syllabus of GTU is not helpful for engineering students to improve their communication skills.

CONCLUSION

Researcher has checked the level of communication competence of students through pre-test and post-test. Researcher has tried to prepare a prototype syllabus in order to help technical students of Alpha College to learn and enhance communication skills.

Through the quantitative analysis of their marks in both the tests, researcher has found that the students are still in a need to improve communication skills. The Prototype syllabus designed by the researcher is partly helpful to students to improve their communication skills. There is a requirement of many changes in the existing syllabus of GTU.

Works Cited

Adair, John. "Effective Communication (Revised Edition) by John Adair." Pan Macmillan.

Blog, Articles Junction. "Meaning of Communication? Definition of Communication." Meaning of Communication? Definition of Communication, 26 July 2013.

Communicative Competence. Language education [Licensed for Non-Commercial Use Only].

Effective Communication for the 21st Century Engineer. U Of T Engineering News, 5 June 2015.

Enhancement | Definition of Enhancement in English by Lexico Dictionaries." Lexico Dictionaries | English, Lexico Dictionaries.

Experimental Research- Definition, Types of Designs and Advantages. QuestionPro, 14 Aug. 2018.

Importance of Language – Why Learning a Second Language Is Important. Importance of Language – Why Learning a Second Language Is Important.

Knowledge Brief. "Prototyping." Knowledge Brief Professional.

Sivapalan, Subarna, and GanakumaranSubramaniam. "The Incorporation of Literature in the English

Language Program for Engineering Students: Learner Interest and Perception." 3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature® 14 (2008).

Solanki, Shyamlee D. "Course Designing and Testing of English Language in Engineering Colleges An Evaluation of Innovative Practices." (2014)

rch Guides: Organizing Academic Research Papers: 7. The Results - Organizing Academic Research Papers - Research Guides at Sacred Heart University, library.sacredheart.edu/C.php?g=29803&p=185931

How to cite this article:

****