

Impact Factor - 5.958

# YOUNG RESEARCHER

A Multidisciplinary Peer-Reviewed Refereed Research Journal Jan-Feb-Mar 2025

Vol. 14 No. 1

# Assessment Of Hindi Language Competencies And LSRW Skills Of Middle Stage Students

Sayantan Mitra<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Samson R. Victor<sup>2</sup> & Dr. K. V. Sridevi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Education, Indira Gandhi National Tribal

University, Amarkantak, Madhya Pradesh

<sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Indira Gandhi National Tribal

University, Amarkantak, Madhya Pradesh

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Education, Regional Institute of Education, Ajmer,

NCERT

*Corresponding Author: Sayantan Mitra* **DOI -** 10.5281/zenodo.15354822

#### Abstract:

Language competency plays a vital and crucial role in shaping the cognitive, social and academic development of any learner. Acquisition of different competencies leads to the better understanding of any language. This study focuses and assess on the Hindi Language Competencies of 8<sup>th</sup> standard students in Kendriya Vidyalaya Amarkantak, Madhya Pradesh, focusing on the 4 basic skills of language i.e. Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing (LSRW) skills. The research employs a descriptive design with a sample of 34 students and a self-designed Hindi Language Competencies Test and Rubrics for the assessment. The findings indicate that a majority of students demonstrate good proficiency in Hindi, yet a significant portion struggles with specific skills, particularly listening and speaking. The study highlights the need for targeted interventions, such as structured listening exercises, interactive speaking activities, and enhanced reading and writing practices, to bridge proficiency gaps. Competency-based assessment models prove effective in identifying students' strengths and areas for improvement, emphasizing the necessity of shifting from traditional rote-based evaluation methods to more skill-oriented approaches. The research underscores the importance of integrating innovative pedagogical strategies and technological tools to enhance Hindi language learning among middle-stage students.

*Keywords: Hindi Language Competencies, LSRW Skills, Language Assessment, Middle-Stage Students* 

#### Introduction:

Language plays a crucial role in shaping an individual's cognitive, social, and cultural development (Hoff, 2006; Sinha, 2015). It is not only a medium of communication but also a tool for learning and expressing thoughts effectively. Hindi holds a significant place as one of the official languages, serving as a bridge for communication across diverse linguistic regions. Ensuring proficiency in Hindi, especially among school students, is essential for their academic success and overall linguistic competence (Hadke, 2021; Ranjan, 2021).

Hindi language holds significant importance in school education, as developing competencies and foundational skills is essential for comprehension effective (Gaikwad, 2024). Proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing enhances students' communication abilities and progresses systematically throughout their academic journey. The curriculum is meticulously designed to integrate various aspects of Hindi language competencies along with literature, ensuring a holistic approach to language acquisition (Pareek, 2024). In an Indian context, the reinforcement of these skills can be approached by engaging the students in structured activities such as storytelling, audiovisual presentations, peer discussions, collaborative exercises, creative writing, and interactive sessions, simplifying a comprehensive understanding of the Hindi language (Shravani, 2024).

Proficiency levels of the students regarding the LSRW skills can be understood with proper evaluation methods. By shifting from conventional evaluation methods to а more structured and analytical approach, educators can foster better language learning experiences for students (Zheng, 2018). For the assessing the Hindi language competencies, various methods like Comprehension writing, Vocabulary, Grammatical assessment etc. are used in any classroom settings. A reliable assessment tool not only

# *Vol.* 14 *No.*1 *Jan - Feb -Mar* 2025

helps in gauging students' linguistic abilities but also serves as a foundation for developing targeted interventions to enhance their proficiency. To measure the effectiveness of these learning approaches, а strong assessment framework is essential. Traditional evaluation methods often focus on rote memorization rather than assessing practical language application, limiting their ability to gauge true proficiency (Salimovna, 2025).

Assessing language competency is a fundamental aspect of education, as identifying helps in students' it strengths and areas that require improvement. Language assessment tools are designed to evaluate various skills. including reading, writing, speaking, and comprehension (Weir & Weir, 1993; Alderson & Banerjee, 2002; 2021). **Rubrics** Hatipoglu, are considered as one of the good evaluation tools for assessing the language competencies because it has the ability to evaluate each competency in depth as well as in a holistic way (Griffith & Lim, 2012; Gallardo, 2024). In the context of Hindi language learning, Rubrics are not popularly used for the assessment but the development of a standardized Rubrics can help in students' measuring competencies accurately and nurturing language proficiency at the school level (Vaidya, n.d.; Dahal, 2022).

Various studies suggest that the integration of Technology in the field of

education has always been a subject of relative and extensive research, highlighting its essential role in making accessible learning more and interactive. Studies have also suggested that the digital tools and computer based teaching learning approaches enhance the effect of engagement but still poses certain challenges in their adoption in traditional classroom settings (Bhatia, 1990; Schindler et.al, 2017). Researches also highlighted the necessity of equipping in service as well as pre service educators with different set of skills to integrate with the technology effectively and efficiently, ensuring the benefits of the students with these advancements (Tondeur, 2012; Lambert & Gong, 2010). Studies on Language acquisition among the students specifically those who belongs to the marginalized communities has been explored in many contexts, describing how skill based learning and students centered learning approaches and strategies leads to the improvement of the communication skills as well as the comprehension skills (Singh, 2017; Ali, 2019). Studies of Language learning suggested that the language learning is dealt with the depths of the linguistics well. The essentiality of the as structured language development is focused on the technicalities of the language like morphology, phonology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics, which further supports the requirement of the systematic teaching approaches

that provide the diverse learning needs (Koutsoftas, 2013; Utami, 2023).

Parallel to these studies. competency based education studies also suggested that the emergence of a transformative model in language learning can shift the focus from conventional and traditional instructions to the skills enhancement and mastery. This kind of approach allows learning experiences on а personalized level which helps in catering the needs of the individual student and foster the deeper engagement in the domain of language acquisition. Skill based assessment and their link to the competency based education have a long history and many studies also supports the fact that this model enhances the retention of the students and their overall proficiency levels (Kellogg, 2018; Levine & Patrick, 2019: Hazarika, 2020). Many researches also indicated that the for the holistic language development, linguistic, sociolinguistic and strategic competencies plays a crucial role in the same, ensuring the integrated teaching methodologies which are important for the learning of language effectively (Shobikah, 2020; Adigun, 2023).

The above reviews indicate that the Language competencies in Hindi Language plays a very significant role in learning the basic as well as complexity of the language. In this context, the present study intends to explore the Hindi Language competencies of the 8<sup>th</sup>

standard students and to study the proficiency levels of the students regarding the same.

#### Material & Methods:

For the present study, Descriptive survey method was used to study and analyze the Hindi Language Competencies of the 8th standard students. A total of 34 class 8th standard students from Kendriya Vidyalaya, Amarkantak, Madhya Pradesh were selected as the sample for the study. The study was limited to the state of Madhya Pradesh. Moreover, it is only focused on the 8th standard students of Kendriya Vidyalaya School situated at Amarkantak. A self-constructed Hindi Language Competencies Test based for the age group of 12-14 years was employed. To assess the Competencies, LSRW skill based Rubrics were constructed. Listening skill Rubrics

consists of 4-point scale ranging from Problematic, Working, Good and Excellent. Speaking and Writing Skill Rubrics consists of 4-point scale ranging from Limited Proficiency, Moderate Proficiency, Proficient and High Reading skill Proficiency. **Rubrics** consists of 4-point scale ranging from Beginning, Developing, Proficient and Advanced. Hindi language Competencies Test was divided into two parts. The first part consists of the General Information of the students and the second part was consisting of 4 sub parts i.e. Listening Skill, speaking skill, reading skill and Writing skill. For the analysis, the research has also developed Rubrics. The rubrics was constructed to assess particular skills based on different criteria. Further, Descriptive and Inferential Statistics were used for analyzing the data using SPSS.

#### **Results**:

Demographics		Frequency	Percentage	
Gender	Male	16	47.1%	
	Female	18	52.9%	
Age	12 years	06	17.6%	
	13 years	25	73.5%	
	14 years	02	5.9%	
	15 years	01	2.9%	
Locale	Rural	24	70.6%	
	Urban	10	29.4%	
Caste	General	10	29.4%	
	OBC	08	23.5%	
	SC	08	23.5%	
	ST	03	8.8%	
	EWS	05	14.7%	

#### Table 1 Frequency & Percentage of the 8th standard students

From the above table, the data reveals that out of 34 students, majority of the students i.e. 52.9% are female and rest 47.1% of the students are male. In the age category, the majority of the students falls under the 13 years of age group i.e. 73.5%. When it comes to the locality of the students, majority of the students i.e.70.6% belongs from the rural background. Lastly, in the caste domain, the General caste students i.e. 29.4% were the highest.

The objective was to study the proficiency levels of the class 8<sup>th</sup> students regarding the Hindi Language and its competencies namely Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing Skills.

Table 2 Proficiency Levels of the 8th standard students regarding Hindi LanguageCompetencies

i i					
Proficiency Levels	Frequency	Percent			
Low Proficiency	08	23.5%			
Moderate Proficiency	09	26.5%			
Good Proficiency	16	47.1%			
High Proficiency	01	2.9%			
Total	34	100%			

From the above table, the data analysis of Proficiency levels of the students shows that majority of the students i.e. 47.1% have Good proficiency in the Hindi language competencies. Whereas, only 2.9% i.e. a single student recorded the lowest percentage with a High proficiency in the overall skills proficiency of Hindi language. After reviewing the data, it can be concluded that the 8<sup>th</sup> standard students possess a good level of proficiency in Hindi language. But there is still a considerable amount of students with low proficiency, which suggests the need of continuous interventions to enhance the skills. It was also highlighted that further efforts can be incorporated to improve the language skills among all the students.

<b>Proficiency Level</b>	Frequency	Percentage	
Problematic	08	23.5%	
Working	11	32.4%	
Good	10	29.4%	
Excellent	05	14.7%	
Total	34	100%	

From the above data, it was revealed that most of the students i.e.

32.4% of them were at Working level when it comes to the Listening skills.

29.4% of the students were at Good level, 23.5% of the students were at problematic stage and least number of students were at Excellent at Listening skills. It can be concluded that the 8<sup>th</sup> standard student's moderate skills of Listening, with majority of students being at the Working or Good level. Furthermore, a significant strength of students struggles with this particular skill, highlighting the need for interventions like listening exercises, interactive activities or focused training. Fewer students are also there in the excellent category which suggests that further efforts can lead to improve of the listening skills among all the students to reach high amount of proficiency.

Table 4 Proficiency Levels of the 8th standard students	s regarding Speaking Skills
---	-----------------------------

Proficiency Level	Frequency	Percentage
Limited Proficiency	8	23.5%
Moderate Proficiency	10	29.4%
Proficient	15	44.1%
High Proficiency	1	2.9%
Total	34	<b>100</b> %

From the above data, it can be analyzed that majority of the students i.e. 44.1% of them are proficient when it comes to the Speaking skills. Whereas, a good strength of students i.e. 29.4% were at moderate level. Limited proficiency category holds the percentage of 23.5% students and only student falls under the High proficiency related to speaking skills. This analysis shows that most 8<sup>th</sup> standard students have a fair number of speaking skills being proficient. Whereas, a significant portion of students still struggles with acquiring the proficiency of speaking skill but still have some knowledge which can be enhanced by the interventions including speaking exercises and activities, confidence building activities and group interactions.

<b>Proficiency Level</b>	Frequency	Percentage
Beginning	8	23.5%
Developing	14	41.2%
Proficient	10	29.4%
Advanced	2	5.9%
Total	34	100%

Table 5 Proficiency	y Levels of the 8th	) standard students	reaardina	Readina Skills

From the collected data, it was depicted majority of the students i.e.

41.2% were at the developing stage of Reading skills. A significant number of

students i.e. 29.4% were at Proficient level and 23.5% of students were only at the beginning stage. Only 5.9% of the students were at advanced level of proficiency. It can be justified that majority of the students were at the developing stage which means more reading practices, comprehension exercise and interactive learning methods were needed to improve the overall development of the reading skills through multiple and constant interventions.

Proficiency Level	Frequency	Percentage
Limited Proficiency	9	26.5%
Moderate Proficiency	9	26.5%
Proficient	15	44.1%
High Proficiency	1	2.9%
Total	34	100%

Table 6 Proficiency Levels of	of the 9th standard student	s rogarding Writing Skills
Tuble of Frojiciency Levels of	ij the oth standard stadent	s regularity withing skills

The above table represents that 44.1% of the students were proficient in Writing skills. Furthermore, 26.5% of students were at Limited and Moderate proficiency levels and only one student was at high level of proficiency. From the analysis, it can be concluded that majority of the students are proficient in Writing but still there was a large number of students needs intervention

like writing exercises, sentence formation and way of writing on any particular subjects.

#### Hypothesis 1:

There is a significant difference between male and female students of class 8<sup>th</sup> standard students regarding overall Hindi language competencies and LSRW Skills.

Table 7 t-value of the students with respect to Hindi Language Competencies and
Gender

Hindi	Gender	Ν	Mean	df	Independent	р	Result
Language					ʻť	value	
Competencies							
Overall	Male	16	98.13	32	-5.716	0.000	S**
	Female	18	135.06				(0.01)
Listening	Male	16	35.0625	32	-0.585	0.563	NS
Skill	Female	18	36.7222				
Speaking	Male	16	26.0625	32	-5.662	0.000	S**
Skill	Female	18	39.5556				(0.01)
Reading Skill	Male	16	18.0000	32	-6.677	0.000	S**
	Female	18	32.4444				(0.01)
Writing Skill	Male	16	19.0000	32	-3.362	0.002	S**
	Female	18	26.3333				(0.01)

S\*\* - Significant at 0.01 level

From the above table, it was analyzed that the overall mean scores of the male and female students were 98.13 and 135.06 respectively with a df of 32 and calculated t value was -5.716 and the p value was <0.01 level of significance. Similarly, in the speaking skills, the mean scores of the male and female students were 26.0625 and 39.5556 respectively with a df of 32 and calculated t value was -5.662 and the p value was <0.01 level of significance. Furthermore, in the reading skills, the mean scores of the male and female students were 18.0000 and 32.4444 respectively with a df of 32 and calculated t value was -6.677 and the p value was <0.01 level of significance. Additionally, in the writing skills, the mean scores of the male and female students were 19.0000 and 26.3333 respectively with a df of 32 and

calculated t value was -3.362 and the p value was <0.01 level of significance. Only in Listening skills, the calculated t value was -0.585 and p value was >0.05 level of significance. By all these analysis, it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between male and female students of class 8<sup>th</sup> standard students regarding Hindi language competencies and in respect to Speaking, Reading and Writing skills. On the other hand, it was clearly indicated that there is no significant difference between male and female students of class 8th standard students regarding Listening skills.

#### **Hypothesis 2:**

There is a significant difference between rural and urban students of class 8<sup>th</sup> standard regarding Hindi language competencies and LSRW Skills.

Locure								
Hindi	Locale	Ν	Mean	df	Independent	р	Result	
Language					ʻť	value		
Competencies								
Overall	Rural	24	121.75	32	1.419	0.166	NS	
	Urban	10	107.90					
Listening	Rural	24	38.5000	32	3.198	0.003	S**	
Skill	Urban	10	29.8000				(0.01)	
Speaking	Rural	24	33.1250	32	-0.074	0.941	NS	
Skill	Urban	10	33.4000					
Reading Skill	Rural	24	25.5833	32	-0.059	0.953	NS	
	Urban	10	25.8000					
Writing Skill	Rural	24	24.5417	32	2.174	0.037	S*	
	Urban	10	18.9000				(0.05)	

 Table 8 t-value of the students with respect to Hindi Language Competencies and

 Locale

S\*\* - Significant at 0.01 level

S\* - Significant at 0.05 level

From the above table, it was analyzed that the overall mean scores of the Rural and Urban students were 121.75 and 107.90 respectively with a df of 32 and calculated t value was 1.419 and the p value was >0.01 level of significance. Similarly, in the speaking skills, the mean scores of the Rural and Urban students were 33.1250 and 33.4000 respectively with a df of 32 and calculated t value was -0.074 and the p value was >0.01 level of significance. Furthermore, in the reading skills, the mean scores of the Rural and Urban students were 25,5833 and 25,8000 respectively with a df of 32 and calculated t value was -0.059 and the p value was >0.01 level of significance. Whereas, in the Listening skills, the mean scores of the Rural and Urban students were 38.5000 and 29.8000 respectively with a df of 32 and calculated t value was 3.198 and the p value was <0.05 level of significance.

Moreover, in the Writing skills as well, the mean scores of the Rural and Urban students were 24.5417 and 18.9000 respectively with a df of 32 and calculated t value was 2.174 and the p value was <0.05 level of significance. By all these analysis, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between Rural and Urban students of class 8<sup>th</sup> standard students regarding Hindi language competencies and in respect to Speaking & Reading skills. Whereas, it was analyzed that there is a significant difference between Rural and Urban students of class 8th standard students regarding Hindi language competencies with respect to Listening & Writing skills.

#### **Hypothesis 3:**

There is a significant difference between mean scores of the students of class 8<sup>th</sup> standard regarding overall Hindi language competencies and LSRW skills with respect to age.

		-					- 1
Hindi Language		Sum of	df	Mean	F	р	Result
Competencies		Squares		Square		value	
Overall	Between	2809.048	3	936.349			
	Groups				1.400	0.262	NS
	Within	20058.393	30	668.613			
	Groups						
Listening	Between	170.389	3	56.796			
Skill	Groups				0.837	0.484	NS
	Within	2035.493	30	67.850			
	Groups						
Speaking	Between	712.865	3	237.622			
Skill	Groups				3.010	0.046	S*

Table 9 One way ANOVA of the class 8th students regarding the Hindi LanguageCompetencies and skill wise with respect of Age

	Within	2368.693	30	78.956			(0.05)
	Groups						
Reading	Between	708.431	3	236.144			
Skill	Groups				3.044	0.044	S*
	Within	2327.333	30	77.578			(0.05)
	Groups						
Writing	Between	215.056	3	71.685			
Skill	Groups				1.405	0.261	NS
	Within	1530.473	30	51.016			
	Groups						

#### S\* - Significant at 0.05 level

From the above table, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of class 8<sup>th</sup> standard students regarding overall Hindi language competencies and Listening & Writing skills with respect to age. Furthermore, from the above analysis it is clearly depicted that there is a significant difference between the mean scores of class 8<sup>th</sup> standard students regarding Speaking & Reading skills with respect to age.

#### **Hypothesis 4:**

There is a significant difference between mean scores of the students of class 8<sup>th</sup> standard regarding overall Hindi language competencies and LSRW skills with respect to caste.

# Table 10 One way ANOVA of the class 8th students regarding the Hindi LanguageCompetencies and skill wise with respect of Caste

Hindi Language Competencies		df	Mean Square	F	p value	Result
Between	11984.175	4	2996.04			
Groups			4	7.983	0.000	S**
Within Groups	10883.267	29	375.285			(0.01)
Between	142.207	4	35.552			
Groups				0.500	0.736	NS
Within Groups	2063.675	29	71.161			
Between	1747.692	4	436.923			
Groups				9.499	0.000	S**
Within Groups	1333.867	29	45.995			(0.01)
Between	2056.798	4	514.200			
Groups				15.232	0.000	S**
Within Groups	978.967	29	33.757			(0.01)
Between	835.388	4	208.847			
Groups				6.655	0.001	NS
Within Groups	910.142	29	31.384			
	petencies Between Groups Within Groups Between Groups Within Groups Between Groups Within Groups Between Groups Within Groups Between Groups	spetencies         Squares           Between         11984.175           Groups         10883.267           Within Groups         10883.267           Between         142.207           Groups         2063.675           Between         1747.692           Groups         1333.867           Within Groups         2056.798           Groups         2056.798           Groups         978.967           Between         835.388           Groups         2056.798	Squares           Between         11984.175         4           Groups         10883.267         29           Within Groups         10883.267         29           Between         142.207         4           Groups         2063.675         29           Between         1747.692         4           Groups         2056.798         4           Groups         2056.798         4           Groups         2056.798         4           Groups         29         333.867         29           Between         2056.798         4           Groups         978.967         29           Between         835.388         4           Groups         978.967         29	squares         Squares         Square           Between         11984.175         4         2996.04           Groups         4         4           Within Groups         10883.267         29         375.285           Between         142.207         4         35.552           Groups         1         436.923         10883.267           Within Groups         2063.675         29         71.161           Between         1747.692         4         436.923           Groups         1333.867         29         45.995           Between         2056.798         4         514.200           Groups         978.967         29         33.757           Between         835.388         4         208.847           Groups	petencies         Squares         Square           Between         11984.175         4         2996.04           Groups         4         7.983           Within Groups         10883.267         29         375.285           Between         142.207         4         35.552           Groups         142.207         4         35.552           Groups         2063.675         29         71.161           Between         1747.692         4         436.923           Groups         2056.798         4         9.499           Within Groups         1333.867         29         45.995           Between         2056.798         4         514.200           Groups         -         15.232           Within Groups         978.967         29         33.757           Between         835.388         4         208.847           Groups         -         6.655         6.655	petencies         Squares         Square         value           Between         11984.175         4         2996.04         7.983         0.000           Groups         10883.267         29         375.285         0.000         0.736           Between         142.207         4         35.552         0.500         0.736           Groups         2063.675         29         71.161         0.500         0.736           Within Groups         2063.675         29         71.161         0.000         0.736           Between         1747.692         4         436.923         9.499         0.000           Within Groups         1333.867         29         45.995         0.000         0.000           Within Groups         1333.867         29         45.995         0.000         0.000           Within Groups         1333.867         29         33.757         0.000         0.000           Within Groups         978.967         29         33.757         0.000         0.001           Between         835.388         4         208.847         6.655         0.001

#### S\*\* - Significant at 0.01 level S\* - Significant at 0.05 level

From the above table, it can be concluded that there is a significant between the mean scores of class 8<sup>th</sup> standard students regarding overall

Hindi language competencies and Speaking & Reading skills with respect to caste. For the Listening & Writing skills, there is no significant difference



between the mean scores of class 8<sup>th</sup> standard students regarding with respect to caste.

#### **Discussion and Conclusion:**

The analysis revealed that a significant portion of students demonstrated good proficiency in Hindi, with 47.1% falling into this category. However, a considerable percentage of students (23.5%) exhibited low proficiency, indicating the need for targeted interventions to improve their language skills. The findings suggest that while a majority of students possess a foundational understanding of Hindi, there remains scope for improvement in enhancing their overall linguistic abilities (Gaikwad, 2024).

When examining language competencies skill-wise, the study found that listening skills posed a challenge for many students, with 23.5% struggling at a problematic level. Similarly, 23.5% of students exhibited limited proficiency in speaking skills, highlighting the need for more interactive and communicative exercises in the classroom. Reading skills were also an area of concern, as 41.2% of students were at the developing stage, requiring additional comprehension reading exercises. Writing skills showed better results, with 44.1% of students being proficient, yet 26.5% remained at limited or moderate proficiency levels, suggesting the need for more structured writing practice.

A comparative analysis of male and female students revealed significant differences in overall Hindi language Female students competencies. outperformed male students across all skill areas except listening, where no significant difference was observed. The results indicate that targeted strategies may be required to support male students in enhancing their speaking, reading, and writing skills (Mabasa & Lumadi, 2016). This gender-based difference highlights the necessity of customized teaching methodologies to cater to the varied learning needs of students (Weber & Custer, 2005).

The study also analyzed the proficiency levels of rural and urban students. finding no significant difference in overall competencies, speaking, and reading skills. However, listening and writing skills showed a notable gap, with rural students performing better than their urban counterparts (Tayyaba, 2012). These findings suggest that while rural students may have stronger listening writing abilities due and to environmental factors, urban students may require additional support in these areas. Future educational interventions could focus on improving writing exercises and listening comprehension activities in urban settings (Carretti et, al. 2014).

When assessing language competencies across different age groups, the study found that age did not

significantly impact overall Hindi language proficiency. However. speaking and reading skills showed a statistically significant difference, with older students performing better. This suggests that as students grow, their exposure and experience in the language improve, reinforcing the need for age-appropriate teaching strategies that gradually enhance their linguistic skills over time (Terletska, 2024).

The results indicated variations in proficiency levels among different caste groups, with General category performing students better in comparison to students from other backgrounds. This disproportion underscores the importance of inclusive education policies that provide additional support to students from marginalized communities, ensuring opportunities for equal language development (Shaeffer, 2019).

The findings of the study showcase the need for a structured and comprehensive approach to assessing and improving Hindi language competencies among 8<sup>th</sup> standard students. While a significant portion of students demonstrated good proficiency, there is a clear requirement for focused interventions to support those with lower proficiency levels. Enhancing teaching methodologies through interactive learning, communicative activities, and targeted exercises can help bridge the existing gaps in language competencies (Chen,

2024; Shamsiddin, 2024). Addressing gender-based differences, rural-urban and socio-economic disparities variations in language proficiency is essential to creating a more inclusive and effective learning environment (Lata, 2024; Shahzad et. al, 2024). Strengthening experiential learning approaches, integrating technology in language teaching. and providing teacher training programs can significantly contribute to enhancing students' Hindi language skills (Duli & Ramana, 2023; Shravani, 2024).

#### **References:**

- 1. Adigun, C. O. (2023). Teacher Socio-Linguistic Factors and Learning Outcomes in English Language Among Public Senior Secondary Students in The Ibadan Metropolis, Nigeria (Doctoral dissertation).
- Alderson, J. C., & Banerjee, J. (2002). Language testing and assessment (Part 2). Language teaching, 35(2), 79-113.
- 3. Ali, S. S. (2019). Problem based learning: A student-centered approach. *English* language teaching, 12(5), 73-78.
- 4. Bhatia, T.K. Computer-based Hindi pedagogy. *Comput Hum* 14, 181–185 (1980). <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/BF024</u> 03766
- Carretti, B., Caldarola, N., Tencati,
   C., & Cornoldi, C. (2014).

Improvingreadingcomprehension in reading andlistening settings: The effect oftwotrainingprogrammesfocusing on metacognition andworking memory. British Journalof Educational Psychology, 84(2),194-210.

- 6. Chen, H. (2024). Innovative approaches in English language teaching: Integrating communicative methods and technology for enhanced proficiency. *Communications in Humanities Research*, 32, 214-220.
- Dahal, S. (2022). Using Rubrics in Continuous Assessment system: A Narrative Inquiry (Doctoral dissertation, Kathmandu University School of Education).
- 8. Duli, B., & Ramana, V. L. (2023). Exploring the Influence of NEP-2020 on Experiential Learning for Language Proficiency and Holistic Development of the Professional Students. *Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow Volume 23: 12 December 2023 ISSN 1930-2940*, 85.
- Gaikwad, R. B. (2024). The Role of Hindi in National Education: A Historical and Pedagogical Analysis. *Multidisciplinary Aspects of Education*.
- 10. Gallardo, K. (2020). Competencybased assessment and the use of

performance-based evaluation rubrics in higher education: Challenges towards the next decade. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 78(1), 61-79.

- 11. Griffith, W., & Lim, H. Y. (2012). Performance-based assessment: rubrics, web 2.0 tools and language competencies. *Mextesol Journal*, *36*(1), 1-12.
- 12. Hadke, S. K. (2021). Hindi language: Its contemporary importance and aspects. *International Journal of Academic Research and Development, 6(4),* 69-74.
- 13. Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2021). Testing and assessment of speaking skills, test task types, and sample test items. *Language assessment and test preparation in English as a foreign language (EFL) education*, 119-173.
- 14. Hoff, E. (2006). How social contexts support and shape language development. *Developmental*

review, 26(1), 55-88.
15. Kellogg, S. E. (2018). Competency Based Education: best practices and implementation strategies for institutions of higher education. In *ProQuest LLC eBooks*.

https://digitalcommons.csp.edu/ cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=100 1&context=edd

- 16. Koutsoftas, A.D. (2013). School-Age Language Development:Application of the Five Domainsof Language across FourModalities.
- 17. Lambert, J., & Gong, Y. (2010).
  21st century paradigms for preservice teacher technology preparation. *Computers in the Schools*, *27*(1), 54-70.
- 18. Levine, E. & Patrick, S. (2019).
  What is competency-based education? An updated definition.
  Vienna, VA: Aurora Institute.
  Content in this report is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.
- 19. Mabasa, L. T., & Lumadi, T. Z. (2016). Teaching strategies for improving reading and writing in English First Additional Language for men and women. *Gender and Behaviour*, 14(2), 7489-7494.
- 20. Pareek, R. (2024). Content Integrated Language Learning-A Sustainable Approach for Language Learners. *New Paradigms of Sustainability in the Contemporary Era*, 25.
- 21. Ranjan, A. (2021). Language as an identity: Hindi–Non-Hindi debates in India. *Society and Culture in South Asia*, 7(2), 314-337.
- 22. Schindler, L. A., Burkholder, G. J., Morad, O. A., & Marsh, C. (2017).

Computer-based technology and student engagement: a critical review of the literature. International journal of educational technology in higher education, 14, 1-28.

- 23. Shaeffer, S. (2019). Inclusive education: a prerequisite for equity and social justice. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 20(2), 181-192.
- 24. Shamsiddin, X. (2024). The Subject is Interactive Methods that Develop Communicative Competence in Students. *International Journal of Pedagogics*, 4(05), 117-122.
- 25. Shobikah, Nanik. (2020). Competences in English. Journal of Research on English and Language Learning (J-REaLL). 1. 23. 10.33474/j-reall.v1i1.5280.
- 26. Shravani, K. (2024). Revitalizing
   English Language Teaching in
   India: Integrating Role-Play and
   Technology for Enhanced
   Communicative Skills.
- 27. Singh, Chandra. (2017). Hindi Language Competency of KGBV Students in Bihar. *Issues and Ideas in Education. 5. 127-141.* 10.15415/iie.2017.52008.
- 28. Sinha, C. (2015). Language and other artifacts: socio-cultural dynamics of niche construction. *Frontiers in psychology*, *6*, 1601.

- Vol. 14 No.1 Jan Feb -Mar 2025
- 29. Tayyaba, S. (2012). Rural-urban gaps in academic achievement, schooling conditions, student, and teachers' characteristics in Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 26(1), 6-26.
- 30. Terletska, L. (2024). The main features of teaching preschoolers a foreign language: effective tips and methods. *Перспективи та інновації науки*, (11 (45)), 84-98.
- 31. Tondeur, J., Van Braak, J., Sang, G., Voogt, J., Fisser, P., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. (2012). Preparing pre-service teachers to integrate technology in education: A synthesis of qualitative evidence. *Computers* & *education*, 59(1), 134-144.
- 32. Utami, N. P. (2023, July). The Role of Linguistic in English Language Teaching. In *Conference on English*

*Language Teaching* (pp. 544-551).

- 33. Vaidya, G. K. (n.d.). Content validation and rubric development of language tools tested in multi-state multilanguage project: Challenges Faced. International Association for Educational Assessment.
- 34. Weber, K., & Custer, R. L. (2005).
   Gender-based preferences toward technology education content, activities, and instructional methods.
- *35.* Weir, C. J., & Weir, C. J. (1993). Understanding and developing language tests. *Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.*
- 36. Zeng, W., Huang, F., Yu, L., & Chen, S. (2018). Towards a learning-oriented assessment to improve students' learning—a critical review of literature. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 30, 211-250.