International Journal of Literacy and Education

Oinam Sarita Devi
Research Scholar, Department of English, Mahatma Gandhi University, Meghalaya, India

Dr. KP Sousa
Research Guide, Assistant Professor, Department of English, Mahatma Gandhi University, Meghalaya, India

Bobby Mahanta
Professor, MGU, Ri-Bhoi, Meghalaya, India

Shital Aher
MGU, Ri-Bhoi, Meghalaya, India

English language learning difficulties in agricultural colleges of Manipur

Oinam Sarita Devi, KP Sousa, Bobby Mahanta and Shital Aher

Abstract
This paper tries to understand the English Language learning difficulties faced by the students in agricultural colleges of Manipur. It aims to examine English language learning difficulties outcomes based on six items of each social psychological and teaching methodology factors, and assess the extent of these difficulties across the different demographic contexts with Likert Scale of 5. The scale reliability is confirmed by the Cronbach's Alpha reliability score which is greater than 0.7. The finding of the study shows that the strong drivers of English learning is instrumental motivation whereas it also reveals that there is area of improvement in the field of teaching aids and classroom activities.

Keywords: English Language, Agricultural, Psychological, Teaching aid, Classroom Activities

1. Introduction

English language plays a pivotal role in education, research, and professional communication so mastery of the language will open more opportunities to accomplish both social and academic triumph in our country. English as a global lingua franca cannot be overstated, particularly in professional fields such as agriculture, where access to global knowledge and communication is vital. However, English language learning poses significant challenges in diverse educational settings, particularly in regions like in the state of Manipur, where linguistic and cultural diversity shape the learning environment.

Manipur is a place with vibrant linguistically diverse landscape where Manipuri, English, and Hindi are three main languages used for communication. Due to the multiplicity of mutually unintelligible languages coexisting in a symbiotic relationship, language contact situations arise where languages tend to influence each other in significant ways. In a multiple linguistic set-up like Manipur, there is always a possibility of having linguistic tension. Therefore, analysing the complex problems concerning society, language and teaching and learning of languages in a multilingual, multicultural and multi-ethnic society like Manipur has great theoretical and practical implications.

Manipur, a border region in northeastern part of India with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, students in agricultural colleges face unique challenges in acquiring English language proficiency.

It can be seen that the higher education and professional education scenario in Manipur has drastically taken a major turn as compared to recent times. It was only during the year 1993 that the first institution for agricultural education in Manipur (Manipur Agricultural College) was established in Imphal. Higher agricultural education is involved in the study of agricultural and agri-food development, natural resources, experimentation and innovation activities, but not without a higher level of English language. In specialised educational field such as agriculture, proficiency in English is particularly vital as it serves as a medium for career growth by accessing scientific literature engaging with global research advancements and employment opportunities.

The current agricultural institutions in the state of Manipur reflect this diversity, with students representing a wide range of linguistic backgrounds. Students frequently struggle to gain English competency due to little past exposure, ineffective teaching approaches, and a lack of language support systems adapted to their specific needs. Such obstacles can impair their academic performance and limit their capacity to engage with course content, impacting their overall competency in agriculture. The significance of addressing these difficulties extends beyond individual learners to the broader agricultural sector, where effective communication in English is essential for knowledge dissemination and professional growth. Understanding the root causes of these challenges and exploring strategies to overcome them

Correspondence Author;
Oinam Sarita Devi
Research Scholar, Department of English, Mahatma Gandhi University, Meghalaya, India

is crucial for improving language learning outcomes.

This paper aims to investigate the difficulties face by students in agricultural colleges of Manipur in learning English. By identifying the key obstacles and examining their implications, it seeks to contribute to the development of targeted interventions that can enhance English language proficiency and support the academic and professional aspirations of these learners.

2. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to identify and analyze the difficulties faced by students in learning the English language in agricultural colleges in Manipur. It aims to investigate the teaching methodology and social psychological factors influencing English language learning difficulties, and assess the extent of these difficulties across different socio demographic contexts such past education exposure. By understanding these challenges, the study seeks to provide actionable insights for improving language learning strategies and creating a supportive educational environment tailored to the unique needs of students in agricultural education.

3. Research Objectives

1. To study the English language learning difficulties based on items of social psychological (Instrumental motivation, Integrative motivation, anxiety, attitude towards learning English, parental encouragement, Desire to learn English) and teaching methodology factors (teaching methods in general, evaluation system, classroom activities, work to measure proficiency, teaching aids, methodology to understand real life application)
2. To examine the relationship among English language learning difficulties outcomes
3. To identify the impact of English language learning difficulties based on students' Class X medium of instruction and grading
4. To identify the impact of English language learning difficulties based on students' Class XII medium of instruction and grading

4. Significance of the Study

The significance of the study lies in understanding the difficulties faced by the students in learning English language in the agricultural colleges of Manipur. Further the data analysis will help in drawing insights for timely interventions catering to the unique needs of the agricultural colleges' educator, policymakers and administrators. The research may also serve as the foundation for future research.

5. Literature Review

This literature review explores the existing research study on English language learning difficulties, with relevant factors to the agricultural colleges of Manipur.

Social Psychological Factors

Anxiety is a significant social-psychological element that impacts language learning. Gardner RC and MacIntyre (1993) [7] define language anxiety as worry or apprehension about performing in a second or foreign language. Based on Gardner's model, a learner's positive attitude, high motivation, and desire to learn a particular language are all

important to be successful in achieving high language performance (Gardner, 1985) [6]. Studies in Bangladesh (Ahmed, T (2009) [2]), Pakistan (Riaz *et al.*, 2018; Saqlain *et al.*, 2014) [12, 14], Vietnam (Nhu, N. T. *et al.*, 2019) [10] highlights the importance of understanding students' multiple motivations, limited English language exposure, interest in learning English, attitude, anxiety and parental support. Agnihotri, R.K. *et al.* (1998) [1] study social psychological measures through attitude, motivation and anxiety in addition to personal background and language achievement in India context. Ruth, G. A. (2007) [13] investigates social psychological practices through background factor of English medium and Telugu medium students.

Teaching Methodology

Findings of the study related to Vietnam (Thi Nguyen *et al.*, 2014) [15], Turkey (Okmen, B. *et al.*, 2016) [11] highlight ineffective teaching method and style, limited student's centered approaches, classroom management challenges. Hussain, G. (2017) [8] emphasize on technological integration, administrative support and teacher training programe for effective English language teaching in Pakistan context. Teachers should adapt multiple methods to optimize teaching effectiveness and students centered approaches in Chinese university and college classroom (Yin, B. 2019) [17]. Walia D, 2012 [6] suggests for blended methodology of traditional and communicative language teaching approaches for effective language learning. Clement and Murugavel's (2015) [4] study highlights challenges in English communication among Indian engineering graduates hindering with gaps between teaching methodologies and students' confidence levels. Auquilla, D. O., *et al.*, (2019) [3]; Eraldemir Tuyan, S. *et al.*, (2019) [5] contributes with their related study the assessment-related barriers such as overemphasis on written exams, limited use of formative assessments, lack of feedback on speaking and listening skills.

6. Methodology

Research Design

To understand the challenges faced by the students and factors that influenced their English language learning proficiency, this study will be of exploratory research design. This research design will help in gathering the data through objectives so that it meets the objective of the study.

Sample

Sample Size: It includes 404 students from different agricultural colleges of Manipur.

Sampling technique: In order to select students from different semesters and colleges, a stratified sampling method is used, so that it ensures the diverse population.

Data Collection Methods

Survey: In order to collect the quantitative data a structured questionnaire will be developed. The questionnaire will comprise of the items on barriers which will include motivation, language anxiety, teaching methods and socio-economic influences.

Focus group Discussion: A group discussion will be conducted with the students in order to explore the insights into the language learning experiences faced by them as

well as the emotional barriers and perception of the current teaching methods that has been followed.

Data Analysis

- **Quantitative Data:** The survey responses will be analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, and means) to identify common barriers and trends. Inferential statistics (such as correlation and regression analysis) will be used to determine the relationship between socio-economic factors and language learning outcomes.
- **Qualitative Data:** The focus group data will be analyzed using thematic analysis. Key themes and patterns will be identified to understand the underlying factors affecting English language learning, along with participants' suggestions for improvement.

7. Data Analysis and Interpretation

This study includes 404 samples from distinctive different of private and government agricultural colleges of Manipur as under:

- Central College of Agriculture (COA), Government College
- College of Food Technology (CFT), Government College
- Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhyay Institute of Agriculture Science (PDDUIAS), Private College
- The South Asian Institute of Rural and Agricultural Management (SAIRAM), Private College

Majority of respondents/students belong to Government Colleges i.e., COA and CFT with 64.9% whereas Private colleges, i.e., SAIRAM and PDDUIAS have 35.1% respondents. The distinguishable result in respondents was due to the student's strengths being different in colleges.

Distribution of Medium of Instruction in Class X		
Language Types	**Frequency**	**Percent**
English	307	76.0%
Hindi	8	2.0%
Manipuri	6	1.5%
Others	24	5.9%
English & Hindi	10	2.5%
English & Manipuri	43	10.6%
English & Others	6	1.5%
Total	404	100.0

In the medium of instruction of the students while studying Class X,. 76% students opt for English as their medium of instruction in Class X, 10.6% as 'English & Manipuri' and 5.9% as 'Others'. 'Others' here refers to respective native or local language belongs to the specific area of the school.

Grades secured with range of marks in Class X (English Subject)		
Range of Marks	**Frequency**	**Percent**
C2 (41-50 marks)	26	6.4%
C1 (51-60 marks)	50	12.4%
B2 (61-70 marks)	92	22.8%
B1 (71-80 marks)	117	29%
A2 (81-90 marks)	89	22%
A1 (91-100 marks)	30	7.4%
Total	404	100.0

In X standard, majority of students (29%) secure the mark range of 71-80 (B1), students of 22.8% score in the range of 61-70 marks (B2) with 22% students in the range of 81-90 marks (A2). It also suggests here that the majority of students achieve a satisfactory performance and obtain higher average grade on their Class X exams.

Distribution of Medium of Instruction in Class XII		
Language Types	**Frequency**	**Percent**
English	307	76%
Hindi	10	2.5%
Manipuri	5	1.2%
Others	26	6.4%
English & Hindi	9	2.2%
English & Manipuri	43	10.6%
English & Others	4	1%
Total	404	100%

Major language used for teaching is English with 76% of the students believed that they received education in English. Likewise, 1.2% of students, equalling just 5 individuals, utilize Manipuri, the local language of Manipur as the medium of instruction. Only 2.5% students are taught primarily in Hindi, the national language. Additionally, 26 students, representing 6.4% of the total number of students, received education in a language that is not English, Hindi, or Manipuri, suggesting the potential use of a local or native language.

Grade secured with range of marks in Class XII (English Subject)		
Grades	**Frequency**	**Percent**
D1 (33-40 marks)	2	0.5%
C2 (41-50 marks)	7	1.7%
C1 (51-60 marks)	25	6.2%
B2 (61-70 marks)	116	28.7%
B1 (71-80 marks)	127	31.4%
A2 (81-90 marks)	115	28.5%
A1 (91-100 marks)	12	3%
Total	404	100.0

Most of the students in agricultural colleges secured average to good grades at English language in XII standard. The majority (31.4%) score mark range of 71-80 (B1), 28.7% of the students in 61-70 marks (B2), and 28.5% in 81-90 marks (A2).

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	Total No of Items
0.775	0.776	12

The reliability statistics of English learning difficulties include 12 items with a Likert scale of 5, which is Strongly Agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral (3), Disagree (2) and Strongly Disagree (1) suggests that the scale is relatively reliable with Cronbach's Alpha value above 0.7 generally indicates acceptable internal consistency. In contrast, a value closer to 1.0 indicates high reliability.

Sl.No	Item Statistics of Difficulties in English Language Learning		
	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation (SD)
1	My job prospect and future career will improve if I study English well in my Agricultural degree course (Instrumental Motivation) (SP1)	3.89	.995
2	I learn English as I want to know more about native English speakers and get in touch with them (Integrative Motivation) (SP2)	3.56	.915
3	I am afraid either my English Faculty will correct me or my classmate will make fun of me if I make mistake in my English (anxiety) (SP3)	2.81	.967
4	Learning English language is fun for me (Attitude towards learning English) (SP4)	3.57	.922
5	My family and parents encourage to study my English paper well and to contact my English Faculty if I have any problem with English (Parental Encouragement) (SP5)	3.67	.944
6	Compared to other courses, I like English (Desire to learn English) (SP6)	3.58	.897
7	I am interested by the methods of teaching English by my English Faculty (Methods in General) (TM1)	3.56	.931
8	Quiz tests and Semester exams of English Paper in my degree course are easy for me after attending classes regularly (Authentic Evaluation System) (TM2)	3.82	.807
9	Many interesting classrooms activities to practise English language and improve my English skills are regular (Classroom Activities) (TM3)	3.06	1.062
10	Project Work and Assignments are given regularly to measure our English language proficiency (Work to measure proficiency) (TM4)	3.19	1.022
11	Teaching of my English paper classes are done through Language laboratory and ICT i.e. computer/projector/mobile phone (Teaching Aids) (TM5)	3.09	1.110
12	After my course, I will be trained enough to face successfully the real-life application of English language (Methodology to understand real life application) (TM6)	3.59	.877

Students strongly believed that learning English in their course will improve their job prospects and future careers (mean = 3.89, SD = 0.995). Integrative motivation, such as the desire to learn English in order to interact with native speakers, scored slightly lower (mean = 3.56, SD = 0.915). Anxiety among the students was less pronounced (mean = 2.81, SD = 0.967) while learning English was generally perceived as pleasant (mean = 3.57, SD = 0.922). Parental encouragement played a notable role (mean = 3.67, SD = 0.944), and students showed moderate interest in English compared to other courses (mean = 3.58, SD = 0.897).

The teaching methods were well received (mean = 3.56, SD = 0.931), and the assessments practices were perceived to be manageable with regular participation in class (mean = 3.82, SD = 0.807). However, teaching activities (mean = 3.06, SD = 1.062), regular project work to measure proficiency of the students (mean = 3.19, SD = 1.022) and the use of teaching aids (mean = 3.09, SD = 1.110) showed room for improvement. Finally, after the course, students felt moderately prepared to use English in real-life situations (mean = 3.59, SD = 0.877).

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix												
	SP1	SP2	SP3	SP4	SP5	SP6	TM1	TM2	TM3	TM4	TM5	TM6
SP1	1.000	.398	.285	.539	.227	.225	.235	.085	.084	.092	.147	.145
SP2	.398	1.000	.233	.278	.374	.278	.320	.130	.234	.262	.219	.214
SP3	.285	.233	1.000	.181	.151	.302	.036	.007	-.009	.103	.065	.085
SP4	.539	.278	.181	1.000	.293	.183	.160	.132	.021	-.019	.110	.078
SP5	.227	.374	.151	.293	1.000	.348	.276	.126	.156	.192	.226	.182
SP6	.225	.278	.302	.183	.348	1.000	.195	.144	.018	.136	.065	.118
TM1	.235	.320	.036	.160	.276	.195	1.000	.404	.443	.381	.395	.364
TM2	.085	.130	.007	.132	.126	.144	.404	1.000	.349	.327	.260	.370
TM3	.084	.234	-.009	.021	.156	.018	.443	.349	1.000	.573	.380	.370
TM4	.092	.262	.103	-.019	.192	.136	.381	.327	.573	1.000	.335	.423
TM5	.147	.219	.065	.110	.226	.065	.395	.260	.380	.335	1.000	.361
TM6	.145	.214	.085	.078	.182	.118	.364	.370	.370	.423	.361	1.000

The inter-item correlation matrix assesses the relationships between various variables/items related to English language learning. Strong positive correlations are observed between attitudes (SP4) and instrumental motivation (SP1) (r = 0.539), suggesting that students who enjoy English also believe it improves their career prospects. Parental encouragement (SP5) is moderately correlated with integrative motivation (SP2) (r = 0.374) and desire to learn English (SP6) (r = 0.348), showing that family has an influence on motivation.

Teaching methods (TM1) are closely related to classroom activities (TM3) (r = 0.443) and assessment of evaluation systems (TM2) (r = 0.404), highlighting the importance of incorporating teaching in improving outcomes. Classroom

activities (TM3) and works to measure students' proficiency (TM4) are closely related (r = 0.573), suggesting overlap in experiential learning methods.

While anxiety (SP3) generally shows weak correlations with other variables, the matrix shows that motivation, parenting and educational elements are more strongly linked, highlighting their combined influence on English learning.

Scale Statistics Overall Items			
Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	Total No of Items
41.40	38.021	6.166	12

The scale statistics provide an overview of the overall measurement of English learning factors. The average score

of 41.40 indicates a moderate to high level of agreement or occurrence across all items. The variance of 38.021 and a standard deviation of 6.166 indicate a reasonable spread of responses and show some diversity in participants' perceptions or experiences. With 12 items on the scale, these statistics reflect a balanced representation of various factors that influence English language learning, including motivation, anxiety, parental support, attitudes, and teaching practices.

Raw Score	Z Score	Raw Score	Z Score	Raw Score	Z Score
21.00	-3.31	35.00	-1.04	47.00	.91
24.00	-2.82	36.00	-.88	48.00	1.07
25.00	-2.66	37.00	-.71	49.00	1.24
26.00	-2.50	38.00	-.55	50.00	1.40
27.00	-2.34	39.00	-.39	51.00	1.56
28.00	-2.17	40.00	-.23	52.00	1.72
29.00	-2.01	41.00	-.06	53.00	1.88
30.00	-1.85	42.00	.10	54.00	2.05
31.00	-1.69	43.00	.26	56.00	2.37
32.00	-1.52	44.00	.42	60.00	3.02
33.00	-1.36	45.00	.59		
34.00	-1.20	46.00	.75		

The Z Score and Raw score represent the respondents responses based on the English learning difficulties variables.

Z-Score	Level of English Learning Difficulties
1.75 & Above	Very High
0.48 to 1.74	High
-0.77 to 0.47	Average
-2.03 to -0.78	Low
-2.04 & below	Very Low

The Z-Score scale categorizes the degree of learning

difficulty in English language acquisition. Scores of 1.75 and higher indicate very high levels of learning difficulty, indicating significant barriers or challenges. Values between 0.48 and 1.74 reflect high levels of learning difficulty, where the problems are noticeable but less severe. A Z-score range of -0.77 to 0.47 represents an average level and implies typical or manageable learning challenges. Values of -2.03 to -0.78 indicate low difficulty and indicate fewer obstacles. Finally, scores of -2.04 and below indicate very low learning difficulties, indicating minimal or negligible challenges in learning English. This scale helps identify students who need tailored interventions based on difficulty level.

Respondent level on English Language Learning Difficulties		
Level of Learning Difficulties	Frequency	Percent
Very Low	9	2.2%
Low	78	19.3%
Average	196	48.5%
High	111	27.5%
Very High	10	2.5%
Total	404	100%

Data on respondents' level of learning difficulty in English shows that almost half of participants (48.5%) fall into the "average" category, indicating manageable challenges for the majority. Approximately 27.5% experience significant difficulty, suggesting that a significant proportion may require additional support. A smaller group, 19.3%, reported little difficulty, reflecting comparatively fewer barriers. Only 2.5% and 2.2% of respondents fall into the "Very High" and "Very Low" categories, respectively, representing extreme learning challenges. This distribution highlights the need for targeted interventions, particularly for those in the high and moderate-difficulty groups.

Level of English Learning Difficulties based on X Standard Medium of Instruction								
Level on Learning Difficulties		X Standard Medium of Instruction						Total
		English	Hindi	Manipuri	Others	English & Hindi	English & Manipuri	English & Others	
Very Low	Response	4	3	0	0	0	1	1	9
	%	1.3%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	16.7%	2.2%
Low	Response	70	1	1	4	1	1	0	78
	%	22.8%	12.5%	16.7%	16.7%	10.0%	2.3%	0.0%	19.3%
Average	Response	145	3	2	11	7	25	3	196
	%	47.2%	37.5%	33.3%	45.8%	70.0%	58.1%	50.0%	48.5%
High	Response	79	1	2	9	2	16	2	111
	%	25.7%	12.5%	33.3%	37.5%	20.0%	37.2%	33.3%	27.5%
Very High	Response	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	10
	%	2.9%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
Total	Response	307	8	6	24	10	43	6	404
	%	76.0%	2.0%	1.5%	5.9%	2.5%	10.6%	1.5%	100.0%
Pearson Chi Square value 76.135, P-value 0.001, Pearson Correlation 0.078								

The study investigated the relationship between the medium of instruction used in X standard and the level of problems in learning English by the students at XII standard.

The most frequently reported level of difficulty across all groups was 'Average' (48.5%), with a higher prevalence among students from English & Manipuri (58.1%) and English (47.2%) backgrounds. The 'High' level of difficulty was reported by 27.5% overall, with the highest percentages in the "Others" (37.5%) and 'English & Manipur' (37.2%) groups. A very low level of difficulty was reported by a very small subset (2.2%), primarily from

Hindi (37.5%) and English (1.3%) backgrounds.

Pearson's chi-square test for independence showed a statistically significant association between the medium of instruction and English learning difficulties, $\chi^2(22, N = 404) = 76.135$, p =.001, indicating a relationship between the variables.

However, The Pearson correlation (0.078) suggests a weak but significant association between the X standard medium of instruction and learning difficulties which highlights the need for tailored interventions to address the specific challenges faced by students of different media.

Level of English Learning Difficulties based on students' grade of X Standard (English Subject)								
Level on English Learning Difficulties		**Grade**						**Total**
		Grade C2	**Grade C1**	**Grade B2**	**Grade B1**	**Grade A2**	**Grade A1**	
Very Low	Response	1	1	2	3	1	1	9
	% X Medium	3.8%	2.0%	2.2%	2.6%	1.1%	3.3%	2.2%
Low	Response	7	7	11	24	19	10	78
	% X Medium	26.9%	14.0%	12.0%	20.5%	21.3%	33.3%	19.3%
Average	Response	6	24	50	57	45	14	196
	% X Medium	23.1%	48.0%	54.3%	48.7%	50.6%	46.7%	48.5%
High	Response	12	15	27	31	21	5	111
	% X Medium	46.2%	30.0%	29.3%	26.5%	23.6%	16.7%	27.5%
Very High	Response	0	3	2	2	3	0	10
	% X Medium	0.0%	6.0%	2.2%	1.7%	3.4%	0.0%	2.5%
Total	Response	26	50	92	117	89	30	404
	% X Medium	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi Square value 22.501, P-value 0.314, Pearson Correlation -0.109								

The analysis examined the association between the grade level the students were at in the X Standard English subject and the level of their learning difficulties in English.

Most of the students face an average level of learning difficulties in English (48.5%), followed by low level (19.3%) and high level (27.5%). Fewer students faced very low (2.2%) and very high difficulties (2.5%). The highest percentage of mean difficulty was for the Grade B1 students at 48.7%, and the lowest was for the Grade A1 students at 33.3% low difficulty.

Pearson's chi-square test for independence was conducted, showing that there is no statistical correlation between the grades and the level of learning difficulties in English, $\chi^2(22, N = 404) = 22.501$, p =.314, indicating that grade performances and the learning difficulties are mainly independent of each other.

The Pearson correlation coefficient was -0.109, which is weak negative correlation. It indicated a slight association between higher academic performance and lower learning difficulties; this effect was negligible and not statistically significant.

Level of English Learning Difficulties based on XII Standard Medium of Instruction									
Level on English Learning Difficulties		**XII Standard Medium of Instruction**							**Total**
		English	**Hindi**	**Manipuri**	**Others**	**English & Hindi**	**English & Manipuri**	**English & Others**	
Very Low	Response	4	3	0	0	1	1	0	9
	%	1.3%	30.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	2.3%	0.0%	2.2%
Low	Response	68	1	1	6	1	1	0	78
	%	22.1%	10.0%	20.0%	23.1%	11.1%	2.3%	0.0%	19.3%
Average	Response	144	4	2	11	5	27	3	196
	%	46.9%	40.0%	40.0%	42.3%	55.6%	62.8%	75.0%	48.5%
High	Response	83	1	1	9	2	14	1	111
	%	27.0%	10.0%	20.0%	34.6%	22.2%	32.6%	25.0%	27.5%
Very High	Response	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	10
	%	2.6%	10.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
Total	Response	307	10	5	26	9	43	4	404
	% LD	76.0%	2.5%	1.2%	6.4%	2.2%	10.6%	1.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi Square value 65.040, P-value 0.001, Pearson Correlation 0.067									

The "Average" level of learning difficulty was the most frequently reported category (48.5%), particularly among students from the "English & Manipuri" (62.8%) and "English & Others" (75.0%) mediums. The "High" difficulty level was reported by 27.5% of the sample, with the highest percentages among those from the "Others" (34.6%) and "English & Manipuri" (32.6%) groups. A tiny proportion of the sample reported the "Very Low" difficulty level (2.2%), mainly among Hindi-medium students (30.0%).

The Chi-square test for the association between XII standard medium of instruction and English learning difficulties was statistically significant, $\chi^2(22, N = 404) = 65.040$, p =.001, indicating a relationship between the two variables.

Pearson's correlation coefficient (r = 0.067) revealed a very weak positive correlation between the two variables, indicating the minimal practical significance of statistical association.

Level of English Learning Difficulties based on students' grade of XII Standard (English Subject)								
Level on English Learning Difficulties		**XII Standard Grade**						**Total**
		Grade D1	**Grade C2**	**Grade C1**	**Grade B2**	**Grade B1**	**Grade A2**	**Grade A1**	
Very Low	Response	0	0	0	1	4	4	0	9
	%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.9%	3.1%	3.5%	0.0%	2.2%
Low	Response	0	2	3	19	26	25	3	78
	%	0.0%	28.6%	12.0%	16.4%	20.5%	21.7%	25.0%	19.3%
Average	Response	2	4	12	54	56	62	6	196

		100.0%	57.1%	48.0%	46.6%	44.1%	53.9%	50.0%	48.5%
	%	100.0%	57.1%	48.0%	46.6%	44.1%	53.9%	50.0%	48.5%
High	Response	0	1	7	41	38	21	3	111
	%	0.0%	14.3%	28.0%	35.3%	29.9%	18.3%	25.0%	27.5%
Very High	Response	0	0	3	1	3	3	0	10
	%	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%	.9%	2.4%	2.6%	0.0%	2.5%
Total	Response	2	7	25	116	127	115	12	404
	% LD	.5%	1.7%	6.2%	28.7%	31.4%	28.5%	3.0%	100.0%
Pearson Chi Square value 26.72, P-value 0.318, Pearson Correlation -0.115									

The "Average" category remains the most common across all grade levels, with the highest proportions observed in Grade B2 (46.6%) and Grade B1 (44.1%). While high levels of difficulty are more common in grades B2 (35.3%) and B1 (29.9%), no clear pattern can be identified linking grade level to specific learning difficulties.

Pearson's chi-square test showed no statistically significant relationship between the two variables, χ^2 (22, N = 404) = 26.72, p =.318.

Finally, the calculation of Pearson's correlation coefficient (r = - 0.115) suggested that the association was weak negative meaning the better grades were only weakly related lower level of learning difficulties and not statistically important.

8. Conclusion
The study investigated the challenges of English language learning in agricultural colleges of Manipur are rooted in social psychological, teaching methodology factors multifaceted by socio demographic context of previous educational exposure. Based on the data analysis from both quantitative and qualitative data, the following key findings and recommendations can be derived:

9. Key Findings
1. English language learning difficulties
- A significant proportion of students reported language anxiety and a lack of motivation as primary barriers to their English language learning.
- Instrumental motivation was high, with students believing that English proficiency increases job prospects
- The fear of mistakes and anxiety were lower while parental encouragement and teaching methods played a notable role.
- A considerable number of students indicated that they preferred practical, conversational English instruction.
- Classroom activities, Work to measure proficiency and the use of ICT and teaching aids showed room for improvement.

2. Relationship among English language learning difficulties outcomes
- Motivation, parental encouragement and educational elements are strongly linked, highlighting their combined influence on English learning.
- Strong positive correlations are observed between attitudes and instrumental motivation suggesting that students who enjoy English also believe it improves their career prospects.

3. Medium of Instruction and Grading
- Medium of instruction in X standard with learning difficulties highlights the need for tailored interventions to address the specific challenges faced by students of different media.
- Medium of instruction in XII standard particularly in

English and bilingual combinations, plays an important role in the experience of students with learning disabilities.

10. Recommendations
Institutional Support
- To input language labs and technology based teaching aids
- To take utmost care in the selection of qualified Language faculty members for the Institutions
- Motivate the faculty members to attend training and seminars regularly to enhance an updated teaching skills

Suggestions for Improvement
- Motivate the students to communicate in English inside the classroom and campus
- Implement teaching approach keeping in mind the unique socio-linguistic environment and students' strength
- Friendly, learners' centered classroom, foster student confidence and motivation

References
1. Agnihotri RK, Khanna AL, Sachdev I. Social psychological perspectives on second language learning. New Delhi: SAGE Publications Pvt. Limited; 1998.
2. Ahmed T. Language learning motivation: What's on a student's mind when learning English language. BRAC Univ J. 2009;6(2):81-92.
3. Auquilla DO, Maggi MT, Camacho CH, Fernandez RA. Factors that influence Ecuadorian university students' motivation towards English learning: An exploratory research study. Revista Cientifica. 2019;5(2):736-766. http://dx.doi.org/10.23857/dc.v5i2.1122
4. Clement A, Murugavel T. English for employability: A case study of the English language training need analysis for engineering students in India. Can Cent Sci Educ. 2015;8(2):116-125. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n2p116
5. Eraldemir Tuyan S, Seringdag E. Revisiting the socio-educational model of second language acquisition in Turkish tertiary EFL context. J Lang Linguist Stud. 2019;15(2):450-469.
6. Gardner RC. Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation. London: Edward Arnold; 1985.
7. Gardner RC, MacIntyre PD. On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. Lang Learn. 1993;43(2):157-194. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1992.tb00714.
8. Hussain G. An evaluation of ELT situation in higher education institutions in Punjab, Pakistan. Eur J Engl

Lang Teach. 2017;2(3):143-167. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.826888

9. Kothari CR. Research methodology: Methods and techniques. 2nd rev. ed. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Limited; 2004.

10. Nhu NT, Minh DD. Factors affecting English language learning processes at Thai Nguyen University. Int J Sci Res Publ. 2019;9(8):463-469. https://doi.org/10.29322/ijsrp.9.08.2019.p9270

11. Okmen B, Kilic A. A research about the level of using language teaching methods and its effect on some variables: In Turkey. Univ J Educ Res. 2016;4(9):1994-2001. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.040909

12. Riaz M, Kamran K, Hashmi QA. Socio-psychological orientations in English language learning: A study of graduate level students. Glob Soc Sci Rev. 2018;3(2):41-54. https://doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2018(iii-ii).03

13. Ruth GA. English language learning at the tertiary level: A social-psychological perspective [dissertation]. Hyderabad: English and Foreign Language University; 2007. http://hdl.handle.net/10603/186656

14. Saqlain NU, Islam RU. Motivation in English language learning: A study of English language centers in Hyderabad. J Educ Soc Sci. 2014;2(1):71-87.

15. Thi Nguyen H, Warren W, Fehring H. Factors affecting English language teaching and learning in higher education. Engl Lang Teach. 2014;7(8):94-104. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n8p94

16. Walia DN. Traditional teaching methods vs. CLT: A study. Front Lang Teach. 2012;3:125-131.

17. Yin B. Discussion on the effective English teaching methods in universities and colleges. Rev Educ Theory. 2019;2(1):26. https://doi.org/10.30564/ret.v2i1.354