Chapter V

Experimentation

Communication

The primary function of language is communication, especially spoken communication. When we learn a new language, we should be able to speak in that language. Unless we are able to speak, though we can read and write, it remains language learning rather than language acquisition.

Communication is a process including three important factors - the sender, the receiver, and the message. The message acts as the link between the sender and the receiver. The sender sends an encoded message to the receiver and the receiver decodes it and sends the feedback to the sender and thus the communication process continues. The vital elements of communication are a) acceptance, b) understanding, and c) action. These are vital for the language teacher and the learner. The teacher and the student should be in the right frame of mind - teacher to convey the message and student to respond positively to the message - to facilitate better learning. This is acceptance. Understanding refers to the way in which a message is encoded and decoded. The language of the teacher should be free from ambiguity and unintended meaning. When the teacher and the pupils are in the right frame of mind, and the teacher is able to express himself spontaneously and clearly, he will be able to elicit expected responses and reactions from the students.

The teacher, as the source of communication, has a specific role in making the vital elements possible. First is the attitude of the teacher. He should have a positive attitude towards himself, the subject, and the audience. If he lacks even one of these
factors, the outcome will not be positive, especially in the case of language acquisition. If the teacher does not believe in himself or in his presentations, or does not like the subject or does not understand the audience, proper communication will remain a dream. Second is the knowledge of the topic and the audience. Effective communication takes place when the sender has a thorough knowledge of the receiver and the message. Since the teacher is the authority and guide, especially in a language acquisition class, he should be topic-relevant and audience-friendly. The design of the course should be relevant too. The language acquisition course for high school students and college students will naturally be different from each other. The course may vary according to students’ background, age, knowledge, etc. The third factor, social system, is also an important aspect in communication. The setting and the context, where communication takes place or learning happens, is crucial. The design of the language acquisition course can be different in the open air, in classrooms with limited space, or in schools with multimedia facility. Culture, the last important component in communication is also relevant in language acquisition. The culture of the speaker and audience, in a language class-teacher and students, matters a lot. The language style of the teacher should not collide with that of the students. Students’ mother tongue does not have rhyme, word accent, sentence accent, intonation, etc. So British style of speaking by the teacher, using accents and stress, may prevent the students from understanding what is intended. The communicator needs to understand the customs, rituals, life style, etc. to a certain extent. Ignorance of such cultural differences can create gap in communication process.

In India, especially in South India, classroom teaching/learning process is mechanical blindly following the conventional methods of teaching. Hence the students go for rote learning and form the habit of memorising the required answers. Even at the plus one/plus two level (class XI and XII) the students hardly get any interesting
exposure to English language and find the experience dull and boring and this affects the learning capacity. The researcher has been visiting other schools observing the classes and interacting with the teachers and students and he has been made to understand that motivation and interest alone can help the students to absorb the language naturally, in other words acquire the language. As in the case of mother tongue when language is acquired, it is long lasting, more or less permanent. But when one learns a language consciously it is a product of hard work and hence not very interesting and leads to early forgetting. Hence, the researcher developed learning materials and conducted the sessions keeping all these factors in his mind. Though games and activities appear simple on the surface level, in the particular classroom situation they provide a strong base for language acquisition.

The present research was undertaken with specific objectives and related hypotheses. Games and activities which are part of the methodology were carefully designed to suit the needs of the students at the same time will enable the researcher to prove the hypotheses and realise his objectives. In general. A sincere language teacher aims at getting expected responses and enthusiastic participation from his students. Unless the teacher takes into account the need, requirements and background of the students, he will not be able to elicit the expected responses. Hence the researcher carefully selected simple but effective activities and games which would make the students easily acquire oral skills; and enrich their vocabulary. The words were mainly chosen from their textbook at random to make them grasp the essence of the text on their own.

In general, the teacher-pupil relationship in India is highly conventional and there always remains a gap between them. In order to thaw the strain, simple exercises based on ‘I Love You’ sentence was purposely used. In continuation Of this exercise, more
serious exercises containing more complex sentences/activities were added. This chapter presents how the experiment was conducted followed by analysis and outcome of the experiment.

**Experimentation**

The difference between language learning and language acquisition is still relevant because of the solid arguments from both the sides. Learning is defined as conscious understanding of the rules and structures of a language. Through continued learning process, the learner is able to communicate in the target language. Acquisition is the unconscious internalizing of language through exposure in informal situations. Thus the learner acquires the language and he/she is able to listen, speak, read, and write as he/she does in mother tongue. Language games and activities create informal and interesting situations and draw the students into spontaneous participation.

The researcher used games and they helped in creating competitive atmosphere and in energizing the students. Winning games was a prestigious issue for the students. So they had to speak and do whatever they were asked to. The spirit of winning overruled the shame of making mistakes. Activities encouraged team morale and ensured individual participation. They helped in making individual performances and thus achieving expected results.

The researcher had to face many difficulties in conducting the experiments. During class days, it was not easy to get students according to the convenience of the researcher. His sample population was from four divisions and he had to conduct the pre-test, four sessions, and the post-test for all the batches. A pre-test was conducted in all four areas of language skills and only one period for each class was given. So the researcher had to take additional sessions in evenings and mornings to complete the
experiment. In total, twenty periods (five periods in each class, each period consisting of 45 minutes) were allotted for the researcher to conduct the sessions. So the researcher designed materials only for four sessions in class and one period was set apart for conducting the post-test. Since the post-test also included all the areas of language skills, the researcher was not able to finish it in one period. So the period allotted was taken for conducting writing skill test. Tests in listening, speaking, and reading areas had to be conducted individually for 200 students. It required a lot of time to meet and test them in three areas. So these tests were conducted taking additional sessions in the mornings and the evenings.

The researcher faced difficulty in designing and conducting the language games and activities. The games and activities had to suit the classroom style of the school. Alterations in the classroom setting were not easily possible since there were periods before and after the researcher’s sessions. But he utilised the first and last periods of the day, and the immediate periods before and after the lunch break. Since the classrooms had benches and desks, it was difficult to arrange them when group activities were conducted and it was not convenient for students to sit in groups. Chairs would have been a better choice. It is easy to form circles using chairs and students get the freedom of space and movement. The researcher had to plan, design, and implement the activity in such a way as to adjust with the limited infrastructure.

Another difficulty faced was not disturbing other classes. Of course, games and activities were learner oriented and they demanded sound and movement. But the researcher had no right to disturb the other teacher-oriented classes. So the researcher had to avoid too much sound and movement-demanding games and he had to tactfully arrange the group with proper instructions. The researcher had to make sure of the attendance of the students also. If there were too many absentees, the researcher could
not have conducted the session or test, since it would affect the outcome of the experiment. So, sometimes, the researcher had to postpone the sessions to another day and had to request the students to be present on that day.

Though the school has the multimedia facility, the room was very small and no movement was possible there. So the researcher had to conduct such sessions in the auditorium, installing all the facilities there.

Despite all these difficulties, the researcher was able to conduct the experiment systematically to achieve the desired outcome.

**Pre-Test**

The researcher conducted a pre-test before he started his designing of games and activities. Without understanding the current knowledge level of the students, no researcher can work on his lessons. The researcher’s focus was on language acquisition. So he had to know whether the sample population had already acquired or learned language proficiency in English. The pre-test enabled the researcher to get the preliminary data regarding the entry behaviour of the students.

The pre-test included all the four areas of language skills - listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Time allotted for testing writing skill was one hour and a maximum of thirty marks were awarded for it. Seven questions included vocabulary, sentence structure, meaning, grammar, comprehension, and paragraph writing.

First question was given for unscrambling of two words - “English” and “look” (gnihels, kolo). Most of the students could find out “look,” but they failed to identify “English.” Only very few students got full marks (two) for this question. These questions intended to test the spelling sense of the students.
Second question was to choose the appropriate word from the bracket. Students had to select the word by comprehending the meaning of the sentence and words given in the bracket. Two similar words were given in bracket like “tale/tail” and “conscience/conscious.” Unless the students knew the meaning of both the words given in bracket, they could not complete it properly. Most of the students found it easy to write the first one, but many of them could not do the second sentence. Marks allotted for question were two.

Question three aimed to check the knowledge of structure of English sentence and to check the tense awareness of the sample population. First question “I will bought a car next month” is to be corrected as “I will buy a car next month.” “We are write the exam now” as “we are writing the exam now.” Only a very few could get the frill mark (two) for this question. So it indicated that most of the students were not well versed in the use of appropriate form of tense.

In question four, students had to rearrange the spelling of the words given to get the word that has the meaning given in the bracket. “Meat (a group of people)” and “rose (painful)” were the words given. Identifying “team” out of “meat” was easier for students than identifying “sore” out of “rose.” Only a few could get two marks.

Students were asked to write the forms of “Be” in question five. It was to check impact of grammar teaching and learning in the English classrooms. Only twenty students wrote the correct answer. Many of them did not know what “Be forms” meant. But later, when the questions were discussed, most of them could answer “is, am, are, was and were” with the help of the teacher. So it was true that they had already learned it but pure technical learning did not help them even at their higher secondary level.
Language learning or acquisition involves inculcating all language skills. Developing reading skill is highly necessary. Reading skill leads to comprehension. That was why reading comprehension was included in the pre-test as question six. This passage was taken from their course book itself. Though it was a familiar passage, many of them could not understand the passage or write the answers properly. Some of the students were beating about the bush. Five questions were asked from the passage. There were two objective type and three descriptive type questions that carried equal marks. Though they could answer the simple objective type questions, they failed in descriptive type. They were good at picking up certain answers but failed in selecting and fine tuning the answers.

Question seven checked the paragraph writing skill of the students. Acquisition of a language means using of that language in any context or situation. Previous questions checked whether they knew the various elements of language. This question checked their ability in the creative use of language. They were asked to write a memorable incident in their life in about 200 words. Marks awarded for this question were ten. The marks were awarded based on correctness of language - grammar and spelling, clarity of meaning, expression of ideas, and based on the number of words. Majority of the students got marks between four and seven. Statistical analysis of the pre-test scores is given along with the post-test score at the latter half of this chapter.

Test for adjudicating reading skill was conducted for all the 200 students individually. Conducting reading, listening and speaking test individually had taken a lot of time. But it had to be done to ensure the credibility of the test. It helped in the post-test assessment also.

A slightly edited passage from the higher secondary course book itself was given for reading exercise. It was a speech of a Dr. APJ Abdul Kalam made in simple English.
The marks awarded for this area were twenty. The researcher assessed the students’ performance based on pronunciation, stress, meaningfulness, and clarity.

If the researcher had not given an edited version, after one or two presentations the students could have identified the passage and they would have come after practicing it. But in this instance, only the researcher had the exact copy and students could not do any malpractice. The students had to come personally to the researcher and had to face the three areas (listening, speaking, and reading) individually.

Compared to writing area, students showed better performance in reading skill test. Detailed analysis is made in the next part of this chapter.

Listening test was conducted immediately after the reading test for each student. The researcher read a story and the students had to listen to it carefully. After completing the story, the researcher analysed their listening ability by asking questions. Twenty marks were distributed for six questions - four questions carried two marks each and two questions carried six marks each. Two marks questions could be easily answered, but six marks questions demanded more attention and comprehension skill. There was the possibility of conducting this test class wise. The researcher could have read the story to the whole class and the students could have been asked to write the answer. But it was difficult to get another four periods and the researcher could not rule out the possibility of copying by the students. If the whole class had the same question paper, there was a possibility that the students could have copied from his neighbor, especially the answers to the objective type questions. So by giving individual test, the researcher could ascertain that the answers given by the students and ultimately the outcome of the research would be genuine.
Speaking test was the most important area for the researcher, since language acquisition started with acquiring spoken skill, which is the natural way of acquiring a language. Thirty marks were awarded in two sections. Section A carried four questions and twenty marks. It included Yes/No Questions and the students were required to give reason for the answer. Section B carried only one question having ten marks. Students had to introduce themselves. The purpose of the exercise was to get a spontaneous and unpremeditated answer rather than accurate and stilted answer, spontaneous presentation rather than concentrated pronunciation.

This test revealed a lot of things to the researcher. Students were not confident and some of them could not produce two sentences consecutively. Though they have learned something about the language, acquisition had not taken place. Comparing all the four areas, the pre-test result revealed that spoken proficiency was far behind the other skills.

The pre-test was an opening to the experiment. It helped to compare the students’ performance in the post-test. Based on the diagnosis of the students’ proficiency and efficiency, the researcher designed and conducted twenty sessions, five sessions in four classes, to suit the need of the 200 students chosen for the experiment.

Language Games and Activities

After analyzing the pre-test performance of students, believing that interactive methods of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) can create language acquisition, the researcher had designed and conducted language games and activities for the classroom. Four periods of forty-five minutes each were set apart to conduct the sessions and they were conducted in actual classrooms, except the session in listening activity. Since the multimedia room was very small, the researcher had to conduct it in the
auditorium. Out of the four sessions, two activities, one game and one combination of
game and activity were included.

Session I: Icebreaker
Area: Vocabulary
Time: 45 mts.
Materials: White papers

This was a combination of game and activity which included four stage: I -
group division, II - self introduction, III - last-letter-word-game, and IV - new group
formation.

Stage I: Group Division

The students were divided into six groups. The researcher prepared six sets of
papers with the words “For,” “Fore,” “Four,” “Form,” “Foam,” and “Font” written on it.
He divided those six papers into nine small pieces and made sure that each small piece
contained a word. Then he invited two volunteers and distributed those small pieces to
students. Each one got one piece of paper.

The following instructions were given to students before distributing the papers.

a. Each student will get a piece of paper.

b. No one should open the paper till it was allowed.

After distributing the paper, the researcher allowed them to open the piece of
paper. The researcher confirmed that the students understood the words in the paper.

Then he gave the following set of instructions:

a. This is a competition.
b. Each student has to identify the group he belongs to.

c. The paper in hand shows which group one belongs to.

d. The group can be identified by speaking out the word in the paper.

e. No one is allowed to show the paper to others.

f. Students can move around and find out other members.

g. There will be minimum six members in a group.

h. Those who are first to identify the six members can stand in a circle and applaud themselves.

i. The team that claps first will be the winners. If there is any inadvertent mistake in identifying their group, the points will go to the next group.

j. No one is allowed to speak in Malayalam.

There was a lot of confusion and some of the students formed incorrect groups. The researcher had to monitor the exercise. The students had to spell out the word loudly as there was a lot of confusion due to similarities in pronunciation and move around to find out their group. They formed the group within minutes. The teacher, then, verified the number of groups and number of students in each group.

Stage I of the session was really interesting since the students never had such an experience before. Instead of sitting and listening the students could stand and move around. They enjoyed the confusion created with words. Though everybody started announcing their word, within a few seconds they understood that most of the words sounded almost same. So they started spelling out the word and thus they formed groups. The researcher had to channelise them to avoid too much noise in the class, which might have been a disturbance to other classes also. The researcher felt that this activity could be one of the best icebreakers to bring the students out of their shell.
Objectives of Stage — I.

The researcher conducted Stage I with the following objectives:

a. To motivate the students to perform by dividing them into groups, (since the students are in teams, they are not anxious about individual performance).

b. To make the activity interesting by giving confusing words which have similar pronunciation.

c. To motivate the students to find out the differences (in spelling and meaning) of words given.

d. To listen to teacher’s instructions and understand them properly.

e. To energise the students with the feel that they are going to do something.

f. To instil in students the spirit of competition.

g. To make the students move around and to activate themselves.

h. To speak and then to spell out the word loudly.

i. To understand the similarity and difference in pronunciation of certain words.

j. To encourage fast movement and action which will keep the students lively.

The researcher felt that his objectives have been realised which motivated him to go further with the research. If the students had been asked to read out the words - for, four, fore, form, foam and font - at the outset itself, they would not have completed the exercise because of the inherent inhibition. In this activity, they had to pronounce almost all the words to understand the distinction and to identify their own words. Since everybody was concentrating on their respective words and group, they were not too conscious of their individual performance. *The loud* utterance of confusing words made the activity fun-filled and interesting. Initial and in-between directions given by the researcher were in English and the sample population followed those instructions and
completed the activity. Though some students had difficulty in understanding the exact meaning, they were also into the activity because of the group influence. As they were in the spirit of competition, most of them helped others to get into the group or to get out of the group. The whole exercise took about seven minutes.

**Stage II: Self-Introduction**

The students were standing in six different groups. Each member had to introduce himself to other members in the group. The researcher gave the following instructions for the introduction:

a. Everyone needs to tell his/her first name only.

b. After the name, a word must be added to describe themselves and that word should start with the first letter of the name, eg: Binto-Bold, Helen-Happy (Help of friends and teacher can be used).

c. They have to listen carefully when others introduce themselves.

After verifying that everybody had finalised his word, the researcher gave time for self-introduction. He identified the shortest persons from each group and asked them to start the introduction. The choice of the shortest person was done on the spur of the moment and does not signify anything. After the first person, the chance went to the person on the right side and it went on till the circle got completed. Same process was going on in six groups simultaneously.

After completing the introduction, the students were asked to tell the names of others and the descriptive word about them. Procedure for that is as follows:

a. The researcher instructed that each member of the group should have a specific number ranging from one to six.
The researcher called upon those numbers and confirmed that the procedure was complete.

When the researcher called each number, that particular student in each group had to use the descriptive word assigned to that particular number. Eg: Binto is Bold; Helen is Happy, etc.

The researcher called numbers at random, noted them down, and confirmed that all students got the chance to speak out.

While conducting the self-introduction the researcher had the following objectives in his mind:

- To overcome the inhibition to speak before others.
- To reduce the chance to speak in mother tongue.
- To find out descriptive/rhyming words to suit their names.
- To enable the students to speak in front of a group.
- To listen to what others speak.
- To reproduce other’s names and their descriptive words.
- To give chance to use the familiar words.
- To get introduced to unfamiliar words.

The objectives of the exercise were realised to a great extent.

After completing Stage II, the students were requested to sit in their respective groups. When the students were comfortable in the assigned groups the researcher went to the third stage of the session. The exercise took about eight minutes.

**Stage III: Last-Letter-Word**

Last-Letter-Word is a vocabulary game, based on the last letter of the previous word. This was given as a competition between teams.
The researcher gave necessary copies of a news item to each group. Each group got different news items. Students went through the news items and each group selected a particular word as their Lead Word. They were not allowed to announce it in public.

After ensuring that all the groups had identified their Lead Word, the Last-Letter-Word game was started. The researcher started the game by pronouncing a word. The first group had to tell another word using the last letter of the first word. Then it was the turn of the next group to tell yet another word using the last letter of the previous word. Thus the game went on. The researcher gave the following instructions:

a. Maximum time allowed for a group to tell a word is six seconds.

b. Each group has to keep an order for telling words. No one is allowed to make a second attempt till everybody in the group gets a chance to speak.

c. Repetition of words is not allowed.

d. Minus marking is there. It is registered as DONKEY. If one group makes a mistake “D” will be added to them. If they make another mistake “O” also will be added. Those who become “DONKEY” first will be out of the game and it continues with other teams. Again, the process will be the same. The last remaining team will get the prize.

e. Repetition of Lead Word of each group is allowed thrice.

f. Minus mark is awarded for taking surplus time to tell the word, repetition of words (except Lead Word), making mistakes (eg. When one group tells “entire” and the next groups says word with “r” instead of “e”), breaking order, etc.

g. No one is allowed to write anything anywhere.

h. Students can discuss words in group. But only the person concerned is allowed to speak out.
The researcher managed the game systematically, especially when there was confusion. After the winning team was selected, the researcher asked the students to identify the Lead Words of other groups. Students naturally got them since those words had been repeated thrice. The researcher wrote down those words on board and discussed the meaning also. Then each group read the sentence that included the Lead Word and others confirmed the meaning.

Students very actively participated in the game. The common excuse of students for not speaking in English was their lack of vocabulary. But this game made clear that most of the students had very good vocabulary. Half of the students from each group could tell words on the spot without anybody’s help. Some of them got help from their friends in the group. Since it was presented as a group-competition, it was prestigious for the teams to win. So all the group members supported others and all the groups put their maximum team effort.

Setting the time limit as six seconds for telling a word became a difficulty for students for five or six rounds. Giving words at the initial stages was very easy. Later, finding out words with often repeated letters like “e,” “s,” etc. became difficult. As repetition was not allowed, fixing a word within six seconds, sometimes, got them in trouble. So the researcher had to extend the time to seven or eight seconds. But it was not openly announced. Students were busy finding out words and so they did not notice the time. As they were not allowed to write anything, everything had to be stored in memory. But it made the game more challenging.

Participation of all the members was commendable. Normally there was the chance of brilliant students’ domination in such games. Others would remain passive. So the researcher brought in the second rule that gave all the members equal opportunity to speak. Otherwise it would have been a scholars’ show. Minus marking enthused the spirit. Being named “Donkey” was not easily acceptable for higher secondary students. So they played their level best to avoid that situation. As Skinner has pointed out, the
fear of punishment and pleasure of reward play a significant role in learning/acquisition situation and the researcher could experience it. The researcher had to be very keen in the following factors:

a. He had to be very sharp on timing.

b. He should make sure that no word was repeated. There were hot arguments from students regarding word repetition. So the researcher had to be very keen on this factor.

c. There were arguments from students regarding number of repetition of Lead Words also. So it demanded continuous teacher attention.

Students understood that it was not their lack of knowledge that prevented them from speaking but their lack of usage of words that blocked their confidence. Six Lead Words were introduced and explained in the class by the researcher with the help of students. So it was a better opportunity to acquire a new language.

**Objectives of Stage III**

The following were the objectives for stage III:

a. To familiarise the new word (Lead Word).

b. To develop the vocabulary skills of the students.

c. To stimulate the students’ brain to think and produce words.

d. To enable the students to feel the thrill of competition and thus to involve them naturally.

e. To equip the students to spell the words correctly.

f. To develop speed in vocabulary production.

g. To assist immediate response.
The researcher’s objectives were achieved to a great extent through Session III also. The Lead Words have been repeated thrice during the game and they were explained after the game was over. Thus those words became familiar to students.

The problem faced by the students during the game was not their ignorance of English words. They knew the words, but often they failed to produce those words in situations. Since they never had the opportunity to think about the appropriate words, even in the English examination, where they memorise and write, finding out exact words was difficult for them. They have never been trained in this habit. In writing, student often had the time to think and write. But the Last-Letter-Word game demanded oral production within six seconds. So students had to think and react simultaneously. Thus this game encouraged cognitive and psychomotor behaviour. Language situations demand spontaneous and on the spot reactions. This game provided a first level practice for it. About twenty minutes were devoted to this part of the exercise.

**Stage IV-Group Formation**

This was another group forming competition. The students had to make different groups of six members. Each student represented his Lead Word. Even their names were replaced by their Lead Word, for the time being. The new groups had to be a set of six different Lead Words. Students moved around and formed six different groups. When they got the full set (six different words/members) they formed a circle. Each student called others using their Lead Words.

Since the students had a previous group division experience, the researcher did not have much difficulty in grouping them. Students could easily follow the instructions and form the groups. It helped to disperse the existing group and form a group of new friends of new category. During the group forming process, all the students were
repeating the Lead Words. So it was a situation that demanded repetition, not memorised repetition for exam purpose. Students were actively engaged as they were doing it as a part of competition.

Group formation was completed within seconds and the researcher ensured the right combination. Instead of calling the names, the students addressed their friends using lead words. So it emerged as a venue for vocabulary acquisition.

Objectives of Stage IV

The group forming activity of Stage IV included the following objectives:

a. To acquire the new words.

b. To make the students repeat the words.

c. To give a second chance for students to move around (this may give more confidence to speak out words).

d. To recollect and utter new words then and there itself.

e. To acquire the lead word by personifying it.

The researcher could again satisfy his objectives for the stage. The natural oral reproduction of lead words gave the opportunity to acquire those words. Since the students got the experience in the pattern of Stage I, they could easily grasp the instructions. Some of them might have been inferring the meaning. It was a positive sign towards language acquisition that their listening and comprehension skills were improved. Personifying lead words made the activity more interesting. Students were after friends’ words, not after their names.

The researcher got the following feedback after the first session:

a. Group activities and games encouraged students’ initiative.
b. Science group students performed better and faster than humanities batch students. So the researcher had to take longer time for humanities batch to complete the session.

c. Classroom setting created difficulty in free movement and group formation.

d. Competitive atmosphere brought out the energy of students and they perform faster.

e. Students were not shy in group performance. They were shy when somebody was watching their performance. In group performance nobody watched, everybody performed.

f. Time factor was a challenge for the researcher. The session was tightly packed.

g. The researcher had to be very alert regarding classroom management.

With these convictions the researcher conducted the next session. The total time taken for this exercise was ten minutes.

Session II: Self Description: I am ... I can... I have ... and I love you

Area: Simple Present Tense

Time: 45 minutes.

Materials: Laptop and LCD projector

Stage I:

In this activity the students were divided into two groups. The researcher divided them by taking numbers “one” and “two.” All the “ones” formed a circle and the “twos” formed another outer circle. Thus the students stood face to face in their inner and outer circles. Then the students greeted each other saying “Good morning / How are you?”

The researcher gave them the following instructions:

a. Inner circle is Team A and outer circle is Team B.
b. Each student in both the circles should give a self-description to the person standing in front of him. It should be using I am..... I can..... I have.... and I love you.

The researcher gave the examples also.

“I am Mahesh. I can speak English. I have a brother. I love you.”

c. The chance will be given to one circle (Team A or B) at a time and the other has to listen carefully. When Team A is called every member in Team A has to speak and all members in Team B have to listen.

d. They should speak in an audible manner so that the person in front need not lean forward to the other.

e. Students can say as many sentences as possible using the above structures and the presentation should end with I love you.

f. Teams can start when their name is called with a “start” command and should wind up when “stop” command is given.

After both members in the pair completed their description, the members of one team (A or B) was requested to move to their first right. The members in the other circle had to remain there. Then each member got a new pair and they greeted each other. Then, when they got the “start” command they started self description and finished when they got the “stop” command.

This process was continued with five or six pairs.

In the second round, the team system and the moving process remained same. But when the members of Team A finished their presentation, members of Team B had to repeat the presentation replacing “I” with “You.” The same had to be reversed also. The researcher gave the initial demonstration and then the exercise went on as in the previous round.
For example: “You are Manoj. You can sing. You have a bike. You love me.”

In the third round the students had to describe somebody else that they had already met (preferably in the current exercise). The researcher suggested some examples too.

“He is Pramod. He can swim. He has a friend and he loves me.”

Here the team that was not moving in the previous two rounds was allowed to move and the other group remained still. This round finished after five or six steps.

Session II was different, in purpose and method, from Session I. The whole class was divided into two groups and they were asked to form two big circles facing each other. So all the students in the sample population had the initial movement and they understood that it was going to be interesting. It was visible from their speed of movement and from their body language. The researcher’s sample sentences helped the students to build their own sentences. The simple structure of the sentence gave them the confidence to form new sentences. Wherever they had doubt, they were allowed to get the help of their friends or of the researcher.

Some of the students, especially students from humanities batch lacked the knowledge of verb. So they developed sentences like “I can song.” So the researcher had to correct it. But he did not teach them the technical definition of a verb. The researcher gave many examples of verbs and clarified the sentence through “I can sing a song.” Majority of the students formed correct sentences. Since “I love you” was very familiar for them they enjoyed it well. Their only dissatisfaction was that they could not do the exercises in a mixed class.

Movement of circles helped the researcher in many ways. First, it could avoid, boredom and kept the students alive, though they were standing for a long time. Second, instead of talking to a single person, the students got the chance to mingle with most of
them. Face-to-face talk in the large group improved their confidence. Speaking English sentences, at the beginning stage, in front of a large group would have been a risk. Students might have lost their confidence. In the previous session they just repeated what others have told. Here, in Session II, they had to make their own sentences and after a few steps, they had to listen to others’ sentences and reproduce them. Since twenty-five students were presenting themselves, nobody was worried about the mistakes and they were comfortable that they were talking to one person only. Listening and speaking exercise kept the momentum of the activity and students were on the track of two essential skills of language development. Students did not feel shy when they were asked to speak aloud, because they were sure that only one person in front of them was listening to him. If it was a performance before the public, they might have hesitated.

Objectives of Stage I

The researcher conducted Stage I of Session II to achieve the following objectives:

a. To introduce simple present tense without giving a theory.

b. To provide simple sentence patterns in present simple.

c. To make the students utter sentences.

d. To instil the structure of English sentences using their own favourite sentence.

e. To continue practice in sentence making.

f. To develop confidence in speaking sentences.

g. To give practice in one-to-one conversation.

Stage I was planned well to achieve its objectives. In normal classrooms simple present tense was introduced in its theoretical way: subject + root form of verb + object/complement. The researcher felt that language acquisition should not be like
learning of mathematics. So the researcher introduced the sentence even without **mentioning** the term “simple present.” Though they could not get the term, they could understand the sentence pattern. Students could use “I love you” as model sentence pattern and whenever they made mistake students could make the corrections themselves. The researcher’s guidance was also there.

This was the first time that the students made three sentences about themselves. This was the first time that they listened to other’s performance and made sentences by changing the subjects. Students who were not in the habit of speaking English, started making their own sentence. It was true that they might have been following the pattern given. Still, it was an achievement of students. The researcher had to support and encourage some of the students in their presentation, since they were introverts. This activity helped the students to become comfortable in one-to-one conversation.

The researcher’s support was needed when the subject was changed into “he.” Some of the students in science batch and many of the students in humanities batch completed the sentence using “he have.” The researcher did not give any theoretical explanation, but guided them to use “has” instead of “have.” It took almost eighteen minutes to complete the session.

When all the presentations were over, the researcher moved to Stage II.

**Stage II: Picture Drawing Competition**

After completing the conversation exercise, the students were asked to sit in pairs, one facing the black board and the other just opposite to it. Students, who were not facing the blackboard, were asked to take a paper and a pencil.

The teacher showed a picture in the LCD screen. Those who sat facing the board could have a closer look. Then these students had to describe the picture to his pair and
he should draw the picture according to the instruction he received from his pair. The picture that maintained maximum similarity got the prize. The process was reversed also. The pair exchanged their seats and the teacher showed another picture and the competition continued.

In the first session, students started speaking words and in the first stage of second session they developed sentences and changed subjects and spoke continuously without changing the sentence pattern. Stage II was an attempt to form the students’ own sentences from their mind, without any help or guidance from the teacher.

The researcher did not expect the students to speak correct English. He wanted to make them speak. No marks were awarded here for speaking correct English. The researcher did not do the individual monitoring. Most of the students did not speak in English because they were afraid of making mistakes. In this competition students were ready to make mistakes as they did not have to worry about losing marks because of the mistakes.

Only one of the pair was facing the LCD screen. So there was no chance of cheating. Student spoke English to a certain extent. In science batches the number of students who spoke better English was high. But in humanities batches majority of the students spoken in broken sentences. Still, they had the courage to speak. Those who drew the picture were not allowed to ask any question. They had to follow the sentences of the speaker.

When the exercise was reversed students got little more clarity. Then points were awarded to the best picture. With the comments of the researcher, students could compare the pictures and in the next round instructions became more clear. It was visible from the better quality of the picture drawn in the next round. Communicative Approach insists on developing fluency first and emphasise that accuracy would automatically
follow. This is an important component in language acquisition. The researcher could visibly feel the transference of the theory into practice.

**Objectives of Stage II**

The researcher had to achieve the following objectives through picture drawing competition:

a. To initiate students to speak in English.

b. To prepare the students to give instructions.

c. To comprehend the instructions and act on it.

d. To make link sentences one after another.

e. To think and speak based on a given item.

Imperatives do not demand subject. Instead of “You take left turn,” “Take left turn” is enough. Most often, students are familiar with such a language. That is why the researcher included this instruction giving exercise in this session. Some of the pictures were not properly drawn. It was not because of the mistakes in the language alone; but lack of drawing sense, co-ordination, etc. also affected the outcome. So the researcher could achieve his objective by enabling the students to give instructions in their own language.

The researcher could watch some of the students display comprehension indicating words like now, then, o.k., finished, etc. For the listener it was a listening comprehension work too. They had to follow instructions of their friend and they had to draw in the way they understood. They were not allowed to ask any questions. This stage needed twelve minutes for completion.

After evaluation and appreciation the researcher went ahead to the third stage.
Stage III: Brain Storming and Sentence Making

After the pair work, students were asked to sit back in the usual classroom style. The researcher asked questions about their habits and elicited answers from them and the Researcher helped them wherever necessary.

Eg: Do you read newspaper? I read newspaper
Do you speak English? I speak English
Do you watch movies? I watch movies

Then the students were asked to talk about their routines - about their getting up, brushing, breakfast, newspaper reading, home works, etc. The researcher gave them some examples.

“I get up at 5 O’clock. I brush my teeth.”

Two minutes were given for preparation. Students were ready with minimum five sentences. They were not allowed to write down the sentences. After the allotted time, students were asked to stand in two circles as Team A and B. All the previous rules were followed there also. As the teacher gave “start” command with the team name, the members of that team spoke about their routine and then the turn was for the members of Team B. After that one team made a move and the same continued for five or six times.

Equipped with better vocabulary production, students started making sentences in English. Then the researcher wanted the students to speak continuous sentences in English. Any communication is in the form of discourse. That is why he has introduced this activity.

When the researcher asked the question “Do you read newspaper?” most of the students answered that “I read newspaper” or “I am reading newspaper.” Without pointing out the error in construction, the researcher gave the correct form of answer - “I read newspaper” and made the students repeat it. This enabled the students to acquire the
language. For the other questions, majority of the students gave correct answer in simple present tense.

The researcher’s example on explaining routines helped the students a lot. They prepared similar sentences about themselves. Discussions were allowed during the two minutes’ preparation. Students discussed among themselves and some of the students raised doubts. The researcher helped them individually. They prepared themselves for the presentation. Most of the students performed well in their circles. Some of them were slow in their presentation and very few students, especially who performed very low in the pre-test, found it difficult to speak. Since they were moving after the presentation by each pair of students, they did not have the feeling of repetition.

**Objectives for Stage III**

The following were the objectives at the Stage III:

a. To enable the students to make sentences in simple present.

b. To give confidence to speak out complete sentences.

c. To make the student speak in English at least for continuous thirty seconds.

d. To create an atmosphere where everybody speaks English.

e. Not to give too much time to think in Malayalam and translate.

f. To help them to think in English.

Students could learn the pattern and meaning of simple present tense through this exercise. Some of them could utter more than ten sentences. Many of them were able to speak in English for minimum twenty seconds. Their confidence to speak in English was visible in their presentation. Even those who were hesitant to speak at the beginning of the exercises, showed improvement. They could perform better in their fourth or fifth presentation. The researcher took special effort in identifying such students and appreciating them. That public appreciation worked well. In each round, fifty students in
the class were speaking in English at least for a few seconds. The researcher pointed out this general improvement and the whole sample population was motivated.

During the discussion, speaking in English was compulsory. By this time the students were not afraid and silent. They spoke English. When they talked to the researcher, there were mistakes but instead of correcting the mistakes then and there, he encouraged them to speak. Even the process of thinking in Malayalam and translating into English started gradually disappearing. The mistakes were a positive sign towards language acquisition. The researcher could believe that when a group of students listen and speak, even with mistakes, a new language even for forty-five minutes, it would change even their thinking. Thinking normally shifted to the target language English. Fifteen minutes were taken to complete this stage. After completing Session II, the researcher prepared himself for the next session.

Session III: Hot Seat
Area: Yes/No Questions
Time: 45 mts.
Material: Paper strips

This session included two stages - Group Division and Hot Seat game - both to acquire the Yes/No type questioning skill.

Stage I: Group Division through Yes/No Questions

The researcher with the help of two student-volunteers distributed the pre-arranged paper strips to students. The plan was to divide the students into six groups under the names - Sachin, Gandhiji, Ambani, Mother Teresa, Bachan, and Pele. These names were written in the strips. Students were not allowed to open the paper till they were asked to do. When all the students received the strips the teacher gave them the following guidelines:
a. Students can open the paper and find out their personality, when they get the start command.

b. No discussion is allowed among students and doubts can be clarified only with the teacher.

c. Students have to find out the persons with the same names.

d. The only way to find out the person is to ask “Are You Sachin/Gandhiji?”
   Answers can be “Yes/No.”

e. When they find out eight members, they can form the group and stand in the circles.

When the students were in the process of group formation, the researcher moved around and observed them. The researcher, after understanding each group’s position asked each group “Are You Sachin?” “Are you Bachan?” and so on. Then the students replied “Yes, we are.....” Teacher repeated it twice. Each group got twelve chances to listen to the question and two chances to speak out the answer.

The group division itself was a helping activity to main language game - Hot Seat. Instead of teaching the role of helping verb in questions and the stating the difference between the structures of statements and questions, the researcher directly gave examples of Yes/No Questions. Students used those examples to find their groups. During the group formation process itself each one of them asked questions in the same pattern minimum ten times. Some of the students could not ask questions at the beginning. They were first moving around. But after a few seconds, everybody started asking questions. As everybody was moving around asking the question, they could easily get a pattern and they became confident too. The spirit of competition also motivated them. They had no other way, but to ask. Then, when the teacher asked them
“Are you Sachin?” “Are you Bachan?” etc., to confirm their groups, it was a listening and learning experience for them.

Here the students were faster in group formation process. Since they had the group making experience they knew the rules. Only the method of group division was different. It was designed to suit the purpose of the session.

The researcher had to manage the noise in the class to ensure that the activity was not disturbing other classes. The researcher had to make sure that students had formed their groups correct. There was the possibility of forming certain interest groups. So the researcher monitored carefully and dismissed the chance. When the researcher raised the question like “Are you Ambani?” he noticed the responses of the students. If anybody was seen not answering, he repeated the question to the same group and ensured that everybody was answering.

**Objectives of Stage I**

The researcher conducted this stage with the following objectives:

a. To make the students ask Yes/No Questions.

b. To listen to questions and answer either yes or no.

c. To learn the question pattern to use in next stage.

d. To make the students comfortable with the new pattern.

The researcher conducted this group division as a preparatory session for Hot Seat game. In the Hot Seat game students were expected to ask Yes/No Questions frequently. Questions were asked individually. So the students had to get confidence to ask questions. So the main objective of the stage was to make the students confident and comfortable with the question pattern. Since they got many chances to ask questions, they could ask questions in the next stage also.
After asking question and confirming the groups the students sat in their respective groups. All the groups were arranged in semi-circle facing the blackboard. A chair was also arranged in front of each group as a preparation for next stage. This part of the exercise took ten minutes of the total period.

Stage II: Hot Seat

This game is to improve the questioning skill, Yes/No Questions, of the students. It necessitates individual performance. The researcher first gave the students a model of the game. He arranged a chair in front of the students. One student was invited to sit on the chair. Instead of the researcher selecting anyone, the choice was given to the students to volunteer. The person on the seat was asked to think of a personality. The only condition was to select a well known personality. He was not allowed to select his neighbour, teacher or friend, unless the person was famous. Then it was the turn of the audience to find out the personality. They could ask a limited number of questions. If they were able to identify the person within those numbers of questions, they would win the game. If they failed, the person on the Hot Seat would win it.

Rules:

The following instructions were given to students to make the game alive:

a. Maximum number of questions allowed is twenty.

b. Only Yes/No Questions are allowed.

c. Person on the Hot Seat is allowed to say only Yes/No.

d. Everybody should ask questions.

e. No one can ask more than three questions.

f. Second question from a student is allowed only after everybody finishes his first question.
g. Direct question like “Are you Sasi Tharoor?” is not allowed.

h. Maximum time for a student on Hot Seat is four minutes.

In the model presentation the audience won the game. The personality was Sreesanth, fast bowler. The students had a clear idea about the game. After clarifying the minor doubts, the researcher conducted the game simultaneously for all the groups.

Each student was allotted a number in the respective group. The researcher verified it by calling out their numbers. When the researcher called a number, that person had to sit on the Hot Seat in front of the group. When they got the “start” command they began the game. They had to finish before the “stop” command. Audience had two options: either four minutes or twenty questions. They had to find out the personality either by asking twenty questions or they had to complete it before four minutes. The researcher was moving around and corrected the questions if needed.

The students participated in the game very actively. Since it was conducted in all the groups simultaneously, the researcher could saved time also. If it was conducted separately, two and a half hours would have been needed to finish it. Moreover, most of the time, many of the students would have remained silent. Here, as maximum number of students in each group was eight (in two groups - nine) everybody could ask minimum two questions. Since it was conducted for all the members in the group, all students got the chance to ask minimum fourteen questions. Though the sample population had difficulty in asking questions, at the beginning stage, after the performance of two or three students everything went on well.

It was not merely a matter of question phrasing. The students were allowed to ask only twenty questions. So they could not miss any question. They had to think and ask. For example after asking “Is the person male?” they did not have to ask “Is the person a
female?” So the students thought a lot and answered. Everybody was speaking in English from Stage I itself. So they had been in English speaking atmosphere. Student’s preparation of questions was also connected to the previously asked questions. Those questions were also in English. So their thought process also might have been in English. So the researcher felt that this game could also be one step forward towards language acquisition.

Students got the rare chance to sit in front of a group and answer the questions. By observing others’ experience and from their own experience students could face the audience and answer the questions. This was one of the objectives of the researcher. Since they had to guess at the identity of the person in mind they did their best to ask relevant questions. Thus it resulted in developing twenty questions in a round. Even those students who were not good at their performance started to ask questions. It might be because they were familiar with the common introductory questions. But since the rule of rotation was there for asking questions, they could not ask all the introductory questions at a time. They had to wait for others to complete. So such students also had to think and ask questions. In Hot Seat, questions were more important than answers. Answers were either “Yes/No.” So the students got situational training in asking questions, they got the opportunity to understand the questions pattern. Questioning skill is most essential even to continue a conversation. Otherwise, the dialogue becomes monologue. Most often, even when the students claim that they talk in English, the conversations from students’ side remain answers to certain question. They did not initiate or continue the conversation by asking questions. It might be because they did not get any training in questioning. Hot Seat game prepared them mentally and linguistically to ask questions.
The researcher had certain difficulties in conducting this game. Arranging the students in semi-circle, that too facing the audience was not easy. The infrastructure of the class did not facilitate such arrangements. So the researcher had to reshape the sample group to fit the classroom space. The researcher had to manage the simultaneous presentations. In some groups students identified the person within ten questions, whereas in some groups the audience could not find out even after asking twenty questions. So there was time variation in the presentation of each group. The researcher had to adjust it. Those who finished early were asked to listen to the presentations of other groups. All the groups went together in each round. In spite of such difficulties, the researcher could complete the exercise successfully.

After the game was over, students were asked to tell the common questions they asked. They gave some of the questions as follows.

a. Is the person a male?

b. Is he/she an Indian?

c. Is he a sportsman/an actor/an author/a politician?

d. Is he alive?

e. Is he married?

f. Did he get any award? etc.

When they repeated the question, the researcher believed that the competition is in the right track of language acquisition.

Objectives of Stage II

The objectives behind this game were the following:
a. **To get the confidence to sit in front of a group and answer.**

b. To have the experience of getting twenty questions on a single topic.

c. To develop the skill of questioning.

d. To think and prepare topic related questions.

e. To create a situation to discuss in English,

f. To divert the thinking process to English (since the key words on topic and question patterns get familiarised).

g. To understand the difference between Yes/No Question and Wh- Question.

This exercise took about thirty minutes.

**Session IV: News and Story**

Area: Listening and Speaking

Time: 45 mts.

Materials: Laptop, LCD projector, Speaker system, and Stories

Session IV was specially set apart for listening and speaking activity. It included two stages: one for listening and the next for speaking practice.

**Stage 1: Listening to News**

The researcher played the video of English news reading. It was a five-minute video downloaded from *YouTube*. Students listened to the complete news twice and then the researcher played it sentence by sentence. After each sentence the researcher paused and asked the students to repeat it. Since the sentences were long, the researcher paused at meaningful intervals and asked the students to repeat. The researcher corrected their speed, pause, stress, tone, etc. The students repeated half of the news like this. The researcher assured that everybody was following the news and doing the exercise.
Students had many opportunities to listen to English in all the previous sessions. They listened to words, phrases, and sentences during group division, self introduction, Hot Seat, etc, both by their friends and by the researcher. This session gave them the experience of listening to a professional news reading. Thus the students were introduced to pronunciation, stress, accent, etc and they had the practice in those language features.

After the first step of listening, most of the students could not understand anything except some words. When it was played for the second time, the students were asked to pay keen attention. Second listening helped them to pick out the names, certain incidents, etc. So the researcher played the news sentence by sentence. For longer sentences, the researcher paused at the meaningful intervals. This broken-up presentation and repetition gave them the time to think and grasp the meaning. When the researcher asked the sum up of the news after this step, majority of the students responded. A few of them could be quite accurate. Rest of them interpreted with little variation. Even to give the meaning of the words in the news item, mother tongue was not allowed. They spoke only English. Though there were mistakes, their effort had to be appreciated. Some of them tried to repeat the words and phrases from the news itself. This exercise was designed based on two psychological principles: first, when you move from simple to complex, it facilitates learning/acquisition; second, acquisition is possible and feasible only through exposure.

**Objectives of Stage I:**

The following were the objectives at the Stage I:

a. To enhance the listening skills.

b. To imitate the speed, tone and, stress of the original news item.

c. To make them understand meaningful pauses.


d. **To keep the verbal pace in team exercise.**

e. To make them aware of their own issues in speaking (pronunciation, stress, speed, etc.).

Through the “news listening” exercises, they could get exposure to the way English has to be spoken. Apart from the interaction with friends and the researcher, listening to the news reading helped them to understand the improvement they needed to have. Since it was conducted as a group activity, they did not have the inhibition to make mistakes in pronunciation, stress or intonation. They tried their best to repeat in the exact manner. Most the students were not in the habit of listening to news or programme, because of the preconceived notion that they would not understand anything. By listening to a live newscast, they got the confidence that, if enough time is spared and keen attention is given, they could also follow and grasp the language.

When reading skill was checked in the pre-test, the major problem felt in the presentation was lack of understanding the meaning of what they read. They had been reading without proper pause. This exercises helped them to be conscious about the meaning of the text also.

The researcher had to pay special attention to the individual. Since it was a group exercises, there were chances of murmuring and escaping. So the researcher had to follow each individual to ensure that everybody was following the task. Some of the students could not follow and replicate the speed of the news. When some of them presented well and some others were not up to the mark, there was the chance of being laughed at. So the researcher had to motivate them and build up their confidence. The researcher asked them to have more practice and assured his special help later. This session was conducted outside the class, because the audio would be a disturbance to the other classes. Moreover, the audio-visual room in the school was small.
After giving feedback and comments on students’ presentation, the researcher went to the next stage of story telling. This part of the session took twenty minutes.

Stage II: Story Telling

The students had to be in six groups. Students in adjacent benches sat face to face and formed a group. A volunteer was selected from each group and they stood up. The researcher gave a story each to the six volunteers. All the stories were different. When the teacher gave the green signal, volunteers read the story to their group. Instructions to the volunteers were as follows:

a. Read the story loudly so that everyone in the group can hear  
b. Let your voice not be a disturbance to others.  
c. Read slowly and with pause so that others can follow.

Everybody in the group listened to the story. The volunteer read it twice. After the first reading, the researcher checked whether everybody had understood the meaning of the story and allowed discussion. Then the volunteer read the story again.

After the second reading was over, students were allotted numbers in their group and thus each student got a number. When the researcher called a particular number (for example No. 4), that number (No. 4) in all the groups presented the story in their own way. All the other students listened to the stories. The presentation continued one after another as the researcher called the numbers.

After all the presentations, each group had to select their best performer. Everybody appreciated them and those six outstanding performers got the chance to present their stories before the whole class. The researcher gave necessary corrections after the presentation.
The researcher did not take too much time for group discussion. Since it had been conducted twice, it would not be much interesting. Moreover, time limit did not permit the researcher to conduct such activities in the session. Here also the researcher did not choose the pupil for reading. He might have picked up some readers for the task. So the choice was given to the students. The researcher revealed the task only after selecting the volunteers. Otherwise, if the students got some idea of the task to be done, they would have selected better language performers. So the researcher got different types of students to do the task. Two were very good performers and others were average students. But their presentation did not create much difference in the understanding of the story.

The researcher had to monitor the reading also. Two were not audible. So the audience had to lean forward to listen. Then the researcher interfered and helped them to read aloud. The researcher had to manage the time variation also. Because of the difference in the length of the story and because of the difference in the speed of reading, some students finished early and some late. After the first reading, the researcher asked questions like the following:

a. What is the title of the story?

b. Name the characters in the story.

c. What is the story about?

**Objectives** of Stage II

The following were the objective at the Stage II:

a. To get the chance to listen to their own reading style.

b. To understand the meaning by listening.

c. To improve the comprehension skill.
d. **To reproduce what they have been listening to.**

e. **To have small discussions in groups.**

£ **To have the confidence to learn from mistakes.**

g. **To develop the skill of restating the story.**

All the sessions were completed within time limit. A maximum of five minutes were taken in some of the sessions. Students participated in all the sessions very actively. The researcher could feel the difference between his own textbook-based ordinary classes and the interaction-based sessions. About twenty-five minutes were devoted to this stage of the exercise.

**Post-Test**

After completing the four acquisition-oriented sessions, it was the responsibility of the researcher to check the reliability of his session. So the last session was set apart for conducting the post-test. It was conducted, as in the pre-test, in all four areas of language skills.

The pre-test was conducted in the order of writing, reading, listening, and speaking. In the school curriculum, prominence is usually given mainly to the writing area. All the other areas are neglected. So the researcher conducted the written test first, followed by tests in other areas. He had to test all the skills, though they were ignored in the school curriculum, to ensure the reliability of his work. The post-test was conducted in listening - speaking - reading - writing order. This is how one acquires mother tongue. The researcher’s point of view was also to assist the students in language acquisition as in the case of mother tongue, rather than language learning. So he included listening and speaking-oriented activities in his sessions. So the first tests were on listening and speaking skills. Since the researcher wanted to check whether development
in these two areas would naturally lead to development in other areas (reading and writing) as stated in the hypothesis, he tested those areas too.

In the listening test, an unfamiliar passage was read and six questions were asked based on that passage. In the pre-test, it was a story and the difficulty level was very low compared to the post-test. As in the pre-test, four questions of two marks and two questions of six marks were asked. First two questions, “What is Maya?” and “What is Daya?” were very easy to pick up from the text itself. Third and fourth questions needed a second reading, still not much difficulty to distinguish and confirm the correct answer. Fourth and fifth questions demanded clear understanding of the meaning of the text. The students had to rephrase and rearrange the sentences to get the right answer.

The researcher invited the students individually and conducted the test. As in the case of the pre-test, since there was the chance of copying, the researcher did not want to conduct a common written test. Though it was time consuming, the researcher wanted to get specific results. The difficulty level of the test was high and the performance level of students was also equally high. Test analysis is detailed in the next part of the thesis.

The researcher, then, conducted the speaking test. The researcher kept the exact pattern of the pre-test for the post-test also. As in the pre-test, questions were asked in two sections - Section A and Section B. Section A included six questions, any four questions were asked in random. This was to avoid pre-planned presentation of the students.

The post-test was designed to check the impact of the sessions the students had undergone. So there were questions to elicit the expected answers on the basis of the sessions. First questions in both the tests (Pre-test: “who is your favourite actor?” Why?”; Post-test: “Who is your best friend? Why do you like him?”) were similar in nature and in difficulty level - a name and the reason to select that name had to be
explained. Question two in the pre-test ("Who is your favourite actress? Why?") was similar to question one. But in the post-test, question two ("Whom do you support in the election - LDF/UDF? Why?") was slightly different. Students had to speak about a political party and their actions. Students could replace person with party and they answered.

Question three in the post-test was a Yes/No Question and its explanation ("Can you sing? What else can you do?"). It was a question about their abilities. There was an activity on making sentences using "can." The students had to identify it and answer the question. Third question in the pre-test ("Which country has the best cricket team? Why?") was in the same pattern of its previous questions. Question four also checked the impact of the session ("Tell five sentences using I am …"). Students were asked to talk about themselves using I am. In fourth question of the pre-test, students were asked to talk about their ambition.

Students were asked to prepare questions to interview the researcher in the fifth question. As students learned to ask Yes/No Questions during the session, the expected outcome was asking such questions. In the pre-test, no questions were included to check their questioning skill. The researcher thought that it would be much difficult for them. To make the questions more easy, the last question in the pre-test was to talk about their mother ("Do you love your mother? Why?"). But in the post-test, confident that the students can speak sentences, the researcher included a question to express their opinion ("Do you like regular English classes or activity oriented classes? Why?").

Session B, in both the tests, was self-introduction. Ten marks were awarded for it. The students were expected to speak five to ten sentences about themselves. The researcher did not change the question to trace the exact behavioural change. The researcher could specifically check the performance level in both the tests.
An unknown passage was given to check the reading skill in the post-test. It was a story. In the pre-test, it was a familiar passage from their course-book itself. The performance, compared to other areas, was better in the pre-test. Since the students had undergone four sessions they might have improved their skills. Hence an unknown story was given in the post-test. The difficulty level also was higher. Out of the twenty, the marks were given based on meaningfulness, stress, intonation, and pause of the reading. Since it was a story, those who could present it dramatically got higher marks.

As in the pre-test, written area included seven questions to check the various aspects of language. First question was unscrambling of two familiar words. It was known to the students because those two words (‘regular’ and ‘installation’) were taken from the “lead words” they used in the previous session. It was true that lead words were different in four batches. But these two words were there in all the batches. Therefore the researcher selected these words for unscrambling. At this level, it was not merely to check the spelling sense of the students, but also to understand whether they acquired the words. Correct answer given by the vast majority of the students revealed the positive influence of the exercise.

Second question was to choose the appropriate word from bracket to complete the sentence meaningfully. Two sentences were taken from everyday context and they could have guessed the word. But when two confusing words were introduced, they were expected to know the meaning of both the words and had to choose the right one. Those words also had their root in the Session I. So most of the students could differentiate the words and could answer properly.

Structure of the English sentence was introduced in Session III: “I am ..., I can. . ., I have. . ., I love you” pattern was presented to acquire the structure naturally. Question three in the post-test checked whether they could grasp them internally. In
question “a” - “I can studied English,” students were expected to correct the form of the verb. In the session, the researcher did not teach anything on the forms of verb. But “I can...” form was introduced. So the researcher wanted to test whether the students could notice the mistake and correct it. Most of the students could do it. Even in Humanities batch, performance was better compared to the pre-test. Question “b” - “Chitra chess plays,” did not go with “I love you” pattern. In all the sessions, students had lots of opportunities to make sentences. So believing that the students might have acquired the sentence pattern, the researcher had given this question. Vast majority of the students from both the batches could respond positively.

In question four, students had to rearrange the given words to get new words having the meanings given in bracket. “Teach” and “taste” were familiar to students. The expected words out of them - “cheat” and “taste” were also known to them. Students were expected to identify the words within words to get the meaning in bracket. If they could understand the meaning of the words in bracket, they could easily pick out the word. Most of the students could do it except the low achievers.

Question five of the pre-test was to write the forms of ‘Be’. In the post-test, it was shifted to the application level. Students were asked to write sentences using “is,” “am,” “are,” and “have.” Since they were familiar with those verbs, the researcher believed that they could answer well and they proved he was right in his belief. Students who did not know what was “is,” “am,” “are,” etc. in the pre-test were able to write sentences using those verbs. Their active participation made them successful.

A familiar passage from the course-book itself was given for reading comprehension in the pre-test. But in the post-test, an unknown passage was given. It was taken from the newspaper. So the passage included long sentences. Hence the difficulty level was also high. Four questions of two marks each were asked, students
could not pick up the answers. They had to read and comprehend the meaning. They had to rephrase or rearrange sentences to get the expected answer. Their performance was better compared to the pre-test.

Paragraph writing was included during the post-test also. Students were asked to write 200 words about their favourite film. Compared to the pre-test question (“Memorable incident in life”) students were confident to write this answer. It was visible from the length of the answer. Great majority of the students wrote more than 150 words. Many of them wrote more than 200 words. There were mistakes, especially in the performance of students from Humanities batch. But they did not quit or left the question with two or three sentences as in the pre-test.

The post-test question paper was prepared to understand the difference between the entry level and the exit level. The questions were set based on the sessions taken. It was in the same pattern of the pre-test to ensure maximum reliability. Since the students got the exposure, the researcher increased the difficulty level of the questions to a certain extent. Even then the performance of the students was better. The post-test helped the researcher to have a better analysis of the performance.

Test-analysis

This research was conducted through the stages of the pre-test, experimentation, and the post-test. Since the researcher had to understand the level of the proficiency of the students in English, he conducted a pre-test. After evaluating the pre-test and diagnosing the weaker areas, the researcher designed and developed four sessions to suit the needs of the sample population and to carry out the research. Then he had to assess the impact of his lessons. So he conducted a post-test. The detailed analysis of this post-test helped the researcher to understand whether his hypotheses were proved or not.
The researcher conducted the tests to check the four skills - listening, speaking, reading, and writing and he had to deal with three types of students - high achievers, average achievers, and low achievers. Testing the four skills on three types of people, making the analysis, and arriving at a conclusion, etc. were not easy for the researcher. Still the researcher tried his best to bring the best out of them.

Total marks for both the tests were 100. Speaking and writing areas carried thirty marks each, and listening and reading areas had twenty marks each. The researcher had analysed each areas separately to identify the performance in all areas and to assess the impact of one on the other, especially the impact of speaking on other areas.

**Distribution of Marks - above 90% (Grade A+)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Distribution of Marks - above 90% (Grade A+)

It is generally believed that in any class, the number of low achievers and high achievers will be lesser compared to the average students who make the majority. It was same with the sample population of the researcher also. The number of top performers in the class was very low. It was eighteen in listening area, eleven in reading area, and the numbers were three and four in speaking and writing areas, respectively. Since the students had undergone a curriculum highlighting writing skill, the number of top performers in that area would naturally be higher than the speaking area. But here it was
same. In both areas, only one student got above 90% marks. More students were there in listening and reading areas, since those areas did not demand so much of knowledge and skill as other areas had.

But their improvement is visible in the post-test. In the speaking areas, the number rose from one to four and in the writing area it was four from one. Though the number of top achievers in speaking area was one lesser than that of the written area, the researcher felt that it was quite natural. Showing improvement in writing area is comparatively easy. But to show improvement in speaking area, they had to improve their confidence, oral production, presentation skill, etc. Developing all these skills within the limited time could not be expected from students. In the listening area, the number rose from fourteen to eighteen and in the reading area there was not much difference. It increased to eleven from ten. Listening area also showed improvement on a par with the other areas. But reading area did not keep that ratio. The researcher believed that it happened because it was the highest level. The result was more visible down the ladder.

Making improvement at the top level would not be easy. Since the top performers were excellent in all the areas, they needed remarkable improvement in style, content, presentation, etc. to get better marks. Reaching such a level could not be expected from four sessions. But since there was improvement at the topmost level also, the researcher believed that his sessions benefited them also.
Distribution of marks - between 80% and 90% (Grade A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Distribution of marks - between 80% and 90% (Grade A)

Compared to the pre-test, all the four areas show a steady growth in the post-test. The number of students who scored better in the listening area was increased from twenty-five to thirty-two and in the speaking area, the number was increased from nine to fifteen. In the listening area, the pre-test exercise was a simple story and in the post-test, it was a passage. It was not as easy as that of the pre-test. Even then, the students had improved their performance. So the researcher could believe that the sample population had benefited from the listening exercises and it helped them to tune their ears to the passage and to comprehend it. The rate of improvement in the speaking area was higher than the previous ladder. Six more students showed improvement in their performance and could reach at the level of A grade. Students showed improvement in both the sections of the speaking area. Pattern of the questions in the speaking area was same in the pre-test and the post-test. He kept the same question of Section B - self-introduction - in the post-test also. So it was clear that the student showed specific improvement in the speaking area.
Students displayed improvement in their performance in the reading and writing areas also. The number of students who got ‘A’ grade mark in the pre-test was twelve and the number was improved up to nineteen. In the writing area, seven more students were upgraded to the ‘A’ grade and the number became twenty. To test the reading skill, a familiar passage was given in the pre-test. Since the students had already learned it in their syllabus, it was supposed to be easy. But the comparison between the scores of the pre-test and the post-test shows that students performed better in the post-test, where an unfamiliar story was given for reading. So it showed that the exercise conducted to improve the reading skill had created positive impact on students. Performance improvement was clear in the writing area also. Though the question pattern was same, the post-test in the writing area was precisely prepared to check the acquisition level of vocabulary, sentence structure, etc. As a result, the growth level in the post-test showed a positive sign.

Distribution of Marks - between 70% and 80% (Grade B+)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area / Test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Distribution of Marks - between 70% and 80% (Grade B+)

This grade could be considered the last step of the high achievers’ ladder. They belonged to any of those groups in their performance. Most of the high achievers could
upgrade themselves to the other stage. In this stage, the researcher believed that, some of the average students also could enter into the high achievers’ level.

Students showed remarkable improvement here. The difference in the scores of the pre-test and the post-test showed their performance. Fifty-five students achieved above 70% of marks in the listening area. It was forty-three in the pre-test. It was also clear that when it was coming down to the ladder towards the average level of mark, the number of students who upgraded themselves also increased. In the speaking area only fifteen students could reach this level in the pre-test. But in the post-test, the number of students was twenty-one. The result of the sessions, though their focus was on speaking, was clear on other two areas also. The number of students who improved their performance in the reading area rose from twenty to twenty-seven in the post-test. Fifty-six students could reach the “B+” grade in the writing area of the post-test, whereas it was forty-seven in the pre-test.

It was clear that the exposure and chances, the students got during the sessions, enabled them to come out with better results. When the pre-test was conducted, students never had any experience of individual presentations, except in the writing area. Other areas were almost ignored. But when they appeared for the post-test, they had experiences in all four areas of language skill and so they could come with confidence and were able to show better results.

The researcher could also notice that the increase of the number of students in each grade also showed growth till it reached the 60% of marks.
Distribution of marks between 60% and 70% (Grade B)

The graph of students’ improvement reached its peak at this stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Distribution of marks between 60% and 70% (Grade B)

Improvement often happens at the average level. Making Improvement at “A+,” “A” or “B+” level (above 90%) will not be easily possible. Each mark was given with utmost care. Perfection, correctness, and quality matter a lot at the higher levels and the students may get full marks for objective type questions just because of the correctness of the answer. For paragraph or essay type questions, especially when the examiner feels the possibility of the paper reaching the highest level, the answers have to show the power and beauty of the language to get top marks. This was visible in the post-test also. Students who were in the average level in the pre-test could show specific improvement. The difference in the number of students in each area of the pre-test and the post-test exemplifies this. Only forty students could reach Grade “B” in the listening skill of the pre-test. But there were fifty-four students who achieved “B” Grade. It did not mean that marks were loosely awarded to them. They had the scope of achieving more marks, since they were in the average level. An “A+” holder could make maximum ten marks of improvement, whereas a Grade “B” holder got the chance of improving up to forty marks. This difference was visible in other areas also. The number rose from twenty to thirty in speaking area and from twenty-five to thirty-six in the reading area. Writing area
too could make this difference. Sixty-two students got “B” Grade in the writing area of the post-test. It was only fifty-one in the pre-test.

So it was clear that the sessions could influence the average students. The students made use of the scope and possibility of their improvement and they proved it in their performance.

**Distribution of marks - between 50% and 60% (Grade C+)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area / Test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 20: Distribution of marks - between 50% and 60% (Grade C+)*

The performance and improvement of average students is noticeable at this grade also. Two areas, listening and writing, show decrease in the scores of students in the post-test. In the listening area, the number of students who got “C+” Grade was twenty-seven; in the post-test it was only twenty-one. The same happened in the writing area also. Forty-three students got “C+” Grade in the pre-test and it was reduced to thirty-four in the post-test. This too was a positive sign. Since the students upgraded themselves to the higher grades, the number of the students in lower grade would naturally be reduced. From the next lower level onwards, it is visible in all the four areas. Reading and speaking areas still keep the vast difference in the number of performers in the post-test. In the pre-test thirty-one students got “C+” Grade in the speaking areas, but it rose up to forty-seven in the post-test. In the reading area, the number of students who showed
improvement was thirteen. Thirty-eight in the pre-test became fifty-one in the post-test. This is the best example of improvement in the speaking and reading areas.

So the researcher concluded that co-operation, participation, and team performance equipped the students to acquire language. These average students also had to undergo test in the speaking area. Most of them might have been good at writing. But their presentation was poor in the spoken form. That is why the number of low achievers was high in the lower grades. The sessions conducted for them made the students speak with confidence. Even the least performer could utter words and sentences to a certain extent. Test analysis proved it. Though the sessions were mainly focused on developing speaking skill, the impact was visible in all the other areas too. It is same with the mother tongue acquisition too. Only after developing the speaking skill, the children undergo training in other areas. In other words, development in the speaking skill helped them in the acquisition of other areas also. The researcher could feel the same in his experiment also. He designed and conducted his session to the enhancement of speaking area and it resulted in the development of other areas also. So researcher believed that as in the case of mother tongue, acquisition of language begins with listening and speaking, and then it is transferred to other areas also.

**Distribution of marks - between 40% and 50% (Grade C)**

A steady decrease in the number of performers in the post-test is visible from this grade onwards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area / Test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Distribution of marks - between 40% and 50% (Grade C)
Students improved and upgraded themselves. So the number of students in the lower grades of the post-test reduced. In the pre-test there were twenty-five students who scored less than 50% mark in the listening area; but in the post-test the number came down up to eight. The difference itself is seventeen. So it was very clear that how the sessions helped to improve the listening skills of the sample population. Speaking area did not show that much of difference in the post-test. The number of students in the pre-test who achieved Grade “C” was forty-two. In the post-test it was forty. It showed only a minute difference. Still, when the researcher analysed the performance of students in the speaking area in the immediate higher (Grade “C+”) and lower levels (Grade “D+”), this small variation also contributed a lot. Students showed improvement in the reading area also. The number of students was forty-seven in the pre-test. It was reduced to thirty-one in the post-test. Writing area also revealed this positive decrease. Twenty-four students were there at this grade in the pre-test. It had grown up to fifteen students in the post-test.

Though the difficulty level of the questions in all the areas were higher, average students also could perform well. They were able to face the question - either to write or to speak. They were better, in listening and reading areas also. The researcher felt that the students could get away with their fear of English and got the courage to present themselves, especially to speak.

**Distribution of marks - between 30% and 40% (Grade D+)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area / Test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22; Distribution of marks - between 30% and 40% (Grade D+)
The table also gives an extended version of the analysis given above. In the higher secondary system “D+” Grade (minimum 30 marks out of 100) is the pass mark. In the pre-test there were fifteen students who escaped failure in the listening area. In the speaking area forty-six students were at this failure point. It meant that almost one fourth of the total sample population faced this critical stage. Since the speaking was never listed in the school system, they did not understand or face this situation. The school curriculum focuses only the results of writing area. Since there were only sixteen students at this stage, the English teachers, including the researcher were very happy regarding their results. As these sixteen got through successfully, the school always had good results in the public examinations. But the researcher’s pre-test brought out the real picture.

The marks in the post-test showed a clear difference in the performance of students. Only eight students remained in the “D+” Grade level in the listening area. In the speaking area, the number of students was only twenty-eight and it was sixteen in the reading area. Writing area also showed a clear decline in the number of students. It was only eight. So the researcher could see the growth of the sample population.

**Distribution of Marks - below 30% (Grade D)**

Getting less than thirty marks out of hundred meant failure. So any mark below thirty was indicated by the Grade “D.” In the researcher's pre-test, there were students who could not get pass mark in different areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Test</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Distribution of Marks - below 30% (Grade D)
As in the table, in the pre-test, eleven students failed in the listening area and thirty-four students failed in the speaking area. The number of failures in other two areas, reading and writing, was twenty and five respectively. Students from Humanities batch had a great role in deciding last two stages of the performance ladder. Majority of the “D+” and “D” Grade students were from the Humanities batch. They might have been just sitting in the class without comprehending anything. Some of the examination techniques would have been useful to them to reach at the higher secondary level. The researcher designed and conducted sessions aiming at those students also.

Since the students were positive and supportive during the sessions, they could perform well and they were able to show the difference also. In the post-test, only four students remained in the “D” Grade in listening. Major difference took place in the speaking area. The number was reduced from thirty-four to thirteen. So it was evident that even the low achievers could improve their performance and it gave the confidence to students that they could also speak in English. In the reading area, number of students became nine and only one student failed in the writing area. So the researcher could believe that improvement in language learning was possible for any normal category of students and if they had been given acquisition-oriented lessons, they would have acquired the language easily and also in a better way.

Data Analysis

The performance analysis of the students in the pre-test and post-test is presented below using histogram and line diagram. It clearly displays the performance improvement in the post-test.

(a) Pre-test and post-test analysis of writing

The figures below show the comparative assessment of pre-test and post-test in the area of writing.
Figure 2: Histogram showing analysis of the pre-test and the post-test on writing

Figure 3: Line diagram showing analysis of the pre-test and the post-test on writing

Analysis

H0: There is no significant difference between the means of pre-test and post-test marks of writing

Vs.

H1: There is a significant difference between the means of the pre-test and the post-test marks of writing

Paired Samples Statistics
The table below shows the statistical representation of the two variables in mean and standard deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test marks(Xi)</td>
<td>58.5600</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14.66258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test marks(Xi)</td>
<td>64.4800</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14.04084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Paired Samples Statistics
Paired Samples Correlations

This table shows the correlation between the two variables, pre-test and post-test of writing area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_{11} &amp; X_{12}$</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: Paired Samples Correlations

There is a strong positive correlation. People who did well on the pre-test also did well on the post-test. At the higher grades (from “A+” to “B”), the percentage of the post-test performance is higher than the pre-test performance. It shows the improvement of high achievers. The percentage of students at the lowest grade is comparatively low in the post-test. This decrease continues till the average grade level (from “D” to “C+”). It means low achievers in the pre-test could improve their performance in the post-test.

Paired Samples Test

It is a statistical test that compares the means of two groups of observation. The table below displays the comparison of $X_{11} - X_{12}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable differences</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{11} - X_{12}$</td>
<td>-5.92000</td>
<td>3.14213</td>
<td>-26.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: Paired Samples Test

**Interpretation:** Here the significance value is less than 0.05; there is a significant difference. There is a significant change between the marks of the pre-test and the post-test of writing.
(b) Pre-test and post-test analysis of listening

The figures below display the performance difference in pre-test and post-test in the listening area.

Figure 4: Histogram showing analysis of the pre-test and the post-test on listening

Figure 5: Line diagram showing analysis of the pre-test and the post-test on listening

Analysis

$H_0$: There is no significant difference between the means of the pre-test and the post-test marks of listening

Vs

$H_1$: There is a significant difference between the means of the pre-test and the post-test marks of listening

Paired Samples Statistics

The table below shows the statistical representation of the two variables($X_{21}, X_{22}$) in mean and standard deviation.
Table 27: Paired Samples Statistics

**Paired Samples Correlation**

This table shows the correlation between X21, X22 in pre-test and post-test of listening area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test marks (X21)</td>
<td>61.2600</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>18.05220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test marks (X22)</td>
<td>68.7200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>15.39567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Paired Samples Correlations

Listening area also gives the same analysis as it is in the writing area. There is a strong positive correlation; people who did well on the pre-test also did well on the post-test. Higher percentage of the post-test marks at higher grades shows it. At the same time low achievers improvement is also visible at the lower grades as their percentage is reduced in the post-test.

**Paired Samples Test**

The table below displays the comparison of two variables- $x_{21}$ and $x_{22}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Differences</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_{21} - X_{22}$</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-7.46000</td>
<td>4.72334</td>
<td>-22.336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Paired Samples Test
Interpretation: Here the significance value is less than 0.05; there is a significant difference. There is a significant change between the marks of the pre-test and the post-test on listening.

(c) Pre-test and post-test analysis of speaking

The following figure shows the grade wise achievement of students in the pre-test and post-test, in the area of speaking.

![Figure 6] Histogram showing analysis of the pre-test and the post-test on speaking

![Figure 7] Line diagram showing analysis of the pre-test and the post-test on speaking

Analysis

$H_0$: There is no significant difference between the means of the pre-test and the post-test marks of speaking

versus

$H_1$: There is a significant difference between the means of the pre-test and the post-test marks of speaking
Paired Samples Statistics

The table below shows the statistical representation of the two variables in mean and standard deviation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test marks $(X_{31})$</td>
<td>45.0900</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>17.00227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test marks $(X_{32})$</td>
<td>52.6200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>17.07523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: Paired Samples Statistics

Paired Samples Correlations

This table shows the correlation between the two variables, pre-test and post-test of speaking area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_{31}$ &amp; $X_{32}$</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>.992</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Paired Samples Correlations

Speaking area shows very significant improvement in the post-test. There is a strong positive correlation. The number of high achievers is evidently improved in the post-test. At the same time, there is specific decrease in the number of low achievers.

Paired Samples Test

The table below displays the comparison of the means and standard deviation of two groups, $X_{31}$ and $X_{32}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable differences</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{31} - X_{32}$</td>
<td>-7.53000</td>
<td>2.22121</td>
<td>-47.942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Paired Samples Test
**Interpretation:** Here the significance value is less than 0.05; there is a significant difference. There is a significant change between the marks of the pre-test and the post-test on speaking.

**(d) Pre-test and post-test analysis of reading**

The figures below display the performance difference in pre-test and post-test, in the reading area.

![Figure 8: Histogram showing analysis of the pre-test and the post-test on reading](image1)

![Figure 9: Line diagram showing analysis of the pre-test and the post-test on reading](image2)

**Analysis**

\[ H_0: \text{There is no significant difference between the means of the pre-test and the post-test marks of reading} \]

Vs

\[ H_1: \text{There is a significant difference between the means of the pre-test and the post-test marks of reading} \]

**Paired Samples Statistics**

The table below shows the statistical representation of the two variables (X41, X42) in mean and standard deviation.
Paired Samples Correlations

This table shows the correlation between X21, X22 in pre-test and post-test of listening area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X41 &amp; X42</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34: Paired Samples Correlations

There is a strong positive correlation. Though the performance variation is not highly significant at the higher levels, it is very clear at the lower levels. The low achievers show specific improvement in the post-test.

Table 35: Paired Samples Test

The table below displays the comparison of two variables- X41 and X42.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Differences</th>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X41 - X42</td>
<td>-5.94000</td>
<td>2.92389</td>
<td>-28.730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35: Paired Samples Test

**Interpretation:** Here the significance value is less than 0.05; there is a significant difference. There is a significant change between the marks of the pre-test and the post-test on reading.
Pre-test and post-test – An overview

The histogram below sums up the performance of students both in pre-test and post-test, in all the four areas of language skills.

Figure 10: Histogram showing the combined the pre-test and the post-test analysis of writing, listening speaking and reading

The above figure gives the graphic representation of the whole experiment and its impact. Students’ improvement in all the four areas testifies the positive influence of the sessions.

Linear regression model for the post-test marks

In order to understand the influence of speaking on other areas, linear regression model is used.

(e) Regression analysis of writing on speaking

Dependent Variable : Post-test marks of writing ($X_{12}$)

Independent Variable : Post-test marks of speaking ($X_{32}$)

Consider the linear model, $X_{12} = A_0 + A_1 X_{32} + E$, where E denotes the error function.
The regression analysis can be seen from the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: $X_{12}$

Table 36: Coefficients (a)

Then we have the linear model as, $X_{12} = 26.13 + 0.729 X_{32}$.

By this model, if we know the marks of speaking, we can predict and tell the mark of writing.

From the analysis we have the values of coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.785$. This value indicates that 78% of the information contained in dependent variable can be explained by the independent variable.

We also have the value of multiple correlation coefficient, $R= 0.886$. This implies that there is a strong linear relationship. The following charts give behaviour of residue:

Histogram

Figure 11: Graph of the error curve embedded on the histogram
Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual

Dependent Variable: VAR00001

Expected Cum Prob

Observed Cum Prob

Figure 12: Normal P-P plot of Regression Standardised Residual

Where dependent Variable: VAR00001 = X_{12}

(f) Regression analysis of listening on speaking

**Dependent Variable**: Post-test marks of listening (X_{22})

**Independent Variable**: Post-test marks of speaking (X_{32})

Consider the linear model, \( X_{22} = B_0 + B_1 X_{32} + E \), where E denotes the error function.

The regression analysis can be seen from the following table:

**Table 37: Coefficients (a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( B_0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( B_1 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: X_{22}
Then we have the linear model as, \( X_{22} = 26.43 + 0.804 \times X_{32} \).

By this model, if we know the marks of speaking we can predict and tell the mark of listening.

From the analysis we have the values of coefficient of determination \( R^2 = 0.795 \). This value indicates that 79% of the information contained in dependent variable can be explained by the independent variable.

We also have the value of multiple correlation coefficient, \( R = 0.891 \). This implies that there is a strong linear relationship. The following charts give behaviour of residue:

![Histogram](image)

**Figure 13 : Graph of the error curve embedded on the histogram**
Figure 14: Normal P-P plot of Regression Standardised Residual

Where dependent Variable: VAR00001 = X_{22}

(g) Regression analysis of reading on speaking

**Dependent Variable**: Post-test marks of listening (X_{42})

**Independent Variable**: Post-test marks of speaking (X_{32})

Consider the linear model, \( X_{42} = C_0 + C_1 X_{32} + E \), where E denotes the error function.

The regression analysis can be seen from the following table:

**Table 38: Coefficients (a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( C_0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_1 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: X_{42}
Then we have the linear model as, $X_{22} = 9.362 + 0.948 \times X_{32}$.

By this model, if we know the marks of speaking we can predict and tell the mark of reading.

From the analysis we have the values of coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.849$. This value indicates that 84% of the information contained in dependent variable can be explained by the independent variable.

We also have the value of multiple correlation coefficient, $R = 0.921$. This implies that there is a strong linear relationship. The following charts give behaviour of residue:

![Histogram](image)

**Figure 15:** Graph of the error curve embedded on the histogram
Figure 16: Normal P-P plot of Regression Standardised Residual

Where dependent Variable: VAR00001 = $X_{42}$

**Observation from the analysis**

The following are the observation that the researcher has made after the statistical analysis of the data:

- a. From all the previous analysis given in (a), (b), (c), and (d), it is observed that there is a significant change between the marks of the pre-test and the post-tests of writing, listening, speaking, and reading.

- b. From the analysis in (e), we have the values of coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.785$. This value indicates that 78% of the information contained in the post-test marks of writing can be explained by the post-test marks of speaking.
c. From the analysis in (f), we have the values of coefficient of determination \( R^2 = 0.795 \). This value indicates that 79% of the information contained in the post-test marks of listening can be explained by the post-test marks of speaking.

d. From the analysis in (g), we have the values of coefficient of determination \( R = 0.849 \). This value indicates that 84% of the information contained in the post-test marks of reading can be explained by the post-test marks of speaking.

e. In all the above cases given in (e), (f), and (g), we can see there is a strong linear relationship for writing, listening and reading with speaking.

The analysis of the pre-test and the post-test helped the researcher to arrive at certain conclusions regarding language acquisition at the higher secondary level. The pre-test analysis gave the researcher a specific idea about his sample population and paved the way for designing the course. The researcher conducted the sessions as per the needs of the students and according to the classroom situations. The post-test finalised the output of the experiment conducted by the researcher. By analyzing the post-test, the researcher could understand the following:

a. The sessions helped vast majority of the students to upgrade themselves, at least to the next level. Some of them could do better and a very few remained low achievers, especially in the Grade “D” itself.

b. The researcher could understand one of the major problems in the English teaching process. Least attention is paid to the spoken area of language development. Students neither get practice in the speaking skills nor is that area evaluated by the system.
c. As the number of students increased at higher grades (A, A+ etc.) in the post-test, the number became low in the lower grades (D+, D etc.). Both indicated the same students’ improvement.

d. The rate of performance improvement is high among average students. High achievers had only limited scope of improvement and low achievers had limited ability to improve themselves.