CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY – RESEARCH DESIGN, DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

To explain how this study set about answering the research questions proposed, in this chapter. This study shall firstly explain the choice of research methods for the study. The study shall then explain how this research was organized and developed through a description of the instruments and procedures of data collection for the pilot study and main study. This will be followed by a brief introduction of the research settings and a detailed description of the participants for both studies.

In addition, the researcher shall briefly explain the reasons for adjusting data collection methods for the main survey based on the problems encountered in the pilot study. Validity and ethical issues will also be considered. This research shall end this chapter with the procedure adopted for qualitative analysis. An overview of all the themes and categories emerging from the data analysis will also be provided.

Musthafa (2001) described the issues in introducing CLT in Indonesia. He identified many difficulties teachers experienced in utilizing the CLT approach in their class-rooms: teacher’s lack of confidence and communicative materials, time constraints, out-dated exam system, etc. Due to those reasons, he argued that CLT had failed to help students become more competent using English for real-life purposes. Pit & Roth (2004) identified various difficulties in implementing CLT in Cambodia. Besides the common problems such as large class sizes, student resistance, and teacher incompetence, one major reason was lack of government funding. At the tertiary level in Cambodia, French was above English in status because the French government was significant in providing financial assistance to higher education in Cambodia. Pandian (2004) talked about English education in Malaysia today. He believed that in choosing a syllabus or teaching method, it was important to take into consideration the local Malaysian socio-cultural context as well as the unique needs of English for the Malaysian learners. Methods developed in the West, which failed to consider these factors, could not be used in Malaysia without adaptation.
Kam & Wong (2004) believe that integration of modern technology is another challenge for the East Asian countries in the ELT classrooms. While many countries have great inclinations for change, many traditional practices still prevail in English teaching. Many teachers are reluctant to use modern technology in their classrooms, partly because of their lack of experience and training, but most importantly because of their mind-set of not wanting to change. In order to achieve a break-through in the ELT field in these countries, a change of technology is not enough. A change of mind-set is necessary. In summary, due to the local contexts, CLT cannot be adopted to the East Asian Countries without any adaptation. In order for CLT to work in these nations, obstacles have to be overcome. Cross cultural understandings have to be achieved.

3.2. CHOICE OF METHODOLOGY

3.2.1. Theory Behind the Approach

This is a wholly qualitative research study within the paradigm of social constructivism and the tradition of case study. The choice of adopting the case study approach within the paradigm of constructivism in this study is due to the following reasons. In the first place, as argued by Stake (1995), case study can be interpreted as ‘the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances’ (Bassey, 1999:27). In addition, it allows the people within their own culture to experience unique situations vicariously through the description portrayed by researchers (see Gomn, Hammersley, Fosler, 2000).

- Therefore, the adoption of case study approach will be helpful in creating a path through the complexity caused by the diversity of variables generated from data collection in Engineering College at different parts of Chennai. This will enable the researcher to explore the divergences existing in participants’ teaching styles from a pedagogical perspective as well as to seek out the unity in diversity in terms of the adjustments made to localize CLT in the Engineering College EFL context in general.

- Secondly, the ‘strong in reality’ nature of case study (Nunan, 1992:78) reminds the researcher of the danger of overgeneralization throughout the investigation. Although instrumental case study calls for the responsibility
of investigators to screen the cases to maximize the possibility of
generalization (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000), the distinctions between
participants should be noted due to the uniqueness caused by the effects
such as individuality, institutional culture, regional difference, and so on.

- Thirdly, the researcher agree with the argument put forward by Roberts
  (1988) that teachers should be considered within a social constructivist
  approach as ‘social beings’ and teaching as a ‘social activity bearing
distinctive meanings and values in specific socio-cultural context’

3.2.2. Validity in this Research

Nevertheless, it should be noted that being labeled as a ‘doubting game’ by
Bailey (1991:70), the case study tradition has long been queried regarding its internal
and external validity (Brown and Rodgers, 2002) due to being too subjective and
lacking the ground for generalization. This is because case studies might involve quite
a lot of personal judgment of the researchers who collect the data from insiders’
perspective. This study intend to tackle this problem by enhancing the credibility of
the study through the coverage of the issues of external validity, internal validity and
triangulation, and ethics.

3.2.2.1. External Validity

Miles and Huberman (1994:262) argued that validity can be considerably
secured by the provision of a specific “Procedural Account of the Analysis”. This
kind of account can be useful to readers and help their judgment regarding the
relevance of the findings to their own situations (Seale, 1999).

Holliday (2001) also claims that the reliability and validity of research can be
greatly enhanced by qualitative methods that include a concrete and detailed
description of data collection strategies and a clarification of the appropriateness to
the particular cultural setting.

Therefore, with a view to assuring external validity of this study, in sections
which follow (3.4.1., 3.4.2., 3.6.1., 3.6.2), This study will present a full description of
research settings as well as the profile of participants for the pilot study and the main
survey. Emphasis will be laid on reporting the procedure of data collection. Data will
then be descriptively analyzed in order to minimize the effect caused by subjective evaluation.

An overview of all the themes and categories emerging will be provided in order to render a general picture of data analysis. The interview transcripts can further enhance the external validity of this research. Given that the Engineering Colleges are under the administration of technical University educational system, this research was conducted at four Engineering colleges in different parts of Chennai.

3.2.2.2. Internal Validity and Triangulation

Internal validity is defined by Silverman (2000) as “the true value of a piece of research”, reflecting authenticity of the reported data. The extent to which the interpretation of the gathered data conforms to reality is a major concern of many researchers. Despite the argument made by Miles and Huberman (1994) that internal validity and external validity actually share some similarity in relation to certain criteria, triangulation is a concept of particular importance in terms of the understanding of internal validity.

This is because the validity of a research can be secured by triangulation of data as the same research question can be looked into by adopting various data sources and methods of analysis. In this study, data were collected with the instruments of interview and classroom observation, and the generated data will be qualitatively analyzed.

3.2.2.3. Ethical Issues

Informed consent and confidentiality are considered as two very important issues in educational qualitative research (Kent, 2000; Baez, 2002; Burgess, 1989; Fraendel, 1990). In this research, the researcher tended to tackle the issues by abiding by the five elements proposed by Kent (2000), namely,

- Information
- Understanding
- Voluntariness,
- Competence of potential participants
- Actual consent to participate, and
- Aiming to protect the ethical principle of autonomy.
Given that this research was not meant to be conducted at the university previously worked in due to some personal reasons, how to get access to other Engineering College and establish my credibility turned out to be a serious concern to me before launching the pilot study.

The researcher therefore contacted other Engineering college friends working at various other engineering colleges in Chennai. The researcher contacted these people mainly through telephone and briefly explained about the research to them. In addition, a written application for launching the research was submitted to them in person. The application, which was written in Tamil, consisted of three parts, namely, an outline introduction of my research topic (including the aim of the study, the research questions, research methods and procedure of data collection); requirements of participants; confidentiality and anonymity. The researcher contacted the English department first and asked for the teachers’ profile and the teaching timetable. The researcher then called the potential informants whose qualifications matched the requirements of this study to enquire about their interest in participating. For those who agreed to participate, the researcher confirmed with them about the time and classroom for observation and interview. All the participants were told that both the observation and interview would be recorded, and reassured that their identities would not be disclosed since pseudonyms would be used in this research report in order to protect their privacy. The Researcher gained verbal consent from most of them. For those who decided to drop out or declined to be interviewed or observed, their wish was respected.

3.3. INSTRUMENTS

3.3.1. Interview

The interview is argued by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) as the best means to access the minds of research subjects so that their knowledge, information, values, preferences, attitudes and beliefs could be reflected. Moreover, it is considered as a useful tool to test hypotheses and follow up certain unanticipated outcomes. The reason why this study taken the interview method is particularly appropriate for this study is mainly due to the fact that the research questions basically set out to investigate the cognitive aspects of knowledge such as ‘conception’ or ‘perception’, which would be too abstract to be quantified with questionnaire.
Furthermore, semi-structured interview can help to enhance the interview dynamics (Arksey and Knight, 1999), and to ensure the coverage rate of main points through approximately equivalent question and time distribution to each interviewee with proper listening and prompt techniques.

Therefore, the semi-structured interview was adopted as the key method of data collection in this study. All the participants were individually interviewed, and the interviews were carried out in Tamil, aiming to encourage informants to express themselves in an open and flexible way (Yang, 1999; Rao, 2002). Each interview was then transcribed in Tamil at first and summarized in English, aiming to facilitate the data coding with rough categories.

In the following part of this section, This study would like to provide the structuring of the interview questions adopted in the pilot study. Slight changes were made to the interview questions for the main study and the adjustment will be mentioned afterwards. Only two informants were interviewed before the observations due to a change of time arrangement in the main study, and the rest interviews (including those in the pilot study) were all carried out after the observations.

Qualitative Method: Interviews

In order to supplement the quantitative data from the COLT analysis, this study administered interview questionnaires to all 9 teachers from the observed classes with their consent. A sit-down interview was planned with each teacher after the observation of their class. However, not all teachers could accommodate me. Some of them had to go to other classes, while others had to catch college buses. The researcher was able to either walk them to their next class, or walk them to their buses and talk to them briefly on the way. Since the researcher did not have enough time to ask all my questions and get complete answers, the researcher sent the questionnaires. Six questions were asked in the interview questionnaires:

1. Please briefly describe your class, including your student composition, your course objective, etc.

2. How do you feel about the second language teaching (EFL) Traditional Method and the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in teaching English as a foreign language in I year B.E./ B.Tech students EFL Classroom?
3. What method do you use in your class? How much of it is Traditional second language teaching and how much is CLT?

4. Do you encounter any difficulties using CLT in different class? If yes, what are they? 5. Do you think the CLT approach fits into the second language teaching setting better than the Traditional method of second language teaching? Why?

5. What do you think would be the ideal method for English teaching in I year B.E. / B.Tech. class rooms? Why?

For the purpose of simplification, letters and numbers are used to represent different teachers and classes. Table 1 shows the coding for each teacher and class observed.

**Rationale of Interview Questions**

**Pre-observation Interview Questions**

Questions 1 to 3 are warm-up questions, aiming to establish the acquaintance between the researcher and the informant as well as to create a detailed profile of the respondents.

1. How long have you been teaching English? How long have you been working at this College? Did you teach English at other institutions before?

2. What sort of second language teaching experience do you have?

3. How would you evaluate your second language learning experience?

Questions 4 to 9 are derived from research question 1 ‘What are the conceptions of CLT held by Engineering College teachers of English with second language teaching experience?’

4. In your view, what is good language teaching?

(Preliminary question -- for the main study but not the pilot study; see 3.5.)

5. When did you first know about CLT? (If before coming for teaching , the follow-up question would be ‘did your second language teaching experience actually change your perception of CLT? How do you
understand it? If after going various training programmes, the follow-up question would be ‘how do you understand CLT now?)

6. Could you briefly describe one or two typical activities in a CLT Classroom?

7. What roles do you think teachers and learners should play respectively in a CLT classroom?

8. What sort of teaching techniques do you think are related to CLT?

9. Suppose you are asked by your colleagues to talk about CLT based on your experience of teacher education overseas, how would you convey your interpretation of CLT?

Question 4 is a transitional question, aiming to explore the extent to which the informant’s overseas background changes one’s interpretation of CLT.

Questions 5 to 9 intend to investigate the informant’s conception of CLT by looking into their understanding of the general features of CLT in terms of roles of teacher and learner, the employment of specific activities, teaching techniques and classroom management skills.

Questions 10 to 13 are derived from research question 2 ‘To what extent do these teachers perceive CLT as appropriate in the I year B.E. / B.Tech students’ EFL context?’

10. To what extent do you think your classroom is CLT-oriented?

11. Have you made any particular efforts to make your classroom CLT-oriented?

12. Do you think those efforts are helpful?

13. Do you think it is appropriate for second language teachers of English to be able to teach communicatively?

Questions 10 and 11 aim to find out the extent to which CLT is considered to be adaptable to the Second language learning culture by looking into the particular ways the approach is adopted, whereas questions 12 and 13 make further probes into the extent to which CLT is reckoned to be effective and helpful.
By investigating the particular efforts made to elevate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the approach, the researcher felt researcher would be able to get a general picture of any perceived mismatch between CLT principles and Engineering College Language Teachers and Students’ perception of appropriate methodology, which would serve as a basis for establishing a second language learning / teaching CLT model subsequently.

The final series of questions are derived from research question 3 ‘Do Engineering College teachers of English with second language teaching experience attempt to enhance learner’s competence in English via CLT adoption and adaptation? If so, in what ways? If not, why not?’

14. Do you think you have changed your way of teaching with your training programme?

15. In what ways did you find you had to adapt things you learned in various training and workshops in the Engineering Language Teaching context?

16. How do you describe your overall teaching approach?

17. How do you decide on your way of teaching?

18. In your opinion, what are the main challenges faced by second language teacher ELT profession at Engineering College? How would you attempt to take these challenges with your training programme education background in terms of teaching methodology?

19. What aspects of CLT have you adopted and adapted in your practice?

20. What sort of suggestions would you like to give to the second language teachers who would like to adopt CLT in the second language teaching/learning context at Engineering college level?

21. Compared with expatriate teachers and your local counterparts with no intercultural experience in English speaking countries, what are the main advantages do you think you have?

The data generated from these questions were intended to reflect the particular ways that the CLT principles are applied to second language teaching / learning EFL contexts by local teachers with intercultural experience.
Questions 14 to 19 intended to investigate the extent to which the informant considers him or herself to be able to teach communicatively. By looking into one’s particular way of teaching and the reason of adopting such a way of teaching, it was felt it would be able to develop an in-depth understanding of any fundamental reasons of incompatibility between CLT and second language learning as well as to see whether CLT matches the learning needs of Engineering College students. The researcher also aimed to get to know the effectiveness of the specific strategies formulated by the informant to cope with any such mismatch.

Question 20 is a suggestive question, aiming to explore the informant’s general attitude towards the implementation and adaptation of CLT in second language learning / teaching EFL context at Engineering College level.

Question 21 aims to find out the extent to which the informant considers one’s intercultural background enables them to teach effectively from a more general perspective.

**Post-observation interview questions**

The following questions aimed to make further clarifications or prompts based on data collected from classroom observation (in a kind of ‘stimulated recall’ procedure).

- I’ve watched one (or two) lessons of your class. Taking the lesson as a whole, what areas were your satisfied with? And what areas were your less satisfied with?
- How satisfied were you with the students’ performance?
- Do you think my presence as an observer somewhat effected the lessons?
- When I observed your class, I noticed that you did (…e.g. activities / techniques, etc) happened, why did you do this? What would happen if you did it differently?
- In what ways is your lesson related to CLT?
- Do you teach some other courses? Could you briefly describe your way of teaching these courses? How do you describe your teaching approach of these courses?
- In your view, what should be the overall goal of teaching English in higher education?
3.3.2. Classroom observation

Open observation was adopted as a supplementary method in this research for the purpose of triangulation, aiming to maximize reliability of the data obtained from the interview. As argued by Tuckman (1988), respondents might deliberately chime in with the researcher by providing the anticipated answers to their questions, which can in fact deviate from their real teaching practice (Cohen and Manion, 1989).

There were nineteen observations carried out in this research, with three for the pilot study and sixteen for the main study. Only one participant was observed twice (in the pilot study) and the rest were all observed once. All of the observations were permitted to be audio recorded, and they covered a wide range of course modules open to either English medium students (hereafter referred to as ‘EM’) or Tamil medium students (hereafter referred to as ‘TM’).

Most observed lessons lasted around 100 minutes in length. All the lessons were observed openly, and each time the researcher sat in the back row, aiming to minimize the effects caused by my presence as stranger.

A descriptive system was adopted as observation instrument, with the preset categories of date and time, school, year level, major, teacher, class size, course book and page number, complementary material, observation number, topic and classroom lay-out. Field notes were jotted down during the observations based on the categories of time, activity and notes. After each observation, it was listened to the recording as soon as possible and combined the data with the field notes to make a full description followed up by a short summary.

This process helped the researcher to reorganize my thoughts and recall what happened in the observed lessons. It should be noted that one observed lesson in the main survey was a Technical English at B.E. / B.Tech. level, with student presentations (on Code Switching and Bilingualism) throughout the session. Given that there was no teaching activity in this class, the gathered data will not be analyzed.

3.3.3. Questionnaire

A questionnaire was designed based on the interview questions (see appendix 1) and therefore contained lots of open-ended questions. It worked as a backup just in case some participants were reluctant to be interviewed. 4 copies were distributed in the main study and 1 was returned. The returned questionnaire contained answers
which were rather simple and superficial, so the questionnaire will not be analyzed. Nevertheless, the observation data gathered from this participant will still be used in data analysis.

3.4. THE PILOT STUDY

The pilot study was carried out in early September 2010 at Mamallan Institute of Technology, located in the Kancheepuram District. Two teachers participated in the pilot study. Both of them were interviewed and observed, and one was observed twice. Data were collected within a week (from 5th September to 10th September).

(Participants: 2; Interviews: 2; Observations: 3)

3.4.1. Research setting for pilot study

Mamallan Institute of Technology (hereafter referred to as ‘MIT’). It is an affiliated self financing Engineering College, with minimum of 3,500 full-time registered students and Minimum of 120 faculty members. The department of College English adopts a multimedia teaching pattern of ‘online teaching + classroom teaching’ (2+2+X). The total teaching hours per weeks are 4, including 2 hours for a big class (around 120 students) with the teaching emphasis on reading, and 2 hours for a small class (around 25 students) with the teaching focus on listening and speaking. ‘X’ stands for learners’ self-study hours (with no less than 4 hours) by using the online teaching platform and resources after class.

3.4.2. Informants and data collection

Data collection lasted from 5th September to 10th September, 2010. According to the original research plan, each participant was intended to be interviewed first before the observations (2 times), followed by a post-observation interview to end up the data collection. Nevertheless, it turned out in the pilot study that this plan was unrealistic as the participants were very reluctant to be observed and interviewed twice. For that reason, the interview was conducted after the observation, and the interview questions were combined, which then served as the standard procedure of data collection in the main study as well.

3.5. INITIAL DATA ANALYSIS AND ADJUSTMENT OF INSTRUMENTS

When the researcher finished the pilot study, the researcher took for three weeks to transcribe and translate the two interviews. Based on the interview
transcripts and observation summaries, it was advised by my supervisor to make the interview more open-ended, since, as inferred from the transcripts, the interviews were more like structured interviews than semi-structured ones.

This change was intended to leave more room for the informants to explore their thinking on the posed questions rather than restricting them with leading questions. Specifically, it was advised to add a question ‘In your view, what is good language teaching?’ before question 5. The reason for this adjustment was because in the pilot study, it was found out there existed the tendency that the participants seemed not to have much to talk about the perception of CLT despite the efforts of making probes.

This phenomenon made this study aware of the danger of failing to gather sufficient data for research question one in the main study, which might lead to a superficial and loose understanding of the results. After the discussion with my supervisor, we decided to place an ice-breaking question (see question 4) before looking into the informants’ perception of CLT in the main study. This aimed to broaden the informants’ thoughts on the interpretation of CLT and perception of appropriate methodology so as to see the extent to which the good language teaching on one’s mind matches the general principles and features of CLT. Given that the pilot study did not result in big alterations of the instruments, the gathered data in the pilot study will be used and analyzed in detail along with those collected in the main survey.

3.6. THE MAIN STUDY

The main study was conducted at four Engineering Colleges namely, S.A. Engineering college, Affiliated by Anna University (hereafter referred to as ‘SAE’), R.M.K. college of Engineering and Technology , Affiliated by Anna University (hereafter referred to as ‘RMKCET’) and S.S.N. Engineering College , Affiliated by Anna University (hereafter referred to as ‘SSN’). There were 21 participants in the main survey, with 5 in MIT, 4 in SAE, 9 in RMKCET and 3 in SSN. 10 of them were both interviewed and observed, and the observations covered a wide range of courses.

All the participants were observed and interviewed once. Two participants were interviewed before the observation (1 in SAE, 1 in RMKCET) due to a sudden change of time arrangement, and the rest were interviewed after the observation. Pre-
observation interview questions were posed to the informants who were interviewed first. Most interviews were carried out right after the observations.

Quick facts (pilot study included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering College</th>
<th>MIT</th>
<th>SAE</th>
<th>RMKCET</th>
<th>SSN</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>5+2 (*PS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21+2 (PS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>5+2(PS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16+2(PS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>3+3 (PS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16+3(PS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both interviewed and observed participants</td>
<td>3+2 (PS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11+2(PS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Questionnaire | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution where participants got Training Programme</th>
<th>British Council</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other colleges FDPs</td>
<td>1+1(PS)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8+1(PS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Programmes</td>
<td>2+1(PS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4+1(PS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering College</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>SAE</td>
<td>RMKCET</td>
<td>SSN</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Training Programmes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*VS</td>
<td>2+1 (PS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11+1(PS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*DS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*P</td>
<td>1(PS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1(PS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years after completing programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*FB</td>
<td>2+1(PS)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8+1(PS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7(DS 2;VS 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7(DS 4;VS 3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Y</td>
<td>4+2(PS)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15+2(PS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering College</th>
<th>MIT</th>
<th>SAE</th>
<th>RMKCET</th>
<th>SSN</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topics taught by the observed participants (EM/TM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical English 2 (PS) NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening and Speaking 2 + 1(PS) NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 1 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 2 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College English 1 TM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening and Speaking 2 TM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 1 EM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 1 EM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening 1EM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation 1 EM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Reading and Writing 2 TM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PS: Pilot Study; VS: Visiting Faculty; DS: Degree Study; P: Programme
* FB: Fresh-back (1-3 years); 4-10: 4-10 years; 11: 11 years and above
* EM: English medium; TM: Tamil Medium
3.6.1. Informants

There were 21 teachers who participated in the main survey, with 5 in MIT, 4 in SAE, 9 in RMKCET and 3 in SSN respectively.

3.6.2. Data collection

The main study was conducted from 9 October, 2010 to 7 November, 2010. Two participants were interviewed before the observation due to the sudden change of the observation dates, and the rest of the observations were carried out before the interviews. Pre-observation questions (see 3.3.1.) were posed to those who were interviewed first. The researcher tried to adopt a more flexible and open style when conducting the interview based on the advice given to me after the pilot study.

Four copies of questionnaires were emailed to those who declined to be interviewed, and one was returned. As related above (see 3.3.3), this questionnaire will not be analyzed. In addition, the observed lesson at Third year level (see 3.3.2) will be not analyzed either. Therefore, the subsequent data analysis will be based on 18 interviews (including 2 from the pilot study) and 18 observations (including 3 from the pilot study). Data collection conducted at RMKCET was carried out.

The following diagrams show the details of data collection in each research setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the College</th>
<th>Name of the Participant</th>
<th>Course Observed</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Class Size</th>
<th>Course Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>Ms.G.Aruna</td>
<td>Listening and Speaking</td>
<td>Tamil Medium</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Technical English Listening and Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.S.Anjana Devi</td>
<td>Listening and Speaking</td>
<td>Tamil Medium</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Technical English Listening and Speaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.A.Christoper Amal Dass</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>English Medium</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Technical English Intensive reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.A.Anbuselvan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.V.Subramanian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the College</td>
<td>Name of the Participant</td>
<td>Course Observed</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>Course Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAE</td>
<td>Mrs.K.Venkatalakshmi</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>English Medium</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Close reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.V.E.Kesavan</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>English Medium</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Advanced Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.J.Edwin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr.S.Sankar</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMK CET</td>
<td>A.Ramadevi</td>
<td>Technical English</td>
<td>Tamil Medium</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Technical English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V.Jayalakshmi</td>
<td>Listening and Speaking</td>
<td>Tamil Medium</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Technical English Listening and Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.Anitha</td>
<td>Listening and Speaking</td>
<td>Tamil Medium</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Technical English Listening and Speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Arasi</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>English Medium</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Extracts from Willie Stone, by R.L. Duffus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.Ruby</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>English Medium</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Advanced Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.Usha Menon</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.Alamelu</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>English Medium</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Intensive Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J.Lakshmi</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>English Medium</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Advanced Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L.Jaishankar</td>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>English Medium</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hand out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.Kavitha</td>
<td>Advanced Reading and Writing</td>
<td>Tamil Medium</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; and 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Advanced Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T.Anuradha</td>
<td>Listening and speaking</td>
<td>Tamil Medium</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Technical English – listening and speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.Kalpana</td>
<td>Advanced Reading and Writing</td>
<td>Tamil Medium</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; &amp; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Advanced Reading and Writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7. PROCEDURE FOR QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

Qualitative analysis was interpreted by Taylor and Bogdan (1998) as a dynamic process of inductive reasoning, realized through coding as well as the process of analyzing the generated data by classifying, reducing and summarizing. Strauss and Corbin (1998) argue that data coding can be conducive to generating theory, concepts and themes as well as testing a hypothesis rather than proving it. As an analytic process, coding is used to describe the particular activities in data analysis involving inference or explanation which allow certain ideas or theories to emerge (Miles and Huberman, 1994).

In this study, open coding and axial coding are applied to interview analysis. All the interviews were first transcribed and then coded in Tamil. 3 interviews (2 from pilot and 1 from main survey) were translated into English as samples to avoid subjectivity during the coding process.

Attached to each Tamil interview transcript was the interview summary in English, serving as a guide in identifying answers to the research questions. This enabled me to trace back the original data easily provided by different informants when doing the data analysis. The researcher started coding the interviews by reading through the Tamil transcripts, and then highlighted the parts related to individual research questions and wrote down the research question numbers, together with key words or phrases in Tamil. The Study then found out the regularities and patterns that emerged as themes and classified them into categories in relation to individual research questions within a framework influenced by Grounded Theory (Strauss, and Corbin, 2000).

These themes and categories were then organized and translated into English. In terms of the analysis of the observational data, as mentioned before, the researcher listened to the recording of the observed class after each observation and wrote up a full description based on the recordings and field notes. The researcher then coded the observational descriptions in the same way as the study coded the interview transcripts. In the rest of this section, this thesis will present an overview of the themes and categories that emerged from the data analysis.
Overview of themes and categories

1. Themes and categories emerging for RQ1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Overall perceptions of CLT</th>
<th>Contributions of CLT to good language teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared perceptions</td>
<td>Particular perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>There is a general perception that CLT is a vague yet practical approach, laying the focus on language function, with the features of being learner-centered, interactive and loose with regard to grammar. CLT – oriented activities take a great variety of forms</td>
<td>1. Misconception of CLT; 2. Seeming-communicative approach; 3. CLT is harmonious with Second language Confucianism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Themes and categories emerging for RQ2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Challenges and constraints on CLT adoption in the Engineering college EFL context</th>
<th>Second language teaching experience teacher and CLT implementation</th>
<th>Different views on the appropriateness of CLT in the Engineering College EFL context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Themes</td>
<td>CLT poses great challenges to both teachers and learners in terms of language proficiency, teaching techniques and procedures</td>
<td>Second language teaching experience can be conducive to enhancing teachers’ CC, IC and critical thinking in general, the elements that are considered as essential to implement CLT effectively. However, participants with different background hold different views on the effectiveness of second language teaching teachers’ experience in terms of CLT implementation.</td>
<td>A. Positive It is important and relevant appropriate for Second language EFL teachers to teach Communicatively. B. Negative CLT is inappropriate in the I year B.E. /B.Tech students’ EFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Challenges and constraints on CLT adoption in the Engineering college EFL context</td>
<td>Second language teaching experience teacher and CLT implementation</td>
<td>Different views on the appropriateness of CLT in the Engineering College EFL context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Themes     | CLT poses great challenges to both teachers and learners in terms of language proficiency, teaching techniques and procedures | Second language teaching experience can be conducive to enhancing teachers’ CC, IC and critical thinking in general, the elements that are considered as essential to implement CLT effectively. However, participants with different background hold different views on the effectiveness of second language teaching teachers’ experience in terms of CLT implementation. | A. Positive  
It is important and relevant appropriate for Second language EFL teachers to teach Communicatively.  
B. Negative  
CLT is inappropriate in the I year B.E. /B.Tech students’ EFL context.  
C. Eclectic  
Teachers should be able to adjust their ways of teaching in accordance with the changing needs of teaching context. |

C. Eclectic  
Teachers should be able to adjust their ways of teaching in accordance with the changing needs of teaching context.
Themes and categories emerging for RQ3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Ways of teaching which reflect CLT as reported</th>
<th>Classroom practice as observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Themes                      | Learners are paid great attention to according to participants’ report. | A. Shared teaching practices and classroom activities  
  - The observed teaching practices and classroom activities reflect ‘communicative ideas’ in a general way.  
  - There are similarities across all the participants in terms of their ways of teaching, while there are also differences between groups of different institutional backgrounds.  
  B. Complexity reflected in various teaching practices  
  - Some of the observed teaching practices reflect the phenomenon of ‘seeming-communicative’ and ‘pluralistic teaching’.  
  - What is CLT in the participants’ mind does not mean CLT in Engineering College Context. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Ways of teaching which reflect CLT as reported</th>
<th>Classroom practice as observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Themes                      | Learners are paid great attention to according to participants’ report. | A. Shared teaching practices and classroom activities  
  - The observed teaching practices and classroom activities reflect ‘communicative ideas’ in a general way.  
  - There are similarities across all the participants in terms of their ways of teaching, while there are also differences between groups of different institutional backgrounds.  
  B. Complexity reflected in various teaching practices  
  - Some of the observed teaching practices reflect the phenomenon of ‘seeming-communicative’ and ‘pluralistic teaching’.  
  - What is CLT in the participants’ mind does not mean CLT in Engineering College Context. |
In this chapter, the study has discussed the advantages of adopting case study method for this research. The study then rationalized the instruments and procedure of data collection for both the pilot study and the main survey. The research mentioned the problems encountered in the pilot study and specified the reasons for the change made to the interview questions. This research then explained how the data were analyzed and presented an overview of the categories emerging from the data analysis.

In the next three chapters, the study will present the findings for the three research questions, presenting them in terms of the emerging categories and subcategories, and provide some initial discussion relating to how the findings seem to echo the relevant CLT theories appearing in the literature. This aims to provide general basis for the overall discussion carried out later (in chapter 7).