CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1 The Study in Retrospect
6.2 Conclusions based on Findings
6.3 Tenability of the Hypotheses
6.4 Educational Implications of the Study
6.5 Suggestions for Further Research
This chapter presents the summary of the study. It briefly outlines the various aspects of the study conducted, arrives at conclusions based on the findings, tests the tenability of the hypotheses formulated, gives the educational implications of the study and presents suggestions for further research.

6.1 The Study in Retrospect

The study was an attempt to find out the effectiveness of Web Integrated Language Learning on the variables English Language Anxiety, Interest in English and Achievement in English among Secondary School Students. Three hypotheses were formulated for the study that are presented in the introductory chapter (Chapter 1, pp 11 to 12). Effort was taken to realise three objectives that are also detailed in Chapter 1 (pp 12 to 13).

Methodology

The Experimental Method with the Pretest–Posttest Non-equivalent Groups Design was adopted was for the study. Stratified Random Sampling Technique was used for selection of the sample giving due representation to Gender, Locale of School and Management of School. The sample comprised 260 Secondary School Students of Standard IX studying the State Syllabus of Kerala.

The variables involved in the study included independent and dependent variables. The independent variables were Web Integrated Language Learning and Activity Oriented Method of Learning while the dependent variables were English Language Anxiety, Interest in English and Achievement in English.

The materials and the tools used for the study were: 1. Lesson Plans for Web Integrated English Language Learning, 2. Lesson Plans for Activity Oriented Method of Learning English 3. Scale on English Language Anxiety, 4. Inventory on Interest in English, and 5. Test on Achievement in English.
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The statistical techniques employed for analysis of data included Arithmetic Mean, Standard Deviation, Critical Ratio (t-test), Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA).

6.2 Conclusions Based on the Findings of the Study

The major conclusions that emerged out of the study are given below.

Conclusion 1: English Language Anxiety is significantly reduced by Web Integrated Language Learning as compared to Activity Oriented Method of Learning among Secondary School Students for their Total Sample, Sub Samples of Gender, Locale of School and Management of School as well as for the six Components of English Language Anxiety.

This conclusion is arrived at based on the following findings.

(i) Total Sample

6.2.1 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly \( (t=18.081, P<0.01) \). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group \( (M_E=94.81, M_C=125.91) \).

6.2.2 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly \( (t=17.127, P<0.01) \). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group \( (M_E=39.31, M_C=8.98) \).

6.2.3 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are \( F_X=0.910, P>0.05 \) and \( F_Y=326.906, P<0.01 \) respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.4 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups \( (F_{YX}=433.77, P<0.01) \) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.
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6.2.5 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=20.54, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_{XE}=96.47$, $M_{XC}=126.20$).

(ii) Sub Samples based on Gender

A. Boys

6.2.6 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=10.721, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=99.53$, $M_C=126.24$).

6.2.7 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=10.391, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=36.2$, $M_C=9.14$).

6.2.8 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are $F_X=0.109$, $P>0.05$ and $F_Y=114.940$, $P<0.01$ respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.9 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups ($F_{YX}=177.93$, $P<0.01$) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.10 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=12.85, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_{XE}=100.81$, $M_{XC}=126.99$).

B. Girls

6.2.11 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=15.504, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=90.45$, $M_C=125.60$).
6.2.12 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=14.007, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=42.18, M_C=8.84).

6.2.13 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=2.241, P>0.05 and F_Y=240.383, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.14 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_YX=279.28, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.15 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=16.86, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_{XE}=92.21, M_{XC}=125.71).

(ii) Sub Samples based on Locale of School

A. Urban Schools

6.2.16 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=13.499, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=93.12, M_C=126.58).

6.2.17 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=12.592, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=37.26, M_C=9.17).

6.2.18 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=0.822, P>0.05 and F_Y=182.220, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.19 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_{YX}=207.56, P<0.01) shows
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that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.20 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=14.07, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M<sub>XYE</sub>=96.03, M<sub>XYC</sub>=127.62).

B. Rural Schools

6.2.21 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=12.063, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M<sub>E</sub>=96.48, M<sub>C</sub>=125.23).

6.2.22 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=11.559, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M<sub>E</sub>=41.38, M<sub>C</sub>=8.8).

6.2.23 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F<sub>X</sub>=0.254, P>0.05 and F<sub>Y</sub>=145.518, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.24 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F<sub>XY</sub>=236.01, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.25 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=15.38, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M<sub>XYE</sub>=96.87, M<sub>XYC</sub>=124.84).
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(ii) Sub Samples based on Management of School

A. Government Schools

6.2.26 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=12.184, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=94.59, M_C=124.47).

6.2.27 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=10.434, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=39.08, M_C=10.88).

6.2.28 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X= 3.064, P>0.05 and F_Y=148.447, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.29 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_YX=151.21, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.30 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=12.51, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_XY_E=94.33, M_XY_C=122.69).

B. Aided Schools

6.2.31 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=13.306, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=95.01, M_C=127.13).

6.2.32 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=13.298, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=39.05, M_C=7.4).

6.2.33 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=0.001, P>0.05 and
Summary, Conclusions and Suggestions

F_y=177.038, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.34 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_{YX}=305.80, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.35 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=16.50, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_{X YE}=98.72, M_{XYC}=129.03).

(iii) Components of English Language Anxiety

Component 1: Listening Apprehension

6.2.36 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=14.58, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_{E}=19.11, M_{C}=24.49).

6.2.37 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=12.85, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_{E}=7.32, M_{C}=2.35).

6.2.38 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_{X}=2.99, P>0.05 and F_{Y}=212.77, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.39 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_{YX}=226.50, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.40 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=15.48, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_{YXE}=19.37, M_{YXC}=24.60).
Component 2: Speaking Apprehension

6.2.41 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=17.79, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=15.19, M_C=21.13).

6.2.42 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=15.96, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=6.52, M_C=0.89).

6.2.43 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=3.35, P>0.05 and F_Y=316.74, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.44 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_{YX}=326.87, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.45 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=18.51, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_{XYE}=15.41, M_{XYC}=21.24).

Component 3: Reading Apprehension

6.2.46 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=15.71, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=10.25, M_C=14.47).

6.2.47 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=14.54, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=5.37, M_C=1.34).

6.2.48 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=1.38, P>0.05 and F_Y=246.85, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.
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6.2.49 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups ($F_{XY}=264.54$, $P<0.01$) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.50 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=16.61$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_{XE}=10.38$, $M_{XC}=14.57$).

Component 4: Writing Apprehension

6.2.51 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=18.68$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_{E}=16.49$, $M_{C}=23.36$).

6.2.52 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=17.82$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_{E}=8$, $M_{C}=1.26$).

6.2.53 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are $F_{X}=0.74$, $P>0.05$ and $F_{Y}=348.94$, $P<0.01$ respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.54 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups ($F_{XY}=414.77$, $P<0.01$) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.55 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=20.21$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_{XYE}=16.77$, $M_{XYC}=23.44$).
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Component 5: Fear of Negative Evaluation

6.2.56 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=15.05, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=5.66, M_C=8.87).

6.2.57 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=14.89, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=4.60, M_C=1.4).

6.2.58 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=0.03, P>0.05 and F_Y=226.41, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.59 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_{XY}=257.51, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.60 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=16.20, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_{XYE}=5.72, M_{XYC}=8.95).

Component 6: Test Anxiety

6.2.61 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=16.51, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=28.09, M_C=33.61).

6.2.62 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=15.41, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=7.5, M_C=1.73).

6.2.63 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=1.20, P>0.05 and F_Y=272.42, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.
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6.2.64 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups ($F_{YX}=316.84$, $P<0.01$) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.65 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=18.61$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_{YXE}=28.17$, $M_{XYC}=34.05$)

Conclusion 2: Interest in English is significantly improved by Web Integrated Language Learning as compared to Activity Oriented Method of Learning among Secondary School Students for their Total Sample, Sub Samples of Gender, Locale of School and Management of School.

The conclusion is arrived at based on the following findings.

(i) Total Sample

6.2.66 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=9.256$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=16.16$, $M_C=11.69$).

6.2.67 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=8.956$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=8.45$, $M_C=2.88$).

6.2.68 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are $F_X=0.090$, $P>0.05$ and $F_Y=85.679$, $P<0.01$ respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.69 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups ($F_{YX}=436.90$, $P<0.01$) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.
6.2.70 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=20.92, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_{XE}=16.32, M_{XC}=11.72).

(ii) Sub Samples based on Gender

A. Boys
6.2.71 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=6.574, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=16.15, M_C=11.11).
6.2.72 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=6.466, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=7.81, M_C=2.82).
6.2.73 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=0.012, P>0.05 and F_Y=43.214, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.
6.2.74 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_{XY}=227, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.
6.2.75 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=15.10, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_{XE}=16.20, M_{XC}=11.23).

B. Girls
6.2.76 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=6.581, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=16.18, M_C=12.24).
6.2.77 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=6.005, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=7.12, M_C=2.95).

6.2.78 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=0.332, P>0.05 and F_Y=43.306, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.79 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_\text{YX}=223.50, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.80 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=14.96, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_{\text{XE}}=16.42, M_{\text{XC}}=12.18).

(ii) Sub Samples based on Locale of School

A. Urban Schools

6.2.81 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=6.692, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=16.39, M_C=12.02).

6.2.82 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=6.501, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=7.42, M_C=2.96).

6.2.83 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=0.037, P>0.05 and F_Y=44.777, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.84 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_\text{YX}=291.40, P<0.01) shows
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that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.85 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly \((t=16.99, P<0.01)\). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group \((M_{XE}=16.62, M_{XC}=12.16)\).

B. Rural Schools

6.2.86 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly \((t=6.417, P<0.01)\). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group \((M_E=15.94, M_C=11.37)\).

6.2.87 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly \((t=6.198, P<0.01)\). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group \((M_E=7.48, M_C=2.82)\).

6.2.88 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are \(F_X=0.048, P>0.05\) and \(F_Y=41.184, P<0.01\) respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.89 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups \((F_{XY}=183.54, P<0.01)\) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.90 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly \((t=13.55, P<0.01)\). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group \((M_{XE}=16.01, M_{XC}=11.30)\).
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(ii) Sub Samples based on Management of School

A. Government Schools

6.2.91 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=6.950, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=16.36, M_C=11.30).

6.2.92 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=6.726, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=7.72, M_C=2.77).

6.2.93 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=0.050, P>0.05 and F_Y=48.298, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.94 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_YX=198.96, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.95 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=14.10, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_XYE=16.19, M_XYC=11.28).

B. Aided Schools

6.2.96 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=6.139, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=15.99, M_C=12.03).

6.2.97 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=5.536, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=7.21, M_C=2.99).
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6.2.98 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are $F_X= 0.363$, $P>0.05$ and $F_Y=37.691$, $P<0.01$ respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.99 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups ($F_{XY}=241.80$, $P<0.01$) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.100 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=15.58$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_{XE}=16.43$, $M_{XC}=12.12$).

Conclusion 3: Achievement in English is significantly enhanced by Web Integrated Language Learning as compared to Activity Oriented Method of Learning among Secondary School Students for their Total Sample, Sub Samples of Gender, Locale of School and Management of School.

The conclusion is arrived at based on the following findings.

(i) Total Sample

6.2.101 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=5.015$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=27.32$, $M_C=20.80$).

6.2.102 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=4.74$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=10.97$, $M_C=4.14$).

6.2.103 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are $F_X=0.076$, $P>0.05$ and $F_Y=25.153$, $P<0.01$ respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.
6.2.104 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups ($F_{YX}=234.59$, $P<0.01$) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.105 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=15.21$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_{XE}=27.62$, $M_{XC}=20.82$).

(ii) Sub Samples based on Gender

A. Boys

6.2.106 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=3.673$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=25.68$, $M_C=18.46$).

6.2.107 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the experimental and control groups differ significantly ($t=3.461$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=10.73$, $M_C=3.87$).

6.2.108 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are $F_X=0.045$, $P>0.05$ and $F_Y=13.495$, $P<0.01$ respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.109 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups ($F_{YX}=104.95$, $P<0.01$) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.110 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=10.18$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_{XE}=25.61$, $M_{XC}=18.83$).
B. Girls

6.2.111 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=3.516$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=28.84$, $M_C=22.97$).

6.2.112 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=2.878$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=11.2$, $M_C=4.38$).

6.2.113 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are $F_X=0.407$, $P>0.05$ and $F_Y=12.365$, $P<0.01$ respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.114 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups ($F_{YX}=127.15$, $P<0.01$) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.115 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=11.21$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_{XYE}=29.48$, $M_{XYC}=22.67$).

(ii) Sub Samples based on Locale of School

A. Urban Schools

6.2.116 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=2.709$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=26.17$, $M_C=21.15$).

6.2.117 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly ($t=2.394$, $P<0.01$). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group ($M_E=10.01$, $M_C=4.47$).

6.2.118 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are $F_X=0.99$, $P>0.05$ and
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\( F_Y = 7.337, \ P<0.01 \) respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.119 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups \( (F_{YX}=74.22, \ P<0.01) \) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.120 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly \( (t=13.55, \ P<0.01) \). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group \( (M_{XE}=28.50, \ M_{XC}=20.39) \).

B. Rural Schools

6.2.121 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly \( (t=4.386, \ P<0.01) \). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group \( (M_E=28.45, \ M_C=20.45) \).

6.2.122 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the experimental and control groups differ significantly \( (t=4.318, \ P<0.01) \). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group \( (M_E=11.91, \ M_C=3.8) \).

6.2.123 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are \( F_X=0.005, \ P>0.05 \) and \( F_Y=19.240, \ P<0.01 \) respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.124 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups \( (F_{YX}=183.65, \ P<0.01) \) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.125 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly \( (t=8.44, \ P<0.01) \). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group \( (M_{XE}=26.72, \ M_{XC}=21.27) \).
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(ii) Sub Samples based on Management of School

A. Government Schools

6.2.126 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=4.74, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=27.23, M_C=19.23).

6.2.127 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=4.35, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=11.62, M_C=4.18).

6.2.128 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=0.152, P>0.05 and F_Y=22.472, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.129 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F_{YX}=143.24, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.130 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=12.05, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_{XE}=26.79, M_{Xc}=19.36).

B. Aided Schools

6.2.131 The Mean Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=2.725, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=27.40, M_C=22.13).

6.2.132 The Mean Gain scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=2.14, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M_E=10.39, M_C=4.1).

6.2.133 The Analysis of Variance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups are F_X=0.342, P>0.05 and
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F\_Y=7.428, P<0.01 respectively. This shows that Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly.

6.2.134 The Analysis of Covariance of the Pre- and Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups (F\_YX=108.78, P<0.01) shows that there is significant difference between the Means of Post-test scores of the two Groups.

6.2.135 The Adjusted Means of the Post-test scores of Students in the Experimental and Control Groups differ significantly (t=10.14, P<0.01). The Experimental Group is superior to the Control Group (M\_YXE=29.47, M\_XCE=22.24).

6.3 Tenability of the Hypotheses

The tenability of the hypotheses is stated below.

Hypothesis I

Web Integrated Language Learning will be significantly more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning in reducing English Language Anxiety among Secondary School Students

i. for the Total Sample,

ii. for their Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale of School and Management of School &

iii. for the six Components of English Language Anxiety, viz. Listening Apprehension, Speaking Apprehension, Reading Apprehension, Writing Apprehension, Fear of Negative Evaluation and Test Anxiety.

The following findings of the study substantiate this Hypothesis.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Finding Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>6.2.1 to 6.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 222 to 223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>6.2.6 to 6.2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>6.2.11 to 6.2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 224 to 224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locale of School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Schools</td>
<td>6.2.16 to 6.2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 224 to 225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Schools</td>
<td>6.2.21 to 6.2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Schools</td>
<td>6.2.26 to 6.2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 226)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided Schools</td>
<td>6.2.31 to 6.2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 226 to 227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components of English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Apprehension</td>
<td>6.2.36 to 6.2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Apprehension</td>
<td>6.2.41 to 6.2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Apprehension</td>
<td>6.2.46 to 6.2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 228 to 229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Apprehension</td>
<td>6.2.51 to 6.2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Negative Evaluation</td>
<td>6.2.56 to 6.2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 230)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Anxiety</td>
<td>6.2.61 to 6.2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 230 to 231)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This hypothesis is converted to null hypothesis to suit the logic of statistical analysis. The hypothesis is rewritten as

“There will be no significant difference between the groups taught using the Web Integrated Language Learning and the Activity Oriented Method of Learning in reducing English Language Anxiety of Secondary School Students for the Total Sample, their Sub Samples and for the six Components of English Language Anxiety”.

The findings numbered 6.2.1 to 6.2.65 indicate that Web Integrated Language Learning will be significantly more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for reducing English Language Anxiety among Secondary School Students for the Total Sample, Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale of
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School and Management of School and for the six Components of English Language Anxiety.

**Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.**

**Thus hypothesis I is accepted.**

**Hypothesis II**

**Web Integrated Language Learning will be significantly more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for improving Interest in English among Secondary School Students.**

i. for the Total Sample,

ii. for their Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale of School and Management of School.

The following findings of the study substantiate this hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Finding numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>6.2.66 to 6.2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 231 to 232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>6.2.71 to 6.2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>6.2.76 to 6.2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 232 to 233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locale of School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Schools</td>
<td>6.2.81 to 6.2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 233 to 234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Schools</td>
<td>6.2.86 to 6.2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Schools</td>
<td>6.2.91 to 6.2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 235)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided Schools</td>
<td>6.2.96 to 6.2.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 235 to 236)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This hypothesis is converted to null hypothesis to suit the logic of statistical analysis. The hypothesis is rewritten as

“**There will be no significant difference between the groups taught using the Web Integrated Language Learning and the Activity Oriented Method of**
Learning for improving Interest in English of Secondary School Students of the Total Sample as well for their Sub Samples”.

The findings numbered 6.2.66 to 6.2.100 indicate that Web Integrated Language Learning will be significantly more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for improving Interest in English among Secondary School Students for the Total Sample, and for the Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale of School and Management of School.

**Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.**

**Thus hypothesis II is accepted.**

**Hypothesis III**

Web Integrated Language Learning will be significantly more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for enhancing Achievement in English among Secondary School Students.

i. for the Total Sample &

ii. for their Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale of School and Management of School.

The following findings of the study substantiate this hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Finding numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td>6.2.101 to 6.2.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 236 to 237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>6.2.106 to 6.2.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>6.2.111 to 6.2.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 238)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locale of School</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Schools</td>
<td>6.2.116 to 6.2.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 238 to 239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Schools</td>
<td>6.2.121 to 6.2.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management of School</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Schools</td>
<td>6.2.126 to 6.2.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aided Schools</td>
<td>6.2.131 to 6.2.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Page No. 240 to 241)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This hypothesis is converted to null hypothesis to suit the logic of statistical analysis. The hypothesis is rewritten as

“There will be no significant difference between the groups taught using the Web Integrated Language Learning and the Activity Oriented Method of Learning in enhancing Achievement in English of Secondary School Students of the Total Sample as well for their Sub Samples”.

The findings numbered 6.2.101 to 6.2.135 indicate that Web Integrated Language Learning will be significantly more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for enhancing Achievement in English among Secondary School Students for the Total Sample, and for the Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale of School and Management of School.

Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

Thus hypothesis III is accepted.

A summary of the tenability of hypotheses of the study follows.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Accepted/Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Web Integrated Language Learning will be significantly more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for reducing <strong>English Language Anxiety</strong> among Secondary School Students for the Total Sample, Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale of School and Management of School and for the six Components of English Language Anxiety.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Web Integrated Language Learning will be significantly more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for improving <strong>Interest in English</strong> among Secondary School Students for the Total Sample, and for the Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale of School and Management of School.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Web Integrated Language Learning will be significantly more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for enhancing <strong>Achievement in English</strong> among Secondary School Students for the Total Sample, Sub Samples based on Gender, Locale of School and Management of School.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4 Educational Implications of the Study

The findings of the study throw light on the fact that Web Integrated Language Learning is significantly effective in reducing Language Anxiety in English, in improving Interest in English as well as in enhancing Achievement in English. This effectivity is also empirically established among the Sub Samples of Secondary School Students based on Gender, Locale of School and Management of School.

The educational implications of the study based on the findings are as follows:

- The findings of the study proved that Web Integrated Language Learning is more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning
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for reducing Language Anxiety in English. Therefore, Teachers should provide adequate web resources for the Students to learn and practice English language. It may help the Students to reduce their Language Anxiety in English.

- The findings of the study revealed that the students who were exposed to Web Integrated Language Learning have lesser ‘Listening Apprehension’, ‘Speaking Apprehension’, ‘Reading Apprehension’, ‘Writing Apprehension’, ‘Fear of Negative Evaluation’ and ‘Test Anxiety’ as compared to those exposed to Activity Oriented Method of Learning. Therefore teachers can utilise the assistance of technology for reducing these aspects of students’ foreign language anxiety.

- The outcome of the present study brings to light the fact that Web Integrated Language Learning is more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for reducing English Language Anxiety for Boys and Girls; Urban and Rural School Students; Government and Aided School Students. So Pre-service and In-service teacher training programme should focus on the importance of web integration in English language learning.

- Teaching of a foreign language like English is a challenging task. Web resources provide simulated learning experience for the Students. Therefore teachers should be provided awareness on various web resources that can be used in English language classroom.

- Web Integrated Language Learning was found to be effective in arousing the Interest of Secondary School Students in the learning of English. So Teachers have to use the assistance of technology to arouse Interest among Students for the learning of English.

- The outcome of the present study brings to light the fact that Web Integrated Language Learning is more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for improving Interest in English for Boys and Girls; Urban and Rural School Students; Government and Aided School Students. So appropriate web assisted learning strategies should be
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included in the revision of curriculum and syllabus for the learning of English.

- The study also proved that Web Integrated Language Learning is more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for enhancing Achievement in English. It is found that Students enjoy Web Integrated English Language Learning. So Teachers should integrate web resources in the teaching-learning process.

- The outcome of the present study brings to light the fact that Web Integrated Language Learning is more effective than Activity Oriented Method of Learning for enhancing Achievement in English for Boys and Girls; Urban and Rural School Students; Government and Aided School Students. Web Integrated Language Learning helps Teachers to provide resource-rich environment to Students for learning English. It equips the Teachers to deliver the content in an effective way, thereby helping learners to understand the content area thoroughly. So Teachers should attempt to offer a resource-rich environment to the Students through the deployment of technological advancement.

- Web Integrated Language Learning provides fun and enjoyment to the Students and makes learning a pleasant experience. It makes the Students eager to receive the content and helps in holding the attention of Students. Therefore Teachers should engage the Students in meaningful web based tasks to provide enjoyment and valuable learning experience to them.

- The Lesson Plans used for Web Integrated Language Learning can be used by English language teachers. English language teachers can also provide various type of web integration in their Lesson Plans.

- The findings of the study pertaining to socio-demographic variables like Gender, Locale of School and Management of School, proved that the study was effective. Thus, measures should be taken to provide information to various educational practitioners regarding the potential of Web Integrated English Language Learning.
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- The Scale on English Language Anxiety and Interest in English and Test on Achievement in English are standardized, valid and reliable tools that can be widely used in English Language Education.

6.5 Suggestions for Further Research

The present study is limited in terms of time, sample size, content selected for study and standard. Keeping in view these limitations of the study and the constraints under which it is conducted, the following studies are suggested for further research.

- Web Integrated Language Learning was used for reducing the language anxiety, improving Interest in English, and for enhancing the Achievement in English among Secondary school Students. Similarly Web Integrated Language Learning can be utilised for Primary and Higher Secondary School Students.

- A study may be conducted on the perception of Educational practitioners and teachers regarding the integration of web resources in the school Curriculum.

- Web Integrated Language Learning was prepared for Secondary School Students. It can also be developed for college level Students.

- Studies on larger samples including other districts and states may be conducted.

- A similar experimental study can be carried out on Students of different types of schools situated in coastal and tribal localities.

- A survey can be conducted to understand the issues involved in the use of Web Integrated Language Learning as a learning tool in the classroom.
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- The effectiveness of Web Integrated Language Learning may also be studied for teaching the concepts related to other subjects in the curriculum.

- A study on the attitude of the Students towards Web Integrated Language Learning can be studied among Students and Teachers.

- The effectiveness of Web Integrated Language Learning on other variables may also be studied.

- Studies on the perception as well as the effectiveness of integrating web resources into Pre-service and In-service teacher training programmes can be studied among Pre-service and In-service teachers.