Chapter VI

Summary of the Study

6.1.0 Rationale of the Study

The learning of ‘English’ language has occupied a significant place in our school curriculum. As the recognized second language, it (English) has its influence in each and every aspect of our lives and livings. The Radhakrishnan Commission (1948-49) observed, “It (English) is a language which is rich in literature - humanistic, scientific and technical. If under sentimental urges we should give up English, we would cut ourselves off from the living stream of ever growing knowledge. Unable to have access to this knowledge, our standard of scholarship would fast deteriorate and our participation in the world movement of thought would become negligible. In fact, it would not be wrong to say that English is a window through which we are able to see the scientific, technological, agricultural, commercial and literary developments taking place to the world”. French (1950) quotes, “Anyone who can read English can keep in touch with the whole world without leaving his own home”. The National Policy on Education (1968) also stressed the importance of the study of English language in these words, ‘Special emphasis needs to be laid on the study of English and other international languages. World knowledge is growing at a tremendous pace in science and technology. India must not only keep up this growth, but also make her own contribution to it. For this purpose, the study of English language deserves to be strengthened’. Now English language has become the global language. Mother Tongue or Regional languages have failed to create market value for themselves, whereas only English is able to achieve it. Knowledge of English is seen to be the key to economic prosperity. So, in our country, the study of English language occupies a very significant place in our whole educational system and more specifically at school stage.

The development of fourfold basic linguistic skills (i.e. listening, speaking, reading and writing) is one of the most fundamental objectives of teaching learning of any language. Stevick (1982) stated that one of the most important tasks of a language
teacher is to help student to build up the basic linguistic skills/competencies from which his/her future performance must flow. Palmer (1926) remarked that “the literary aim of teaching English should not be followed at the school stage. This stage is for linguistic aims only. To aim at language is to pave the way to literature. If we aim at literature in the beginning, we shall miss the way for language. Thus, during elementary stage, teaching of English should concentrate upon training in listening, speaking, reading and writing only. School activities and programmes should direct and develop these abilities in their proper order”. Therefore, it is necessary that the Indian pupil should not only understand English when it is spoken or written but also s/he should be able to speak or write it. Our chief concern should not be about the difficulties of pronunciation, growth of vocabulary, grammar and structure but with language abilities (i.e. listening, speaking, reading and writing). These four basic linguistic skills are not only important but interrelated. Here proficiency in one leads to proficiency in others. So, in the language learning process, these basic linguistic skills are not to be kept in water tight compartment. Those who offer to study English must be equipped with all the skills to use the language (Kohli, 1989). Chesbro (2000) stated that during school stage, learning activities should focus upon the acquisition of basic linguistic skills. Further he stated that here are different aspects of communication but fundamentals are speaking, listening, reading and writing. These communication skills are central to our lives and work; provide support for the development of whole person, the improvement of educational enterprise, being a responsible citizen of the world, both socially and culturally and succeeding in ones career in the business world. The U.S. Department of Labor (1991) identified competencies necessary for solid job performance. Among the competencies listed were interpersonal communication skills, listening and speaking. The National Governor’s Association (1990) has adopted a national educational goal which included a commitment not only to having students communicating effectively but also to demonstrate an advanced ability to communicate effectively. It further specified that achievement tests must not simply measure minimum competencies, but also higher levels of reading, speaking, writing, reasoning and problem-solving. Chesbro (2000)
mentioned that proficiency in communication skills is central to all learning, critically useful to the individual in all areas of life and is a developmental process in which skills acquired early serve as a foundation for subsequent learning activities. So LSRW are the basic linguistic skills that all students must master for academic success. Creativity is that trait of human being which distinguishes him/her from other living beings. Gowan; Demos & Torrance (1967) say that, ‘Of all the powers of man that of creativity seems most unique’. There is some creative urge in all human beings. Different studies (Osborn, 1957; Parnes & Meadow, 1959, 1969; Sullivan & Taylor, 1967; Maltzman, 1960) have shown that creative abilities of the individuals can be enhanced. Sharp (2001) remarked that creativity is increasingly gaining recognition as a human trait that can and should be developed through education. It is viewed as important not only for personal development and fulfillment but also for its contribution to the advancement of society/nation. The recent report from the National Advisory Committee for Creative and Cultural Education (1999) made a number of detailed recommendations designed to support the recognition and development of creativity within the formal and informal education system. The National Curriculum Handbook (QCA, 1999) stated that “the curriculum should enable pupils to think critically, to solve problems and to make a difference for the better. It should give them opportunity to become creative, innovative, enterprising and capable of leadership to equip them for their future lives as workers and citizens”. The Arts Council of England (2003) stated that “Across the world, countries are reforming their systems of education to prepare young people for the increasingly complex and challenging demands of the 21st Century. In many countries, creativity is being given the priority as never before”. Ofsted (2003) recognized the importance of schools promoting creativity. Henderson (2008) reported the need for developing student’s creative skills for 21st century success. The Creative Partnerships in education (CAPE,2004) stated that ‘today’s essential life and work skills include innovation, creative thinking, complex problem solving, imagining what future holds and above all the ability to cope with choice, uncertainty and the unknown’. The Partnership for 21st Century stresses the importance of creativity in its guide 21st Century Skills,
**Education and Competitiveness** that many of the fastest growing jobs and emerging industries rely on workers creative capacity - the ability to think unconventionally, question the herd, imagine new scenario and produce astonishing work. Therefore, students must learn how to imagine the unimaginable and hone their creative talent (Henderson, 2008). Epstein (1993) remarked that creativity occupies the heart of problem solving, students will always have problems to solve; both in their personal and social lives; if you help them develop creative competencies they will be better equipped for the world (Henderson, 2008). The importance of creativity in the education of child has long been felt by the educationists in our country also. Reports of Education Commission (1964-66), National Policy on Education (1986), Programme of Action (1992) and NCERT Curriculum Framework (1987, 2000 & 2005) have all along emphasized the need to develop in child spontaneity, curiosity, independence in thinking, originality, courage to ask questions, scientific temper and in short creative skills and abilities. Hence, the development of creative talents/abilities should be the chief concern of school education.

The teaching of language and literature at the school stage is the best medium through which the creative abilities of the young children can be enhanced. Craft (2000) stated that language is a medium through which possibility can be explored. By possibility, Craft means creative ability. Craft (2000) further remarked that even with very young children it is possible to encourage experimentation, analysis and the expression of feelings - and that the National Curriculum leaves plenty of room for so doing. Chomsky (1965) stated that most of what we hear and speak are created rather than recalled from memory. Therefore, the use of language becomes the most common creative art that all humans possess and exhibit as a regular part of their daily lives. Further, he stated that one of the qualities that all languages have in common is their creative aspect. Thus, an essential property of language is that it provides the means for expressing indefinitely many thoughts and reacting appropriately in an indefinite range of new situations. The procedure for language is not simply one where a single phenomenon comes about; it must simultaneously open up the possibility of producing an indefinable host of such phenomena. Humboldt (1836) also talked about the
creative aspect of language. For him creativity involves ‘infinity’ and he called language an unending and truly boundless domain. Craft (1999) reported that opportunities for developing creativity do exist, even at the most basic levels of language and literacy. As the child’s skill progresses, the opportunities extend, as their more skillful use of language enables them to both explore other people’s composition and create those of their own. Carter (2004) stated that every language user is linguistically creative is a truism, yet the literature on linguistic creativity is not as extensive as one would expect. Further, he stated that linguistic creativity is not simply a property of exceptional people but an exceptional property of all people. Although it was well understood that linguistic processes are in some sense creative but the technical devices for expressing a system of recursive processes were not simply available until much more recently. In fact, a real understanding of how a language can (in Humboldt’s word) ‘make infinite use of finite means’ has developed only within last thirty years. Attempts are now being made for an explicit formulation of the creative processes of language.

The main objectives of teaching English at our school stage are not limited within the development of fourfold fundamental linguistic skill (i.e. LSRW) and linguistic creativity only. However, one of the most important concerns for teaching English to our school students is to enhance their academic performance in English language learning. Since English has now become the part and parcel of Indian sanskriti and it is taught as the second language, so, it is expected that all our students especially at school level should have better academic performance in English. Academic performance in English refers to performance of students relating to various competency areas of English language learning like communication competency, vocabulary competency, grammatical competency, comprehension competency etc. Whether we like it or not, English has genuinely become the language of great prestige in our society because of its influence in every aspects of life. But it is found that students have failed to acquire adequate competence in the area of English language as they have a heritage language that is not English and they are not yet proficient in using English. These discussions clearly state that development of academic
performance in English should be one of our chief concerns of teaching English at our school stage. Technology has wide effect on present day teaching learning process. Teaching learning strategies supported by the use of technologies benefit a lot to the learners in learning environments. A number of benefits for students related to the general use of technology in classrooms have been reported (Salaberry, 2001). These include increased motivation, improvement in self-concept and mastery of basic skills, more student centered learning and engagement in the learning process and more active processing, resulting in higher order thinking skills and better recall (Brownlee-Conyers, 1996; McGrath, 1998; Weiss, 1994). Additionally there seems to be a beneficial multimedia effect, especially for low achieving students when it is used to illustrate concepts and organize factual information. Students also appear to gain confidence directing their own learning (Nowaczyk, 1998).

The use of Technology supportive teaching learning strategies in the teaching learning process of English language is highly realized now days. The Sixth Survey of Educational Research (2007) cites that technology oriented strategy is now widely used for English language learning and more specifically at secondary and higher level of education in India. Stepp-Greany (2002) remarked that the use of technology, especially multimedia, for foreign language instruction has expanded rapidly in the United States during the last two decades. Studies of the effect of technology enhanced instruction on achievement and studies of student attitudes regarding learning with technology have also increasingly been reported (Salaberry, 2001). However, most of these studies have examined the use of only one element of technology and those regarding student perception have been largely concerned with the use of computer mediated communication via e-mail or networking (Beauvois, 1994, 1996, 1998; Cononelos & Oliva, 1993; Kern, 1996; Sanaoui & Lapkin, 1992; Warschauer, 1996).

The use of technology supportive learning for achievement of objectives in the three main domains of language learning i.e. linguistic skills, linguistic creativity and academic performance in the area of language learning has been highly recognized. Its (technology supportive learning) use for the achievement of objectives in these three
domains especially of English language learning has also been recognized to a greater extent. Also research findings suggest that development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity and academic performance in the area of language learning is one of the most fertile areas of research. Warschauer (1996) stated that pedagogy that is supported by the use of electronic technologies as necessary for ESL learners to acquire the linguistic, social and technological knowledge is the key to literacy in a digital world. Stepp-Greany (2002) mentions that use of technology also appear to influence the development of linguistic skills. Kasper (2000) remarked that the use of technology promotes the acquisition of literary skills. Several researches have reported an improvement in student writing skills through the use of networked computers (Beauvois, 1998; Cononetos & Oliva, 1993; Warschauer, 1996). According to Beauvois, students in the networked writing project displayed more fluidity of conversation, more use of complex sentences and more self-disclosure. There have been reports of improvement in reading as well. Lunde (1990) reported that students of Japanese enrolled in a computer-mediated communication project showed improvement in reading comprehension. Beauvois’s study (1994) stated that students expressed an increased confidence in speaking in controlled interactive environment. Further he reported that the increased language use promoted this self-confidence. Sanaoui and Lapkin (1992) also found that considerable growth occurred in French speaking skills and possibly listening and reading comprehension as well. The use of technology in language learning class increases the linguistic creativity in many ways. Berk (1991) stated that children in traditional facts and memory classrooms exhibit less creative behavior than those from non-traditional open classrooms, which offer more choice and hands on experience. Recent researches are looking more toward domain-specific abilities that are fostered and developed through a supportive environment and perhaps through some portion of natural ability. Mellou (1996) remarked that creativity may be nurtured through educational setting in three respects: the creative environment; creative programs; and creative teachers and ways of teaching. For achieving better academic performance in language learning process, the use of technology can be used as the best learning strategy. The Sixth Educational
Survey (2007) mentioned that technology itself became a strategy for enhancing academic performance of the students in the area of English language learning. Parhar (1994) reported positive result of the students learning outcome. The use of multimedia has also proved beneficial for slow learners (Reddy & Ramar, 1997) and as a remedial strategy for overcoming learning disabilities (Bose, 1996). Use of technology increases students motivation as it promotes their active engagement with language and content through authentic, challenging tasks that are interdisciplinary in nature (McGrath, 1998). According to a report published by the United States Department of Education (1995) technology is an important enabler for classes organized around complex, authentic tasks and when used in support of challenging projects, technology can contribute to students since that they are using real tools for real purposes. When students search for information in a hyper linked environment, ESL learners benefit from increased opportunities to process linguistic and content-information. Despite knowing the significance of using technology supportive learning environment, little has been done to assess their impact on student learning outcome (Bryant, Campbell, Kerr; 2005).

From the above discussions, it is clear that the development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity and academic performance relating to language learning are the main concerns/objectives of any language learning. Referring to learning of English language in our country, these concerns/objectives must be highly realized among our students because English is taught as the second language in our country. From the above discussions, it is clarified that technology supportive learning (learning with the help of different technologies but not limited within the use of computer only) is an innovative/learner-centric approach of teaching learning that has wider implication for achieving learning objectives in different areas of study at the school stage. Further, it is inferred that technology supportive learning has a greater impact on language learning. Many of the above-mentioned research evidences state that technology supportive learning can be used as a best method/medium/strategy for developing linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance relating to any language/English language learning. However, from the above discussions it is found
that the development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in English learning are not properly cared at our school stage. Therefore, the researcher is keen to see the effect of a new/innovative/learner-centric approach of teaching learning (Technology supportive learning) for development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in English learning among elementary school students. Hence, the researcher states the problem in the following way:

6.2.0 Statement of the Problem

On the basis of the above research gaps, the present study is titled as: ‘Development of Linguistic Skills and Creativity in English Learning at Elementary Stage through Technology Supportive Learning: An Experimental Study’.

6.3.0 Operational Definition of the Terms Used

**Linguistic Skills**: Linguistic means the scientific study of a language or connection with language. Linguistic skills refer to different performance or skill-areas connected to language. The acquisition of a language is concerned with development of so many types of skills: like vocabulary-related skills, grammatical skills, listening skills, speaking skills etc. Out of which four skills are most important i.e. listening, speaking, reading and writing. Every language acquisition /learning emphasizes on development of these four skills to a maximum extent. In the present study, linguistic skills are understood in terms of four skills relating to a language (i.e. listening, speaking, reading, and writing).

**Linguistic Creativity**: Creativity is an ability of an individual that helps him/her to produce new or original ideas. Since it is a psychological construct, so, it has no any clear-cut referent. However, many psychologists and educationists operationally define creativity in terms of divergent thinking mainly characterized by fluency, flexibility and originality. In the present study, linguistic creativity is understood as the divergent thinking characterized by fluency, flexibility and originality relating to learning of language and literature.
**English Learning:** English learning refers to learning of English language. In the present study, English learning refers to the teaching learning of the language subject ‘English’ at class VI stage.

**Elementary Stage:** Elementary stage generally covers class I to class VIII. Present study is confined to class VI of elementary stage.

**Technology Supportive Learning:** Technology, in general, refers to the use of new, innovative, developed and scientific techniques/strategies/methods/materials (both hardware and software) in different sectors of human life for the development of human kind. Technology supportive learning in the present study refers to the practice of teaching learning with the help of different technological devices (both hardware and software) like computer, slide presentation, power point presentation, use of tape recorder, use of models, charts, projectors etc.

6.4.0 **Objectives of the Study**

The objectives of the present study are:

i. To develop technology supportive learning (TSL) for the development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in English learning.

ii. To study the effect of technology supportive learning (TSL) over usual learning method (ULM) for the development of overall linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.

iii. To study the effect of TSL over ULM for the development of component-wise linguistic skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), linguistic creativity (fluency, flexibility, and originality) and academic performance (prose, poetry and non-detailed) in English learning with regard to pre-test and post test scores.

iv. To study the effect of TSL over ULM for the development of overall linguistic skills and linguistic creativity in different content areas of English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.
v. To study the effect of TSL over ULM for the development of component wise linguistic skills and linguistic creativity in different content areas of English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.

6.5.0 Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses of the present study are:

i. There exists significant difference between mean scores of overall linguistic skills developed through TSL and mean scores of overall linguistic skills developed through ULM in English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.

ii. There exists significant difference between mean scores of overall linguistic creativity developed through TSL and mean scores of overall linguistic creativity developed through ULM in English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.

iii. There exists significant difference between mean scores of overall academic performance developed through TSL and mean scores of overall academic performance developed through ULM in English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.

iv. There exists significant difference between component wise mean scores of linguistic skills developed through TSL and component wise mean scores of linguistic skills developed through ULM in English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.

v. There exists significant difference between component wise mean scores of linguistic creativity developed through TSL and component wise mean scores of linguistic creativity developed through ULM in English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.

vi. There exists significant difference between component wise mean scores of academic performance developed through TSL and component wise mean scores of academic performance developed through ULM in English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.
vii. There exists significant difference between mean scores of overall linguistic skills developed through TSL and mean scores of overall linguistic skills developed through ULM in different content areas of English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.

viii. There exists significant difference between mean scores of overall linguistic creativity developed through TSL and mean scores of overall linguistic creativity developed through ULM in different content areas of English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.

ix. There exists significant difference between component wise mean scores of linguistic skills developed through TSL and component wise mean scores of linguistic skills developed through ULM in different content areas of English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.

x. There exists significant difference between component wise mean scores of linguistic creativity developed through TSL and component wise mean scores of linguistic creativity developed through ULM in different content areas of English learning with regard to pre test and post test scores.

6.6.0 Delimitation of the Study

The study is delimited to following points

i. The study is delimited to the class VI students.

ii. The study is delimited to English medium (CBSE) schools.

iii. The study is delimited to three schools of Malda town of West Bengal.

iv. The study is delimited to co-educational schools.

v. The Study is delimited to the effect of TSL on the development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity and academic performance of the students.

6.7.0 Profile of the Study Area

The present study was concerned with the elementary school level and more specifically it was conducted on class VI students of three CBSE affiliated schools of Malda district. These schools where experiments were conducted were Delhi Public
School (D.P.S.), NTPC, Farakka; Kendriya Vidyalaya (K.V.), NTPC, Farakka; and Kendriya Vidyalaya (K.V.), Malda.

6.8.0 Methodology of the Study

The present piece of research was a quasi-experimental research. In the present study, the researcher had used ‘non-randomized/ unequated-two-groups pretest and posttest design’. The relative effect of Technology Supportive Learning (TSL) and Usual Learning Method (ULM), for the development of Linguistic Skills, Linguistic Creativity, and Academic Performance in English learning of class VI elementary students was studied in the present study. In this study, ULM and TSL were considered as the independent variables; and Linguistic Skills, Linguistic Creativity, and Academic Performance in English learning were considered as the independent variables.

6.9.0 Sample

In the present study, the researcher had followed the purposive sampling method in order to select the sample. The researcher took two sections i.e. Section-A and Section-B of class VI of K.V., Malda; one section i.e. Section-A of class VI of K.V, NTPC; and one section i.e. Section-B of D.P.S. for her experiment. Total 128 students were there in the entire sampling group at the beginning of the experiment. However, 122 students were present in all the stages of experiment. The details of the sample of the present study are given below.

Description of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Purposively selected schools</th>
<th>Name of the learning stage</th>
<th>No. of the sections/ classes taken for experiment</th>
<th>Name/ Category of sections</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>Sections forming the Treatment groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>School-1 (K.V., MALDA)</td>
<td>Class VI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sec- A</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec- B</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Control Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>School-2 (K.V., NTPC, FARAKKA)</td>
<td>Class VI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sec- A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Control Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>School-3 (D.P.S., NTPC, FARAKKA)</td>
<td>Class VI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sec- B</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. 10.0 Tools Used

The study, being an experimental one, necessitated two types of tools as follows:

i. Instructional tools

ii. Testing tools

The instructional tools were used to impart instruction to the treatment groups. The two types of instructional tools used in this present study were –

A. Technology Supportive Learning (TSL)
B. Usual Learning Method (ULM)

Three types of testing tools were used in the study. They were:

A. Linguistic Skills Test in English
B. Linguistic Creativity Test in English
C. Academic Performance Test in English

6.11.0 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher administered pretests on all the groups before giving treatments to them. After that, she taught the experimental group through technology supportive learning and control group through as usual learning method. After the treatments were over, the researcher administered the same pretests as posttests to all the groups. This is how data collection was done.

6.12.0 Techniques of Data Analysis

For the present piece of research work, the researcher has used descriptive statistics like mean, standard deviation, graphical representation of data etc. and the inferential statistics like ‘t’ test, ANOVA, ANCOVA etc. for analysis of the data.

6.13.0 Major Findings and Conclusions

The findings and conclusions of the present study showed the relative effectiveness of Technology Supportive Learning (TSL) and Usual Learning Method (ULM) for the development of Linguistic Skills, Linguistic Creativity, and Academic Performance in English learning of class VI elementary students. Total 40 experimental effects are studied in the present study. All these 40 experimental effects are related to last four
objectives of the study (i.e. study the effect of TSL over ULM for the development of overall linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in English learning; study the effect of TSL over ULM for the development of component wise linguistic skills, linguistic creativity and academic performance in English learning; study the effect of TSL over ULM for the development overall linguistic skills and linguistic creativity in different content areas of English Learning; and study the effect of TSL over ULM for the development of component wise linguistic skills and linguistic creativity in different content areas of English Learning). Relating to the second objective, three experimental effects are studied; relating to the third objective, ten experimental effects are studied; relating to the fourth objective, six experimental effects are studied; and relating to the fifth objective, twenty-one experimental effects are studied. The data analysis referring to all these 40 experimental effects have been made using ‘t’ test, ANOVA and ANCOVA. The Mean level (Raw Mean Level) analysis of the study shows that out of 40 cases, in 39 cases the experimental group did better than control group whereas in one case the control group did better than experimental group. The ANOVA level analysis of the study shows that out of 40 cases, in 28 cases, the experimental group did better than control group; and in 12 cases, there were no significant difference between the control group and the experimental group. However, in no case it was found that the control group did better than experimental group. The ANCOVA level analysis of the study shows that out of 40 cases, in 12 cases the experimental group did better than control group; and in 28 cases, there was no significant difference between the control group and the experimental group. But, in no case it was found that the control group did better than experimental group. Taking into consideration all these inferences, it is summarized that TSL is a better method than ULM for developing linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in English learning at elementary stage.

Master Chart showing the experimental effect of TSL over ULM in English learning based on Raw Mean Scores, ANOVA & ANCOVA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Effect areas of English learning</th>
<th>Experimental Effect sub-areas of English learning</th>
<th>Further division of the sub areas (if any)</th>
<th>Experimental effect based on Raw Mean Scores</th>
<th>Experimental effect based on ANOVA scores</th>
<th>Experimental effect based on ANCOVA scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Linguistic Skills, Linguistic Creativity, and Academic Performance</td>
<td>Linguistic Skills</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Creativity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Wise Linguistic Skills, Linguistic Creativity, and Academic Performance</td>
<td>Linguistic Skills</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Detailed</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Linguistic Skills and Linguistic Creativity in different content areas of English Learning</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Skills</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Creativity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>Linguistic Skills</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Creativity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Detailed</td>
<td>Linguistic Skills</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic Creativity</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Wise Linguistic Skills and Linguistic Creativity in different content areas of English Learning</td>
<td>Prose</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.14.0 Educational Implications of the Study

The findings of this study prove that it is possible to develop linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic achievement in English learning with the help of technology supportive learning strategy. The following educational implications can be drawn from the present study:

☞ The aim of language education at school level should not be the development of language skills only. It should also aim at developing other important language competencies like language achievement, linguistic creativity etc.

☞ Proper care should be taken to develop creative ability of the students through the teaching of different school subjects instead of teaching creativity as a separate discipline.

☞ Due care must be taken to use language as a means for the development of creativity among school students.

☞ Technology supportive learning method can be used to develop linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in language learning.

☞ Appropriate environment should be provided to the children for facilitation of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity and academic performance in language learning.

☞ The teaching learning process of language classroom should focus on development of individual as well as corporate/group creativity among the learners.

☞ Teachers need to be careful while using technology supportive learning method at different school level for developing various abilities of the students.
Policies need to be framed regarding the development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in language learning from national to local level.

6.15.0 Suggestions for Further Research

This piece of research has been conducted in English medium schools of urban setting. This type of study may be extended to many vernacular medium schools as well as schools of rural and semi-rural setting.

This study measures the effectiveness of technology supportive learning over usual learning method for the development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in English learning of elementary school children. But, studies can be conducted to study the effectiveness of technology supportive learning over usual learning method for the development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity and academic performance in English learning separately.

The present study is conducted to know the effectiveness of TSL over ULM for the development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in English learning but, this kind of study may be extended to other areas like science, social sciences, mathematics etc.

The present research work is confined to elementary stage. This kind of study can be conducted at different stages of education like secondary stage, tertiary stage etc.

The researcher has studied the effectiveness of TSL over ULM for the development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in English. Studies can be conducted to judge the effectiveness of TSL over other teaching learning strategies (i.e. synectic method, co-operative method etc.) for developing different types of teaching learning competencies.

The present study does not include background variables like cast, gender, IQ, socio-economic status of the student etc. for comparison. Therefore, a
study may be undertaken to judge the effectiveness of TSL over ULM for developing linguistic skills, linguistic creativity and academic performance in English at elementary stage with regard to background variables like cast, gender, IQ, socio-economic status of the students etc.

A theoretical study may be undertaken to develop sufficient number of TSL activities for developing various abilities of the school students in various subject areas.

A factorial study may be conducted to ascertain the nature of the factors /attributes those contribute to the development of linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in English at elementary stage.

Many other innovative techniques besides TSL like peer to peer learning, co-operative learning etc. can be used for developing linguistic skills, linguistic creativity, and academic performance in English at elementary stage.

*****