Chapter 5
Methodology
1. Introduction

This chapter includes the measures used for gathering data, the ways population has been defined and sampled, the kinds of data relevant to the study, and the statistical techniques to be used for data analysis.

This chapter describes the design and plan of the study and highlights the details about the research procedure followed in conducting the study. It includes information about the population, method of selecting samples, description of research tools, data collection procedure and statistical techniques used for analysis of data.

The design of the study was set under the following sections:

5.1. Methodology
5.2. Tools
5.3. Group size
5.4. Sampling
5.5. Settings
5.6. Research ethics
5.7. Procedure
5.8. Statistical tests
5.9. Hypothesis testing

5.2. Methodology

The study has adopted qualitative analysis alongside the quantitative analysis in order to support quantitative data analysis by providing much detailed and rich data in the study matter. The quantitative data was gathered through the distribution of questionnaires among the learners and teachers of Aligarh Muslim University, A.M.U, Aligarh. SPSS version 20 software was used for all the analysis. Various tests were applied in order to get the results, alongside, doing a comparative data analyses. The t-tests and ANOVA were applied to compare the ESL and EFL learners’ self-regulated learning, self-reflective practices, and self-efficacy in writing, at the level of their target group (ESL/EFL), gender, grade (under-graduation/post-graduation) and socio-economic background (occupation/qualification of parents).

The data of the teacher questionnaire was also put to analysis in the spss software. The analysis was done to obtain a more detailed explanation of the teachers’
responses to the teaching and learning practices in writing and self-regulated learning, self-reflective practices of their learners in writing.

Apart from the questionnaire survey, the study has also adopted the interview technique for performing the qualitative research. The secondary data sources were explored in which the method adopted for the data collection is an audio recording of the interview sessions held between the researcher and the participants. Another type of qualitative data was collected from the teachers through the questionnaire method. The teacher questionnaire consists of two sections, one for the quantitative data collection, consisting of objective type questions with a Likert scale of 5. Another section of the teacher questionnaire is subjective in nature that consists of three subjective questions to which teachers were supposed to respond according to their classroom observation and teaching pattern. The analysis for this followed the pattern of qualitatively analyzing all the written responses given by the teachers. The researcher shortlisted participants and incorporated each variable of the study like; background (ESL/EFL), level (under-graduation/post-graduation), and gender (male/female). All of these variables were taken care of while selecting the participants for the interview. Each variable was included while selecting the participants, and overall 11 participants were selected to take part in the interview respectively. The analysis of the qualitative data was done by paraphrasing and providing an interpretation of participants’ responses (Audio & Written).

The interview included prepared structured cum discussion questions, which the researcher asked the learners one by one. The researcher gave full freedom to the participants to elaborate their answers which paved the way for detailed discussions. The participants were more at ease and took this interview very seriously unlike the questionnaires, where the participants tend to get non-serious and are not one hundred percent honest with their responses. The interview technique is a more personal way to interact and become aware of the participants’ writing practices. The researcher wanted to go in-depth with the writing practices of the participants at different levels and backgrounds. The interview technique was adopted for various reasons and advantages of this technique:

(1) The interview is synonymous with the qualitative of rigor and high quality of data gathering.
(2) It provides great emphasis on the subject matter.
(3) Complements and supports the quantitative analysis.
(4) Participant-researcher face to face contact is helpful in coming more personal to the writing practices of participants.

(5) Participants are more elaborate and conscious of their answers. The qualitative data was backed up by quantitative results of the study, to achieve a much solid ground.

5.3. Tools

5.3.1. Questionnaires

The questionnaires were developed to analyse the self-regulated learning, self-reflective practices and self-efficacy in writing of the learners. Student questionnaire consisted of three sections which covered self-regulated learning, self-reflective practices, and self-efficacy of learners in writing. The questions were put in such a manner that they captured the attitude of learners towards their self-regulated learning, self-reflective practices, and self-efficacy in writing. The learners’ questionnaire consist of 61 questions and teachers’ questionnaire consist of 25 multiple choice questions and 3 subjective questions respectively. The teacher questionnaire consisted of three sections as well, the third section dealt with the subjective questioning, rest of the two sections dealt with self-regulated learning and self-reflective practices employed by teachers and their learners in the teaching and learning of writing in a writing classroom. The teacher questionnaire collected the opinions and attitudes of the English teachers towards efficiency levels of their students in writing tasks and what initiatives and techniques teachers implement in the writing classroom in order to develop self-regulated learning and self-reflective practices in writing among learners.

5.3.1.1. Validity and Reliability

The validity and reliability of the responses was calculated. The Cronbach’s alpha calculated for the students’ questionnaire was 0.916 and for the teachers’ questionnaire 0.914. Both the values confirm the reliability of the questionnaires. Any alpha value which is either 0.65 or more than this specifies reliability. Question number eight of the students’ questionnaire showed that if it would have been removed, the reliability level would have been raised to 0.917. Questions ten, eleven, and fourteen of the teachers’ questionnaire showed that if they would have been
removed the reliability would have been raised to 0.915, 0.918, and 0.918 respectively. Researcher did not remove these questions because of only negligible increment which could have been achieved by eliminating them.

The study also shows validity and reliability of the distribution of the data and responses of the participants in the questionnaires through normal Q-Q plots and histograms. These graphical representations are used to ensure the validity and reliability of the samples and responses of questionnaires.

**Graph: 5.a. The normal Q-Q plot for the scores of Self-monitoring**

**Graph 5.b. The normal Q-Q plot for the scores of Goal setting and planning**

**Graph 5.c. The normal Q-Q plot for the scores of Self-reinforcement**

**Graph 5.d. The normal Q-Q plot for the scores of Self-Reflection**

**Graph 5.e. The normal Q-Q plot for the scores of Self-efficacy**
Graphs 5.a, 5.b, 5.c, 5.d and 5.e are the Q-Q plots of the responses given by the learners to the questions of the students’ questionnaire. The plots show the approximate normal distribution of the data. As the graphs indicate, the dots that fall on the line shows the normal distribution and those that are falling away from the line, shows discrepancy and disorder in the responses given. The graphs below show negligible discrepancy, therefore, the spread of data is closer to the normal distribution. The first three graphs show the normal distribution for the questions of the sub-divisions of self-regulation (self-monitoring, goal-setting and planning, and self-reinforcement), this is the first half of the questionnaire. The fourth graph shows the normal distribution of the data for self-reflection questions which is the second half of the questionnaire. The last graph shows the normal distribution of the data for self-efficacy questions which is the third half of the questionnaire.

**Histogram 5.i. The normal distribution for the scores of Self-monitoring**

**Histogram 5.ii. The normal distribution for the scores of Goal setting and planning**

**Histogram 5.iii. The normal distribution for the scores of Self-reinforcement**

**Histogram 5.iv. The normal distribution for the scores of Self-reflection**
Histogram 5.v. The normal distribution for the scores of Self-efficacy

Histograms 5.i, 5.ii, 5.iii, 5.iv and 5.v show the normal distribution of the data for the students’ questionnaire. As the histograms show that the lines are crossing the normalcy level which falls under the bell-shaped curve. They cross this normal curve which means that the data is slightly scattered and drifted from the exact normal state. Therefore, this distribution is considered as the approximate normal. These histograms are just another reflection of the Q-Q plots discussed above. Both define the approximate normal distribution is present in the data that has been collected. These graphically represent validity and reliability of the questionnaire and the data gathered through it. The graphs assure good level of validity and reliability as the data is in approximate normal distribution.

Graph 5.f. The normal Q-Q plot for the scores of Self-regulation

Graph 5.g. The normal Q-Q plot for the scores of Self-reflection
The Q-Q plots for the teachers’ questionnaire (5.e and 5.f) show the approximate normal distribution of the data. The plots show the approximate normal distribution for self-regulation and self-reflection portion of the questionnaire as separate. These assure validity and reliability of the teachers’ questionnaire and the data gathered through it.

5.3.2. Interview
The tool used for collecting the qualitative data in this study was a smartphone with an audio recording application. All the interviews were recorded with the same phone and were saved for further reference and analysis by the researcher. The data that has been analyzed is in the following chapter six of the thesis. Some extracts are taken from the recorded data and rest is paraphrased and interpreted by the researcher. The researcher has gone very carefully through each recorded data and its content was interpreted with utmost care in order to include all the relevant aspects and points delivered by the participants. The researcher has taken all the views and statements made by the participants and have interpreted them by showing the importance and connecting it with the study’s concern and area; the way qualitative data supports the quantitative data is interpreted by the researcher.

5.4. Group size
The group size for questionnaire survey was 285 participants consisting of ESL and EFL learners both male and female at under-graduation and post-graduation level. Twenty teacher participants were taken for the teacher questionnaire survey. The interviews were conducted in groups and also with the solo participant. The participants who were interviewed in groups belonged to the same background (ESL/EFL) and level (under-graduation/post-graduation). One group was mixed where there were two female learners and one male participant. In another group, there were two male participants. Rest of the interviews were done solo with a single participant. In total there were 5 female and 6 male participants who took part in the interview.
Table 5.a. Frequency distribution score for Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 5.1.a. Frequency distribution for gender group

Table 5.a shows the frequency distribution for gender. The study has a sample size of 285 participants out of which 138 are males and 147 are females. Graph 5.1.a is the bar-graphical representation of table 5.a. In this study the ratio of females is larger than males.

Table 5.b.
Frequency distribution score for Target Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.b. shows the frequency distribution for target group. The study has a sample size of 285 participants out of which 209 are ESL learners and 76 are EFL learners. Graph 5.1.b. is the graphical representation of table 5.b. In this study the ratio of ESL learners is higher than EFL learners.

Table 5.c.

Frequency distribution score for Proficiency group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.c. shows the frequency distribution for proficiency group. The study has a sample size of 285 participants out of which 192 are UG (under-graduation) learners
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**Table 5.d.**

**Frequency distribution for Fathers’ occupation group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fathers’ occupation group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low academics</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average academics</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Academics</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good academics</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.d Table shows the frequency distribution for father’s socio-economic group. The study has a sample size of 285 participants out of which 55 comes from a socio-economic background whose fathers had very low academics, 89 from average academics, 53 from average academics, and 88 to good academics. Similarly table 5.e shows the frequency distribution for mothers’ socio-economic group. The ratio for very low academics is comparatively higher than the rest of the groups. The socio-economic groups are categorised on the basis of academic qualification and occupation of the parents. Under fathers’ socio-economic group, the high academics group includes advocates, doctors, engineers, teachers, civil servants, school principals, pilots and accountants. The average academics group includes librarians, section officers, servicemen, policemen, managers, computer programmers and soldiers.

and 93 are PG (post-graduation) learners. Graph 5.1.c. is the graphical representation of table 5.c. In this study UG learners’ ratio is higher than PG learners.
Table 5.e

Frequency distribution for Mothers’ occupation group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very low academics</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average academics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Academics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good academics</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The below average academic group includes businessmen, post-men, salesmen, swim instructors, chefs, and laborers. The very low academics group includes masons, farmers, barbers, weavers, and grocers.

Under mothers’ socio-economic group, the good academic group includes doctors, civil servants, teachers and social workers. The average academics group includes service-women, stenographers, and managers. The below average academics group includes housewives, post-masters, and businesswomen. The very low academic group includes housewives and weavers.

Table 5.f. Frequency distribution score for Teachers’ experience group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;=x&lt;10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&lt;=x&lt;15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15&lt;=x&lt;20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x&gt;=20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.1 shows the frequency distribution for teachers’ sample size and the categorisation of the groups. The sample size for teachers was taken 20. Teachers’ years of experience was taken as the dependent variable for testing the level of self-regulation and self-reflection in the writing of ESL and EFL learners. The categorization of the teachers’ data was done on the basis of their work experience in teaching. The categories include teachers with 5 years or less experience (<5), with 5 to 10 years experience (5<=x<10), with 10 to 15 years experience (10<=x<15), with 15 to 20 years of experience (15<=x<20), and with more than 20 years of experience (x>=20).

5.5. Sampling
A total number of 300 questionnaires were distributed among the ESL and EFL learners out of which 285 were shortlisted and considered appropriate for the analysis. Another set of teacher questionnaires was distributed among the teachers and 20 questionnaires were collected back. The collected data was then put to analysis by the researcher.

A total of 8 audio clips of researcher-participant interviews were recorded. All the recorded interviews were analyzed by the researcher and included in the research study. 20 written scripts were analyzed by the researcher. These scripts included three subjective questions for which responses of 20 teachers were collected and analyzed for the research study.

Written drafts were also collected from the learners to study and relate them with the quantitative and qualitative findings and results of the study. The researcher included some drafts in the study and studied its style, techniques and structure implemented by the learners, and identified the relation of what the results have to say with respect to it.

5.6. Setting
The questionnaires were handed over to the learners individually, and, were then collected from them after some time gap at the convenience of the learners.

The settings chosen by the researcher for the interview was according to the convenience of the participants and the convenience of the location to avoid any disturbances while the recordings were made. All the settings were natural and were
within the university’s premises. Therefore, all interviews were done within the settings of classroom and library.

5.7. Research ethics

This kind of research which entails especially collecting audio recordings certainly impinges upon the private space of the participants, which they might not feel comfortable to share or reveal. Therefore, every possible step was taken to maintain the confidentiality of the sources’ names and other personal details in both the survey settings (quantitative/qualitative). The researcher has only revealed the details that were of concern for this study, that too after having full consent from each participant. Participants were given assurance that there would be no act of misuse of the collected data at any stage by the researcher and that this data will be used for research purpose alone.

In the interview setting before any data was recorded, each participant was informed about the contents of the interview and each one of them was apprised of this research study, its purpose, aims, the confidential and the voluntary nature of their participation and of their right to withdraw at any point of time during the interview. Participants’ identity information such as their names were kept confidential in both kinds of surveys (qualitative & quantitative). Furthermore, before the interview was started and its recording was made, an oral consent was taken from each participant to confirm their willingness to participate in this audio-recorded interview.

5.8. Procedure

Prior to the collection of data, the participants were again reminded of their rights to withdraw from participation at any time that their identity and other details would be kept confidential and would strictly be used for research purposes only. The participants were provided opportunities to make inquiries about nature, purpose, aim, the implications and other related concerns about this study. The study adopted two analysis methods; quantitative and qualitative. Data for the quantitative analysis was collected through questionnaire survey. It was done through individually distributing the questionnaires among the learners and the teachers. Data for the qualitative analysis was collected through conducting interviews. The interviews were recorded through audio recording application of a Smartphone. Each interview followed similar
pattern, where researcher asked questions and participants were supposed to answer them. The researcher also comforted participants by saying, that, “we can pause in between whenever you like to take a timeout or need a pause to think about what you are going to answer”. The interview followed a structured approach, but in between of the sessions, it got unstructured as the interviewees somewhat extended their answers. This resulted into interviewer and interviewee to get in a detailed discussion. This was broadly related to their self-regulated learning and self-reflective practices in writing. The interview never got digressed from the topic and its concern. The researcher asked 17 questions to the learners. The participants responded to all the questions and answered all the questions by keeping their own writing practices in mind.

The interview consisted of eleven participants. The participants were shortlisted randomly from the people who took part in the quantitative survey of the study through questionnaire method. The participants were selected keeping in mind the concern and objectives of the study. It focused on ESL and EFL learners, studying at under-graduation and post-graduation level in various subjects, such as; Literature, ELT, Linguistics and Psychology. All the participants both EFL as well as ESL, who took part in the surveys, had English as their main subject or as an optional subject.

All the interviews were audio-recorded by the researcher. The researcher did a qualitative analysis of all the interviews and transformed them into a paraphrased form of all the responses in the question wise manner. All the 11 responses were taken together and analyzed by the researcher. A summary of the interviews has been presented in chapter six. Chapter six contain explanations and interpretations on the basis of writing skills and practices of ESL & EFL learners. The analysis of the responses has followed a question wise interpretation. The researchers took all the answers and combined them to break them into relevant units of meanings which state the main ideas and points related to the study’s concern.

The researcher has also collected written drafts from the participants. The written drafts consisted of participants’ personal writing (for example; prose, poetry, journal) and academic writing which they do (for example; note-making/note-taking, writing assignment/project and other kinds of academic writing; article/research paper etc). The researcher went through all these written drafts and has attached the relevant ones in the chapter and appendix of the thesis. For the interpretation, the researcher has also attached some of the drafts along with the interpretation of the texts for
giving a clearer view on participants and their compositions. The researcher has used some parts of the learners’ drafts within the chapter, and had used them to justify, what the participants meant when they said a particular thing, and if, they actually follow all that in their writing tasks.

5.9. Statistical tests

The questionnaires were filled quite appropriately by the participants. They provided answers to all the questions. For the analysis of the data the SPSS version 20 software was used. Significance levels (p values) were calculated to test the hypothesis of the study. The t-test and ANOVA were applied to test the level of significance (LOC) for the scores. To apply t-test and ANOVA the data has to be continuous, therefore, the researcher has taken the collective sums of the groups and their sub-categories. Moreover, there is an assumption that to apply ANOVA we need to check the homogeneity of the variances. Mann Whitney’s U test and Kruskal Wallis test was applied on individual questions to test their significance level. The researcher applied the Mann Whitney’s U test to target group, gender group, proficiency group and Kruskal Wallis test was applied to parents’ educational level group to analyze if any statistical significance lies among the variables at the individual question level. Mann Whitney’s test is applied when there are two variables and Kruskal Wallis test when there are more than two variables. Null hypothesis ($H_0$) was tested and alternative hypothesis($H_a$) was formulated for the study. To test the hypothesis that ESL and EFL learners were associated with statistically significantly different levels of self-regulation and self-reflection, an independent samples t-test was performed. Each table is distributed in the pattern that interprets the results obtained after applying the tests in spss. The results were obtained on the basis of variables that are displaying the level of difference among the ESL and EFL groups, under graduation and post graduation groups, gender groups and parents’ education groups. These were the dependent variables, at each level that distinguished the nature of analysis and its results were carried out. These variables remained constant for the groups, basing the hypothesis on these variables and deriving out the assumptions that the learners’ self-regulation and self-reflection capability would differ at these levels. In order to carry out the differences among the target learners the data was obtained and was analyzed on the basis of these dependent
variables to make the comparison. These dependent variables include the target group (ESL and EFL), the proficiency level (under-graduation and post-graduation), gender, and parents’ educational level. The differences in the mean (X) standard deviation (SD) and the level of significance were tested. The data was tested at these levels, showing the statistical difference among the ESL and EFL learners and their capability to self-regulate and self-reflect their writing.

Apart from the aspects of self-regulation and self-reflection in writing, the research has also added another interrelated aspect which contributes and affects the efficiency level of writing among the learners of different backgrounds and groups. Relating to the present study then, the groups include the heterogeneous group of ESL & EFL learners belonging to various backgrounds and level. That third aspect is self-efficacy. According to Bandura's social cognitive theory, self-efficacy and self-regulation are key processes that affect students’ learning and achievement (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2007).

Self-efficacy leads to the development of self-regulation and self-reflection. The more the level of self-efficacy the higher will be the level of self-regulation and self-reflection. Self-efficacy influences the cognitive processes of learning. The effects of self-efficacy beliefs on cognitive processes take a variety of forms. Much human behaviour, being purposive, is regulated by forethought embodying valued goals. Personal goal setting is influenced by self-appraisal of capabilities. The stronger the perceived self-efficacy, the higher the goal challenges people set for themselves and the firmer is their commitment to them (Bandura, 1994. P4). Self-efficacy boosts the motivation and self-appraisal of the learners. It helps them to take charge of their learning and actions and direct their own actions by generating the beliefs of motivation and self

5.10. Hypothesis Testing

The study has developed null hypothesis.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$ is formulated in the manner which states that there is no difference between the selections thinking of categories on sums of divisions. (No difference between the categories and the options they choose).

Whereas, Alternative Hypothesis $H_A$ states that there is a difference between the categories.
In the present study, the categories were the groups or variables formed on the basis of target group (ESL and EFL), proficiency group (under-graduation & post-graduation), gender group (male & female), socio-economic group, and teachers’ group (divided on the basis of their teaching experience).

Based on p values we reject or accept null hypothesis. By default we take level of significance as 5% or 0.05. If the p-value is less than 0.05 then we reject the null hypothesis. Furthermore, to conclude that there is a significant difference between the categories of each factor.

For the present study, statistically, there was no significant difference found among the variables. A very marginal difference can be seen in the calculated scores but, this does not imply the significant variation among the groups. Chapter VI discusses the results obtained from quantitative and qualitative analyses and its interpretations.